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ABSTRACT

The primary focus of this research was to understand a high-performance university development organization. This was done by examining organizational performance and leadership characteristics as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s *Competing Values Framework (CVF)* and by using qualitative methods to identify “best practices” in the organization. Fifteen organizational managers were selected from twelve “high-performance” development sub-units to participate.

(CVF) surveys were completed by and profiles generated for the participants as well as members of the Leadership Prospect Group and individuals that comprised functional layers of management. “Best practices” were studied using qualitative methodologies such as participant observation, document analysis, semi-structured and unstructured interviews. These methodologies were also used to further understand the leadership characteristics of the participants.

The findings identify leadership of the Vice President for Development as the most important and influential characteristic of effectiveness for The Ohio State University Department of Development. Upon arrival to the University the Vice President was largely responsible for establishing four “process” and nine “substantive” best practices that shaped the direction,
performance, and culture of the Development Organization. The most prominent and guiding “best practices” were: dedication to major-gift cultivation, emphasis on teamwork and collaboration, and commitment to alignment of development objectives to academic priorities of the University. These best practices were identified in each development sub-unit studied in this research. The magnitude of these guiding best practices was enhanced when combined with unit-specific innovations and best practices addressing specific characteristics unique to the culture, environment, staffing, budget, and development goals for each of the “high-performance” development sub-units studied.

Cameron (1986), Quinn, (1988 & 1996), and Torbert, (1987, 1991, 1998) all identify organizational leaders as “a” or “the” key ingredient in achieving organizational success and high performance. In this study, leadership was a fundamental dimension for achieving high-performance in this organization. The (CVF) profiles for the Vice President other members of the organization illustrated their abilities of to use multiple frames of reference and translate their insights into purposeful action (i.e., behavioral complexity).
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem
The role of fund-raising for higher education institutions is increasing in its importance. In most other nations, colleges and universities are owned, operated, and funded by the national government; however, in the United States, the responsibility for higher education has been left primarily to private initiative and state government (Worth, 1993). In today’s competitive environment, fund-raising has become the principle means to meet the increasing needs and ambitious goals of American colleges and universities.

Because of declining support from traditional sources, such as state and federal budgets, university leaders across the country have been charged with finding new ways to support their university’s fundamental priorities: research, teaching, and service (Kozobarich, 2000). In an article published in Giving USA Today (2000), The Council for Aid to Education (CAE), citing findings from its annual survey - Voluntary Support of Education 1999 (VSE), estimated that the total 1999 contributions to institutions of higher education rose to an all-time high of $20.4 billion – 10.9% higher than the $18.4 billion given in 1998.
CAE suggests the intergenerational transfer of wealth over the next fifty years will be considerably larger than the widely cited estimate of $10.40 trillion. The article also notes that a study conducted in the fall of 1999 by the Boston College Social Welfare Research Institute calculates that the transfer of wealth between 1998 and 2052 will be at least $41 trillion and could reach as high as $136 trillion.

Clearly, there is a lot of money that possibly could be used to enhance the quality and scope of American higher education. In fact, the San Francisco-based philanthropic research organization Newtithing Group, estimated that in 2000, U.S. tax filers could have comfortably given 80% more than the $143.71 billion Giving USA estimated individuals gave in 1999 (Browne and Kaplan, 2000).

Like most public universities, The Ohio State University engages in strategic and continuous fund-raising activities to support the University’s educational mission and academic priorities. Ambitious campaigns like Ohio State’s five year Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign highlight the transformative impact of fund-raising for colleges and universities. The success of the Ohio State campaign, which raised $1.23 billion, allowed the University to make substantial investments toward its future by using contributions to create 493 endowed scholarships and fellowships and 79 endowed chairs and professorships; and dedicate nearly $150 million toward the improvement of learning environments, and just over $240 million to support teaching, outreach and discovery initiatives (On Campus, 2000).

Gifts received during a campaign are often earmarked for special university priorities and for increasing the size of the institution’s endowment. Large endowments tend to enhance a university’s ability to
compete academically with peer institutions by allowing them to pursue cutting edge programs and research, attract top-notch faculty by offering enticing start-up packages, and offer scholarships and fellowships to talented undergraduate and graduate students. In turn, exceptional faculty, students and initiatives positively influence the institution’s reputation on a national or international scale. Henry Rosofsky, former dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University, a university that enjoys the largest endowment in the country at $19.20 billion (Powell, 2004), puts it this way,

How does an American university rise in reputation and esteem? Money is the sine qua non, and for private universities the size of endowment is a fairly reliable indicator of prestige (p. 228, 1990).

Today the same can be said for public institutions. Institutional capital can influence the caliber of faculty a college or university can interest in joining them. A respected faculty will attract good students, grants, alumni, and public support, as well as national and international recognition. Higher education development organizations typically include programs for annual giving, planned giving, corporate and foundations giving, and major gifts. Jerry May (1997) contends that,

Integrating intradevelopment office initiatives, such as annual funds, planned giving, and capital campaigns, with major gift programs dramatically increase fund raising results (p. 17).

In today’s competitive fund-raising climate, securing major gifts has become the principle means to meet the increasing financial needs of higher education institutions. This has been especially true during periods of economic uncertainty. Buchanan (1993) asserts,

Major gifts can mean the difference between an imperiled cash flow and the constancy of firm revenue. . . . In the scope of the development endeavor, major gifts are not only the sign of a mature and well-planned development operation – they are the mark of an institution that is “going places” in an impressive, dynamic, and sustainable way (p. i).
With over 90 percent of the funds normally given to colleges or universities coming from fewer than 5 percent of the total donors (Smith, 1997), it is not surprising that the magnitude of major gifts and related cultivation strategies have taken on significant importance for higher education institutions. According to Muir and May (1993) a comprehensive fund raising program will encourage individuals to make gifts through a variety of combinations and options over their life-time. This spectrum of options includes:

1. annual gifts from their income to provide for on-going operating expenses;
2. large, significant gifts from time to time throughout their lives to support a special program, facility, or endowment need, and;
3. a portion of their lifetime resources through an estate plan (Muir and May, 1993, p. iii).

The cultivation of donors who can contribute at the major gift level and beyond has become a central focus for many college and university development organizations (Meyer, 1993). Drucker (1990) advocates the use of strategic planning to enable non-profit organizations to focus attention on critical issues; potential and real problems; and decisions to be made about the present and future direction of the organization. Inherent in this assertion is the need for effective leadership. Without effective leadership, organizations can flounder and pursue peripheral or irrelevant goals that ultimately do not benefit the organization.
Leadership

Although the research on high performance leadership and organizational effectiveness will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, it is important to note that Cameron (1986), Quinn, (1988 & 1996), and Torbert, (1987, 1991, 1998) all identify the kind and character of organizational leaders as “a” or “the” key ingredient in achieving organizational success and high performance. Today, the primary objectives and responsibilities of organizational leaders are complex. Leaders are expected to create effective, high-performing organizations that respond quickly and logically, as well as thoughtfully and responsibly to a variety of challenges occurring in an ever-changing competitive and dynamic world. An additional reality of the complexity of leadership today involves the accelerated nature of organizational change. Fast-paced organizational change has forced leaders to refocus their attention toward understanding their internal and external environments more thoroughly than they were required to in the past. Leaders must now fully comprehend domestic organizational pressures as well as outside forces impacting their organization in the “here and now,” while simultaneously accurately forecasting and planning for the future. How can a leader be effective at all of these things? Morgan (1997) believes,

Effective managers have the capacity to remain open and flexible, suspending immediate judgments whenever possible, until a more comprehensive view of the situation arises. They are aware that new insights often arise as one approaches situations from “new angles” and that a wide and varied reading can create a wide and varied range of action possibilities. (p. 4)

The leaders Morgan describes have developed the complexity to use multiple frames of reference while managing their organizations. In contrast, less effective managers tend to use fewer and narrower frames to understand their environments. Consequently, they frequently are
unable to respond to and deal with the full range of issues they will inevitably encounter as managers, especially when compared to managers who take a more dynamic and sophisticated approach.

Effective leaders are those who, given the demands placed on them by society in general and their organizations in particular, are capable of responding with an understanding of the combined situational variables in a way that makes the most sense for the organization and its wellbeing. This kind of leadership involves the behavioral and cognitive complexity to use multiple frames of reference for understanding and responding to the environment. Complexity of this kind holds the potential to transform organizations and leaders alike. To view one’s organization simultaneously through multiple frames is not only challenging and counterintuitive at times, but, for some leaders, it is impossible.

High performance leadership requires the ability to see new possibilities and to create new opportunities for success. The power to reframe is vital for modern leaders because it enables them to discover alternatives in situations that initially appear severely constrained. Leaders who are at home in a variety of domains come to appreciate the importance of planning and goal setting, interpersonal relations, coordination, marketing, politics, and so on. In doing so, they take on a higher level of cognitive complexity (Quinn, 1988; Quinn, et. al, 1996; Torbert, 1987, 1991; Fisher, Merron & Torbert, 1987; Merron, Fisher, & Torbert, 1987; Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 1984). The presence of sophisticated strategic leadership in organizations often is the difference between success and failure.
Not only must organizations transform their strategies as they develop, or as their environment changes, but managers must be capable of transforming their own leadership strategies depending upon the person or organizational unit they are dealing with (Torbert, 1987, p. xvi).

Quinn (1988) and Torbert (1987 & 1991) believe that leaders who are clear about their own strengths and weaknesses, who develop self-understanding, and who lead their respective organizations in balanced and contextually appropriate ways, are most effective at creating and maintaining high performance organizations.

Transformation calls for leaders who have discretion and a vision. It is important to meet both tests. A leader must have sufficient discretion to call for radical change. Vision calls for insight into possibilities. To initiate a transformation, a leader must offer an idea that makes fundamental changes in an organization (Nutt & Backoff, 1997, p. 492).

Quinn (1988) refers to these leaders as “master managers” because they understand and they choose to embrace paradox and ambiguity as fundamental elements of their strategic management practices.

Excellence is a paradoxical phenomenon that emerges under conditions of uncertainty and creative tension. It is also an idiosyncratic and dynamic phenomenon (Quinn, 1988, p. 12).

Master Managers are those rare leaders who can inspire and empower colleagues to co-create an organizational vision that allows everyone to contribute in important and meaningful ways toward achieving shared organizational goals. Master managers are the leaders who have the capacity to engage in what Torbert (1987, 1991) calls *action inquiry*, that is, they have the ability to take action and to inquire into their motivations for action simultaneously; they are the leaders who master the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance (Quinn, 1988).
According to Quinn (1988), organizations are often viewed in very static ways typically characterized by relatively stable, predictable patterns of action. Expectations are for organizations to be governed by, and products of, rational/logical thinking. What exists in reality, however, are contradictory pressures from various sources within and outside of the organization. Master Managers see their organizations as evolving, changing, and dynamic systems. They have the aptitude and ability to adapt to different perspectives. At times they may be very analytical and structured; while at other times they may be intuitive and flexible. If analyzed at one point in time, the actions of these managers may seem paradoxical and considered illogical or contradictory. However, when viewing their leadership as a whole, these contradictory patterns come together in fluid, almost artful ways.

Moving beyond rational management means using multiple frames of interpretation and reference; frames that, in some cases, present seemingly competing values. Quinn (1988) believes the Competing Values Framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Quinn, 1988; Cameron & Quinn, 1999) is a useful mechanism for analyzing and understanding organizational effectiveness and leadership practice, particularly given the competing goals of stakeholders and unpredictable environmental influences in which organizations of all kinds currently operate (see Figures 1.1 and 1.2).
Figure 1.1: The Competing Values Framework for Organizational Effectiveness.

Each of the four models of organizing in the competing values framework assumes different criteria of effectiveness. Here we see the criteria in each model; the labels on the axes show the qualities that differentiate each model. (Source: R.E. Quinn, 1988)
Each of the eight leadership roles in the competing values framework contains three competencies. They, like the values, both complement the ones next to them and contrast with those opposite to them. (Source: R.E. Quinn, 1988)
Quinn (1988) also believes the *Competing Values Framework* offers clear direction for managing change in difficult and turbulent environments. Quinn has developed the *Competing Values Framework*, which can be used for understanding organizations and leadership strategy. He identifies the multiple management perspectives he believes should be in the repertoire of all high performance managers, and provides a view of organizations that illuminates not only the dialectical tensions between opposing leadership roles, but also addresses the potential for leaders to utilize multiple leadership roles. He positions the concept of leadership roles, styles, actions, and strategic postures within four quadrants of value orientations.

It is important to note that very little scholarly research has been conducted examining the leadership characteristics of administrators in higher education development organizations. No research was found that focused specifically on Chief Development Officers, their administrative teams, or development professionals in general that employed the *Competing Values Framework*; therefore, research involving the *Competing Values Framework* will be described in detail in Chapter 2.

**Organizational Effectiveness**

Defining organizational effectiveness in the context of higher education is particularly difficult because institutions of higher education are highly paradoxical in nature (Birnbaum, 1988). By paradoxical Birnbaum means that institutions of higher education need to be innovative and progressive, while simultaneously connected to their histories, new and dynamic leadership as well as management stability, that both specialists and generalists, as well as, both structure and flexibility to foster effectiveness. Additionally, “they have a tradition of resistance to assessments of effectiveness that have kept consensual criteria of
effectiveness from emerging” (Cameron, 1986). In spite of the unique characteristics and challenges of these organizations, higher education institutions must increasingly present evidence demonstrating their own effectiveness to multiple and sometimes very different constituencies. Often, these constituencies serve as diverse and important sources of funding for colleges and universities.

Within higher education the importance of fund-raising, or development as it is referred to in higher education settings, has been steadily increasing over the past quarter century and continues to intensify as economic, demographic, and societal issues have an impact on the missions and goals of institutions of higher education in the United States (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Duronio & Loessin, 1991; Worth & Asp, 1994; Cosovich, 1993). Today development plays a substantial role in the financing of many institutions, often requiring large staffs and budgets. The chief development officer (CDO) of a college or university often is a senior officer of the institution reporting directly to the president with a place in the administrative hierarchy equivalent to that of chief officers for academic, business, and student affairs (Worth & Asp, 1994). The CDO has the responsibility of creating and implementing a strategic plan for successful fund-raising that not only embraces institutional priorities, but also successfully advances them. Nevertheless, there has been little systematic research on the effectiveness of fund-raising practices in higher education.

The most widely used measure of success for higher education development organizations is the amount of money raised by an institution. This measure, however, is inadequate because no norms have been established for comparing dollar amounts. Duronio and Loessin (1993) contend that using the amount of money raised without
norms for systematic comparison eliminates consideration of the
differences between schools in institutional resources for fund-raising
and provides no assessment of how a given year’s results compare with
an institutions potential for raising money. Hence, according to
Cameron (1986), the importance of establishing a foundation for
assessing and reporting on organizational effectiveness in development
will never go away. People are always making judgments about whether,
for example they should make a gift to their Alma Mater. In some cases
philanthropic decisions are based on how well a university’s football or
basketball programs are performing - even when those gifts will not be
designated for athletics programs. In other words, if there is no reported
evidence of success by the institution, then governmental agencies,
foundations, corporations, and private citizens will make assessments on
their own, potentially using inappropriate or irrelevant criteria to reach a
decision.

High performance higher education development organizations may rely
on the visionary, strategic, and administrative leadership of the chief
development officer and identifying the best practices of the organization.
Therefore, a study of the leadership and best practices of a highly
productive organization seems important. What will be the Competing
Values Framework profiles of the leadership of a high performing
development organization be? What are the perceptions of “best
practices” by the staff as well as organizational leaders?

Hence, this study explored the intersection of “best practices,”
leadership, and university development by employing a mixed method
multicase study methodology. This study was designed to provide
insight, description, and interpretation of the leadership characteristics
and *best practices* of a high-performance development organization as a whole and of twelve high-performance development units within the development organization.

**Purpose of the Research**
The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze characteristics of leadership and organizational performance, as well as perceptions of organizational and personal “best practices” as they relate to The Ohio State University Development Organization.

**Focus of Research**
The research foci for this study are The Ohio State University Development Organization as a whole and its twelve sub-units of the organization. The purposes are to facilitate an identification and understanding of the following:

1. the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leaders in each of these twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as perceived by members of the organization;

2. the “best practices” currently in use by the leadership of the Development Organization and by each of the twelve “high performance” development sub-units at The Ohio State University;

3. the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leadership in each of these twelve “high performance” sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s *Competing Values Framework*; and,

4. the organizational effectiveness of the Development Organization overall and for each of the twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s *Competing Values Framework*. 
While the term “high-performance” is somewhat subjective, Katzenbach and Smith (1999), describe the concept as a function of authentic and committed teamwork in which, “The high-performance team significantly outperforms all other like teams, and outperforms all reasonable expectations given its membership (p. 92).” Duronio and Loessin, authors of Effective Fund-Raising in Higher Education (1991) define high-performance higher education development organizations as those whose actual performance exceeds predicted fund-raising results.

Because The Ohio State University has successfully exceeded its goals and predicted fund-raising results in its last two major capital campaigns (effectively outperforming other “like teams”), their development organization was selected as the focus of this research. In 1990, OSU raised $430 million, exceeding its goal by $79 million and completing the largest campaign ever by a public university at the time. In 2000, OSU raised $1.3 billion exceeding its goal by $380 million and becoming one of only a handful of public universities to complete a billion dollar campaign.

This research is intended to be exploratory; therefore, it is important to note that the methods for this study were designed to be appropriate to the topics under investigation, as well as practical and functional. This research focuses on high performance, leadership, and best practices; subsequently, the research methods can be characterized as follows:

1. focus on The Ohio State University Development Organization overall and on twelve development sub-units identified as high-performers with opportunities for follow-up interviews and discussions;
2. allowed participants to articulate in their own words their perceptions of the best practices organizational effectiveness, and leadership characteristics in their particular development sub-unit and in the organization as a whole;

3. allowed for the identification and detailed description of the perceptions and patterns of practice and leadership characteristics in the whole organization and in the twelve sub-units.

Significance of this Study

This study is intended to further the understanding of the characteristics and “Best Practices” of leadership and organizational performance for The Ohio State University Development Organization. The literature is replete with information discussing leadership and organizational performance from a corporate perspective. A much smaller amount of literature exists on the topic of higher education development organizations and leadership, organizational performance and effectiveness. By providing Quinn’s perspective of leadership and organizational performance, as well as insight into individual’s perceptions of organizational leadership and organizational “best practices,” this research may contribute to understanding high performance leadership and organizational performance in the context of fund-raising at a large public research university such as The Ohio State University.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to analyze characteristics of leadership and organizational performance, as well as perceptions of organizational and managerial “best practices” as they relate to The Ohio State University Development Organization. This chapter outlines a review of the scholarly literature most closely aligned to the study: fund-raising in higher education institutions; organizational effectiveness in higher education; organizational leadership; and the Competing Values Framework for Organizational Performance and Leadership.

Development and Public Colleges and Universities

The advancement of the mission and goals of an institution has led to the establishment of divisions of institutional advancement at colleges and universities. A division of institutional advancement for a college or university is responsible for external and internal communications, government and public relations, fund-raising, and alumni relations (Muller, 1986). These various functions are perceived as interdependent and an integral component of the entire campus enterprise. The role of educational fund raising is viewed as developing resources to achieve institutional goals and objectives (Muller, 1986). Hence, the term development is used to emphasize the fact that fund raising is directly related to the educational mission and priorities of an institution. A
division of development is comprised of various development offices and development officers who work toward securing private gifts for advancing important educational priorities of the school.

Dudley Hafner, (cited in Bennis, 1989) executive vice-president and CEO of the American Heart Association, describes development this way:

    Development means bringing the donors along, raising their sights in terms of how they can support you, giving them ownership in the outcome of your organization. That takes a long-term strategy.

The development function of public institutions of higher education is not merely to raise money for the sake of raising money; rather, the purpose of development is to advance an institution’s fundamental priorities: research, teaching, and service (Kozobarich, 2000). Brittingham & Puzzullo, (1990), note that fund-raising efforts on college and university campuses have accelerated in recent history and that,

    Most institutions are growing increasingly dependent on voluntary support: gifts from alumni, friends, and corporate and business firms. What was once the expert domain of private institutions is now common at public colleges and universities (p. xix).

Today public colleges and universities are increasingly more dependent upon philanthropy from private sources to support programs and initiatives that specifically complement and enhance academic and programmatic objectives; provide high quality instruction; support research that impacts and influences communities; and, offer outreach and engagement that changes lives (Kozobarich, 2000; May, 1997; Brittingham & Puzzullo, 1990: Hunter, 1987; Shealy, 1992; Worth, 1993).

Buchanan (1991) writes that an institution should clearly state its needs and then “accept gifts for priority areas and projects only – even if that
means accepting smaller gifts and turning some larger gifts away” (p. 10). Emphasizing the importance of clearly stating institutional needs and relating development activities to these needs, Buchanan asserts,

The most important thing is for everyone to see your goal is clear; that your needs are understandable (and, you hope compelling); and that you can and will measure your progress toward achieving your priority objectives. The least important thing is that your goal is large (p. 18).

Major Gifts Programs
Perhaps the most important component of any development organization is the sophistication, effectiveness and integration of its’ major gifts programs. Major gifts programs play essential roles in the success of today’s development organizations and, therefore are vital to the success of higher education institutions. Nichols (1994) conveys an important point: “a minority of your donors give a majority of your funds” (p. 38). Nichols (1994) goes on to suggest that the key to successful fund raising hinges upon concentrating on “those prospects with the capability and the willingness to give and give big” (p. v). Cosovich (1993) also believes “the single most important component of any educational institution’s development strategy is major gift fund-raising” (p. 1). Meyers (1993) echoes these observations as well, asserting that, “an effective and efficient major gift program is essential to sound development” (p. 16).

The following statistics were reported in Giving USA AAFRC Trust For Philanthropy (2002). In 2001, total giving increased to $212.00 billion. American colleges and universities accrued an estimated $31.84 billion during the 2000-2001 academic year, a one-year increase of close to 1 percent. Gifts to education accounted for 15% of total gifts. Giving by individuals increased to $160.72 billion in 2001, representing a 1.1% increase over 2000. Gifts from individuals represented 75.8% of all
charitable giving in 2001. In identifying major donors, Nichols (1994) advocates focusing attention on individual donors rather than on corporate and foundation giving. Cosovic (1993) also believes “that individuals will continue to be the major source of major gift support for institutions” and will promote the “greatest impact, in terms of both level and purpose of giving” (p. 1).

Nichols (1994) distinguishes between wealthy and affluent donors. She cautions against seeking out only the wealthiest individuals since, “The wealthiest Americans – those who earn more than one million dollars annually – appear to be decreasing the share of their income that goes to charity” (p. 51). Development programs in higher education institutions can be symbolized by a pyramid, as shown in figure 2.1.

There is a general consensus that the top of the donor pyramid has been narrowing in the past two decades. The shape of the pyramid represents the number of donors participating in various categories of giving. The base of the pyramid indicates the institution’s total constituency, including all individuals and organizations that may potentially be interested in providing institutional support.

The constituency of most colleges and universities includes alumni, faculty and staff, parents of students, corporations, foundations, “friends” and other groups. Some percentage of this group supports the annual giving program, providing gifts to support the institution’s current operating budget.
Figure 2.1

*The Fund-raising Pyramid*
Individuals who participate in annual giving may also be promising prospects for major gifts. A much smaller percentage of donors make major gifts. These kinds of gifts are often directed toward institutional priorities, such as specific capital needs, new and renovated facilities, or endowment. Because major gifts have the potential to profoundly transform an institution, most colleges and universities have major gifts staffs that are responsible for the cultivation and securing major gifts for the institution.

If the pyramid were drawn to represent dollars resulting from gifts at each level it would be inverted. During the 1980s, approximately 80% of private gifts came from approximately 20% of the donors. This trend was adjusted in the 1990s to 10% of the donors supplied 90% of the private gifts (Nichols, 1990). Today, the ratio is closer to 95% of private gifts donated by 5% of the donors. The bottom of the donor pyramid remains the same; however, according to Nichols (1990), “the middle of the pyramid is bulging” (p. 15) with increased major gift potential. With fewer dollars in the top five percent of the donor pyramid, the middle segment represents a greater capacity to produce major gift donors.

Major Gift Processes
According to Dunlop (1993) many institutions define “major gifts” differently. Typically a college or university will define the gifts they seek in relation to the amounts that are in proportion to their needs or experience (Dunlop, 1993). In other words, some schools would consider a major gift to be $50,000 and up, while other schools will consider gifts of $1,000,000 and up as major gifts. Based upon their own definitions, colleges and universities establish fund-raising programs that encourage gifts at their own major gift levels.
Development professionals and authors agree that fundamental elements of practice and strategy must be undertaken in order to enhance the success of major gift fund raising programs for institutions of higher education. May (1997) believes one of the most important elements in motivating major gifts prospects is the extent to which the donor prospects have a personal involvement with the institution. One of the most common ways to achieve this is to invite the prospect to serve as a volunteer on behalf of the college or university. As volunteers, prospects can assist in raising money by promoting the institution; recruiting and persuading others to become involved; and by serving on committees and advisory boards (May, 1997). May asserts that,

The significance of volunteering and involvement is no mystery; it leads to commitment, which in turn leads to major gifts (1997, p. 18).

In making a major gift, a donor possesses,

a personal and deep sense of commitment that motivates the giver. . . . This commitment has been nurtured by experience that developed the giver's awareness, understanding, caring, involvement, and sense of commitment (Dunlap, 1993, p. 9).

Dunlop advances seven steps for successful major gift fund raising. They are identification, information, awareness, understanding, caring, involvement, and commitment. The process of major gift fund raising takes time and effort and these seven steps, according to Dunlop (1993), provide an integrated, solid foundation upon which fund raising processes can build relationships between donors and members of the institution that will lead to mutually rewarding and substantial contributions to the college or university.
Hedgepath (1991) advances a cyclic five-step process for major gift work that begins with cultivation and moves to solicitation, negotiation, resolution, accountability, and then back to cultivation. Hedgepath highlights the role of negotiation within the cycle as primarily concerned with “connecting supporters to the educational mission they – and you–believe in” and “far less about money” (p. 42).

Dailey (1990) believes that a major gift solicitation consists of a predetermined process that involves seven sequential steps. The seven steps are:
1) Identify the donor prospect;
2) Do appropriate research on the donor prospect;
3) Set a cultivation strategy for securing a gift from the donor prospect;
4) Involve the donor prospect in ways that will be rewarding to them;
5) Make an “ask” of the donor prospect for a gift to the initiative;
6) Close the solicitation; and
7) Follow up with the donor on a regular basis to inform them of the impact of their generosity.

Daley believes that by implementing each step in sequence, “a good, solid lead is worth pursuing because it might lead to something spectacular” (p. 43).

Luck and Evans (1992) believe the key to successful major gift fund raising is rooted in six fundamental principles.

1. When it comes to major gift cultivation and solicitation, individualization is everything;
2. Methodical, thoughtful cultivation is crucial;
3. Paying careful attention to what the prospect is saying and to their non-verbal cues is vital;
4. Maintaining regular, meaningful, and personalized communication with prospects is essential;
5. Patience is a virtue -- never rush the ask; and,
6. Donor clubs should be honed and fashioned to fit with precision into the culture of the charity.

Kozobarich (2000) asserts that a successful development cycle must begin with priority setting within the institution; progress through identification, cultivation, and solicitation of donor prospects; and conclude with sincere gestures of gratitude and appreciation.

While each of these strategies has their merit, none will be successful if the fundamental importance of strong relationships with donor prospects is ignored.

The relationship between donors and people with the organization becomes the glue that bonds donors with an organization; often, it is part of the reason donors want to get more involved. The spirit of growing and expanding relationships is a powerful and captivating force in any major gift program (May, 1997, p. 19)

Once prospects are identified as potential donors for specific initiatives it is important to understand the “individuals through whom the prospect relates to the institution” (Dunlop, 1993, p. 10). Simply assigning a staff member or volunteer to cultivate a relationship with a prospect without considering with whom that prospect feels most comfortable, is to risk securing the full potential of the donor’s generosity. Dunlop and Ryan (1990) foster the use of primes and secondaries to help promote major gift relationships.

Primes are individuals who “provide the best direct link with a prospective giver” while the secondaries are “the lesser but still helpful links” (p. 32). Dunlop (1993) clarifies this process by recommending a
simple six step process. Since the process involves various initiatives or “moves” in nurturing the relationship with the donor, he calls the process the moves concept of major gift fund raising. Dunlop (1993) suggests that the role of a staff manager in the moves concept is to “support, facilitate, and stimulate initiatives of these important individuals on behalf of the institution” (p. 10). Development staff will often work with volunteers with whom the donor prospect is very familiar, a business associate for example. Typically, a development supervisor will work closely with his or her development staff as they work toward building and nurturing relationships with prospects. If they use the moves management methodology, he or she would facilitate the following procedures for each major prospect every few weeks:

1. Review conversations and activities that have occurred with the prospect;
2. Plan and set priorities for next steps with the development staff;
3. Coordinate “next moves” with all individuals who are involved with the prospect (i.e., staff and/or volunteers);
4. Act on the “next moves”;
5. Evaluate the effect of those “moves”;
6. Report and record the results of the “moves.”

These six steps are not a magic potion ensuring success, as Dunlop (1993) warns.

These six steps do not, in and of themselves, constitute an initiative or move to build awareness, understanding, caring, involvement, or commitment. Rather, these steps make up a sound procedure for generating such initiatives (p. 10-11).

According to Meyers (1993) approximately 25% of each development officer’s time during a given year is devoted to early cultivation, 25% cultivation, 30% solicitation, and 20% stewardship (p. 16 & 18). When
using the *moves concept*, Meyers (1993) identifies four categories that serve as goals in the entire major gift process. The categories are:

- early cultivation which includes “visiting prospects to estimate both capacity and inclination” to give;
- cultivation in which calls are made to prospects to increase the prospect’s awareness and insight about projects and priorities “that might fulfill prospects’ need, desires, and convictions;”
- solicitation in which prospects are asked for a gift; and,
- stewardship which not only expresses gratitude to the donors but also keeps “donors engaged with the university and periodically relay to them how their gift is benefiting the project” (p. 18).

Meyers (1993) believes that these goals provide a framework that can help measure one’s progress and effectiveness in using the *moves concept*, and to determine the quality and the quantity of the contacts.

According to May (1997), it is vitally important to develop continuing and meaningful relationships with current and new prospective donors that include fostering new relationships with family and friends of the prospective donors. May notes that, “Just as corporations spend a great deal to acquire customers and develop customer loyalty, so do the most successful fundraising organizations” (1997, p. 20). The quality, frequency, and continuity of the initiatives taken with each prospect are important factors in fostering and sustaining meaningful relationships with donor prospects (Dunlop, 1993). Focus is essential in nurturing genuine relationships because institutions, and development officers alike, are limited by time and energy in developing and sustaining these relationships. Prospect identification, research, and assessment are
important steps in identifying new prospects and should provide insight into the financial capacity of the prospect, and the prospect’s interest or potential interest in the institution.

May (1997) also points out the importance of extending and forming relationships with key family members and friends of the donor prospect. There are at least three positive outcomes of this approach:

First, major gift decisions are more easily encouraged by influential family members and friends who have been brought under an organization’s tent and who have been nurtured or treated with respect by the organization. . . . Second, assets are often jointly held or linked in some way with private corporations, trusts, family foundations, or anticipated inheritances requiring joint support, approval or consensus. Third, other family members and friends often become major donors themselves, stimulated by major gifts made by parents, siblings, or friends (May, 1997, p. 21).

Building on this point, May (1997) stresses the importance of maintaining multiple relationships with current and new prospective donors. When prospective donors have multiple relationships at a university for example, they are presented with numerous opportunities to “get to know” the institution on another level. They interact with deans, school directors, and professors in the areas they find compelling. May (1997) points out those development organizations that encourage multiple relationships with donors have a “better chance of providing continuous relationships and retaining donor loyalty over time (p. 21).” Additionally, several people can advance the cultivation process and major gift decision more quickly as a result of their regular contact with donor prospects. As a result, the donor’s potential to give grows much more over time (May, 1997).

Many development professionals stress the importance of integrating development programs (May, 1993, 1997; Dunlop, 1993; Smith, 1997;
Marks, 1993). These professionals see integrated programs as a vital component for successful major gift fund raising. By integrating major gifts programs and initiatives with other development programs, significant momentum can be generated and sustained prior to and throughout campaigns.

May (1997) also points out that integrated programs increase the likelihood of sustaining lifetime relationship with donors. Rather than competing with other fund raising efforts, major gift programs should be integrated, coordinated, and complementary to the rest of the institution’s fund raising programs (Dunlop, 1993; May, 1993, 1997). Dunlop and May do not perceive major donor cultivation as a separate or independent endeavor. Rather, they stress the interdependent nature of the various fund raising programs in which annual giving provides a foundation to expand and enhance major gift giving. Building on this perspective, May (1997) states that by integrating intradevelopment office initiatives, such as annual funds, planned giving, and capital campaigns, with major gift programs, fund raising results can increase dramatically. May states:

The whole of the development program is greater than the sum of its parts. The results of major gift efforts are so enormous that all programs should feed into major gift activities to maximize results (1997, 22).

Evaluation of Major Gifts Programs

Because the results of major gift programs are both impressive and vital, there is a tendency to measure them primarily by quantitative indicators (O’Brian, 1993). Evaluation of major gifts programs raises questions about what can be assessed. Major gift work is the consummate donor-focused, team-building program; and, therefore, qualitative indicators are equally important (O’Brian, 1993). As Dunlop (1993) indicates, when
adopting a nurturing, or relationship building approach to development, a bottom-line philosophy is not really conceivable since the amount raised from a major donor is not completed until the end of the prospect’s life. Nor is it appropriate to use the number and amount of gifts received in a given year because major gift activity is a long-term process. Wood (1993) points out that a typical major gift takes approximately eighteen months to complete, beginning with the discovery meeting, moving at some point to an “ask” meeting, and eventually culminating in a negotiation and close meeting. Initial meetings to promote institutional initiatives are also focused on establishing solid relationships with prospective major gift donors, as a result significant gifts are not secured in the short-term.

It may be more realistic to examine the number and amount of gifts received over a period of several years. O’Brien (1993) suggests that development officers should be evaluated on their abilities to manage relationships. A development professional, in O’Brien’s view should be able to:

- identify prospective major givers;
- discover or create friendships and activities that will draw givers into the life of the institution;
- determine the philanthropic interests and motivations of donors;
- assist volunteers, the president, or chief development officer in approaching donors for major commitments; and,
- possess a sophistication with friendships and communications that provide both the stimulation and the leverage to foster significant giving (1993, p. 23).

O’Brien (1993) also indicates that the team-building skills of a major gifts development officer can be evaluated by examining his or her support of
volunteers, faculty, or staff that interacts with major donor prospects, as well as their willingness to collaborate with members of the entire institutional development organization: annual giving, planned giving, corporate and foundations giving, and other constituencies.

Because relationship-building processes cannot be evaluated accurately in the short-term in the same way that other development programs might be, Wood (1997) suggests evaluations of major gifts programs should be based on an established set of criteria. Dunlop (1993) believes it is helpful to review the initiatives that a major gift program has undertaken in a given year by reviewing major gift prospects on a regular basis to develop strategies for their cultivation. This process also helps to evaluate the effectiveness of some major gift initiatives. Dunlop (1993) articulates eight questions that should be addressed annually; these questions are:

1. Are the initiatives taken with each major gift prospect consistent with the institution’s strategic plan?
2. Has each major gift prospect been asked for an annual gift?
3. Has each major gift prospect received the quality, frequency, and continuity of initiatives required for the successful development of their awareness, understanding, caring, involvement, and commitment?
4. Has there been an appropriate distribution of initiatives among the program’s prospects?
5. Is the program focused on the correct prospects?
6. Is the program working with the optimal number of prospects?
7. Have the most appropriate primes and secondaries been identified for each prospect?
8. Is the staffing and budget of the program sufficient to support its gift potential?
While examining these questions, it is also appropriate to assess the quality and reliability of the tracking system employed in prospect management (Dunlop, 1993). O’Brian, (1993); May, (1997); Smith (1997); Schervish, (1997); Boardman, (1993) and, Dunlop, (1993) all suggest regular meetings to evaluate the status of prospects, determine next steps, and share information. Boardman believes:

Evaluating, refining, communicating, and coordinating prospect strategies must be ongoing. Small group meetings to evaluate and refine strategies may include the president, a key volunteer, and fund-raisers who have knowledge of specific prospects and can provide fresh perspectives and approaches (1993, p. 82).

Loessin, Duronio, and Borton (1986) believe that “systematic, formal measurement and evaluation of fund-raising activities is essential for ongoing success” (p.56). The goals of a program provide an objective measure for evaluating a fund raising program (Dunn, 1986; Kotler, 1982).

Kotler (1982) suggests three possible approaches to goal setting in development organizations: the incremental; needs; and, opportunity approaches.

- The **incremental approach** generates a goal figure based on an analysis of the previous year’s revenues and the current year’s inflation rate and other significant economic conditions that should be considered.
- The **needs approach** generates a goal figure based upon organizational needs.
- The **opportunity approach** begins with the question: How much money could be raised from each donor group with different levels of fund raising expenditures?
Higher Education Development Research

Carbone (1986) writes that fund-raising has a vast amount of meaningful and instructive lore and experience to share, but limited research based knowledge. The scholarly research on higher education development focuses on two primary components. The first stream of research explores the behavior, attitudes, and/or attributes of donors by identifying personal characteristics of donors. The second stream is geared toward understanding the effectiveness of institutional fund raising by examining institutional characteristics. Little systematic scholarly research has been done on the performance and effectiveness of higher education development organizations. One reason for this dearth of research is that defining the term effectiveness in the context of fund raising has been challenging and inconsistent. The amount of money raised by a college or university has served as the primary measure for successful performance of higher education development programs.

Perhaps the most relevant and closely related research on effective higher education development organizations to this study is by Duronio and Loessin (1986, 1988, 1990, 1991). They define “high performance,” or “effective” higher education development organizations as those whose actual performance exceeds predicted fund-raising results. They also note that research to understand what really works in fund raising is still in its infancy and that more research exploring best practices in higher education development organizations is necessary. Duronio and Loessin (1993) stress that judging the success of a development program solely on the amount of money raised is a mistake because there is no rubric for comparing dollars amounts across institutions.
Using money raised as the criterion without norms for systematic comparison eliminates consideration of the differences between schools in institutional resources for fund raising and provides no assessment of how a given year’s results compare with an institution’s potential for raising money (Duronio and Loessin, 1993, p. 171).

In 1986, Duronio and Loessin conducted research examining the performance potential of several higher education development organizations. They performed analyses of fund raising results, basic institutional characteristics, fund raising expenditures, and basic fund raising methods of 575 institutions they surveyed. Four sources were used to identify areas of peak performance: alumni giving, non-alumni giving, foundation giving, and corporate giving. Institutions were also divided into categories for analysis: private and public research, doctoral, and comprehensive universities, and private and public baccalaureate and two-year colleges.

The researchers found that in addition to type of institution and public or private status, characteristics most commonly associated with fund raising success were educational and general expenditures; endowment; expenditures per student; cost of tuition; alumni of record; enrollment; and age of institution. For all types of institutions, total voluntary support was most highly correlated (.78 - .73) with expenditures for fund raising, institutional budget, and size of endowment. Moderate correlations (.68 - .59) were found with the number of alumni of record, type of institution, expenditures per student, and enrollment. Low correlations (.28 - .12) were found with the age of the institution, tuition, and private or public college status. Duronio and Loessin (1993) note that,

These findings are not particularly useful to administrators seeking to improve fundraising programs, because they do not have the ability to change such factors. This initial study confirmed that it
is not possible to fully understand either effectiveness or potential for success in fundraising by studying quantitative factors alone (p. 172-173).

In a follow-up study, Duronio and Loessin (1991) turned away from the quantitative methods they used to examine the 575 higher education development organizations they had previously studied and employed a qualitative case study methodology to explore characteristics commonly associated with fundraising success in just ten institutions. In that research Duronio and Loessin (1991) found the several characteristics of effectiveness present in the ten “high performance” fund-raising institutions. Figures 2.2 and 2.3 provide an overview of those findings. No single pattern emerged for all ten of the institutions and no institutions were outstanding in all of the characteristics associated with fund raising success. Duronio and Loessin (1991) note that,

Our results confirm much of the conventional wisdom about fund-raising effectiveness but also suggest that factors associated with fund-raising success are complex and vary in individual institutions more than conventional wisdom would sometimes indicate. . . . Fund-raising effectiveness is multifaceted and complex and has a great deal to do with the context in which the fund-raising occurs (p. 196-197).

Duronio and Loessin’s (1991) findings suggest that appropriate internal and external strategic leadership processes and team building practices could be the foundations for success in high performance university development organizations. They hypothesize that leaders who understand the importance of using a variety of leadership perspectives, particularly those in formal leadership roles, not only are most likely to lay a foundation for success for the organization, but also have the opportunity to inspire, coordinate and assist members of the organization to strive for individual and collective peak performance.
Characteristics of Institutions

- Presidential leadership - University Presidents were enthusiastic about fundraising and effectively articulated the institution's mission and case for support to all internal and external constituents. They believed fundraising was a major responsibility of their position and provided strong leadership for fund-raising initiatives. They also relied on the fundraising expertise of the chief development officer and development staff (p. 198-199).

- Trustee's participation - Trustees were donors to the institution and participated in the identification and solicitation of donors. They also set institutional policy that supported fund-raising (p. 200).

- Institutional commitment to fund-raising - An institution's commitment to fund-raising is evident in the resources allocated for fund-raising, the overall acceptance of the need for fund-raising on campus, the definition and communication of the institution's niche and image, and the accomplishment of certain institution wide tasks that facilitate fundraising (such as planning and goal setting for fund-raising priorities and policies). Institutional commitment to fund-raising was a strong characteristic of the fund-raising programs studied by Duronio and Loessin (p. 200-201).

- Resource allocation was appropriately sufficient for meeting fund-raising goals

- Acceptance of the need for fund raising - refers to the degree of acceptance at the institution of the need for fund-raising and appreciation of staff members who raise funds. (p. 201).

- Definition and communication of institutional niche and image - Institutional niche refers to what the institution actually does, and institutional image refers to how well, how accurately, and how extensively information about the institution is conveyed to external constituents (p. 202).

- Institutional fundraising priorities and policies - Institutional priorities for fundraising help focus time and resources on the areas most related to achieving institutional goals (p. 203).

Figure 2.2 - Characteristics of Institutions
Source: Duronio & Loessin (1991) Effective Fund Raising in Higher Education
Characteristics of Fund-Raising Program

- *Chief development officer’s leadership* - Chief Development Officers (CDO) were articulate, professional, and ethical representatives of the institution and fund-raising field. They were effective leaders who successfully created strategic fund-raising plans to implement programs focused on the specific needs of the institution, and committed to, and designed for, long-term benefit to their institution. They worked closely with the president, trustees, and development staff to carry out the strategic plans for their institution. They understood the fund-raising history of their institutions and built on the success (and lessons learned) from previous capital campaigns. They established formal fund-raising programs (annual, capital, major, and planned) and employed a fund-raising team with balanced and appropriate responsibilities. Most, but not all, of these CDOs encouraged volunteer participation in fund-raising (p.204-213).

- *Entrepreneurial fund-raising* – a number of the institutions studied had fund-raising programs that had innovative or unconventional features (p. 214).

- *Volunteers’ role in fund-raising* – some institutions had very strong volunteer programs, in which volunteers were integrated into various cultivation strategies (p. 214).

- *Emphasis on management of the fund-raising program* – managers in seven institutions emphasized that teamwork was important to fund-raising success at their institutions, but only in four institutions did managers actually provide structures or processes to facilitate effective teamwork (p. 215).

- *Information and communication systems* - This was the strongest management area across the ten institutions. Fund-raisers emphasized that good systems to collect, store, retrieve, and disseminate information were essential for effective fund-raising. Additionally, fund-raisers identified the importance of good communication across organizational levels, with fund-raising colleagues, within the development office, with the rest of the institution, and with external constituents (p. 216).

- *Planning, goal-setting, and evaluation* – Eight of the institutions had formal fund-raising plans; however, only four of them had comprehensive, long-term plans that were used as working tools (p. 217).

Figure 2.3 - Characteristics of Fund Raising Programs

*Source: Duronio & Loessin (1991) Effective Fund Raising in Higher Education*
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Figure 2.3 continued

- **Staff development, training and evaluation** – fund raising managers in only three institutions emphasized the importance of staff training and development. Three institutions held yearly retreats for staff development, program planning, and team building. Staff member in six of the largest institutions studied received merit raises based on performance evaluations.

- **Staff commitment to institution** - The researchers found strongly committed staff members at every institution; however, they did not always find a strong commitment to the institution itself. What they did find were staff members who were committed to professional excellence, to improving their own personal work skills, and to the success of their programs (p. 219).

- **Emphasis on constituent relations** – This relates to donor, alumni, faculty, and community relations. Although every institution studied had strong relationships with one or more of its constituents, only two institutions (both public) were outstanding in all constituent relationships (p. 221).

This study will contribute understanding of effective leadership qualities in one high performance higher education development organization.

**Complexities of Organizational Leadership**

When people want to understand organizations and their performance, typically leadership is one of the first things to be examined. Researchers such as Torbert (1987, 1991) and Quinn (1988) have hypothesized and written widely that a balanced leadership style provides a foundation for long-term success. In their view, leaders who have the capacity to interpret accurately as well as effectively respond to paradox are those who are viewed as “high performance” leaders (Torbert, 1991; Quinn, 1988). High performance leaders rely on integrated and innovative strategies for success. These strategies need to
be appropriate given the context and the complexities of their environmental and organizational circumstances. High performance leadership requires the simultaneous mastery of seemingly contradictory and paradoxical capabilities (Torbert, 1991; Quinn, 1988). As managers develop the capacity, comfort, and skill associated with paradoxical thinking, they find themselves moving toward a sophisticated orientation that allows them to function and lead organizations in a world of paradox and competing demands (Quinn, 1988).

The task of managerial leadership is becoming more and more complex as the environment continues to become increasingly dynamic, forceful, and competitive. The education, training, and development of managers have, therefore, become critical elements for the success of organizations of all kinds. As managers advance in their careers and assume positions of greater responsibility, they experience an increased demand for identifying and managing tensions and contradictions. As leaders, they are expected to create effective, high-performing organizations that respond quickly and logically, as well as thoughtfully and responsibly to a variety of challenges occurring in an ever-changing competitive and dynamic world. In order to master an approach that effectively manages the competing demands of today’s organizations, a manager must possess the cognitive and behavioral complexity to use multiple frames of reference and translate their insight into purposeful action.

Cognitive Complexity and Leadership
Despite the vast number of studies in leadership that have been conducted over the years, relatively few have attempted to explore the relationship between leadership, cognitive complexity and developmental stage. Those that have, such as Torbert (1994), Torbert & Fisher (1992), Fisher, Merron, & Torbert (1987), Kegan & Lahey, (1984), Merron, Fisher,
& Torbert (1987), Rooke & Torbert (1998), and Gratch (1987) have, for the most part, confirmed that managers who are at more complex developmental stages (i.e., those who are more cognitively complex) typically are found at higher organizational hierarchical positions and use more complex decision making processes than those at lower developmental stages in the organization. According to Rooke & Torbert (1998), developmental theory offers a view of the path and the multiple transformations that leaders and whole organizations can follow in order to become “learning leaders” and “learning organizations.”

Torbert and his colleagues believe leadership can best be understood by examining the complexity with which leaders are able to construct their world, as well as how they interpret the world for their followers. From the constructive-developmentalist viewpoint, the nature of leadership is not framed in terms of the possession of requisite skills and behaviors. Instead, it acknowledges that individuals actively “construct” a view of the world that then becomes the world within which they live and work (Kegan, 1982). As one develops more complex capacities to construct meaning from experience, new ways of expressing ideas, feelings, and purposes are manifest.

Development is viewed as a process of transformation based on shifts of complexity of perspective (Merron, Fisher, & Torbert 1987). With each transformation, the corresponding worldview deeply influences what the person perceives and how he or she interprets and reacts to what is seen (Merron, et al. 1987). As a result, those at higher stages of development can take a perspective on more complex things and will define reality in significantly different ways (Kegan, 1892) than those at less complex stages of development.
As individuals move to more complex stages, their thinking not only becomes more complex and abstract, but also more precise and specific. Further, they become “more able to empathize with others who hold conflicting views, to understand interpersonal relationships, to act on perceptions of mutual dependence, and to tolerate higher levels of stress and ambiguity” (Merron, et al., 1987, p. 275). In each successive stage the individual builds on earlier capacities, but transforms them into a reordered worldview that includes an increased capacity for understanding and action (Kegan, 1982; Fisher & Torbert, 1991). This is the case because each stage is governed by more complex logical capacities, interpersonal interactive capacities, interpersonal analysis, and modes of ethical judgment (Piaget, 1971; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kohlberg, 1969, 1972, 1981, 1984; Torbert, 1987, 1991; Fisher & Torbert, 1991). When you consider this in the context of leadership, it is evident that a leaders’ cognitive complexity plays a major part in the way in which he or she is able to lead an organization.

In a review of adult leadership, Kegan and Lahey (1984) state that the constructive-developmental approach suggests the following:

1. **Meaning making** is central to being human. An evolution of systems of meaning making takes place during the course of one’s life-span. Although individuals develop more complex systems for making meaning, they typically are unaware of the transitions they are undergoing because meaning is not so much something we have as much as it is a system of what we are.

2. **These meaning systems shape our experience.** Simply put, experience is the way we understand what happens to us. Thus we cannot understand another’s experience by simply knowing the events and particulars of another person’s day. We must ascertain
how an individual is experiencing and making meaning of the events and particulars of a given situation through observation and inquiry.

3. *These meaning systems to a great extent give rise to our behavior.* Our behavior is not random, but rather rooted in our meaning making systems. The way we understand the world around us is a key determinant of the way in which we behave in the world.

4. With exception to periods of transition and evolution from one meaning making system to another, to a great extent a given system of meaning organizes our thinking, feeling, and acting over a wide range of human functioning.

5. Although everyone makes meaning in richly idiosyncratic and unique ways, *there are striking regularities to the structure of meaning-making systems* and to the sequence of meaning systems through which people grow.

Torbert (1987 & 1991), who has applied the theories of cognitive-structural development to managerial and organizational leadership, contends that there are eight stages of development each of which is increasingly more complex than the previous stage. Descriptions of Torbert's stages of development can be found in Figure 2.4.
1) Impulsive

2) Opportunist Short time horizon; focus on concrete things; manipulative; deceptive; rejects feedback; externalizes blame; distrustful; fragile self-control; hostile humor; views luck as central; flouts power, sexuality; stereotypes; views rules as loss of freedom; punishes according to an ‘eye for an eye’ ethic; treats what can get away with as legal; positive ethic = even trade

3) Diplomat Observe protocol; avoids inner and outer conflict; works to group standard; speaks in clichés, and platitudes; conforms; feels shame if violates norms; sin = hurting others; punishment = disapproval; seeks membership, status; face-saving essential; loyalty to immediate group; not ‘distant’ organization or principles; positive ethic = nice; cooperative.

4) Technician Interested in problem-solving; seeks causes; critical of self, others based on craft logic; chooses efficiency over effectiveness; perfectionist; accepts feedback only from ‘objective’ craft masters; dogmatic; values decisions based on merit; sees contingencies, expectations; wants to stand out, be unique, positive ethic = sense of obligation to wider, internally consistent moral order.

5) Achiever Long-term goals; future is vivid, inspiring; welcomes behavioral feedback; effectiveness and results oriented; feels like initiator, not pawn; appreciates complexity, systems; seeks generalizable reasons for action; seeks mutuality, not hierarchy, in relationships; feels guilt if does not meet own standards; blind to own shadow, to subjectivity behind objectivity; positive ethic = practical day-to-day improvements based on self-chosen (but not self-created) ethical system.

6) Strategist Creative at conflict resolution; recognizes importance of principle, contract, theory, and judgment – not just rule, customs, and expectations – for making and maintaining good decisions; process oriented as well as goal oriented; aware of paradox and contradiction; relativistic, aware that what one sees depends upon one’s worldview; high value on individuality, unique market niches, particular historical moments; enjoys playing a variety of roles; witty, existential humor (as contrasted to prefabricated jokes); aware of dark side, of profundity of evil, and tempered by its power.

7) Magician/Clown Disintegration of ego identity, near death experience; seeks participation in historical/spiritual transformations; creator of mythical events that reframe situations; anchoring in inclusive present, seeking light and dark, order and mess; blends opposites, creating ‘positive-sum’ games; exercises own attention, researches interplay of intuition, thought, action, and effects on outside world; treats time and events as symbolic, analogical, metaphorical.

8) Ironist *

---

**Figure 2.4 – Managerial Style Characteristics Associated with Torbert’s Developmental Stage (Source: Rooke & Torbert, 1998; Hartwell & Torbert, 1999)**

Note: no managers were tested at the Impulsive or Ironist stages development, and therefore no description is provided.
Empirical studies of leaders’ developmental stages have generally taken two approaches. One has been to determine how individuals at various stages of ego development are distributed throughout the organization. The other has been to determine how characteristics and behaviors of managers at different stages of ego development differ.

In all these cases, developmental stage was determined through Lovenger’s Sentence Completion Test. Understanding leadership in the context of cognitive complexity is important to this study because the cognitive complexity of an individual in a leadership role impacts the ways in which that leader understands and acts upon challenges associated with leading his or her organization.

Developmental Distribution
In his article, *Cultivating Postformal Adult Development: Higher Stages and Contrasting Interventions*, Torbert (1994) cites six studies that have attempted to identify and describe the developmental distributions of managers and professionals at different hierarchical levels in organizations (Smith, 1980; Davidson, 1985; Torbert, 1983; Gratch, 1985; Quinn & Torbert, 1987; Hirsch, 1988).

A summary of the findings is given in Figure 2.5. Torbert suggests that the findings from these studies are generally consistent with other “ego demographic” studies. For example, Cook-Greuter (1994) proposed that approximately 10% of adults operate at the Impulsive or Opportunist stages; 80% of adults operate at the Diplomat, Technician or Achiever stages; and 10% operate at the Strategist, Magician, and Ironist stages. The findings cited by
Torbert (1994) generally support this premise, with the exception that no adults were found at the Impulsive or Opportunist stages, and the number at the Diplomat, Technician, and Achiever stages was 10% or higher than predicted by Cook-Greuter. Torbert’s sample consists only of adults in positions of responsibility. Adults at the early preconventional stages would be unlikely to hold such positions.

At lower levels of leadership and management, leaders tended to be at early to middle stages of development (i.e., Diplomat and Technician), with a few at higher (i.e., Achiever and Strategist). These proportions gradually reverse themselves for participants of upper levels of leadership. However, even at the senior-most organizational levels, only 14% of those sampled are at the Strategist stage. No examples of Magician, Clown or Ironist leaders were identified or discussed in this article (Torbert, 1994).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Impulsive</th>
<th>Opportunist</th>
<th>Diplomat</th>
<th>Technician</th>
<th>Achiever</th>
<th>Strategist</th>
<th>Magician</th>
<th>Ironist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1: First Line Supervisors (n=37)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2: Nurses (n=100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Jr./Middle Managers (n=177)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4: Senior Managers (n=66)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 5: Sr. Managers &amp; Top Execs (n=104)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 6: Entrepreneurial Ophthalmologists (n=13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5: Percent Distribution of Managers by Developmental Position in Six Studies (Torbert, 1996)
From these studies, it could be hypothesized that there is a relationship between organizational hierarchical level and ego stage of development. If one further assumes that those toward the top of the organizational hierarchy are considered (at least by the organization) to be the most effective leaders, then these results indicate that those at higher stages of ego development are more effective leaders. However, it is unknown whether individuals moved up the organizational hierarchy due to higher levels of cognitive complexity or whether their cognitive complexity in fact, developed a result of facing the challenges associated (e.g., multiple perspectives and responsibilities, ambiguity, and turbulence) with upper level management.

Openness to Feedback
The research on openness to feedback (Torbert, 1987; Quinn & Torbert, 1987) suggests that as managers become more complex in their meaning making processes, they also become more likely to request feedback on their performance (n=281). These findings support the assumption that managers at the Impulsive, Opportunist, and Diplomat stages are much less inclined to solicit, let alone acknowledge, feedback than are managers at the Achiever, Strategist, and Magician/Clown/Ironist stages. Managers at the Technician stage will accept feedback only when it is offered by a “craft master” whom they respect. Technicians tended to prefer to recognize their own success and would prefer not to listen to the “unsolicited” opinions of others. These findings suggest that as a manager’s thinking becomes more complex, they become much more open to self-development and constructive criticism.
Managers at the Achiever stage will seek any feedback that will help them achieve their desired goals. Managers at the Strategist, Magician/Clown/Ironist stages will solicit feedback and integrate it with their ever evolving sense of themselves.

_Developmental Action Inquiry_

The term _action inquiry_ refers to a kind of behavior that is simultaneously inquiring and productive (Fisher & Torbert, 1995, p. 13). Individuals who have the ability to use action inquiry have the capacity to learn about developing situations, accomplish whatever tasks appear to have priority, and invite reframing or restructuring of the task if necessary simultaneously. Understanding is developed by means of rational analysis of relevant contextual and circumstantial information and decisions regarding action follow. According to Torbert (1987, 1991), only those who are minimally at the Strategist stage of development can engage in developmental action inquiry in meaningful ways; however, if an individual at the Achiever stage is experiencing environmental challenges to his or her current meaning making system and that person is ready to develop a more complex meaning making system, then they can use developmental action inquiry techniques to foster their own development.

Torbert and Fisher (1992) reported on research conducted over a number of years (ranging from 21 months to 8 years) that followed the development of 192 managers’ cognitive complexity. Of the 192 studied, 25 of the managers had experienced one or two developmental transformations while the other 162 had remained at the same stages over time.
The researchers learned that 22 of the 25 studied did progress from the Technician or Achiever stages to the Strategist stage over several years. During those years they participated in ongoing self-inquiry groups which integrate autobiographical conversation and writing (see Figure 2.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did participate in self-inquiry group</th>
<th>Did develop to later stage</th>
<th>Did not develop to later stage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not participate in self-inquiry group</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not participate in self-inquiry group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>n=192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.6: Effects of Autobiographical/Behavioral Self-Inquiry Groups on Managerial Development (Torbert & Fisher, 1992)

On the other hand, of the 165 of the 167 managers studied who did not progress to a more complex stage over the same period also did not participate in ongoing self-inquiry groups. Hence, Torbert summarizes as follows:

It is only at the transition between the achiever and the strategist action-logics that voluntary self-criticalness, a mutual criticalness with others, and a critical study of vital cultural values begins to become the basis for action. It is only in this transition that inquiry begins to take priority over conformity (Hartwell & Torbert, 1992, p. 201).
Group Effectiveness

Levels of complexity also effect group effectiveness. In a study of sixteen managerial groups, it was learned that when managerial project groups include one or more Strategist managers, group task performance is more effective, group time use is more efficient, and members perceive greater group support for their own learning than if there are no Strategist level managers in the group (Torbert, 1987).

Behavioral Differences

In research designed to explore the relationship between management style and cognitive complexity, Merron, Fisher and Torbert (1987) gave an “in-basket” exercise to 50 managers and MBA students. Managerial style was measured through the use of the Consolidated Fund In-Basket Test, an exercise developed by Educational Testing Services, which positions participants as director of a community fund, newly appointed in mid campaign, who must deal with staff members, board of directors composed of leading citizens, and a large volunteer group organization. For three hours the participant writes memos or letters in response to 34 in-basket items, and then completes a reasons-for-action form describing what action was taken on each item and why.

Overall, these researchers found that managers that had capacities for and used more complex stages to construct meaning also used more effective problem solving strategies. Specifically, there was a strong positive correlation between effective problem defining, collaborative decision-making, and stage of ego development. Merron, Fisher, & Torbert (1987) constructed two categories to describe the patterns of manager’s responses: The fire-fighting approach and the systemic management approach. Fire-fighters treated in-basket items as given and fixed, separate from one another, and required quick action. These
managers tended to act unilaterally. Seldom did they schedule meetings for collaborative decision making. Items that could not be addressed immediately were not treated as important. Systemic managers, on the other hand, took a broader view of the organizational problems and examined the underlying assumptions and goals behind each stated problem. At times, whole new lines of inquiry were developed. Context was the key for these managers. They prioritized items and worked collaboratively at finding solutions.

**Differences between Diplomat, Achiever, and Individualistic Managers**

Smith (1980) conducted clinical research interviews with 12 managers, 3 of whom were at the Diplomat stage, 3 at the Achiever stage, and 6 at the Individualistic (similar to a Technician) stage. She found that Diplomat leaders tended to be dependent people. They could not make decisions on their own. They tried to learn what the popular position was and proceed from there without consideration of the implications of these decisions. Their management style was characterized by an emphasis on loyalty. That is, subordinates were to complete their work out of loyalty to the group and the manager. Diplomat leaders also were found to limit communication and interaction among their followers to task-related assignments. These leaders are also unlikely to confront someone who is not performing well because they fear confrontation.

Individualistic (Technician - like) managers were able to see beyond their formal roles and were more compassionate than Diplomat managers. They also recognized opportunities for recognition; they were obsessed with achievement and expertise in their particular domain. They were stressed, and described themselves as overworked, overruled, and caught between their followers and higher level managers. They were frustrated by an inability to solve problems that were not technical and found
managerial decision making stressful. These managers had many complaints, but no ideas about how to change things for the better. They were, however, aware that they were responsible for their emotional perceptions and recognized that this was a personal, not organizational problem (Smith, 1980).

Achiever managers were aware of the conflicts and uncertainty in their jobs but did not feel victimized. They were substantially different than managers at lower stages because they demonstrated a preoccupation with planning and had a greater capacity for empathy than the others. These managers were able to be creative, flexible, and timely in their planning and problem-solving activities. They were able to deal person-to-person with their followers, and valued doing so. Thus, they were more likely to form a power relationship based on collaboration than a Diplomat or Individualistic manager. They were action-oriented and defined their roles in terms of their self-concepts (i.e., skills, values, virtues), rather than, as in the case of Diplomat managers, defining self in terms of role concept (Smith, 1980).

Differences in Organizational Outcomes
Hirsch (1988) conducted research using a small sample (n=13) of entrepreneurial ophthalmologists. They were intensively studied to determine whether the Technician, Achiever, and Strategist ophthalmologists exercised significantly different business strategies from one another. The results showed that ophthalmologists at each stage of development employed significantly different strategies and practices, and employed contrasting approaches and enjoyed varying economic results.
Technicians insisted on hands-on participation in every technical phase of their operations. They saw one patent at a time. Technological expertise was the key to success for these doctors.

Achievers, in comparison, were more effective at delegating significant aspects of the operation to others on their staffs, with some oversight. Achiever Ophthalmologists were able to see approximately three patients at a time. These doctors' identified their office staff as the essential ingredient to success. The Strategist physicians were able to identify critical gaps in services, move into unoccupied niches, and create contracts that motivate partner physicians. These doctors concentrated on broader strategic issues, such as overall patient satisfaction, critical service gaps, unoccupied niches, and partnership contracts with fellow professionals. These ophthalmologists were able to create multisite practices and hence, the practices saw three times as many patients as ophthalmologists at the Diplomat and Achiever stages. Figure 2.7 shows a comparison of the ophthalmologists' developmental stage and their gross annual revenues for their practices (Torbert, 1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Developmental Stage</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Average Years Practice</th>
<th>1987 Annual Gross Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Achievers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategists</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.7: Developmental Stage and Gross Annual Revenues for 13 Entrepreneurial Professionals (Hirsch, 1988)*
Characteristics of Post-Strategist Managers

In a very small sample (n=6), Torbert (1996) deliberately sought out subjects at the rare Post-Strategist stage and conducted qualitative interviews to learn about abilities to lead successfully. He found that:

- All were key players in multiple organizations simultaneously;
- All varied their pace between urgency and leisureliness within each workday;
- All monitored the analogical alignment or incongruity among activities of the self, the group, the organization, and the larger social system;
- All were viewed as charismatic, but exercised this quality not to generate worshipful subservience, but rather to challenge others and support their initiatives.

Torbert (1996) concludes that their sensitivity to current conditions, and their ability to analyze across the domains of mission, strategy, own actions and outcomes, suggest that their on-going action awareness is consistent with a “chaos theory” appreciation of social reality.

Differences between Achiever and Strategist Leaders

Fisher and Torbert (1991) conducted research to determine how the various developmental stages determined approaches to 1) leadership of followers, 2) relationships with superiors, and 3) action initiatives in which the individual proposed or implemented ideas or programs. The method involved conducting semi-structured interviews with 9 men and 8 women, 2 of whom were at the Technician stage, 10 of whom were at the Achiever stage, and 5 of whom were at the Strategists stage.

Based upon qualitative analysis of these interviews, Fisher & Torbert (1991) developed several grounded hypothesizes about the contrasting
leadership styles of Strategist and Achiever leaders. They hypothesize that Strategist leaders are more likely than Achiever leaders to:

- Articulate principles that they espouse as bases for their own leadership practice and to notice and learn from discrepancies between their action and these principles.
- Make more frequent and more conscientious efforts to understand followers' frames, inquiring about them rather than dismissing them.
- Test the limits of their organizations' and their supervisors' constraints and to create new spheres of action for themselves and their followers.
- Influence superiors to undertake a negotiation among initially diverse frames to create a new shared frame and recognize that their own view is not beyond questions.
- Identify their perceptions as perceptions, rather than immutable realities, and discuss differences in perceptions explicitly with their superiors.
- Base their actions on principles rather than rules, even when those principles are at odds with rules established by their supervisors.
- View their action processes as unique rather than generalizable and rule governed.
- Define their effectiveness as consisting in setting a context as their own as well as others' aims can be expressed and used – rather than getting their own solutions and processes adopted (Fisher & Torbert, 1991, p. 195).

Fisher and Torbert (1991) found that the Achiever leaders use their awareness of others' points of view to design ways of gaining acceptance of their own goals by others. They see implementation as a linear move toward their goal. However, Strategist leaders use their awareness of
others’ points of view to question and possibly revise their goals. They see implementation as an iterative process involving creation of new shared meanings, leading to the reframing of problems. Both Achiever and Strategist leaders see it as appropriate to influence their superiors’ beliefs, goals, and actions.

**Follower Development**

Hall and Thompson (1980) reported findings that suggest Strategist leaders are more likely to create conditions and foster environments that support and facilitate the personal and professional development of subordinates than are Opportunist or Diplomat leaders.

**Leader-Follower Developmental Fit**

Kegan and Lahey (1984) argued that a follower’s understanding of effective leadership is a function of both the meaning-making systems of followers and the meaning system of the leader. They suggested that employees are generally dissatisfied with leaders who are operating out of meaning systems less sophisticated than their own. For instance, suppose that followers who are at the Achiever stage report to leaders who are at the Diplomat stage. The followers, who tend to define their identity through their role and their achievement at high levels, will have high expectations for themselves and for others, especially their leader. However, for the Diplomat leader, the desire to achieve is not as strong. Instead, conformity and adherence to norms are more important. Anything that is seen as disruptive to these norms is avoided. The Achiever follower, who prefers to get things done rather than “play by the rules,” will likely cause a Diplomat leader a great deal of anxiety. The leader will endeavor to maintain harmonious relations while, at the same
time, preventing the follower from going outside of established boundaries. The follower will likely regard this leader as weak, close-minded and ineffective (Kegan & Lahey, 1984).

Leaders who are developmentally beyond their followers may find themselves misunderstood. For example, suppose we have the reverse situation as outlined above, that is an Achiever leader and a Diplomat follower. In this situation, it would be the leader who is pushing hard to perform at high levels and expectations for the followers to have self-agency in doing their work. He or she will place high expectations on their followers to do the same. Diplomat followers tend to define themselves by their relationships and may feel stressed by the Achiever’s “go, go, go” attitude and expect the Achiever to tell them what to do rather than have the capacity to decide this for themselves. Achievement and high performance are valued by the leader, not relationships. Achievers’ can be misinterpreted by Diplomat subordinates as leaders who are only interested in achievement; thus, the follower may interpret the leader’s actions as getting the job done “at any cost.” Consequently, these followers are likely to label their leader as uncaring, obsessive, and ineffective.

The leadership behaviors that a follower experiences as supportive may differ, depending on the follower’s developmental position. Leaders who can provide support in ways the followers themselves experience as support will probably be considered more effective (Kegan & Lahey, 1984). For example, Diplomat followers define themselves by their relationships. Thus, they will find leadership behaviors that focus on building and maintaining relationships while avoiding conflict as very supportive. This will be less of a priority for Achiever followers who
would probably regard the removal of roadblocks by the leader that are preventing the achievement of a task the more supportive action.

These propositions suggest that the most effective leader, from the follower’s perspective, is the one who both challenges and supports them at the same developmental stage as the follower. Hence, the leader could be at the same level as the follower or at more complex levels and choose consciously to challenge and support at the followers level. In this case, the leader should act as a “pacer” helping the follower toward developing a more sophisticated stage of development.

Rooke and Torbert (1998) have studied organizational transformation efforts in ten organizations, five for-profit and five not-for-profits. They determined that ego development stage of CEO and of his or her most trusted advisor (in these cases, the Organizational Development consultant) is a critical variable influencing the likelihood of successful organizational transformation. They proposed that when the consultant and CEO have similar stage of ego development, successful influence and positive transformation are more likely to occur. This was the case in five out of five successful organizational transformations. Conversely, only two out of five organizations transformed when the CEO was at a stage of development less than the consultant. Further, in all cases when consultants and leaders were at the same stage, this stage was the Strategist stage. Thus, it is unclear whether organizational transformation demands effective leadership of persons at multiple stages. Strategists are capable of making cross-stage communication. Thus, in cases where the leader is at the Strategist stage, the developmental “fit” between leader and follower may be less important than the developmental stage of the leader.
Although the number of studies is limited, they suggest that the dynamics of the relative developmental stages of the leader and follower may well be a significant factor in determining leader effectiveness. However, it is unclear as to whether leaders who are at the same developmental stage as their followers are more or less effective than those who have capabilities one or more stages higher than their followers.

Behavioral Complexity and Leadership
Robert Quinn, Robert Hoojiberg, and their colleagues have noted that traditional theories of leadership often attempt to classify the behaviors of managerial leaders into distinct categories. For example, McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y (1957) as well as, Burn’s (1978) comparison of transactional and transformational leaders can be applied to organizational managers and leaders alike. Both attempt to describe the actions of leaders and managers as fitting either one category or the other. However, more recent theorizing has amplified awareness to issues of paradox, contradiction, and complexity. This awareness suggests that the behavior of managerial leaders may actually assume “multiple categories simultaneously” (Denison, Hoojiberg, & Quinn, 1995).

This approach goes beyond static behavioral or contingency approaches that require a leader to identify the characteristics of a situation and then select the appropriate behavior for that situation. In today’s turbulent environment,

Most leaders interact almost simultaneously with a variety of stakeholders in multiple and rapidly changing settings covering a virtually endless list of contingencies (Hoojiberg, Hunt, & Dodge, 1997, p. 376).
This perspective implies that effective organizational leaders are those who have the capacities to respond to the complexities of the myriad demands of their organizational environments. Quinn and his colleagues, particularly Robert Hoojiberg, have integrated the concepts of paradox, contradiction, complexity, and managerial behavior to form the concept of behavioral complexity. Behavioral complexity is the ability to simultaneously perform and adapt behavioral roles based upon the organizational and environmental conditions. Quinn and Hoojiberg note that previous research has supported a link between cognitive complexity and effective leadership practices (e.g., Steufert & Sweezy, 1986; Torbert, 1987 & 1991). Cognitive complexity is theorized to be the precursor to behavioral complexity. In other words, cognitive complexity may be a necessary condition for the kind of leadership effectiveness desired; however, behavioral complexity is the sufficient condition for high performance (Denison, Hoojiberg, & Quinn, 1995). To follow their argument to its conclusion, Denison, et al. (1995) assert that managerial leaders may possess the cognitive ability to map the complexities of the environment accurately; however, they may have limited motivation or may be limited in their ability to translate that understanding into context-appropriate action.

Quinn’s (1988) Competing Values Framework for Leadership Effectiveness advances the notion that organizational leaders possess a behavioral repertoire unique to their cognitive complexity and experience. Hoojiberg and Quinn (1992) define behavioral repertoire as the breadth and depth of the kinds of managerial perspectives that can be translated into action. A broad portfolio of leadership roles improves the likelihood of an organizational leader behaving effectively given the unique circumstances of any situation. Behavioral repertoire suggests that more effective organizational leaders incorporate more leadership roles, and incorporate
them to a greater extent than do less effective leaders (Hoojiberg & Quinn, 1992). Additionally, highly effective organizational leaders maintain a balance across the various roles they can access (Quinn, 1988; Torbert, 1987 & 1991). Sophisticated leaders do not emphasize any particular role more than any of the others in their repertoires. Thus, effective leadership requires the ability to perform in a variety of managerial roles appropriate to any given situation.

The recent literature on managerial and leadership roles is based primarily on Quinn’s (1988) *Competing Values Framework*. In one of the earliest studies, Quinn, Faermann, and Dixit (1987) compared role profiles of managers who were considered either effective or ineffective in their work performance. They reported that ineffective profiles could be categorized into one of two groups. The first group consisted of managers who scored poorly on nearly all of the managerial roles. The second group consisted of individuals who performed exceedingly well in three or four of the eight roles, but scored below the mean on all of the remaining roles. The high performance managers performed at or above the mean in each of the eighth of the roles. Quinn, et al. (1987) assert that the difference between effective and ineffective managers is the ability of the effective leaders to balance their managerial approaches by drawing upon behavioral portfolios rich with roles, perspectives, and strategies. Managers who rely solely on the insights of only a few of the leadership roles find effectiveness an elusive endeavor.

Denison, Hoojiberg, and Quinn (1995) built upon the findings of Quinn et al. (1987) by studying a sample of 176 executives in the public utilities industry. They learned that effective managers were more “behaviorally complex.” Their results support the proposition that effective managers demonstrate a diversity of behavioral roles. Hoojiberg (1996) investigated
the concept of behavioral repertoire by examining the impact of leadership roles on the perceptions of effectiveness by the subordinates, peers, and supervisors of the managerial research participants. The sample was taken from two industries. Hoojiberg reported that managers with wide-ranging behavioral repertoires were perceived as more effective in their effectiveness by subordinates, peers, and supervisors, than by managers who only performed a limited number of roles.

Hart and Quinn (1993) reported that behavioral repertoire influences not only managerial leadership, but also affects organizational effectiveness and performance. Their results indicated that CEO’s who had balanced portfolios of managerial behaviors and roles, had significantly more impact on their firms performance than CEO’s whose portfolios were less balanced. Balanced leaders were identified as those who scored in the top third of the four leadership roles investigated.

Each of these studies suggests that effective organizational leadership is a function of leaders drawing upon an extensive set of behavioral roles to perform their work and lead their respective organizations. Leaders who are cognitively and behaviorally complex construct wide-ranging perspectives and enjoy the ability to respond and act in a variety of ways in which they can lead their organizations.

The Competing Values Framework
There is little doubt that organizational effectiveness is a fundamental goal for leaders and stakeholders alike. Unfortunately, because this construct is rarely defined consistently (Cameron, 1986), differing conceptions of effectiveness can result in tension among stakeholders and leaders based upon their incongruent understandings of this
concept. The *Competing Values Framework* was developed initially from research conducted on the major indicators of effective organizations. The key questions asked in that investigation were:

1. What are the main criteria for determining if an organization is effective or not?
2. What key factors define organizational effectiveness?
3. When people judge an organization to be effective, what indicators do they have in mind? (Cameron and Quinn, 1999)

Campbell (1977), stressing the elusiveness of this construct, conducted an extensive literature review that yielded 39 different criteria for organizational effectiveness. He claimed this list represented a comprehensive set of all possible measures of organizational effectiveness. During this time some organizational researchers were so frustrated by the imprecision in defining organizational effectiveness that they called for a moratorium on studies of organizational effectiveness (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

The *Competing Values Framework* emerged from conceptual papers and empirical studies by Robert Quinn, John Rohrbaugh, and other colleagues. The best-known and most frequently cited of these studies is an empirical analysis of organizational effectiveness criteria presented by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983). The study showed that differences among the many effectiveness criteria in the literature can be better understood when they are organized along axes that represent organizational orientations toward flexibility and control, and external versus internal foci.

In that study, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) asked organizational theorists and researchers to make judgments about similarities or dissimilarity between pairs of effectiveness criteria (i.e., Campbell’s list of organizational effectiveness criteria). Their objective was to understand
how organizational theorists and researchers thought about organizational effectiveness, rather than ascertaining what they thought organizational effectiveness was. These data were analyzed using multidimensional scaling (Quinn, 1988) to determine if patterns or clusters could be identified that would make understanding organizational effectiveness easier. Results of the analysis suggested that organizational theorists and researchers share an implicit theoretical framework (Quinn, 1988).

Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) found that the criteria of organizational effectiveness could be sorted according to two axes or value dimensions (See figure 2.8). Thus, the Competing Values Framework has four quadrants (i.e., rational goal model, internal process model, human relations model, and open systems model) differentiated by a vertical and horizontal axis that represent differing cultural orientations (i.e., flexibility, control, internal and external foci). Each quadrant includes two inherent leadership roles and their related competencies. Additionally, using the same axes for orientation, the Competing Values Framework has evolved to describe organizational culture (i.e., Clan, Hierarchy, Adhocracy, and Firm).

It is important to note that the Competing Values Framework was developed during a time when organizations operated primarily in the bottom half of the framework (i.e., internal process and rations goal models). Managers and leaders held formal roles and maintained a portfolio of clear-cut objectives and responsibilities. Given this origin, the Competing Values Framework is most applicable and provides the most useful insight for organizations that have clearly defined organizational units and management responsibilities. By using the
Figure 2.8: The Competing Values Framework for Organizational Effectiveness.

Each of the four models of organizing in the competing values framework assumes different criteria of effectiveness. Here we see the criteria in each model; the labels on the axes show the qualities that differentiate each model. (Source: R.E. Quinn, 1988)
tools of the *Competing Values Framework*, organizations can initiate purposeful cultural change designed to bring their culture, strategic leadership practices, management roles and effectiveness criteria into alignment, which will enhance their overall performance.

The *Competing Values Framework* continues to be a valuable tool for understanding organizational and leadership effectiveness. It provides a view of organizations that illuminates not only the dialectical tensions models of organization and management theory extrapolated from the literature and empirically validated through multidimensional scaling (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983) and includes two leadership roles per quadrant (which will be discussed). As leaders develop an understanding of the management models and their complimentary as well as competing relationships, the *Competing Values Framework* can be used as a tool for developing the skills required to lead or manage in the today’s fast-paced and demanding environments (Quinn, 1988; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Initially, the four management models that comprise the *Competing Values Framework* seem to be entirely different perspectives; however, they can be viewed as interconnected. They are four important subdomains of a larger construct: organizational effectiveness (Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, & McGrath, 1996). The Competing Values Framework integrates these four management models and provides a framework through which multiple approaches to organizational effectiveness can be described, understood, and implemented. The *Competing Values Framework*’s basic assumption is that each differing approach is potentially useful, depending on an organization’s operating environment and objectives (Brown & Dodd, 1998).
Taken alone, no one of the models allows us the range of perspectives and the increased choice and potential effectiveness provided by considering them all part of a larger framework: the competing values framework (Quinn et al, 1996, p. 11).

Again, the relationships between the models can be seen in terms of two axes. The vertical axis reflects whether an organization focuses its attention inward, toward its internal dynamics, or outward, toward its external environment. The horizontal axis reflects preferences for flexibility versus control in organizational structuring (Zammuto, Gifford & Goodman, 2000). Each model comprises one of the four quadrants.

*The Internal Process Model*

This model reflects the view that organizations are effective if they are stable and keep track of activities within the organization (DiPadova & Faerman, 1993). There is a great emphasis on measurement, documentation, and information management because these processes bring stability and control. In such an organization, people are given well-defined roles and are expected to follow rules that outline what they should do (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). The major reward for their efforts is job security. From a purely cultural perspective the *Internal Process Model* can be thought of as a *Hierarchy*. Hierarchies seem to function best in this environment because of the internal focus on high structure and long time lines. From this viewpoint the external environment is largely ignored (Cooper & Quinn, 1993). The culture of the *Internal Process Model* manifests itself as a formalized and structured place to work (Hooijberg & Petrock, 1993). Procedures govern what people do and leaders pride themselves on being good coordinators and organizers. Maintaining a smooth running organization is important in this environment. Given this context, managers are expected to assume *monitor* and *coordinator* roles.
As a Monitor, a manager is expected to know what is going on in the unit, to determine if people are complying with rules, and to see if the unit is meeting its quotas. The monitor knows all the facts and details and is good at quantitative analysis (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). Behaviors in this role include handling paperwork, reviewing and responding to routine information, and carrying out inspections, tours, and reviews of printouts and reports (Quinn, et al, 1996).

As a Coordinator, a manager is expected to maintain the structure and flow of the system and to be dependable and reliable. Behaviors include various forms of work facilitation such as scheduling, organizing, and coordinating staff efforts, handling crisis, and attending to technological issues (See Figure 2.9 for an illustration of the managerial leadership roles in the Competing Values Framework).

The Open Systems Model
Organizational effectiveness for the Open Systems Model is defined in terms of organizational survival and expansion (Cooper & Quinn, 1993). This orientation contrasts with the Internal Process Model and can be associated with terms such as organic system, flat system, loosely coupled system, matrix, and temporary system. The criteria of effectiveness in this model are adaptability, readiness, growth, resource acquisition, and external support. In such an organization, there is great emphasis on innovation and creativity, that is, on doing things that have never been done before (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). Here people are not controlled but are inspired.
Figure 2.9:  
The Competing Values Framework Leadership Roles and Competencies. Each of the eight leadership roles in the competing values framework contains three competencies. They, like the values, both complement the ones next to them and contrast with those opposite to them. (Source: R.E. Quinn, 1988)
These organizations are driven by a desire to deal with rapidly changing environments, technologies, and global competition (DiPadova & Faerman, 1993). Organizational members are part of a collectivity which is attempting to do something of great importance. Motivation is seldom an issue; people feel fully committed and fully challenged. If they succeed in implementing a new vision, considerable external recognition and resources will follow. Survival and elaboration are difficult because the environment is perceived as complex, turbulent, and politicized (Cooper & Quinn, 1993).

The *Open Systems Model* can be thought of as an adaptive adhocracy. The adhocracy culture is characterized as a dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative place to work. People take chances in this environment and an emphasis is placed on always being on the “cutting edge.” Readiness for change and meeting new challenges are important. The organization’s long term emphasis is on growth and acquiring new resources. Managers assume the roles of *innovators* and *brokers* in this environment.

An *Innovator* is expected to facilitate adaptation and change. The innovator absorbs uncertainty by monitoring the outside environment, identifying important trends and conceptualizing and projecting needed changes (Quinn, et al, 1996). Unlike the *Monitor* role, where deduction, facts, and quantitative analysis rule, the innovator role requires the manager to rely on induction, ideas, and intuitive insights (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). In this role the manager is expected to be a creative, clever dreamer who sees the future, envisions innovations, packages them in inviting ways, and convinces others that they are necessary and desirable (Quinn, 1988).
In a system like the *Open Systems Model*, that focuses its energy toward the external environment, politics become important, and the manager must understand the dynamics of power to be effective. In short, they must utilize the *Broker* role. A *broker* is particularly concerned with maintaining external legitimacy and obtaining external resources. Here the manager is expected to be politically astute, persuasive, influential, and powerful. The manager is expected to meet with people from outside of the organization, to represent the organization and market its product or services. The *Broker* acts as a liaison and spokesperson, and is motivated to acquire resources that are desirable and beneficial to the organization (Quinn, et al, 1996).

*The Rational Goal Model*

The major emphasis in this model is on profit or the bottom line. There is an underlying theory of rational action. Effectiveness is defined in terms of production or economic goals such as profit maximization (Cooper & Quinn, 1993) or reaching fund-raising goals. *The Rational Goal Model* assumes that planning and goal setting result in productivity and efficiency. Tasks are clarified; objectives are set; and action is taken. Here people are clearly instructed by a decisive authority figure and are rewarded financially if they perform well (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). If they do not perform well, they are asked to leave, forced out, or fired. The *rational goal model* seeks clarity and short time horizons. The basic assumptions of this approach are rooted in rational economic principles, and the organization is considered a competitor in a competitive market.

The *Rational Goal Model* is characterized by the *Market* culture. Leaders are hard driving producers and competitors; they are tough and demanding to work for. The long term concern in this culture is on competitive strategies and achievement of goals and targets (Hooijberg &
Managers in this model are expected to direct others and produce results. As a Director, a manager is expected to clarify expectations through planning and goal setting. Directors are decisive initiators for themselves, their subordinates and for their organizations who define problems, select alternatives, establish objectives, define roles and tasks, generate rules and policies, evaluate performance, and give instructions (Quinn, et al, 1996).

A Producer is task-oriented and work-focused manager. They have high interest, motivation, energy and personal drive (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). These managers accept responsibility, complete assignments, and maintain high personal productivity (Quinn, et al, 1996). Producers are usually involved in motivating co-workers and subordinates to increase production and to accomplish ambitious goals.

The Human Relations Model

This model focuses on the importance of cohesion and morale with emphasis on human resources and training. Here the organization’s informal behavioral structure (interpersonal systems of power, status, communication, and friendship) rather than the formal structures (rules, “official” positions, and procedures) is emphasized (Cooper & Quinn, 1993). Value is placed on information sharing and participative decision making. Employees are not seen as isolated individuals but as cooperating members of a common social system with a common stake in what happens (Quinn, et al, 1996). They are held together by a sense of affiliation and belonging (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). The organizational culture is a cohesive clan or team. The clan culture is characterized as a friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves (Hooijberg & Petrock, 1993). The organization is held together by loyalty or tradition and commitment is high. The organization emphasizes the
long-term benefit of personal development and morale (Hooijberg & Petrock, 1993). Here managers are expected to be Facilitators and Mentors.

The Facilitator is expected to foster collective effort, build cohesion and teamwork, and manage interpersonal conflict (Quinn, et al, 1996). Facilitators are often described as process oriented managers who will intervene in interpersonal disputes, use conflict management techniques, develop cohesion and morale, obtain input and participation, and facilitate group problem solving (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993).

Managers in the Human Relations Model are also expected to be Mentors, eager to engage in the personal and professional development of co-workers through caring, empathetic interactions (O’Neil & Quinn, 1993). In this role mentors are helpful, considerate, sensitive, approachable, open, and fair. Mentors listen, support legitimate requests, convey appreciation, and give compliments and credit when due. Mentors view people as resources to be developed and not ignored (Quinn, et al, 1996). Mentors help others with skill building, provide training opportunities for them, and help them develop plans for their own individual development.

Paradox and Performance
Each organizational model and leadership role has a perceptual opposite. For example, the Internal Process model, which emphasizes control and internal focus, stands in stark contrast to the Open Systems model, which stresses flexibility and external focus. The same relationship exists for the Broker, who works hard at establishing and maintaining a power base; negotiating agreement and commitment, and presenting ideas to external constituencies, and the Monitor, who supervises personal and organizational performance. The parallels among the
models are also important to note. The Internal Process model and Rational Goal model share an emphasis on predictability and control while the Open Systems and Rational Goal models share an external focus.

The scheme is called the Competing Values Framework because the criteria seem initially to carry a conflicting message: We want our organizations to be adaptable and flexible, but we also want them to be stable and controlled. We want growth, resource acquisition, and external support, but we also want tight information management and formal communication. We want emphasis on the value of human resources, but we also want an emphasis on planning and goal setting (Quinn, et al., 1996; O’Neil & Quinn, 1993; Quinn, 1988). The framework does not suggest that these tensions cannot exist at the same time in an organization. It does suggest, however, that the criteria, values, and assumptions that create tension are viewed as opposites in our minds. We tend to think about them as mutually exclusive; we assume we cannot hold competing values at the same time.

For managers the world keeps changing. It changes from hour to hour, day to day, and week to week. The strategies that are effective in one situation are not necessarily effective in another. Even worse, the strategies that were effective yesterday may not be effective in the same situation today (Quinn, et al., 1996, p. 14).

If these challenges are not demanding enough, a majority of managers typically employ very similar strategies, if not the same strategies, in almost all situations they face (Quinn, 1988; Nutt & Backoff, 1992). The Competing Values Framework can increase organizational and leadership effectiveness because each model conveys the value of each different management perspective, including contrasting or competing
perspectives and strategies. The framework reflects the complexity confronted by people in real organizations (O'Neil & Quinn, 1993).

It therefore provides tools for broadening thinking and for increasing choice and effectiveness. This, however, can only happen as three challenges are met.

Challenge #1: To appreciate the values and weaknesses of each of the four models.

Challenge #2: To acquire and use the competencies associated with each model.

Challenge #3: To dynamically integrate the competencies from each of the models with the managerial situations we encounter (Quinn, et al., 1996, p. 14).

The Competing Values Framework attempts to highlight the tensions and conflict between opposite quadrants as well as the cohesive tensions between and connectedness of adjacent quadrants and poles. Quinn (1988) believes that people who become “masters of management” do not see their work environment only in structured, analytic ways. Instead, they also have the capacity to see it as a complex, dynamic system that is constantly evolving. Successful managers are able to move from quadrant to quadrant, with appropriate leadership styles, to overcome the apparent paradoxes and contradictions facing them. In order to interact effectively, they employ a variety of different perspectives or frames. In other words, they use a balanced approach.

Because the Competing Values Framework is embedded in the integration of opposing organizational and managerial values, it inherently contains contradiction and tension: paradox (Van de Ven & Poole, 1987). The paradoxical nature of the framework suggests that organizations are dynamic and alive. Paradoxes are ever present and are themselves dynamic streams of energy which are constantly transformed (Ford &
Backoff, 1988). Environmental and organizational tensions often reveal issues of competing interests or values (Nutt & Backoff, 1993), and when these competing values or tensions are interpreted together, rather than separately, they provide deeper insights into the whatever the situation may present (Cameron, 1986).

According to this perspective organizations can be both cohesive and productive or stable and flexible. This is the central strength of the Competing Values Framework. Not only is paradox a complex phenomenon to comprehend in terms of the competing values organizations hold; it is in many cases a strong predictor of effectiveness for both organizations and their leaders (Quinn, 1988; Quinn, et al., 1996; Cameron & Quinn, 1988; Torbert, 1987, 1991). The Competing Values Framework is built around the concept of paradox. However, in order to manage the paradoxes of high performance a leader must possess the ability to engage in paradoxical thinking, and in order to engage in paradoxical thinking, one must be willing to engage in contradiction (Quinn, et al, 1996).

Master Managers are behaviorally as well as cognitively complex individuals. Behavioral complexity is directly linked to the concepts of paradox and contradiction (Hooijberg & Quinn, 1995). Effectiveness and high performance requires not only complex thinking processes but also a complex set of performance or behavioral skills.

Behavioral complexity is the ability to act out a cognitively complex strategy by playing multiple, even competing roles, in a highly integrated and complementary way (Hooijberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 164).
The notion of behavioral complexity suggests that more effective leaders will engage in more roles, and utilize them to a greater extent, than less effective leaders. Effective leaders will also strike a balance among the various roles that they play. That is, they will not emphasize certain roles substantially more than other roles.

The effective leaders are also more likely to have the cognitive complexity to understand the four contrasting mind-sets, values, or philosophies underlying each of the quadrants and to be able to integrate behaviorally the behaviors embedded in the contrasting mind-sets (Quinn, 1988).

Master Managers have an appreciation of competing values in their organizations and examine organizational issues from the perspective of each of the values before acting (Quinn, 1988). By managing these tensions as issues of importance to the organization, leaders remain issue centered. “Thus an issue posed as a tension does not identify a problem to be solved but a paradox to be transcended” (Nutt & Backoff, 1993).

Cameron (1986) investigated effectiveness of colleges and universities facing decline and found paradox to be critical to organizational resurgence following a substantial decline in revenues and enrollments. He asserts:

Organizational effectiveness is inherently paradoxical. To be effective, an organization must possess attributes that are simultaneously contradictory, even mutually exclusive (p. 545).

In a paradox, contradictions exist simultaneously. Master Managers accept contradictions; they do not try to choose between the two competing entities, they try to integrate them and develop new, more dynamic perspectives.
Other researchers have identified paradox as an essential capacity for surviving in today's fast-paced environments. Cameron (1986) identified several paradoxical attributes of successful companies that were reported by other researchers:

1. loose-coupling, which promotes wide search, initiation of innovation and functional autonomy, coexists with tight-coupling, which encourages quick execution, implementation, and functional reciprocity (Morgan, 1981);
2. high specialization of roles, for expertise and efficiency, along with high generality of roles, for flexibility and interdependency (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967);
3. continuity of leadership, which provides stability and long term planning, and turnover among leaders, to infuse ability to innovate and to adapt (Chaffee, 1984);
4. processes to encourage productive conflict and opposition at the same time as process to encourage harmony and consensus (Maruyama, 1963);
5. expanded scanning of the wider environment before decision making, as well as inhibitors to prevent information overload (Huber, 1984);
6. disengagement with tradition to encourage new perspectives and innovation while also reintegrating and reinforcing corporate roots to foster identity and commitment to the corporate mission (Tichy, 1983).

Cameron explains (1986) that the tension that exists between simultaneous opposites in organizations prevents schismogenesis, a process by which an organizational or managerial attribute reproduces itself until it becomes dysfunctional, in a negatively reinforcing cycle. No
one managerial leadership role or organizational management theory provides the sole answer to organizational and leadership performance. Effective leaders are cognitively and behaviorally complex and are able to integrate opposite roles most of the time. Master Managers are able to integrate opposite roles whenever necessary.

In situations when managerial leaders become highly committed to the behaviors associated with one role, they lose touch with the management roles and values from the other quadrants. As a result, a seemingly successful leader can quickly become ineffective when facing unique challenges. Without behavioral complexity one’s strengths can become the source of one’s failure. Low behavioral complexity on the part of a leader can lead to disastrous personal and organizational outcomes. To illustrate this, Faerman and Quinn (1985) developed the concept of the “negative zone.” It can be seen in Figures 2.10 and 2.11.

Figure 2.10 reflects organizational effectiveness and Figure 2.11 reflects leader effectiveness. Each of the circles is divided into four quadrants. The vertical dimension ranges from chaos (i.e., too much flexibility and spontaneity) to rigidity (i.e., too much order and predictability). The horizontal dimension ranges from belligerence and hostility (i.e., too much external focus and too much emphasis on competition and engagement) to apathy and indifference (i.e., too much internal focus and too much emphasis on coordination within the system). In the middle or second circle are the positively stated values from the Competing Values Framework. The inner and outermost circles are considered negative zones. The inner circle is straightforward and represents a lack of ability to perform in a given role. The most interesting circle, however, is the outer circle.
Figure 2.10

Negative Zone in Organizational Effectiveness

Figure 2.11
Negative Zone in Leadership Effectiveness

Here each set of positive values is “pushed” until it becomes negative. In the upper left quadrant is the *irresponsible country club*.

In this quadrant, human relations criteria are emphasized to the point of encouraging laxity and negligence. Discussion and participation, good in themselves, are carried to inappropriate lengths. Commitment, morale, and human development turn into extreme permissiveness and uncontrolled individualism. Here, administrators are concerned only with employees, to the exclusion of the task (Quinn, 1988, p. 69).

The upper right quadrant is the *tumultuous anarchy*.

In this quadrant, there is so much emphasis on the open systems criteria of effectiveness that disruption and discontinuity result. Emphasis on insight, innovation, and change turn into premature responsiveness and disastrous experimentation. Concern for external support, resources acquisition, and growth turn into political expediency and unprincipled opportunism. Here the administrators are concerned only with having a competitive advantage and show no interest in continuity and control of the work flow (Quinn, 1988, p. 71).

The lower right quadrant reflects an *oppressive sweatshop*.

In this quadrant, there is too much emphasis on the criteria of effectiveness associated with the rational goal model. Effort, productivity, and emphasis on profit or impact of service turn into perpetual exertion and human exhaustion. Here we see symptoms of burnout. Concern for goal clarification, authority, and decisiveness turn into an emphasis on strict regulation and blind dogma. There is no room for individual differences; the boss has final the say (Quinn, 1988, p. 71).

The lower left quadrant is the *frozen bureaucracy*.

Here there is too much concern with internal processes. The organization becomes atrophied as a result of excessive measurement and documentation; it becomes a system of red tape. Control measures, documentation, and computation turn into procedural sterility and trivial rigor. Everything is “by the book.” The emphasis on stability, control, and continuity lead to the blind
perpetuation of habits and traditions. Procedures are followed because “we've always done it this way”; there is no room for trying something new (Quinn, 1988, p. 71).

A leader or manager’s actions can produce such extreme adverse results that the system they are responsible for can fall completely out-of-balance and disintegrate. Unlike schismogenesis, paradox implies mutually exclusive opposites, not opposites that are mutually reinforcing. For instance, loose-coupling does not cause a reaction of tight-coupling or of more loose-coupling. Instead, simultaneous, equally compelling, contradictory attributes coexist which create both balance and dynamism (Cameron, 1986). Managers need to stay in the positive zone. In other words, they must pursue the seemingly “competing” positive values in the middle circle while also being careful to stay out of the external negative zone (Quinn, 1988). They must maintain a dynamic, creative tension.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In the book Becoming a Qualitative Researcher, Glesne and Peshkin, (1992) instruct new researchers carefully to consider the methods they choose because, “the research methods we choose say something about our views on what qualifies as valuable knowledge and [reveals something of] our perspective on the nature of reality.” I agree with this insight; however, it is of equal importance, and perhaps more revealing to integrate one’s choice of methods with additional elements in the research process – elements that fundamentally shape and guide one’s research.

Michael Crotty (1998), in his book, The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process, describes four elements of the research process: method, methodology, theoretical perspective, and epistemology. He defines them this way:

- **Methods**: the techniques or procedures used to gather and analyze data related to some research question or hypothesis.
• **Methodology**: the strategy, plan of action, process, or design lying behind the choice and use of particular methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes.

• **Theoretical perspective**: the philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria.

• **Epistemology**: the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective and thereby in the methodology (p.3).

Crotty suggests that when researchers ask themselves questions like, “How will I justify the methodologies and methods of my study?” that the most convincing support for one’s research is found in the fundamental assumptions held by the researcher. “Justification of our choice and particular use of methodology and methods is something that reaches into the assumptions about reality [and intersects with the kinds of questions we are asking]. To ask about these assumptions is to ask about our theoretical perspectives” [as they relate to the kinds of questions we ask] (p.2). These assumptions provide the link that bonds each of these elements; together they present considerably more insight into the nature and purposes of one’s research than does the presentation of any one of the elements individually.

I believe reality accommodates several ideologies and theoretical perspectives; therefore, I feel comfortable in employing mixed-methodologies when different kinds of research questions can be asked in a given study. This study asks two kinds of questions and, subsequently uses both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to address them. This chapter describes the specific methods I am using to collect and analyze data for this study, the methodology that undergirds my research, the theoretical perspective that informs my mixed paradigm
methodology, and the epistemological assumptions that guide my research. Decisions about these elements as they relate to my research will also be discussed, as well as strengths and limitations of this study.

The nature of knowledge and justification
Epistemology is essentially a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know or addressing what counts as knowledge, given a kind of question and inquiry. Subsequently, it influences the questions being asked and how the research is conceptualized, conducted, and justified. Crotty (1998) believes that one’s epistemology is inherent in the theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches used by researchers. Of course, the opposite certainly holds true as well. Crotty’s use of the term epistemology is often referred to as one’s paradigmatic preference in other qualitative research texts and articles; therefore, the terms will be used interchangeably. In either case, one’s paradigmatic perspective, or epistemology “locates a researcher in history, both guiding and constraining work that will be done in any study” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p.12).

A paradigm provides the researcher with a general perspective. It is a way of organizing complexity and a set of basic assumptions (Patton, 1990). Broadly speaking, a paradigm may be viewed as a set of basic beliefs that constitute a perspective of the researcher in the context of the questions he or she is asking. As a result, there is considerable debate among researchers about the nature and use of paradigms for conducting research. Maguire (1987) suggests that paradigms develop in response to historical and cultural conditions. Popkewitz (1984), believes that paradigms represent constellations of theories, questions, methods and commitments which share central values and themes and give direction to scientific work. Schwandt (1989) puts it this way, “Each
model holds a radically different view of the nature of reality, values a
different kind of knowledge, and promotes a different set of standards”
(p. 379).

Maguire (1987) believes that the choice of paradigm forces us to abandon
“the myth of safe, value-free work be it education, activism, or research”
(p. 330). Speaking specifically to the task of paradigm selection, she
notes,

. . . . every input of our work is influenced by the particular
paradigm out of which we choose to operate. Perhaps the most
dangerous position is one of blind and tacit acceptance of any
paradigm without conscious and critical exploration of the choice-
making involved in the implications of those choices. Making
explicit choices forces us to come to grips with our own values.
Who and what purposes does our work serve? (p. 32-33).

Guba and Lincoln (1994) assert that the basic beliefs that define
research paradigms can be summarized by responding to three
fundamental questions:

1. The ontological question: What is the form and nature of reality?
2. The epistemological question: How do we know reality?
3. The methodological question: How do we learn about reality?

These questions are, “interconnected in such a way that the answer to
any one question, taken in any order, constrains how the others may be
answered” (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 108). This is true. In fact, in
Crotty’s (1998) view, ontology (which is concerned with understanding
the kinds of things that constitute the world) and epistemology (which is
cconcerned with how we know what we know) are interconnected to the
point of near fusion. “Ontological and epistemological issues tend to
emerge together” (p.10); therefore, questions relating to a study’s
ontology and epistemology are addressed simultaneously. In any event,
by answering these questions, deeper insight is generated about one’s
worldview and basic assumptions as compared to only thinking about methods for data collection. The perspective that one possesses, whether it is referred to as an epistemology or paradigm, influences the way in which one sees and hears; perceives and interprets; and thinks and conducts research. A researcher’s paradigm enables them to see the world from a particular perspective; however, by virtue of that perspective, paradigms can also be constraining:

A paradigm is a world view, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world. As such, paradigms tell us what is important, legitimate and reasonable. Paradigms are also normative, telling the practitioner what to do without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration. But it is this aspect of paradigms that constitute both their strength and weakness - their strength is that it makes action possible; their weakness is that the very need for action is hidden in the unquestioned assumption of the paradigm. (Patton, 1980, p. 203).

Positioning within a paradigm was not the simple task I presumed it to be. In fact, as I asked myself the questions: “what epistemic perspective informs my scholarly outlook; how does that perspective relate to my theoretical framework; and, how does my own relationship to reality influence the methodology of this study?” I realized how difficult answering these questions can be and how, as Crotty (1998) points out, Not too many of us embark on a piece of social research with epistemology as our starting point. . . . We typically start with a real-life issue that needs to be addressed, a problem that needs to be solved, a question that needs to be answered. We plan our research in terms of that issue, problem or question (p. 13).

My study is no different. My research goals are to understand and describe the “best practices” of leadership and organizational performance in a university development organization as perceived and constructed by members of the organization. I began to carefully think about my assumptions as a researcher and as a person. I wondered,
“What does it mean to describe myself as a constructivist or positivist, or member of any paradigmatic category?” I worried about constraining myself, as Patton warns, by claiming I adhere to only one fundamental perspective. I thought to myself, “Am I misrepresenting my theoretical perspectives or the methodological goals of this study by claiming one particular epistemology?” After contemplating these questions, thinking about my academic and research interests, and reflecting on this particular study, I realize that reality accommodates both qualitative and quantitative paradigms and that I have approached this research from multiple perspectives. I am influenced by both the constructivist epistemology and traditional epistemologies of positivism. It is my position that one can use multiple paradigms in a study employing mixed research questions because reality accommodates them all.

Constructivism is a perspective that focuses on the ways in which people individually and collectively construct and interpret their social and psychological worlds. More specifically, my philosophical assumptions are aligned with constructive-developmentalism. The constructive-developmental perspective focuses on how people know what they know, not on what they know. This epistemology defines how someone thinks or feels; it does not define what they think or feel. (Kegan, 1982 & 1994). We invent concepts, models, and schemes using stage structures that are inherent in our psychological make up. These concepts, models, and schemes help us make sense of our experiences. When developmentally appropriate however, we test and modify these constructions in the light of new experience. In other words, people do not react to an objective, uniformly agreed upon experience of the real world because there is no such thing. Instead, they react and respond to the meanings they have attached to the experiences they have in the world (Lewis & Jacobs, 1992).
Our constructions of the world, our values, and our ideas about how to inquire into those constructions, are mutually self-reinforcing. We conduct inquiry via a particular paradigm because it embodies assumptions about the world that we believe and values that we hold, and because we hold those assumptions and values we conduct inquiry according to the precepts of that paradigm. (Schwandt, 1989, p. 399)

Constructive-developmental theory brings together two powerful lines of intellectual discourse that have influenced not only the field of psychology, but nearly every corner of intellectual life in western society in the past century (Kegan, 1994). These two lines of thought are constructivism (i.e., the idea that people or systems construct reality), and developmentalism (i.e., the idea that people or organic systems evolve through qualitatively different eras of increasing complexity). These evolutions follow consistent patterns according to regular principles of change and stability (Kegan, 1994). These principles represent deep structures of personality that influence people’s thoughts, feelings, and actions (Kegan, 1982; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

Development is viewed as a process of transformation based on shifts of one’s structural perspective or capacity for making meaning (Merron, Fisher, and Torbert, 1987). At each step, the corresponding structure or worldview deeply influences what the person is able to see, and how he or she interprets and reacts to what is seen (Fisher, Merron, and Torbert, 1998). As a result, those at different stages of development will be able to take a perspective on [or take as an object] different things and will define reality in significantly different ways (Kegan, 1892). As individuals move to more complex stages, their constructions become more complex and abstract, but also more precise and specific.
This impacts research on two dimensions: 1) data collection and analysis are influenced by the level and complexity of the researcher, and 2) by the level and complexity of the participants.

At the very least, this means that description and narration can no longer be seen as straightforwardly representational of reality. It is not a case of merely mirroring ‘what is there’. When we describe something, we are, in the normal course of events, reporting how something is seen and related to, and thereby meaningfully constructed, within a given community or set of communities (Crotty, 1998, p.64).

Kegan and Lahey (1984) clearly state the assumptions inherent in the constructive-developmental epistemology:

1. *Meaning making* is central to being human. An evolution of systems of meaning making takes place during the course of one’s life-span. Although individuals develop more complex systems for making meaning, they typically are unaware of the transitions they are undergoing because meaning is not so much something we have as much as it is a system of what we are.

2. *These meaning systems shape our experience.* Simply put, experience is the way we understand what happens to us. Thus we cannot understand another’s experience by simply knowing the events and particulars of another persons day. We must ascertain how an individual is experiencing the events and particulars of a given situation through observation and inquiry.

3. *These meaning systems to a great extent give rise to our behavior.* Our behavior is not random, but rather rooted in our meaning making systems. The way we understand the world around us is a key determinant of the way in which we behave in the world.

4. With exception to periods of transition and evolution from one meaning making system to another, to a great extent *a given system of meaning organizes our thinking, feeling, and acting over a wide range of human functioning.*
5. Although everyone makes meaning in richly idiosyncratic and unique ways, there are striking regularities to the structure of meaning-making systems and to the sequence of meaning systems through which people grow.

Theoretical Foundations

Theoretical perspective is taken here to mean philosophical stance lying behind a methodology... Another way to put it is to say that, whenever one examines a particular methodology, one discovers a complexus of assumptions buried within it. It is these assumptions that constitute one’s theoretical perspective and they largely have to do with the world that the methodology envisages (Crotty, 1998, p. 66).

Schultz (1988) reminds us that while any research project can be approached from a variety of methodologies, it is the choice of one theoretical perspective over another that most influences the research process. This assertion is true; however, its construction assumes mutual exclusiveness. I believe reality accommodates both traditional and qualitative methodologies; therefore, this study takes a both/and, rather than an either or approach to inquiry. Essentially all aspects of research are influenced by the theoretical perspectives of the researcher, ranging from the identification of relevant concepts and constructs, definitions of key variables, specific questions to be investigated, selection of research design, data collection strategies, data analysis techniques, to interpretation of findings (Schultz, 1988).

The theoretical perspective that informs one of my methodology is interpretivism; one of the objectives of my dissertation research is to learn first hand about the perceptions held by several university development professionals regarding their own leadership styles, the performance of their area of supervision, and their perceptions of the overall performance of the university development organization.
Interpretivists attempt to understand, explain and clarify the experiences of others, while also recognizing that knowledge is a human construction and that experience is always open for interpretation. Knowledge and truth, as Schwandt (1994) reminds us, is the result of perspective. (p. 125). The interpretivist researcher views phenomena as consisting of multiple layers of reality that are interrelated and where each layer has its truth. In seeking out the patterns of truth or reality that exist, a researcher does not expect to find one truth; instead the researcher hopes to gain a better understanding of the phenomena under investigation and to provide a well rounded, rich description and explanation of it (Lincoln & Guba, 1994), including the use of traditional and qualitative paradigms.

The fundamental goal of research is to uncover the nature of the social world through an understanding of how people act in and give meaning to their own lives. Thus, the major tasks of this approach are accurately describing and interpreting the nature of reality of others. In order to accurately describe and interpret the views of others, the researcher must engage in meaningful dialogue geared toward understanding the perceptions of others. The interpretivist believes that in order to understand this world of meaning, one must interpret it (Schwandt, 1994). Therefore, clarifying and understanding contexts and definitions of situations discussed by participants is very important because ultimately these meanings are at the center of analysis.

According to Blumer, (1969, “Interpretivism, requires that the researcher actively enter the worlds of the people being studied in order
to see the situation as it is seen by the participant, observe what he or she takes into account, and observe how the participant interprets what is taken into account” (as cited in Schwandt, 1994).

Because qualitative methodologies are fundamentally anchored in a concern for developing depth of understanding of a particular phenomenon and the construction of meaning individuals attribute to their particular experiences, care must be taken to attend to the complex dynamics that emerge (Jones, 2002, p. 3).

The complex dynamics that emerge during research can prove to be challenging, time consuming, or even frustrating; however, they cannot be ignored. In my research, for example, there were times when participants shared confidential materials or insights with me in order to provide a context for decisions they had made professionally or to clarify or expand upon comments they had made during our interviews. In those cases, it was incumbent upon me to listen, learn, and understand, while simultaneously balancing that insight against ethical obligations I have such as, honoring confidentiality agreements, remaining focused on the aims of the research, and maintaining my own integrity by “telling the stories” of the participants as accurately as possible without betraying their trust.

The fundamental assumptions of interpretivism are: understanding comes from an emic, or insider’s perspective; the researcher is the instrument; research is field-based or occurring in natural settings; research is inductive in nature; and research findings depend upon rich description and writing to tell the central story of a phenomenon under investigation (Merriam, 1998). Interpretivists explore the world of lived experience, and all of its complexity, from the point of view of those who live it (Schwandt, 1994).
Methodology

This section connects the philosophical assumptions of constructivism and interpretivism, as well as those of traditional research with the methodology and specific methods for data collection and analysis of this study. The research foci for this research apply to The Ohio State University Development Organization as a whole and to twelve sub-units of the organization. The purposes are to facilitate an understanding and identification of the following:

1. the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leaders in each of these twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as perceived by members of the organization;

2. the “best practices” currently in use by the leadership of Development Organization and by each of the twelve “high performance” development sub-units at The Ohio State University;

3. the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leadership in each of these twelve “high performance” sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s Competing Values Framework; and,

4. the organizational effectiveness of the Development Organization overall and for each of the twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s Competing Values Framework.

Because this research is intended to be exploratory, it is important to note that the methods for this study were designed to be appropriate to the topics under investigation, as well as practical and functional. This research focuses on high performance, leadership, and best practices; subsequently, the research methods have the following characteristics:

1. focus on the overall Ohio State University development organization and on twelve development sub-units identified as high-performers with opportunities for follow-up interviews and discussions;
2. allow participants to articulate in their own words their perceptions of the best practices, organizational effectiveness, and leadership characteristics in their particular development sub-unit and in the organization as a whole;
3. allow for the identification and detailed description of the perceptions and patterns of practice and leadership characteristics in the whole organization and in the twelve sub-units; and,
4. view leadership and organizational effectiveness through interpretation of Quinn’s theory of Competing Values

This research draws upon the *Competing Values Framework for Organizational Performance and Leadership* literature and the higher education fundraising literature, specifically that of Duronio and Loessin (1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991).

**Grounding Literatures**
As indicated previously in the literature review, Duronio and Loessin (1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991) used qualitative and quantitative methods to ascertain the nature of effective fundraising. They found that institutions vary across institutional types and also within the same type with regard to institutional characteristics that impact fund-raising. They concluded that comparison of similar institutions or comparisons across institutions is inappropriate. Duronio and Loessin’s findings suggest that institutional characteristics may not be effective measures of fundraising because they are not subject to change or manipulation.

Duronio and Loessin (1990) also concluded that quantitative analysis does not adequately explain variation in fundraising success between institutions with similar resources. Because this indicates that other factors may contribute to fundraising outcomes, Duronio and Loessin adopted a qualitative approach to explore these factors. In a subsequent study, Duronio and Loessin (1991a), investigated ten institutions identified as having exceeded their fundraising potential. The purpose of
this study was to determine which institutions utilized any, or all of
eighteen qualitative institutional factors previously identified in the
literature (Glennon, 1996; Leslie; 1969, Pickett; 1977; Willmer, 1981).

The findings of Duronio and Loessin’s (1991) research indicated that no
single institution was strong in all eighteen factors. Similarly, no one
qualitative factor was common to all ten institutions. The most common
factors included presidential leadership, institutional commitment to
fundraising, the chief advancement officer’s leadership and role in setting
institutional mission, and entrepreneurial fundraising programs. These
findings suggest that development organizations can utilize institutional
characteristics and strengths, as well as create strategies for improving
areas of weakness to maximize fundraising success.

As indicated in the literature review, the Competing Values Framework for
Organizational Effectiveness was developed by Robert Quinn and his
colleagues in a series of conceptual papers and empirical studies. The
best-known and most frequently cited of these is an empirical analysis of
organizational effectiveness criteria presented by Quinn and Rohrbaugh
(1983). The study showed that differences among the many effectiveness
criteria in the organizational performance literature can be better
understood when they are organized along axes that represent
organizational orientations toward flexibility and control, and external
versus internal foci. This model provides a view of organizations that
illuminates not only the dialectical tensions between opposing theoretical
perceptions and leadership roles, but also addresses the potential for
leaders to utilize multiple leadership roles. Quinn positions the concept
of leadership roles, styles, actions, and strategic postures within four
quadrants: rational goal, internal structure, human relations, and open
systems. The model provides four ideal organizational culture contexts and eight leadership styles that coordinate with the organizational contexts systems (see Appendies A and B for models).

According to Quinn (1988), organizations are often viewed in very static ways typically characterized by relatively stable, predictable patterns of action. Expectations are for organizations to be governed by, and products of, rational-deductive thinking. What exists in reality, however, are contradictory pressures from various sources within and outside of the organization. Master Managers see their organizations as evolving, changing, and dynamic systems. They have the personal complexity of meaning-making to adapt to different perspectives. At times they may be very analytical and structured; while at other times they may be intuitive and flexible. If analyzed at one point in time, these managers may seem paradoxical, with their actions considered illogical and contradictory. However, when viewing the whole, these contradictory patterns come together in a fluid, almost artful way.

Methodological Choices
The purpose of this study is not to provide a perfect explanation of “best practices” for development organizations at large public universities. The purpose rather, is to develop an understanding of the perceptions of “best practices” of the participants of this study during a particular time in history. In order to examine and understand the perceptions of the participants, I knew I needed to work within a methodology that acknowledges the construction of reality by the participants in their own context and purposefully used the theoretical framework of Quinn as “eyes” to interpret leadership behaviors and organizational performance in the organization. Hence, I found myself most comfortable approaching this research using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. To
be clear, this study employs primarily ethnographic methodologies, but also incorporates traditional paradigm theoretical research methodology as well.

Given constructive-interpretivism as one of my foundations, it may appear to some as contrasting and incongruent to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methodologies into this research. However, as Crotty (1998) points out, “the distinction between qualitative research and quantitative research occurs at the level of methods. It does not occur at the level of epistemology or theoretical perspectives” (p. 14). Implications for data collection are influenced by the presence and extent of differing goals of the research.

This study employs an interpretive mixed-method case-study design because some of the aims of this study are best addressed using qualitative approaches, while other aims are best achieved using traditional or theoretically-based techniques. In order to understand and identify “best practices” as they relate to organizational performance and leadership at both the organizational and sub-unit levels, qualitative methods are employed. To understand and identify characteristics of organizational performance and leadership at both the organizational and sub-unit levels, the interpretative lens of Quinn’s (1988) theory of Competing Values is used.

Although there are numerous debates between qualitative and quantitative approaches, researchers should feel comfortable in changing their methodological stance when their research asks different kinds of questions.
The data collection procedures selected depend on the specific questions being investigated, the theoretical perspective taken, the circumstances that allow or limit various techniques in the field situation selected, and the skills and imagination of the researcher (Zahalick, 1992, 120).

Good research can be both process-oriented and outcome-oriented without compromising or adversely affecting the integrity of the study.

Most methodologies known today as forms of ‘qualitative research’ have in the past been carried out in an utterly empiricist, positivist manner. . . . quantification is by no means ruled out within non-positivist research (Crotty, 1998, p. 15).

The mixed-methodology used in this study provides not only another data source, but also enhances the overall depth, richness and trustworthiness of the study.

We should accept that, whatever research we engage in, it is possible for either qualitative methods or quantitative methods, or both, to serve our purposes. Our research can be qualitative or quantitative, or both qualitative and quantitative, without this being in any way problematic (Crotty, 1998, p. 15).

Case studies do not employ any single form of data collection or data analysis. “Any and all methods of collecting data, from testing to interviewing, can be used in a case study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 28). The case study approach allows the opinions, insights, and experiences of the participants to guide the focus of the study. According to Merriam (1998), the decision to focus on qualitative case studies stems from the fact that the design is chosen precisely because researchers are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation.

Yin (1994), Merriam (1998), Stake, (1995), and Creswell (1998) have each outlined the qualitative case study method. Creswell believes the case study is an actual methodology defining it this way: “a case study is an exploration of a ‘bounded system’ or case over time through detailed, in-
depth data collection involving multiple sources of information in a rich context” (p. 61). Yin defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that “investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (1989, p. 23). Yin sees strength in this approach and describes it this way:

The case study relies on many of the same techniques as a history, but it adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian’s repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing . . . .the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence – documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations (1994, p. 8).

According to Yin (1994), “The evidence from multiple case studies is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust” (p. 52). Although this study does not examine more than one university’s fund-raising program, it does focus specifically on twelve development sub-units of The Ohio State University. The resulting data present equally compelling and robust insights because the same data collection strategies were used in collecting data from each sub-unit and can therefore be commented on individually, collectively or in comparison to one another.

Denzin (1982) asserts that a study’s authenticity is often judged in large part by thick description grounded in the natural, everyday language, behaviors, meanings, and interactions of those studied. I have attempted to design this study so that it provides rich insights into the professional worlds of the participants. According to Jones (2002) and others, if a study is well conceived, the world of the subject speaks through the researchers document.

The role of theory is very important in traditional case studies, and according to Yin (1994), the initial step in designing traditional study
must consist of theory identification. The obvious logic for this involves practical considerations such as the necessity of a rationale for the development of a case selection criteria and the need for having some idea of what lines of inquiry to explore, what data to collect, etc. In other words, raw data by themselves are of little significance or use without the existence of a rich theoretical context in which to interpret the data and explore and explain its meaning. This study relies on the Competing Values Framework theory for organizational effectiveness and leadership as a theoretical backdrop.

Triangulation
A valuable way to strengthen the design of a qualitative case study is through the use of triangulation, or the combination of data sources (Patton, 1990). This can mean using several kinds of methods or data, including both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) offer the following advice when considering triangulation techniques:

Consider carefully what you want to learn. Different questions have different implications for data collection. In considering options, choose techniques that are likely to (1) elicit data needed to gain understanding of the phenomenon in question, (2) contribute different perspectives on the issue, and (3) make effective use of the time available for data collection. (p. 24)

It is possible to achieve triangulation within a qualitative inquiry strategy by combining different kinds of qualitative methods, for example by mixing purposeful samples, and including multiple perspectives and data sources (Patton, 1990); however, it is also possible, and in some cases more appropriate, to achieve triangulation by combining qualitative methods (e.g., purposeful samples and multiple perspectives) with quantitative methods such as theoretically grounded surveys. This study is interpretive in nature and is most closely associated with ethnographic methodologies. Quantitative methods, however, are also
used (i.e., Competing Values Framework Surveys) to strengthen the overall research design and to facilitate a thorough examination of all of the study’s purposes.

Schwandt (1997) describes the aims of triangulation succinctly, “The central point of triangulation is to examine phenomenon from more than one vantage point” (p. 163). This study draws upon multiple types of data (interview transcripts and tapes; researcher field notes; document analysis; and, theoretically-grounded survey results), and employs, what is referred to by Patton (1990) and Denzin (1982) as methodological triangulation.

The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows investigators to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal, and behavioral issues. However, the most important advantage represented by using multiple sources of evidence is the development of converging lines of inquiry. (Yin, 1994, p. 92).

Case Selection
In 1990, Ohio State University raised $430 million from private gifts for the university. At the time, the campaign was so successful that it was recognized as the largest campaign ever by a public university (Duronio and Loessin, 1991). The university’s final fund-raising totals exceeded original goals set by the administration by nearly $80 million. Ohio State followed that campaign up in 2000, with a $1.3 billion effort, becoming one of only a handful of public universities to complete a billion dollar campaign. The final totals of that campaign exceeded original goals set by the administration by $380 million.

Because Ohio State University has successfully exceeded its goals and predicted fund-raising results in its last two major capital campaigns (effectively outperforming other similar institutions in many cases), and because they have done so in turbulent times of declining support from
traditional sources, such as state and federal budgets, their development organization was selected as the focus of this research.

Based upon my understanding of the development, leadership, and organizational performance literature, as well as my previous experience as Development Projects Coordinator in the College of Education Office of Advancement and current position as Director of Development for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, I believe The Ohio State University setting provides the ideal forum to conduct this study. It is important to note that integration and analysis of data occurred after I became a member of this organization. I attempted not to let this personal development influence the “voices” in the data; however, it could have done so.

Access/Entry

The first step I took in gaining access to the University development organization as an “official researcher” was arranging a meeting with Jerry May, Vice President for Development and President, The Ohio State University Foundation to discuss the purpose, protocol, and methodology of my proposed research. At the time, I was a full-time doctoral student and not formally a member of the University development organization. I held an assistantship in the College of Education as a Development Projects Coordinator and regularly attended staff meetings. As a result, I knew handfuls of development officers on campus and felt comfortable in advancing my idea. In that meeting I explained to Mr. May that based upon my experience in the College of Education Office of Advancement, my studies as a doctoral student in Higher Education Administration (where my studies focus on high performance leadership and organizational effectiveness) that I believed The Ohio State University development organization was a “high performance” organization worthy of scholarly inquiry. The two of us discussed the project at length.
addressing issues such as the amount of time required of the participants, the kinds of meetings and functions I was interested in attending, and the nature and format for data collection and presentation of the findings. We also discussed several offices that he believed were “high performance” development sub-units. We identified more than ten development sub-units at that time; however, we agreed that initially only ten cases would be studied with the possibility to add others later.

A subsequent meeting including John Meyer, Assistant Vice President, and Director of University Development was arranged to further discuss the “high performance” sub-units that might be studied. This strategy is referred to as purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned (Merriam, 1998). Patton (1990) explains that,

the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling (P. 169).

The following definitions of “high performance” were used to facilitate the selection of these high-performance development sub-units:

- **A high-performance team significantly outperforms all other like teams, and outperforms all reasonable expectations given its membership** (Katzenbach and Smith, 1999, p. 92).

- **High-performance higher education development organizations are those whose actual performance exceeds predicted fund-raising results** (Duronio and Loessin, 1991).
The following sub-units were selected for study:

- Senior Administrative Team (i.e., Vice President and Assistant Vice Presidents for development);
- The Office of Corporate and Foundation Giving;
- The Office of Planned Giving;
- The Office of Development Communications;
- The Office of Development Special Events;
- The Fisher College of Business;
- The College of Food, Agriculture & Environmental Sciences;
- The College of Veterinary Medicine;
- The Department of Athletics;
- The College of Engineering;
- Medical Center and Health Sciences;
- Merit Scholarships.

Although no rules exist for sample size and variety in case study research, variation of experience, gender, ethnicity, and areas of responsibility are represented in this study. Even though balance was obtained, it is important to note that this study and sample should not be judged on its variety, but rather should be judged on its contribution to the purpose and rationale of this research.

The validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with information-richness of the cases selected and the observation/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with the sample size (Patton, 1990, p. 185).

The logic of purposeful sampling, as was employed in this study, is quite different than the logic of probability sampling; therefore, this study should be judged in the context of its purposes.
The next step in gaining access to each of the “high performance” development sub-units and their directors occurred in January of 2001. At that time I began attending Leadership Prospect Group (LPG) meetings at the invitation of Jerry May. This group includes senior management and management from all but three of the sub-units identified as high-performers (i.e., Merit Scholarships, Development Special Events, and Development Communications were not included). During LPG meetings, members collaboratively discuss on-going and future strategies for soliciting and stewarding current donors and new prospects that have the ability to make major gifts to the university at or beyond the million dollar range.

During the first meeting I attended, I was formally introduced to the group and my research was outlined and endorsed by Jerry May and John Meyer. LPG members were asked to consider seriously participating in my study. They were told that I would be contacting them in the coming months “officially” to solicit their participation and that I would become a regular attendee to the LPG and Prospect Planning Group (PPG) meetings. PPG meetings focus exclusively on the top prospects and donors for a particular constituency. For example, one meeting may focus on the College of Mathematical & Physical Sciences, while the next meeting will focus on the University Libraries. In those meetings the development director for the selected constituency provides an overview of their best prospects and strategies. The senior team and a few other development directors discuss in-depth the strategies presented and offer advice and support for continued success.

In June of 2001, just prior to mailing my “official” solicitation letters to the administrators and managers of the initial ten “high-performance” development sub-units, John Meyer sent an email memorandum to each manager supporting my research. Shortly thereafter, written
correspondence from me was used “officially” to solicit participation from members of each development sub-unit (Appendix C). When The College of Engineering, and Medical and Health Sciences were added to the study, John Meyer sent the same supportive email memorandum to each director.

Managers from each of the development sub-units were asked to complete Robert E. Quinn’s *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment* (Appendix D) and *Competing Values Framework: Organizational Effectiveness* (Appendix E) instruments before our first interview. After receiving these completed surveys, three 45 – 60 minute interviews were scheduled with each participant. Interview protocols were emailed at least three days in advance of each interview so that participants would feel comfortable with the topics of discussion and have time to reflect on the focus of the interview. Each interview took place in the participant’s office, except on a few occasions when an alternative location was selected by them.

**Data Collection**

*Participant Observation*

Participant observation refers to the researcher’s investment of significant time to learn about the culture of an environment. I have spent more than two years collecting data for this study using this methodology.

Direct, prolonged contact is considered essential in order to learn the complex patterns of people’s beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. . . [This methodology] allows the researcher to see how people diverge from the idealized model of behavior that may present through interviews and other data collection activities (Zaharlick, 1992, p. 119).
As a methodology, participant observation and prolonged engagement is a procedure for generating understanding of the ways of life of others. It requires that the researcher engage in some relatively prolonged period of participation in a community or group; take some part in the daily activities of the people among whom he or she is studying; and reconstruct their activities through the process of description in field notes made on the spot or soon after observations, as well as transcription of interviews and conversations. Schwandt (1997) describes it this way:

Broadly conceived, participant observation includes activities of direct observation, interviewing, document analysis, reflection, analysis, and interpretation. It encompasses logistical, ethical, and political concerns involved in entering the world of those one studies, gaining their trust, developing empathy, and understanding their ways of talking about and acting in their world. Participant observation is a means whereby the researcher becomes socialized into the group under study (p. 111).

An important component of this approach involves investing enough time with the participants to establish trust, and to become familiar with the context of inquiry. Trust can be thought of as a developmental process in which the researcher demonstrates on a continual basis his or her integrity and trustworthiness.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) provide this insight:

Participant observation provides the opportunity for acquiring the status of “trusted person.” Through participant observation – through being a part of a social setting – you will learn firsthand how the actions of your others correspond to their words; see patterns of behavior; experience the unexpected, as well as the expected; and develop a quality of trust with your others that motivates them to tell you what they otherwise might not (p. 39).

For this reason I waited until June of 2001 to begin interviewing the participants. I did however, begin regularly attending Leadership Prospect Group, Prospect Planning Group in January of 2001, and
continued attending development staff meetings, as well as attending
development hosted special events and seminars so that I could develop
an understanding of how the participants interact with each other and so
that they would become comfortable with my presence on a regular
basis. By the time I began interviewing participants, I had developed a
healthy rapport with them and it was clear that I could be trusted and
had no hidden agenda. This was an important accomplishment because,
as Wolcott (1995) points out,

Maintaining rapport presents a continuing challenge through the
very presence of an intrusive and inquiring observer forever
wanting to know more and understand better (p. 91).

I was fortunate enough to interact with all of the participants in several
contexts and in various ways over the course of data collection. In fact,
later in the data collection process, I was invited to help the Senior Team
collect data for a benchmarking project they have been undertaking.
This anecdote conveys the level of trust I had established with not only
the senior team, but also with the rest of the participants. As a result, I
believe the data collected in this study is representative of the actual
opinions and perceptions held by the participants.

Interviews

Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that the major advantage in interviewing
is that “it allows the respondent to move back and forth in time – to
reconstruct the past, interpret the present, and predict the future, all
without leaving a comfortable armchair” (p.272). Using interviews also
lessens the chance of misunderstanding between the interviewer and the
respondent. If a respondent is unsure of the meaning of a question or
term used in the interview, he or she can simply ask for additional
information. For example, in one interview, I used the term *Learning
Organization*. In that instance, the participant asked me to clarify the
term because she was unfamiliar with it. As a result, she better understood the nature of my comment and was able to respond according to the context of the statement I had made.

Another advantage of interviewing is the interviewer can check throughout the interview to ascertain whether he or she understands the nature and context of the information being received. There were many instances when I would ask for clarification, particularly when it related to context. For example, there were several occasions when participants would refer to previous campaigns or administrations as a background for explaining the university’s current success in fund-raising. Because at the time I had a relatively short history with the university, I often asked for clarification and additional information so that I could understand more clearly the nature of their comments.

The interview also gives greater flexibility than other research methods in that the interview may change directions and pursue other avenues of understanding not intended prior to the beginning of the interview. This also occurred frequently. In many cases, the participant would discuss topics I did not expect them to address, such as the impact of professional mentors on their careers, the role of family in following a career path, and in some cases current obstacles for increasing high performance in their particular area of responsibility. Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe interviews as either structured or unstructured. The structured interview is the “mode of choice” when the interviewer knows specifically what he or she is looking for and frames the questions accordingly. The unstructured interview, on the other hand, is chosen when the interviewer does not know what he or she is looking for and relies on the participants to help clarify what it is.
The interview protocols used in this study are best described as semi-structured, which incorporate both open-ended and structured designs. Interviews are structured to the extent that the questions were formulated in advance of the interviews; however, they were designed to facilitate open conversational flow between myself and the participants. Both Maxwell (1996) and Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend the semi-structured interview approach in multiple case study research. Patton (1990) also recommends this type of interview protocol since it insures that basically the same information is obtained from different respondents while allowing the interviewer the freedom to probe or to ask additional questions for further explanation or clarity on the topic of discussion.

Interview protocols were emailed at least three days in advance of each interview so that participants would feel comfortable with the topics of discussion and have time to reflect on the focus of the interview. Each interview took place in the participant’s office, unless they suggested an alternative location.

Prior to beginning each of the first interviews, participants were given an overview of the purpose of the study, an opportunity to ask questions, and given a participant consent form to sign (Appendix F). Participants were also given a draft letter including names of individuals to whom I was planning on mailing the Competing Values Framework: View of (manager’s name) (Appendix G) and Competing Values Framework: Organizational Effectiveness (Appendix H) instruments to their particular development sub-unit. Participants were asked whether any names should be added to include individuals who represent functional layers of their development sub-unit. Additional names were added to my lists and letters were mailed to them.
Participants were also notified orally that the LPG group would be receiving the *Competing Values Framework: View of (manager’s name)* instrument for all participants agreeing to interviews regarding their leadership and particular sub-unit. In other words, all participants would be described through *Competing Values Framework* profiles as perceived by the LPG group. Following the first interview *Competing Values Framework* instruments were mailed to individuals representing functional layers of the participant’s sub-unit with letters requesting their participation (Appendix H). To avoid bias during the interview process, none of the *Competing Values Framework* instruments were scored until after all of the interviews were completed.

The goal of interview #1 (see Appendix I for interview #1 protocol) was to allow the participants to define the term “best practices” in their own words and in the context of their particular work environment, and to create a dialogue about their perceptions of “best practices” occurring in The Ohio State University development organization overall and in their particular area of supervision. Participants were asked to make a list of the best practices they were thinking of to help them during the interview. According to Pelto and Pelto (1978),

> Asking people to create lists not only produces a working inventory of names and categories, but it can also be considered a trial exploration of people’s taxonomic systems – their ways of organizing information. Some researchers have also suggested that the order in which items are mentioned reflects the salience or importance of those items – highly salient items occur early on the list, while those of lesser significance are likely to be mentioned later (p. 85).

In the second interview, participants were given an opportunity to address any “best practices” they did not mention during the first interview or comment further on ones they had mentioned previously. However, the primary focus of the second interview (see Appendix J) was
to discuss the extent to which the characteristics of effective fund-raising programs, outlined in Duronio and Loessin’s (1991) book Effective Fund-Raising in Higher Education were present or not present at The Ohio State University.

The purpose of the third interview (see Appendix K for interview #3 protocols) was to discuss the participant’s leadership style and preferences, including strengths and weaknesses, as they relate to Quinn’s (1988) Competing Values Model for managerial leadership.

For this interview, I forwarded a summary of Quinn’s (1988) Competing Values Model for the participants to read, as well as a visual representation of the model (see interview schedule #3 Appendix K) and questions for reflection. I used additional questions that were not forwarded to the participants during the interview to help me further explore leadership preferences represented in the Competing Values Model without overwhelming the participant with paper and reading materials (Appendix L). The additional questions were taken from Quinn’s (1988) Interview Questions Based on the Competing Values Approach (Exhibit 12, p. 181).

There is little doubt in my mind that good ethnographic research is demanding. Miles and Huberman (1984) warn researchers that,

Collecting data [particularly conducting, transcribing, and analyzing interviews] is a labor-intensive operation, traditionally lasting for months if not years. Field notes mount up astronomically, so that data overload is a given. It may take from many months to several years to complete a thoughtful analysis... Qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help the researcher go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks” (p. 15).
The transcriptions for each interview have yielded thousands upon thousands of words – each describing insights, contexts, and opinions the participants wanted to share about their perceptions of organizational performance and leadership. To that end, the analysis has been a lengthy endeavor. Interviews typically produce a wealth of detailed information about a much smaller number of people and cases (Patton, 1990) than do traditional quantitative studies. This increased understanding of the cases and situations studied is both a “blessing and a burden,” as Jones (2002) warns: [With the] “depth of understanding this approach is intended to unearth [it] also carries with it a significant responsibility to tell the stories of those whom we come into contact in as true a way as possible” (p.3).

**Surveys**

In order to understand and identify the perceived leadership characteristics and perceptions of organizational effectiveness for each of the twelve “high-performance” development sub-units and their respective administrators, *Competing Values Framework* questionnaire surveys were used to collect data. As indicated, each of the participants (i.e., the managers in the twelve development sub-units in this study), completed the *Competing Values Framework self-assessment* (Quinn, 1988) and the *Competing Values Framework for Organizational Performance surveys* (Quinn, 1988).

Individuals who represent functional layers in each of the participant’s development sub-units completed The *Competing Values Framework: View of (manager’s name) and Competing Values Framework for Organizational Performance instruments* for their respective development...
sub-unit and administrator. Members of LPG completed only the 
*Competing Values Framework: View of (manager’s name)* survey for all of the participants.

The *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* measures the respondent’s perceived development and/or skill level in the eight leadership roles described in the *Competing Values Framework*. The *Competing Values Framework: View of (manager’s name)* measures the perceptions of others for the same eight leadership roles. The *Competing Values Framework Organizational Performance instrument* measures the respondent’s perceptions of organizational effectiveness in eight areas of performance described in the *Competing Values Framework*.

A common limitation associated with survey research involves poor response rate. Fortunately, response rates were exceptional for this study and are not an issue.

*Documents*

Although participants were not “formally” asked to submit samples of documents for analysis, I received a variety of documents, ranging from performance reports and updates, meeting agendas, stewardship and cultivation strategies, newsletters, newspaper clippings, promotional materials, video tapes, invitations to special events, email correspondence, and information from the university’s development website. Glesnes and Peshkin (1992) describe the value of documents in research.

Documents provide both historical and contextual dimensions to your observations and interviews. They enrich what you see and hear by supporting, expanding, and challenging your portrayals and perceptions. Your understanding of the phenomenon in question grows as you make use of the documents and artifacts that are part of people’s lives (p. 54).
Documents are important because they provide specific details that may not have been addressed in interviews or surveys, they can help enhance the researcher’s understanding of examples used by participants, they can also help the researcher develop and stronger and more accurate insight into the participant’s behavior or organization by verifying or contradicting things the participant has shared with the researcher.

The documents I reviewed have helped me develop a broader and deeper understanding of the development organization and its sub-units as well as the management and leadership practices of the participants.

**Member checking**

Member checks are meaningful ways to include the participants’ input in the study beyond simply turning on a tape recorder. Guba (1981) refers to this process as the most important action researchers take in terms of establishing credibility. Because this study focuses specifically on The Ohio State University Development Organization and some of its employees, anonymity for participants who agreed to be interviewed was not possible. In order to assure participants that they would not be misrepresented or their words taken “out of context,” participants were given copies of the transcripts from our interviews and were provided the opportunity to clarify inaccuracies in transcriptions of our discussions, as well as add any pertinent contextual information to the interview transcript. On several occasions transcripts were returned to me with additional and clarifying information.

Without member checking, this study could have resulted in a limited and potentially inaccurate interpretation. Its purpose is to place the participants in a position of central importance in the creation of knowledge (Demerath, 2000). Member checking also contributes to the triangulation of data sources I use, as well as to the trustworthiness of
the study’s findings. It is also important to note that participants had control over the tape recorder during all of the interviews and were able to turn it off if they want to speak “off the record” for any reason. This also occurred occasionally.

Ethical Considerations: Establishing Trustworthiness and Validity

The principle characteristic of scholarly and scientific inquiry, as opposed to informal, intuitive kinds of inquiry, is the use of rationally grounded procedures to extend knowledge that a community of scholars regards as reliable and valid (Rudestam and Newton, 1992, p. 20).

Concerns about validity and reliability are common to all forms of research, as is the concern that the investigation be conducted in an ethical manner (Merriam, 1998). Many researchers are concerned only with issues of internal and external validity, as well as reliability in their studies. The concept of validity is described by Thomas Schwandt (1997) in this way: “To call [something] ‘valid’ is to indicate that it is sound, cogent, well-grounded, justifiable, or logically correct” (p. 168). This is true. Of course, one’s paradigmatic, or epistemological perspective shapes the way in which one legitimizes terms such as, sound, cogent, well-grounded, and so on. Merriam (1998), points out that:

Regardless of the type of research, validity and reliability are concerns that can be approached through careful attention to a study’s conceptualization and the way in which the data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted, and the way in which the findings are presented (p. 199-200).

As an interpretivist, I believe there are many truths and multiple realities in the world. The aim of this study is to provide descriptions and explanations for the actions and perceptions of those who are the focus of this inquiry. Insightful descriptions often result from the combination of methodologies. For instance, although I have primarily used qualitative data collection strategies, ultimately this study employs a
mixed-method case study design and methodology. As a result, in order for this study to be regarded as worthwhile, it is important to make sure that this study is not only “valid” in the context of quantitative research, but also “trustworthy” in the context of qualitative research.

It was important to me to construct this research in a way that enhanced the probability of identifying, understanding, and describing the behaviors and perceptions of the participants in this study. This study utilized a mixed-method case study design to achieve such ends, and in the process issues of “trustworthiness” and validity and reliability were addressed and appropriate techniques implemented.

The question of internal validly or trustworthiness (i.e., the extent to which research findings are congruent with the reality of the participants) is addressed by using triangulated data sources. Issues relating to reliability (i.e., the extent to which there is consistency in the findings) are again addressed through the use of triangulation, and by creating an audit trail (i.e., describing in detail how the study was conducted and how the results will be generated from the data).

External validity (i.e., the extent to which the data can be generalized to other data) is more difficult to accomplish in a mixed-method study. The survey findings have external validity because the data were collected using instruments that are theoretically grounded, valid and reliable (Quinn, Faerman, and Dixit, 1987).

The findings generated from the qualitative methods cannot be generalized in the same way. However, the use of predetermined questions and specific procedures for coding and analysis (all of which are used in this study) enhances the generalizability of findings in the

Lather (1997) believes that researchers should move away from rigid and specialized rubrics for evaluation and move to the principle of ethics and relationships as our “measuring stick” for trustworthiness and validity. She believes scholarship and contemporary society will be better served if we move validity from knowledge to the principle of ethics. As readers we should ask ourselves the question: to what extent is the researcher ethical? If the researcher is ethical, the research he or she produces should be trustworthy.

No amount of trustworthiness techniques built into a study will ever “compel” anyone to accept the results of inquiry; it can at best persuade (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 329)

Again, it is important to mention that although data was collected prior to my full-time employment as a development officer, integration and analysis of data occurred after I became a member of the organization. I attempted not to let position in the organization influence the “voices” in the data. I worked closely with and shared my interpretations regularly with another “rater” to enhance the trustworthiness of these findings.

Data Analysis

Data from the interviews, surveys, documents, and observations were analyzed in the context of the conceptual framework for this study.

Survey Analysis

The individual responses from each of the completed surveys were analyzed using the assessment guidelines and scoring formulas.
(Appendix M) provided by Quinn (1988) through the use of MINITAB, a statistical software package. Organizational effectiveness profiles were generated for each of the twelve development sub-units and plotted graphically (Appendix N) to visually represent areas of strength and weakness for each of the development sub-units. Similar profiles were generated using the same techniques for generating profiles of leadership characteristics. These data were also plotted graphically to represent visually areas of strength and weakness for each of the managers in the development sub-units (Appendix O & P).

The survey questionnaires used to understand and describe perceptions of leadership characteristics and organizational performance are theoretically grounded, valid and reliable (Quinn, Faerman, and Dixit, 1987). In other words, they consistently measure what they are supposed to measure: perceptions of existing leadership characteristics and organizational performance.

Descriptive statistics were used to present the data. Descriptive statistics are used to summarize, organize, simplify, and describe patterns found in the data (Gravetter and Wallnau, 1996). The results will be used to describe the perceived leadership characteristics and levels of organizational performance for the twelve development sub-units included in this study.

*Interview Coding and Analysis*

The interview data was organized and coded thematically. Initially the “NUDIST” computer program for analyzing qualitative data was used; however, I found it not helpful so I abandoned the NUDIST approach and did all of the analysis myself. This strategy involved reading all of the interviews and identifying emergent themes for organizational best
practices, leadership characteristics and perceptions about individuals participating in this study. To ensure trustworthiness, interview transcripts were given to my advisor, Robert Rodgers, who also analyzed the data for categories and patterns. We then compared analyses. Once emergent themes were identified and agreed upon, thematic documents were created and appropriate thematic data from each of the participant’s interviews was reorganized and placed into the documents reflecting various “best practices,” leadership characteristics, and sub-unit, as well as overall organizational profiles. These thematic documents were then used to develop insight into leadership characteristics of individuals, and organization-wide and sub-unit level “best practices.”

In chapter 4, you will find “best practices” presented in sub-categories: process and substantive. These descriptions will show in-depth interpretation and analysis of relationships between the complexities of how “best practices” interact with leadership characteristics.

Case Study Analysis

The data from each of the twelve development sub-units are presented in the form of an individual case study narrative and together they produce a somewhat comprehensive description of the university development organization as a whole. Each case study narrative begins with an overview of the responsibilities of each of the sub-units, including descriptive information about its role in the larger university development organization. Using data from the interviews, documents, observations, and surveys, the narrative describes the perceptions of “best practices” for organizational performance and leadership. Organizational effectiveness and leadership profiles are presented based on the Competing Values Framework.
An obvious limitation of this study is that I did not conduct investigations of each of the university development organization’s sub-units. By doing so, the results would be representative of the entire organizations “best practices” leadership and organizational effectiveness. A fully comprehensive study was not undertaken for two reasons: money and time. Additionally, the focus of the study was on “high performance” development sub-units; therefore, it would not have been appropriate to investigate every sub-unit of the organization unless each unit was viewed as a high performer.

Additional note: Prior to data collection for this study Linda Seitz, who served as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts, assumed a new position and responsibilities for University Development. In time, that position morphed into Assistant Vice President for the Colleges of Arts & Sciences Development. Because Linda Sietz had held the position of Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts throughout the Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign she was interviewed and evaluated as though she was still holding the same position. Carole Moss, who was hired as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts began prior to my formal data collection. In other words, I had been observing the Senior Administrative Team for some time when Carole Moss began. She was not evaluated in her new role; however, she did participate in LPG and PPG meetings and as a new member of the Senior Administrative Team. Subsequently, she participated in this study as a survey respondent by virtue of her role in LPG meetings.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to analyze and describe characteristics of leadership and organizational performance, as well as perceptions of organizational and individual “best practices” as they relate to The Ohio State University Department of Development. This chapter presents the specific findings of this study. The research foci for this study apply to The Ohio State University Development Organization as a whole and to twelve sub-units of the organization that were identified as high performance development sub-units. The purposes of these foci are to facilitate an understanding and identification of the following:

1) the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leaders in each of these twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as perceived by members of the organization;

2) the “best practices” currently in use by the leadership of Development Organization and by each of the twelve “high performance” development sub-units at The Ohio State University;

3) the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leadership in each of these twelve “high performance” sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s *Competing Values Framework*; and,
4) the organizational effectiveness of the Development Organization overall and for each of the twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s Competing Values Framework.

Fifteen “high performance” development professionals from twelve “high performance” development sub-units are the foci of this study. Data collection was comprised of personal observations, semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and Competing Values Framework questionnaires. Findings were analyzed and are presented in a manner consistent with the methodology of this study (described in Chapter 3) and address each of the foci of the research agenda. Figure 4.1 describes the participants and their respective high performance development sub-units at the time of data collection. Initially, however, the context of fund-raising at The Ohio State University will be described.

Fund-Raising and The Ohio State University
The University’s beginnings date back to 1870 when the Ohio General Assembly established the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College in the state’s capital, Columbus. This new college was made possible by the provisions of the Morrill Land-Grant Act, signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. In 1878 the college’s name was changed to The Ohio State University.

Today, The Ohio State University is recognized as a leading comprehensive public research institution with an enrollment of approximately 50,000 students and more than 325,000 alumni of record. In recent years, the University has set a goal of becoming one of the “world’s truly great universities” and has pursued this objective by creating a strategic Academic Plan that focuses on fostering four core elements:
1. Becoming a national leader in the quality of academic programs offered;
2. being universally recognized for the quality of the learning experience Ohio State offers its students;
3. creating an environment that truly values and is enriched by diversity; and
4. expanding the land-grant mission to address our society’s most compelling needs.

In pursuing this goal, the University offers 174 undergraduate majors, 111 Master’s degree programs, and 93 doctoral programs (institutional reports) for its students and was recently recognized as one of the nation’s top 20 public universities as well as the top public university in the state of Ohio by *US News & World Reports* in their 2003 *America’s Best Colleges* edition.

Like most public universities, The Ohio State University engages in strategic and continuous fund-raising activities to support the University’s educational mission and academic priorities. Less than 20 years ago, however, fund-raising at The Ohio State University was in its infancy, relying on the Presidential leadership and vision of Edward Jennings (years served 1981-1990) and the motivations of a small staff of University fund-raisers. Almost immediately upon beginning his presidency, Dr. Jennings encountered a budgetary crisis relating to shrinking state support. According to participants in this study who were working for Ohio State during that time, President Jennings was the first president to invest in institutional fundraising at the University. These participants cited that Dr. Jennings recognized that without private support the University would be a vastly different kind of institution than its’ mission envisioned for the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>High Performance Sub-Unit</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry May</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Team</td>
<td>Vice President for Development and President, The Ohio State University Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meyer</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Team</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President and Director of University Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Seitz</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Team</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President - Major Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kistmiller</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Team</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President - Development Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Adlemen</td>
<td>Development Communications</td>
<td>Director - Development Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff McMahon</td>
<td>Development Special Events</td>
<td>Director - Development Special Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bull</td>
<td>Planned Giving</td>
<td>Director - Planned Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Donnelly</td>
<td>Corporate &amp; Foundation Giving</td>
<td>Director - Corporate &amp; Foundation Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hof</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Associate Athletic Director for Development, Marketing and Club Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Pontious</td>
<td>Medical Center and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Assistant to the Sr. Vice President, Health Sciences Medical Center and Health Sciences Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Groff</td>
<td>Fisher College of Business</td>
<td>Associate to the Dean - Development and External Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave McCarthy</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Director of Development - College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Heyl</td>
<td>College of Food, Agriculture &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>Director of Development - College of Food, Agriculture &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Longbeake</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Director of Development - College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Cavanaugh</td>
<td>Merit Scholarships</td>
<td>Director of Development - Merit Scholarships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Participants and high performance development sub-units
Under his leadership, the budget for the Department of Development increased from approximately $2 or 3 million dollars a year to about $7 or 8 million and the University embarked on its first comprehensive capital campaign. Associate Vice President and Director of University Development, John Meyer recalled that once the development budget increased, “the development staff started growing; the expertise of the staff became more sophisticated and the University’s gift totals started growing.” Meyer went on to say: “For me, that was really the start of presidential leadership in this area.”

Although the University launched its first capital campaign in 1913 to build Ohio Stadium, the University’s first truly comprehensive capital campaign began in 1985 with an ambitious goal of $350 million. When the campaign concluded in 1990, $430 million had been raised for institutional priorities. At the time, this accomplishment was recognized as the largest campaign ever by a public university (Duronio & Loessin, 1991). John Meyer put this accomplishment into perspective,

I would say that’s more a testimony to Ed Jennings knowing that the University could start dealing with large numbers [fund-raising goals and receipts] then it had anything to do with the campaign being directed and managed in a way that led it to that number. We learned a lot as an institution by doing the first campaign. It was highly successful; the first sort of goal whispered was $250,000,000, which at that time was astounding and then it went to $350,000,000 and we ended up at $461,000,000 or something. So performance based on just looking at numbers was extraordinarily successful.

In 1990 the University hired E. Gordon Gee as President of the University (years served 1990-1998). In the context of fund raising, Lynda Heyl,
Director of Development for the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, described the presidential transition in this way:

I think [Jennings] had the original vision and I think that’s probably the first president that really saw the potential Ohio State had. It was during a time when state budgets were being cut and [Jennings] saw the writing on the wall -- it was development or nothing. Later, when President Gee was hired, he brought in Jerry May [as Vice President for Development], which was one of the smartest things he ever did and, as they say, the rest is history.

Although, presidential leadership and involvement are important characteristics of effectiveness for the University’s fund-raising initiatives, the findings of this research reveal the leadership of Jerry May as the most important and influential characteristic of effectiveness for The Ohio State University Department of Development and its continued success. These findings suggest the characteristics of effectiveness for the organization and its’ subsequent “best practices” for high performance fund-raising and organizational performance overall stem from the leadership of Jerry May and the role he played in supporting, advancing and operationalizing his philosophy of high performance development. For this reason, organizational best practices will be described following a discussion of the characteristics of leadership and patterns of behavior for Jerry May, in his role as Vice President for Development, President The Ohio State University Foundation.

The Impact, Leadership, and Influence of Vice President Jerry May

When the University conducted its search for a new Vice President for Development in 1990, five candidates were brought to campus; several of them were vice presidents of other institutions. Jerry May was not. At the time, he was an Assistant Vice President for Leadership and Principle Gifts at the University of Michigan. John Meyer recalled:
When he interviewed, what stood out was that he was absolutely on target with every question. There were faculty members on the committee who at the end of the interview wanted to become staff members in development because Jerry made it sound like it was the greatest profession in the world. If you can make a faculty member feel that way, then chances are you’re probably pretty good. . . . At the end of those five interviews, it was clear to me and everyone else on the committee that the university should hire Jerry May.

The Ohio State University hired Jerry May and soon the Department of Development became a “high performance” development organization. When asked why he chose to come to Ohio State, May stated:

I was attracted to Ohio State because in my 14 years or so at Michigan, I had pretty much been in all the jobs there and there weren’t too many other jobs (thoughtful pause) . . . . What brought me here was the challenge of the job, and I was attracted to what the University was trying accomplish. It was very important to me; and it’s clear that the University was committed to significant academic achievement and improvement. That’s what attracted me.

An inherent challenge associated with any cultural change is that of transforming the mind-sets, visions, paradigms, images, beliefs, and shared meanings embedded in the existing organizational psyche. To transform a culture, a leader must have the capacity to articulate a vision and inspire members of the organization to embrace a new philosophy for doing things. This was a challenge May faced upon his arrival to Ohio State. There is little question that Jerry May is an inspirational and visionary leader, and the best practices described throughout this study support this assertion. However, the following best practices also demonstrate Vice President May’s ability to embrace several leadership roles found in the Competing Values Framework – which is presented next. The best practices will follow.
The Competing Values Framework literature asserts that the most sophisticated leaders do not emphasize any particular role more than any of the others in their repertoires. Thus, effective leadership requires the ability to perform in a variety of managerial roles appropriate to any given situation. May’s ability to use multiple frames of management is a central element of his leadership style. In many respects, Vice President May views himself as a catalyst for the success of The Ohio University Development Organization. “I’m here to support and promote the priorities of this institution. . . . It’s not my job to tell people you can’t do this, but to tell them how you do it,” stressed May in an interview.

The Competing Values Framework advances the conception that any given organizational leader’s profile will reflect the breadth and depth of the kinds of managerial perspectives and roles a leader can translate into action. A broad portfolio of leadership roles improves the likelihood of an organizational leader behaving effectively in different circumstances and effective organizational leaders incorporate more leadership roles than less effective leaders.

As indicated previously, the Competing Values Framework is structured around three dimensions reflecting the seemingly competing and contradictory beliefs people hold about how organizational performance is best attained:

- Organizational structure - key question: Is there more of an emphasis on stability and control or flexibility and change?
- Organizational focus - key question: Is there more of an emphasis on the internal or external environment when thinking about people and responsibilities?
• Temporal focus- key question: Are criteria for performance evaluation keyed primarily to organizational processes (means) or to program outcomes (ends)?

If you take the two opposing emphases in the realms of organizational structure and organizational focus and consider the third competing dimension - time, the result is a basic conceptual framework that provides four simple models that each represent potential orientations towards organizational effectiveness. These models are titled: Internal Process, Rational Goal, Open Systems, and Human Relations.

Figure 4.2 depicts Vice President May’s assessment of his own leadership portfolio as measured by the Competing Values Framework. Note May’s emphasis on externally focused, achievement oriented roles, such as Director, Producer, and Broker, as well as the prominence he places on the Facilitator role. What this profile reveals, in the broadest sense, is May’s strong emphasis on action and results. The most significant emphasis is placed on externally focused management roles: Director, Producer, Broker, and Innovator and one internally focused role as Facilitator.

The Director and Producer roles reflect clear direction, goal setting, and action lead to high performance as do many of the organizational best practices presented in this chapter. The Director and Producer management roles are found in the lower right-hand quadrant called the Rational Goal Model. The Rational Goal Model stresses stability and control by focusing attention on goal achievement and planning as a means, and productivity and accomplishment as ends. The emphasis is built on the assumption that clarity of direction leads to productive outcomes.
Figure 4.2: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment for Jerry May
The *Broker* and *Innovator* roles highlight the importance of staying in tune with changes in the external environment, using innovation and adaptation as a means, and legitimacy and acquisition of resources as ends. These emphases are built upon the assumption that continuous research, adaptation and innovation lead to the acquisition of external legitimacy and essential resources. Given these self-perceptions, the *Competing Values Framework* would predict which leaders have the ability to act in politically astute ways and therefore allow the organization effectively to respond to ever-changing environmental challenges associated with university development.

An example of Vice President May’s external focus and ability to blend the orientations of the *Open Systems Model* and *Rational Goal Model* is illustrated in a message May included in *Giving Update*, a publication that goes to donors of the *Affirm Thy Friendship* Campaign and can be seen in Figure 4.3. The message illustrates Mr. May’s capacity for communicating clearly and effectively with his audience of major-gift donors. He conveys their “insider” status with the University and thanks them for their support and role in helping to achieve the $1 billion goal. In addition, May highlights the impact of their generosity as well as challenges the group to continue supporting the University and its ongoing and emerging priorities. A *Facilitator* is expected to foster collective effort, build cohesion and teamwork, and manage conflict. Facilitators are often described as process-oriented managers and leaders.
A Message From the Vice President

As you can see from our front-page story, we’ve hit our $1 billion campaign goal! We received the news just as we were going to press on this issue, and we couldn’t wait to tell you. After we finish tabulating gifts, we’ll give you a full report on the breakdown of the campaign in our next issue. We’ll also highlight some of the many ways that your contributions have already impacted the university, as well as the challenges that lie ahead.

I want to take this opportunity, though, to thank the hundreds of thousands of donors and volunteers who have made this remarkable achievement possible. Because of the support of alumni and friends like you, Ohio State has broken one record after another throughout this campaign. Four years of such dedication and generosity have pushed us past the $1 billion mark with nearly a year to go in the campaign.

Now won’t you help us to break another record by achieving all of our individual campaign goals. There is much more to do to meet the needs for support for scholarships and fellowships, chairs and professorships, facilities, research, endowment, annual giving, and planned giving. All of these areas represent not only priorities of the campaign, but priorities of the university. They are central to the academic mission of the university and factor prominently in Ohio State’s ascent to the top ranks of universities nationwide.

It’s imperative that we address ongoing and emerging needs like these on a continuing basis. One of the most frequent questions I’m asked is what happens after the campaign is over? The great universities are in fund raising for the long haul. Fund raising is not an extra; it is part of the fiscal strategy and essential to reaching our aspirations. We will keep focus on private support needs this year and in the years after the campaign.

We appreciate your loyalty and commitment to the university. Your efforts are significantly impacting the quality of this great institution.

Jerry May
Vice President for Development
President, The Ohio State University Foundation Board

Figure 4.3: A message from the Vice President
While the management roles depicted in figure 4.2 are Vice President May’s own perceptions of his leadership portfolio, it is also helpful to compare his self-perceptions with the perceptions of other members of the organization. Figure 4.4, which shows the *Competing Values Framework – View of Others* profile for Jerry May as seen by others in the organization. Quinn (1988) says that effective managerial profiles almost always have some element of weakness (found below the mean, or zero-point in these profiles); however, the scores in May’s weakest areas as perceived by others tended to fall towards the mean, with only the Mentor role being slightly below the mean.

The *Competing Values Framework* profile for Jerry May as seen by others most closely resembles Quinn’s archetype for the *Aggressive Achiever*. Leaders with this type of profile are typically highly effective and tend to score highest on the bottom four leadership roles, as well as demonstrate skill in the *Innovator* role. Vice President May’s scores are clustered in much the same way as the *Aggressive Achievers*; however, this profile also suggests Vice President May is seen as a skilled *Broker* as well.

Virtually every person interviewed in this study noted Jerry May’s emphasis on high-performance, and superior productivity, characteristics inherent in the *Producer* role. Tom Hof, Associate Athletics Director for Development described May’s intensity this way:

No one was going to outwork Jerry. He set a standard, an ethic and an expectation and you either bought into that and stayed and thrived or you went a different direction . . . . Jerry knew he was going to come in and change the culture in this operation. He saw the potential; he knew there was a sleeping giant here. I think you have to give him tremendous credit for what we did, no question . . . . He was not going to be denied.
Figure 4.4: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Jerry May
Gary Kitsmiller, Assistant vice President for Operations noted May’s ability to operate effectively in the bottom-half of the *Competing Values Framework*:

He’s donor driven . . . . He’s very strategic; he’s very methodical, he’s very detail oriented too. I think Jerry May is a perfectionist, which is good and bad – but that’s part of how he derives his success . . . . He knows where our success lies and that’s our relationship with the donors.

Lynda Heyl’s (Director of Development – College Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences) comments highlight May’s skill as both a *Facilitator* who built a high-performance organization and as a *Broker*, working to strengthen donor relationships and secure major-gifts for the University.

Jerry May, he is our strength. He’s built a staff that carries out his focus. We have formal fundraising programs, and he has talked about team-fundraising more than anyone prior to him. In terms of volunteer participation, he works with our very top volunteers and that sets the model for the rest of us. He never waivers.

Examples throughout this chapter demonstrate that one does not have to perfectly emphasize all of the leadership roles of the *Competing Values Framework* to be an effective and valuable organizational leader. Vice President May is perceived as having done an impressive job both of personally utilizing a variety of managerial roles and empowering others to assume roles that create balance in the leadership of the Development Organization.

When asked why the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign was so successful, Linda Seitz, Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts stated emphatically,

Jerry May is the reason! From his first days, he conveyed a very clear message about his philosophy in terms of partnering, communication, and thinking big. We we’re ready [for the campaign] because Jerry challenged us to think bigger than we had ever before. We were incredibly organized and strategic.
Everything was in place; everyone was ready, and for the first time in the Universities’ history we were ready for big time success. That’s why we were successful.

The following comment by John Meyer, Associate Vice President for Development about Jerry May’s arrival to Ohio State and subsequent creation of the Senior Administrative Team seem to reflect subtleties in the Mentor and Facilitator roles.

He’s able to surround himself with good folks and I don’t say that to try to blow my own horn. Jerry understood that there was a chance to be very successful. Does that mean we were under performing as an institution? Sure, we were under performing . . . . He didn’t come in here and decide, “I’ve got to clean house. These people must not know what they’re doing.” Instead, he came in and assessed people’s strengths and tinkered with the organization and put people in places that help them use their strengths and kind of hide their weaknesses. I give him and immense amount of credit for that.

When comparing the two Competing Values Framework profiles for Vice President May, the Coordinator and Monitor roles were the two lowest scores found on his Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment profile; whereas, the two lowest scores on the Competing Values Framework: View of Others profile were found in the Human Relations quadrant: Mentor and Facilitator roles. Although May’s Competing Values Framework profiles show a very strong emphasis on externally oriented managerial roles, his view of his strongest internal leadership role is that of Facilitator followed by Coordinator. Others view his highest as Coordinator. Facilitators foster collective effort, build teams, and manage organizational conflict, while Coordinators manage projects, design work, and manage across functions.

One possible reason for this finding could be that those who evaluated Vice President May were members of the Senior Administrative Team as
well as members of the Leadership Prospect Group. These groups are comprised of people who work very closely with the Vice President and recognize and experience his desire to oversee the structure and flow of the system.

The *Coordinator* role is described as one in which the manager is “hands on” and manages the flow of external information and facilitates the completion of important tasks. The responsibility of a *Coordinator*, as Quinn, et al (1996) point out, is “to see to it that the right people are in the right place at the right time to perform the right task” (1996). Coordination was without a doubt an important function of the Leadership Prospect Group and Prospect Planning Group Meetings and May played an important role in each of these meetings. “He’s, very hands on” explained Linda Seitz.

He’s also puts a lot emphasis on volunteer participation too. He comes from a volunteer driven rather than a staff driven background. So, the Gerlock [volunteer] Awards, the Foundation Board in terms of their volunteer role, as well as their own gifts, was established during Jerry. So yeah, we wouldn’t be where we are if it wasn’t for Jerry.

An example of how Vice President May utilized the competencies of the *Internal Process Model* was evident during the Monday morning Senior Team meeting he held. In these situations, Vice President May was able to monitor the stability and direction of the organization, as well as coordinating appropriate “next steps.” He did this by combining his focus on monitoring and coordinating with the *Director* role. May wanted to know the actions of his Senior Team were always aligned with organizational goals and priorities. May described the purpose and function of the meeting this way:

The senior team is made up of the people that are generally my direct reports and periodically we bring anybody else in that can add value to a particular discussion or topic. What goes on in the
meetings is basically a focus on objectives and on problem solving. I want to make sure that anybody that’s responsible for an area has the opportunity to do a lot of problem solving. . . . I include my direct reports that are senior people who have some insight.

For example, during a Senior Team meeting I attended the group engaged in logistical discussions about where guests will sit in the President’s Box during a football game. Because it was the Vice President’s meeting, when he had gathered enough information, he would begin to delegate responsibilities to the group. Linda Seitz remembered it this way:

Jerry might say, “We need to start thinking about Winter College next year. Linda, I want to see a list of all of the major gift prospects in the Naples area and let’s talk about how effective it’s been. When can we get on the president’s calendar?” That kind of stuff. It’s never prospect discussion really. He will review the appointments that he has for that coming week to see if anybody has anything he needs to know for that, but that’s as far as it goes. It keeps the senior team aware of organizational issues that are important to him; that way we are all on the same page.

The focus of the Senior Team meeting usually cycled back to the fundamentals associated with the Rational Goal Model: goal clarification, planning, rational analysis, and action taking. These are competencies Vice President May strongly emphasized in his Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment. May summarized the purpose of the Senior Team meeting this way:

Part of my objective in that meeting is problem solving; part of my objective is making sure people know what their responsibilities are; part of what happens in that meeting is planning; we’ve got a problem we’re going to work on a plan.

Vice President May also perceived himself as giving prominence to the Facilitator role, which is found in the Human Relations Model. The Human Relations Model, places value on the development of individuals as well as on the smooth functioning of group processes. This orientation put people first, viewing them as important resources that
ultimately impact group functioning and practice. The guiding philosophy of the Human Relations Model is that involvement results in commitment and commitment results in excellence. This quote by Dan Grafner, Director of Development for the Fisher College of Business reflects on the Vice President’s role as Facilitator with members of the senior staff.

The way Jerry promotes teamwork and sharing information, all of the messages he gives us all the time about being part of something great, and making a difference; it has an underlying dynamic that builds a sense of belonging among the senior folks, we’re part of a team. The team orientation is very important to Jerry; and, I think it’s very important to this organization.

This quote from Linda Seitz illustrates May’s directive leadership style and his skill as a Coordinator.

From his first day he conveyed a very clear message about his philosophy - partnering, communication, and those kinds of issues. He demanded that we set our sights high, saying major-gifts staff should focus on $50,000 plus gifts, and then we went into campaign mode it was 100,000 plus . . . . We would not have the success or the focus if it wasn’t for him; I think he demands that from everybody. The way he brought University Development Communications, Development Events, Research, he was the one who brought it all together and established all of those programs.

Lynda Heyl remarked on May’s talent as a Broker.

I think that the relationship between our Vice President and the Academic Administration - the Deans is a best practice. He has built good relationships. I have to say that Jerry May has done a phenomenal job of representing University Development internally and getting funding, because, you know funding makes a big difference on how successful you’re going to be.

Tom Hof, described May’s strengths as a Director this way:

[Jerry May] had a blueprint in his head the day he got here; he evaluated what he had and saw that there were obvious strengths to build on. . . .
He also worked with Gordon Gee, the president at that time, and John Meyer at identifying institutional priorities for what would become the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign.

Jeff McMahon, Director of Development Special Events, had this to say about May and his focus on productivity and relationship building:

The guy is just a genius. He really does see it; he sees big picture, and he sees it 24/7; he never stops . . . .

Jerry May taught me that fundraising is an ongoing process that never stops. It’s about partnering and the relationships you develop with people. You do not deal with them one night a year; you deal with them all the time. I’ve learned that from him, and if I walk out of here and that’s all I ever learned that’s a heck of a lot.

Although, to a great extent, Vice President May’s Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment suggests a managerial style focused almost exclusively on competencies and orientations associated with in the Open Systems and Rational Goal models, his initial focus upon arriving to Ohio State was on monitoring, coordinating and facilitating organizational change. May successfully blended the competencies of these roles first by monitoring the collective performance of the Development Organization. His primary emphasis was on developing an understanding of existing organizational processes, attitudes, and philosophies of the employees of the development organization overall. Vice President May met with virtually everyone in the organization, providing each person an opportunity to talk personally with him about their experiences, insights, and opinions about at Ohio State University Department of Development.

By fostering openness and emphasizing a group process for sharing, May developed the legitimate credibility with the development staff he hoped to establish. During this time, Vice President May was also acting as a Facilitator and Coordinator. As a Facilitator, May’s attention was focused
on working with various groups and fostering teamwork and cooperation — values May believes are vital to the success of any organization. In the role as Coordinator, May began focusing on placing the “right” people in the “right” positions, as well as creating new work teams and sub-units.

Subsequently, by establishing credibility and assessing structure and personnel, May helped himself move toward initiating best practices that advance each of the orientations found in the Competing Values Framework. As a result, during the 1990s, Jerry May was busy transforming the Development Organization into a culture where the new priority was cultivating and securing major-gifts and advancing institutional priorities. To sum up, interviews, Competing Values Framework profiles, and observations all indicate that May performed many management roles as Vice President for Development and demonstrated his ability to foster high-performance in this organization. He was skilled enough to embrace the fundamental tensions that exist between the Human Relations and Rational Goal models and seemed to use them all over time.

Best Practices
There were four “process” best practices and nine “substantive” best practices emerged and influenced this development organization. These best practices emerged from an analysis and interpretation of the interview data, observations, and documents. They were also adopted by managers and members of several of the organization’s development sub-units, ultimately leading to cultural change within the Development Organization.
Process Best Practices:
1) Establish credibility and assess structure and personnel;
2) Foster focus, motivation, expectations, and accountability;
3) Empower a Leadership Team; and,
4) Keep talented staff.

Substantive Best Practices:
1) Focus on major-gift cultivation and formal “asks;”
2) Align with academic priorities of the University;
3) Cultivate internal partners;
4) Emphasize the importance of collaboration and teamwork;
5) have multiple relationships with donors and prospects;
6) Create roles for volunteers;
7) Redefine roles of the Foundation Board;
8) Create a centralized and decentralized organizational model;
9) Focus on strategic use of meetings (i.e., staff meetings, Leadership Prospect Group, and Prospect Planning Group).

These organizational best practices are described in order and followed by the Competing Values Framework of Organizational Performance and Leadership for the Senior Administrative Team and its members. The chapter concludes with descriptions of the best practices and Competing Values Framework profiles for each high-performance sub-unit examined in this study.
Process Best Practices

Establish credibility and assess structure and personnel

When May arrived to campus, he spent his first year learning about and adjusting the organization’s structure and personnel. Linda Seitz, Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts recalled May’s approach:

He was asking questions, meeting with everyone, trying to understand their strengths, and then he started moving people around and creating different organizational structures that supported his philosophy.

May believed it was important to understand the organizational philosophy, structure, and culture first-hand from the perspective of the University development team. May was also concerned with establishing credibility with the development staff.

I thought if I am in any way going to capture their imagination and have credibility with them, particularly as an outsider from the University of Michigan - which I frankly didn’t take lightly – I needed to listen and learn from them first.

His focus was on analyzing the system carefully to find strengths to be accentuated, as well as identify flaws to be corrected. Vice President May accomplished this over the course of several months by meeting with various small focus groups of 8 to 12 people. This was done systematically, and in doing so Vice President May was able to meet with all of the development staff and engage them in substantive conversations in a relatively short period of time. “I felt like I needed to have personal credibility with them, not just outside credibility,” May explained. The only way he believed he could make a substantive impact on The Ohio State University Development Organization early in his tenure was to listen carefully, learn, and evaluate. May explained:
I asked two questions: I wanted to learn what everybody felt they were doing best and what they felt they could do better. It wouldn’t have been right to come in and tell everyone what to do without understanding their perspective first. Sure, I had my ideas about what I wanted to do, but I just had to sit there and listen.

The benefit of this approach was manifest in two important ways. Vice President May developed rapport with the staff and he gained valuable insights into the culture, structure, mind-set, and effectiveness of the organization in the form of candid, voluntary information. This information helped inform him as to what the development staff believed were their own “best practices” and what they thought needed improving. This approach served him very well, as Dan Grafner, Associate to the Dean – Development and External Affairs remarked,

During the process of learning as much as he did, he developed traction. He had a real understanding of the situation he was in. As a result, [traction] allowed him to make informed decisions about the whole direction this [Organization] should go. He knew what needed to change, where people should be, and what the basic strengths and weaknesses of the organization were.

This is perhaps one of the most fundamental and far-reaching achievement of Vice President May, because the extent to which he succeeded in shaping the culture of the organization directly influenced the larger university community and prospect base for the institution. By establishing credibility and assessing structure and personnel, May was able to take his first steps toward effectively building a high-performance organization.

_Foster Focus, Motivation, and Accountability_

As Vice President May thought about characteristics of his own leadership style, he initially noted these fundamental characteristics: focus, motivation, accountability. These characteristics reflect not only
his personal leadership style, but also reflect the expectations he has for others in the development organization. For example while thinking about his own leadership, May explained that,

I am very focused on the fundraising goals and objectives of this University . . . . It’s a very delicate balance for me though. You have to remain committed to your priorities as best as possible, but I also have to remain flexible enough and clear minded enough to create innovations as we go along. It’s an issue that, frankly I wrestle with at night.

Vice President May explained that he had recently been focusing very carefully on preparing himself and the organization for the next capital campaign. May clarified by explaining the need for volunteer leadership for the next campaign and his focus on developing and identifying individuals that could potentially serve as lead prospects and volunteers for the next campaign. May continued:

The other night I spent two hours at home on this. All I did was think of names of people that I need to work on. I was on an airplane and I was thinking of names of people. I was in a retreat with the President and a bunch of other people. The session digressed, so I started writing on the right hand column the names of people that I thought could be volunteers in the next campaign. . . . [My assistant] is redoing a list right now and it’s going to go in my pocket everyday; I’ll look at it whenever I can and think about what we need to do next.

May views himself as enthusiastic about the work he does for the University, noting his ability to make others feel special and his talent for developing relationships with high-level prospects and volunteers. As May continued to describe his leadership style, he talked about the fact that he has high expectations of his staff and holds them equally to high standards. “My job is to push and make sure that [development officers] have enough prospects to work on and that enough ‘asking’ is going on.” May insists that his development officers perform at a high-level and
recognizes that this expectation can be experienced by others as "pressure." "That makes some people feel pretty uncomfortable," May admitted. Using the following example, he shared a process he sometimes uses to foster motivation and accountability:

> You bring people in that have a stake in a project; you raise the issues with them, you challenge them, you push them, you give them a series of goals to work on, you give them the opportunity to come back and show you how they are going to solve that problem. If they don't solve the problem, you can solve it for them and give them another chance or you change their position and move them into a different area because you've decided that they really don't have the edge, they don't have the leadership skills to solve that problem. If they do meet the challenge, you make sure they know how well they're doing.

He described this leadership style as both a strength and a weakness. For example, May explained he feels compelled to make sure everybody is motivated and accountable. "I don't know how to say it in a way that doesn't sound aggressive, but everybody has to be pushed, everybody has to be stretched, and you can never let up on the pressure." May commented specifically on the strength of his personality, noting that although he is talented at motivating others and creating a vision for success, he is also aware of ways in which his personality can also stymie some people.

> I don't bring out the best leadership skills if a person is timid and they withdraw. They're probably not going to work very well for me, but this is such a powerful, important area that I have to be there pushing. . . . If you are not careful, [this style] can strangle the leadership of other people in the organization; so what I try to do, I'm not going to say I've succeeded in this, only time will tell - I try to make sure that other people can step forward and their leadership can be seen.

May explained that those who communicate with him, by keeping him informed of strategies, accomplishments, challenges, and progress towards objectives enjoy, “as much power and as much autonomy as
they want.” Another characteristic Vice President May values highly in his staff is the ability to be self-motivated and focused on organizational goals. He remarked,

I love staff that are proactive and think “how can I get ready for that one; how can I see it coming?” That’s what I really like. That’s part of my leadership style and part of my expectation from the staff.

May reiterated that he views the ability to be self-motivated and proactive as a best practice. When asked to define best practices, he put it this way: “best practices are the highest end for innovation, the highest end for quality, the highest end for customer service.” Vice President May stressed the importance of understanding organizational goals and establishing best practices that support success. “I want our people to have such good practices that when other people learn about them, they resonate with it and want to use it as a model for their institution.”

John Meyer shared these thoughts on Vice President May’s first year:

He’s a thorough guy; so he spent time while he was being recruited thinking about [the issues] and planning on ways to attack it . . . . It was damn near flawless for the first year. I’ve still got things hidden some place in this office about things Jerry did that first year, and if I ever decided to be a vice president someplace, by god, I’ll find them and drag them out and remember how he did the transition and the kind of things he did when he first got here. He sort of made everybody go, “hey, this is going to be fun.” He’s been able to put the right things in place to have a record of achievement here that I think most people would kill for.

**Empower a Senior Administrative Team**

Something Vice President May is very proud of is the role in which the Senior Administrative Team has played in the success of the Development Organization, particularly during the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign. May accomplished this by creating an environment of enthusiasm, vision, and trust, all of which fostered the empowerment of
his Senior Team. As a result, high performance was facilitated through thoughtful, logical, and consistent alignment to the University’s Academic Plan, and the subsequent goals May set for himself, the Senior Team and the Development Organization overall. Each member of the Senior Team understood their role in creating and fostering the high-performance development organization Vice President May envisioned.

Vice President May was committed to contributing to the success of The Ohio State University and empowered the Senior Administrative Team to play an important role in accomplishing this objective. He remarked on the process of managing the Team:

To build a successful team, you have to understand the job at hand. I asked myself, “What are we really trying to do?” Well that was pretty exciting to me. Then I identified the key activities and areas in need of specific leadership . . . . From there, it was up to me to make sure John, Linda and Gary all knew what they were going to accomplish and it was up to them to take responsibility for thinking through what each one of them needed to do to do the job.

The Senior Administrative Team has been largely responsible for creating and implementing strategic plans and “best practices” that support Jerry May’s philosophy for high-performance development. May describes the Senior Administrative Team as the group he relies on to provide insight, critical and strategic thinking, motivation, and direction to the Development Organization.

A key factor in empowering the Senior Administrative Team was May's regular positive, public endorsement of their abilities to lead the Development Organization. May described the importance and impact of this approach.

I was telling them how much confidence I have in them, and I repeatedly put Linda Seitz in front of people because she was new
to the team. I did this with Linda; I do this with John, and I tell I tell vice presidents and other people, what a great job John Meyer is doing. Now I tell development officers around the University how much confidence I have in Carol Moss. As a leader when you affirm the importance of people’s role in the organization, then others are going to say, “I guess I ought to talk to Linda,” or “I guess I ought to talk to John.” I’ve worked very hard at endorsing the Senior Administrative Team, and so when you ask the question of me, “how well are doing?” I know I have responsibility in how well they are doing, and part of how well they’re doing is part of how well I’m doing for them and how much I’m empowering them. I’m not sure I ever liked the word empower, but how much endorsement and support I give them so that they can go off and do their job and not be timid and know that I’m going to support them and know that I may do some corrective things. I might say I don’t like the direction of this - we do that in a kind of closed or quiet kind of session, but I think my people are quite effective.

*Keep Talented Staff*

Duronio and Loessin (1991) identified staff commitment to the institution as a characteristic of effectiveness of an organization; there is little doubt that the Ohio State University Department of Development possesses this characteristic. One reason the Development Organization is successful in keeping talented members of the staff is because the Senior Administrative Team has created and utilized *best practices* designed specifically for keeping the most talented development professionals on staff. Linda Seitz explained, “Within reason, we try to do whatever it takes to retain our best people.”

For example, the level of experience and number of years of combined service for the development organization’s leadership team (i.e., the group that comprises the Leadership Prospect Management group) is quite impressive. Nearly all of members of the LPG group had been on the development staff for ten years or more. This experience provides robust insights and keen intuitions when undertaking strategy sessions.
Perhaps at the root of this strength is the best practice of spending time talking about keeping good people on the development staff. John Meyer remarked,

> It doesn’t always involve money; it doesn’t always involve promotion. Sometimes It’s as simple as calling somebody and saying “hey lets go out and eat lunch,” and telling them how much we appreciate what they do.

John Meyer and Jerry May explained that at the beginning of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, they were committed to retaining key development directors from colleges responsible for generating large sums of private funding. Meyer and May believed that enhancing the roles and responsibilities of these directors would improve the likelihood each of them would remain through the campaign. Subsequently, these directors played a much more substantial role in the success of the University’s campaign efforts. Jerry May referred to this best practice as a ladder.

Now the concept of using ladders is not new or unique idea. It’s basically a way of stretching the responsibilities of your best people into new jobs – to give them more opportunities for meaningful contributions to the organization - to provide a good professional growth experience. Look at Dan Grafner; not only is he the Director of Development for the College of Business, he also gets additional assignments from the dean which makes him feel good, but he also actually manages and mentors [the College of] Social Work, [the College of] Law and [the College of] Education. He is a resource for the development officers and the deans. He participates in the evaluations of the development officers for those units because John [Meyer] has too large a span of control. . . . and so it improves John’s quality of supervision because he’s got fewer people to supervise, secondly Dan Grafner gets a broader span of control, he gets his own job which he loves at the Fisher College.

The benefit in utilizing ladders at Ohio State goes beyond simply keeping good people on staff; it has allowed the Senior Administrative Team to
expand their level of influence on the Development Organization by allowing talented, experienced development professionals to work closely with several colleges and constituencies on maximizing their fundraising results. In some respects, the increased responsibilities for these development officers are comparable to those of a vice president for development at smaller institution. “I think most of them view their role here as equal to a vice president at a small college or perhaps some of them even as vice president of a medium size public university,” noted John Meyer.

While discussing promising yet less experienced development officers, Linda Seitz explained that keeping talented development officers is a difficult endeavor for most institutions. The key, in her view, is recognizing the potential and leadership capacity of good development officers and providing them with additional professional responsibilities, challenges, and opportunities to advance their career without leaving the University.

John and I try to create opportunities for people to move up... positions open and we look at who needs that next step or we’re going to lose them; who do we want to reward with a next step? We move the chess pieces around when we can to encourage people to stay and to feel that their work is rewarded. So when you see people moving around its more for that, then them just jumping.”

In a conversation about the consistency of the senior leadership in the Department of Development, John Meyer remarked:

I don’t know of another place in this country where if you asked, “okay during the seven years that would have characterized your campaign, were you able to retain nearly 100% of your senior people?” I dare say that you won’t be able to find this anyplace; it is fairly unique and it’s something I’m proud of. . . . I’ll go to the Big 10 meeting at the end of the month and I’ll see a lot of new people in important roles; they’re still raising lots of money. It’s not a crippling kind of thing, but I know they look at us and say “how
do you guys do that at Ohio State?” I think it's because we pay attention to people’s careers and we try our best to make sure we're retaining the best ones.

Linda Seitz had this to say about working with the members of senior level management:

This is the best group of people to work with and many people stay because of that. The work environment in terms of our colleagues is great. There is a support system among the development staff that I never saw at UCLA. . . . Everyone wants to help everyone else and there is a real love of this place. . . . Maybe even more than the institution, people are committed to each other and the institution is a part of that. ‘Cause I have no desire, I mean we get calls all the time, I get calls all the time and I just say I’m not moving.

John Meyer bragged:

I haven’t been to Stanford and Harvard, but by God I'd stack us up against almost anyplace in the country in terms of really important talented people who’ve come together and do their work and who have managed to stay pretty much together as a team. It helps our ability to recruit other people in here. I have absolutely no trouble telling people, “Hey, if you get lucky and we hire you, you are going to work with a great group of people.” We occupy some high ground because of our success; so more people are finding their way to my door. Our staff is a big reason why we were so successful in the campaign and still are today.

**Substantive Best Practices**

*Focus on major-gift cultivation and formal “asks”*

As May honed his analysis of the organization, the goals for development became more clear and compelling to him. Thus substantive *best practices* were implemented. His evaluation of the organization was that the University had performed very well at acquiring annual gifts, gifts of $1,000 - $2,000 dollars, lead gifts for special initiatives, and some gifts of a million dollars or more. Where he noticed a glaring omission in performance was in the acquisition of $100,000 to $1,000,000 gifts for University priorities. May explained,
I compared us with other institutions in terms of $100,000 gifts and it seemed like a real opportunity for us to excel. So I decided to dedicate the bulk of the fundraising staff towards cultivating and securing gifts of $100,000 and higher... I made it clear to the entire staff that this is what put Stanford and Harvard at the top of the fundraising world.

Soon job descriptions were redrawn to reflect a clear focus on major-gift cultivation. Additionally, all development officers regardless of their positions (i.e., annual giving, planned giving, corporate & foundations giving, or major gifts) were asked to increase the number of formal "asks" (i.e., formal solicitations they made). The motivations for this was rooted in Jerry May’s desire to shape the culture of philanthropy at Ohio State by inspiring both the donor-base and the development staff to invest in the success of the University. “You might call these changes innovations,” May remarked, “but I would call them fine tuning from the perspective that we weren’t living up to our potential.”

John Meyer explained that once Jerry May felt he understood enough about the basic strengths and weaknesses of the development organization, he redirected the organizational focus towards major-gift cultivation and implemented this focus with a variety of strategies that would later become organizational best practices. He encouraged collaboration and team-work; the use of multiple and meaningful relationships with donors, prospects, and internal partners, all of which will be discussed later.

Under May’s leadership the Senior Administrative Team successfully influenced the culture of the Development Organization by making it clear that the development staff is to remain focused on major-gift identification, cultivation, and solicitation strategies. “Major-gift fund raising brings in significantly more dollars to the University than other
fundraising initiatives," remarked Lynda Heyl, "One of our best practices is that we stay focused on our top people (i.e., major givers); that’s where the majority of our time has to be spent," added Heyl.

Bruce Pontious, Assistant to the Sr. Vice President, Health Sciences, Medical Center and Health Sciences Development, added these thoughts:

I would say one of our best practices is how we function at the top of the [gift] pyramid, although we can improve there. I’m making a distinction between gifts at the top of the development period pyramid and gifts at the bottom of the development pyramid. Certainly over the last decade or so all the great development gurus tell you that you are really going to live and die by the top of the pyramid. I think we’ve become fairly sophisticated at the top of the pyramid.

When asked to reflect on the changes that ensued following Jerry May’s arrival, Linda Seitz noted that although previous to Jerry’s administration the development organization had successfully completed a campaign, the extent of their success was largely rooted in the fact that Ohio State had never before pursued a capital campaign of this kind. Seitz described it this way:

The University was really was winging it then. The fundraising structure and internal organization were really not defined that well. After [the first campaign] it was like, “wow we were really successful; how did we do that?” I think it was successful because it was the first campaign. The University had never asked anybody for anything before; so it was guaranteed to be successful. . . . Jerry taught us to think big! He taught us to think about minimizing missed opportunities and finding and maximizing the potential of every opportunity.

Although the culture of philanthropy at Ohio State was successfully transformed into one of high performance, creativity, and alignment with the University’s Academic Plan, the transition took time nonetheless, John Meyer recalled:
[Jerry May] brought in Linda Seitz from California, and together she and I played mom and dad for four years. So, I would say it took about two to four-years [for all of the staff] to really internalize the changes [culture shift] across Development. We conveyed the focus and philosophy that Jerry May wanted, and we really worked hard to develop that. That’s how the program evolved.

*Align with Academic Priorities of the University*

Vice President May explained the importance of *Alignment* with the academic priorities of the University this way:

If you are raising money for things that aren’t important to a dean, then you are not “value-added;” and, as a fundraising team, you’re not going to be taken too seriously. But if you are raising money for the central academic initiatives – the ones seen by the president, the provost, and the deans as significant, then you are important.

This clarity of focus is referred to as *alignment* in this study. In other words, the fund-raising initiatives and underlying philosophy for the Department of Development reflects, and supports the University’s most important priorities. The advantage of aligning university-wide, college, and departmental fund-raising priorities to the academic priorities of the institution is that the development staff, as well as academic leaders can consistently and collaboratively communicate the same vision for excellence.

The following excerpt from, *Setting the Stage: Context and Strategies for the Academic Plan* (The Ohio State University web-page, 2004) reflects the ambitious goals of the University’s administration as well as touches upon some of the fundamental challenges associated with successfully achieving them.

Today, Ohio State is perceived as having great athletics and good, but not outstanding, academics. We are viewed as big and bureaucratic but with a strong spirit, particularly among alumni.
Allowing for many exceptions to such gross generalizations, that perception is fairly close to the mark. So where do we start?

Any review of the comparative data makes it clear that our focus must be on building academic excellence. For while the University needs to continuously improve in many areas, we will never be a truly great university without dramatically enhancing the reality and perception of the teaching and learning and research and scholarship we do - and without the service activities that flow from our excellence in these endeavors.

Although much has been accomplished in recent years, our academic reputation has not appreciably improved. The 20-10 Plan is designed to move Ohio State into the top-tier of America’s public research universities by the year 2010, with 10 programs ranked in the top 10 in their respective disciplines and 20 programs ranked in the top 20. This is a bold objective and the essential starting point of our plan. It is an important benchmark in reaching our ultimate goal.

While the perception of being a “football school” may endure, particularly in light of the University winning the 2002 National Championship, the academic and development leaders for The Ohio State University have done a fine job of expressing and acting upon the Academic Plan. Figure 4.5 outlines the academic highlights of the University since 1995 and serves not only as evidence of the advances the University has made in recent years, but also is an example of the kinds of information the Development Organization has relied on in making compelling cases for private support.
Academic Highlights

- Profile of incoming freshman class has improved dramatically since 1995:
  - Average ACT score has risen from 22.8 to 25.4.
  - Percentage of entrants ranking in top 10 percent of high school class has risen from 21 to 33-34.
  - About one entrant in five is a minority.
- Student retention rates increased at all levels in the 2001-02 academic year:
  - Freshman retention has risen from 77.7 percent in 1995 to 86.5 percent last fall.
  - Second-year retention rate is now 79%.
  - Third-year retention rate is about 71%, a rise of nearly five percentage points in one year.
  - Six-year graduation rate is 58.8%. (This rate is projected to be at least 62% for 2002-03.)
- Comparing the freshman class that entered Ohio State in 1994 with the class that entered in 2001: Even though the 2001 class was smaller, about 450 more of those new students returned for their second year at Ohio State. That is equivalent to the student population of an entire residence hall such as Taylor Tower or Stradley Hall.
- Research grants have increased by 80 percent over the past five years, to $426 million.
- Ohio State ranks among U.S. News & World Report’s Top 25 Public Universities in America and is number one in Ohio.
- The Ohio State faculty now includes 22 members of national academies: five members of the National Academy of Sciences, nine members of the National Academy of Engineering, three members of the Institute of Medicine and five members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- This year, there are a record-breaking 411 scholar-athletes, a 12 percent increase in one year and a 56 percent increase from the 263 scholar-athletes just seven years ago. Today, 48 percent of all student athletes have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher.
- U.S. News ranks many graduate/professional programs among the best in the nation, including Veterinary Medicine (6), Education (17), Fisher College of Business (19 and 14 for undergraduate), Nursing (19), Engineering (24), Arts (28), Medicine and Public Health (37 - up from 44 last year), Moritz College of Law (38).
- The number of National Merit Scholars in the Autumn 2003 freshman class is the largest ever at Ohio State.
- Students have been recipients of such prestigious recognition as: Mellon Fellowships, Goldwater Scholarships, Truman Scholarships, NSF Graduate Fellowships, Udall Scholarships, and national defense and microbiology fellowships.
- The Council for Advancement and Support of Education ranks Ohio State 15th in fund raising among nation’s public universities.
- Private support to the University is up 9% over last year. The total of $195.8 million is the second largest total in the University’s history, with a new record for the most donors in a single year: 102,779.

Figure 4.5: Academic Highlights of The Ohio State University OSU website, (2003)
To realize its "2010 Plan" goal of placing some of its strongest programs into the top ranks nationally and internationally, as well as among peer public universities, Ohio State University introduced the Selective Investment program in 1997-98. The purpose was to identify some of the University's strongest departments and programs and to provide them with additional resources they need to move to the very top of their fields. This approach is rooted in the philosophy that the very best programs should be rewarded and given opportunities to achieve at the highest levels.

May consistently conveyed the importance of advancing the fundamental priorities of the Academic Plan and stressed the importance of maximizing opportunities for success by working with internal and external partners. May was routinely complimentary of the achievements of the development staff; however, he always challenged the staff make more “asks,” develop more partnerships, and to identify more prospects for the University. John Meyer described the importance of Alignment this way:

I think in general we do a good job at managing the priority setting process with the academic leadership. There are a lot of wish-lists out there, and not always a lot of [donors] that will support them. . . . Our job is to assist not only in raising the money, but also in assisting [academic leaders] by telling them what we feel is viable in terms of raising money. As a result, we know what we’re supposed to be raising money for. . . . There’s a very tight relationship between the president, provost, and the budget side of the university and us [development]. I think that was achieved through years of hard work and relationship building.

When Linda Seitz discussed the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, she also noted the importance of alignment and the role it plays in creating momentum.
We had our campaign priorities with [President Gee], and now we have some real solid institutional priorities set by President Kirwin. Not only for fundraising, with libraries emerging as the next top priority, but with his Academic Plan, diversity, the undergraduate experience, and how those all translate, very very clearly. It’s very comfortable for the development staff to know exactly where it all stands institutionally.

During the planning period of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, each academic college and other constituencies on campus submitted their priorities for fund-raising. From there, explained Dan Grafner,

. . . the [academic] administration takes look at all that and throw it into a funnel and shake it out and come out with campaign priorities. Jerry May was at that table. In the past, he might not have been there. But he had been so successful and so focused that he brought credibility to the entire process.

The following quote by John Meyer addresses the importance of aligning development initiatives to academic priorities as well as the necessity to communicate them effectively.

During the campaign we had very clear campaign goals and we still do today. Everything we do is aligned with the academic goals of the university. Our goals are disseminated to the development staff, the faculty, and the local community and nationally in a very clear way. . . . The money we generate really does help attack the question of “how do we become one of the glorified top 10 institutions?” Private money can help you get there, state money alone will not.

Assistant Vice President for Operations, Gary Kitsmiller described the challenge of reinventing the image of the University this way:

Our transformation has been the result of a lot of hard work and it has been tough. I won’t tell you that the image of being a football town isn’t still here; we all know it is, you’re never going to get around it because universities aren’t going to make it in this day and age without a good athletic program. Its big bucks and national publicity.
Although the Ohio State University administration realizes it may never get away from the alumni’s love of Woody Hayes and all things Buckeye, they continue to capitalize on the “spirit” and fondness for the University by articulating the importance and impact the goals of the Academic Plan will continue to have on the future of Ohio State. During a development staff meeting in March of 2001, Jerry May challenged the staff to focus on the success stories about the University when he said:

Some people don’t think we’re good enough; so we have to explain to them why we are excellent, and why they should be a part of something really great.

Jeff McMahon, Director – Development Special Events described the importance of aligning development priorities with the Academic Plan this way:

I’ve watched this university go from a bunch of guys throwing a piece of leather up and down a field on a Saturday afternoons to becoming an academic leader nationally. Which is what [the academic leaders] pushed hard for. [The Academic Plan] has been the catalyst to raise all this money - to build the new facilities we have and hire the amazing faculty we need to be world-class. It’s working. We have better students now; we have better faculty; and, we have a better reputation now.

**Cultivate internal partners**

*Importance of President’s Involvement*

Presidents Gee and Kirwin were described as very effective at articulating the institution’s Academic Plan and the related case for support to both internal and external constituents during the Affirm They Friendship campaign. This is an important point, because as Jerry May points out, “the amount of time the President puts into fundraising is directly proportionate to the amount of dollars raised.” This sentiment was echoed by many of the participants of this research. Linda Seitz underscored the importance of presidential involvement when she said:
The president plays a pivotal role in securing the largest gifts to the university. This is absolutely essential because if we don’t have the president’s support and involvement, the largest gifts may not happen.

Karen Longbrake, Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine, remarked, “If [academic leaders] know that they can trust our judgments and advise, then we are way ahead of the game; we need them as partners.” Joe Bull, Director of the Office of Planned Giving added, “It doesn’t hurt when the president and provost understand what you are doing and how it benefits them. That’s value-added! That’s how the Academic leadership needs to see us.

Although the development staff can be effective in communicating institutional priorities to donors and prospects alike, it is typically more effective to have an academic partner. To that end, it is important to involve academic leaders at the college and constituent level for advancing development initiatives.

Gary Kitsmiller described the role of presidential leadership this way:

I’m not sure Presidential leadership is the most important [characteristic] for success, but it certainly is not possible to be continually successful in fundraising over time without it. I think if you look at the history of [Ohio State’s] rapid progression in fundraising you would go back to the early 80’s when President Jennings came to Ohio State. He established a commitment to invest resources in fund raising activities and he had the vision to launch the first comprehensive capital campaign for the University. That kind of leadership and commitment has carried through to other administrations.

Importance of Dean’s Involvement

During Vice President May’s tenure, he worked diligently with Presidents Gee and Kirwin concerning the importance of including development in the portfolio of all deans. He asked that the appreciation and willingness to participate in fund-raising activities become a part of the rubric for
hiring new deans as well as evaluating them. It did. Soon May was
included in the interview process for hiring deans. According to John
Meyer,

At that point, the message from the provost and the president to
candidates was the expectation that they will help raise money for
the university. That was a best practice and that was brand new
with Jerry.

“I think that helped set the tone,” added Dan Grafner, “and he started
developing those [internal] relationships that I alluded to earlier and that
has developed into a best practice for all of us.” It’s very important to
know who your internal partners are going to be and equally important
to cultivate those relationships. Building on this point, Gary Kitsmiller
added:

The relationships he developed with the presidents, both Gordon
Gee and Brit [Kirwin] have served us tremendously well . . . . Jerry
set the tone in that when deans are hired, they know they will be
helping us raise money for their college. 20 years ago fundraising
was not part of part of the job description. Do you realize how
important that is, I mean with respect to a change in culture?

In terms of cultivating internal partners and aligning the development
goals to the academic priorities of the university, one of the most effective
innovations Jerry May developed was a fundraising program for deans at
the beginning of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign. His objective was
to clearly communicate with deans the value of participating in fund-
raising and the relationship between their involvement and their success
in raising money. By explaining the important roles academic leaders
can play in cultivating major-gifts for their college, May introduced them
to a philosophy of high-performance development.

Vice President May described the program this way:

In terms of innovations, one of the things we do, and I don’t know
if you can call this innovation or just good management, but you
have to stick to the discipline of teaching people how to do fundraising. You have to be an educator; you have to be a teacher. So what we’re doing right now is offering a seminar on “asking” for the new deans. John’s going to put 12-15 people in the room; they are new deans, new department chairs, or new heads of fundraising programs.

Linda Seitz added,

This is absolutely a best practice . . . He taught them how to be effective partners with their development officers. John [Meyer] and I would sit in and Jerry was very clear with deans. He would say, “The amount of money you raise is directly proportionate to the amount of time you spend assisting the fundraising effort.” That was his message. He taught them about prospect identification and asking for the gift – the whole process. It was incredibly helpful.

Lynda Heyl shared her thoughts on the process as well.

I remember him coming over here (the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences) several times to work with our administrative cabinet. It helped too. I was around for the last campaign; so I can see the difference. I remember him saying, “Your success is directly related to your involvement,” I can remember those words.

In October of 2000 I attended one of Jerry May’s Dean’s Development meetings. I was impressed with the way he handled the session. Again, his message was clear: “The amount of money you raise is directly proportionate to the amount of time you spend working with your development officer.” He explained that the Department of Development is a tremendous resource in terms of pursuing excellence. He reinforced the notion that deans don’t have to know everything about development; they just need to be involved in the process and trust their development officers.
May distributed handouts including a document entitled the *Fund-Raising Process* (see figure 4.6), and for the next hour and a half the group discussed fundamental principles in identifying, cultivating, soliciting, and stewarding prospects. The group discussed the importance of developing strategic fund-raising plans, using volunteers as partners, and the essential nature of personal contact with prospects.

John Meyer explained the importance of internal partnerships with academic leaders this way:

> When you're at a major university like Ohio State, Michigan, or Penn State you need the president and the deans out there. Long ago we learned that the concept of expert witness applies not only to law but also to fundraising. If a dean says, “Here’s my vision, my priority, and here’s what I hope to do,” [prospects] resonate to that and they get on board.

Vice President May emphasized the importance of deans and other academic leaders to the fund-raising process when he made the following remarks:

> The president of the university is key; the provost is key; the alignment of goals is fundamental, strong credibility with the deans is key. If you don’t see the deans as a customer in a major comprehensive campaign like Ohio State had, then you are making a tremendous mistake. Those are some of the most important partners we’ve got.

---

**Emphasize the Importance of Collaboration and Teamwork**

A priority the Senior Administrative Team established during the Jerry May administration was to transform the internal culture of development from one of competition to one of collaboration. “You need a leader that can really push this,” stated Jerry May.
So John Meyer and Linda Seitz and I pushed this [concept of teamwork]; I forced it on [the development officers]. I wasn’t going to let good development opportunities pass us by because some people couldn’t see the big picture.

To that end, the Senior Team developed a system that reinforced partnering and collaboration. The prospect management role was changed to foster more collaboration amongst the development staff. Linda Seitz explained that on annual evaluations, a development officer gets more credit for partnering on an “ask” than if the cultivation and/or ask is made alone. “Anything that we could think of that would encourage partnering, we put into place,” noted Linda Sietz. The prospect management system previously included only a Prospect Manager and an Assistant Manager. A Prospect Manager is the person with the strongest relationship with the prospect or donor and historically was solely responsible for coordinating all activity with that prospect. Activity Managers were added to increase opportunities for collaboration and teamwork. Activity Managers do not necessarily have long-term relationships with prospects. Typically, they are only involved for a short-term cultivation and “asks.” Linda Seitz explained:

By adapting the prospect management system to include assistant managers and activity managers, we could reinforce partnering at all levels and decrease a development officer’s tendency to want to “own” a prospect. Credit was given equally for all levels on the contact report form. We added a column in which you could list all the partners who went with you on an appointment. This eliminated the need for each development officer to fill out reports for the same appointment and also served to reinforce the partnering concept. It also forced development officers to work together on developing next steps. I think that’s a best practice here.

Because development officers are evaluated by a combination of the number of prospects they manage and co-manage, the number of contacts with prospects they make annually, and the number of “asks” in
which they participate, the mechanism for evaluating the performance of
the development staff was also modified. Jerry May explained that the
performance review was written in a way that also reinforces partnering.
For example, included in the performance review document is the
following question: *Identify the five best moves you have made during the
past year and who your partners have been.* Bruce Pontious explained
how this philosophy of collaboration and teamwork has permeated the
culture of development in the Medical Center and Health Sciences:

> Collaboration is an imperative; therefore, if we are not of a
collaborative nature, we are swimming upstream. So our challenge
is to always stay aligned with the fabric and the grain of the
institution, be it the University or the Medical Center.

Joe Bull also endorses this philosophy as well:

> One of the best practices we have here at Ohio State is that we
allow multiple credit for a specific gift. . . . By allowing people to
have credit on their personal ledgers for the work they do
encourages collaboration and team work.

By virtue of giving multiple credit for gift solicitation and cultivation, the
Senior Administrative Team is clearly communicating and rewarding the
value it places on the culture of teamwork. At the time this data was
collected, Carol Moss, had only been at The Ohio State University for four
months and was assimilating into her new position as Assistant Vice
President for Major Gifts. She remarked:

> I’ve never seen a teamwork approach quite like this one.
Teamwork - I think that’s one of the things we do best here. Now
that I look back over my time at Case Western and Pittsburgh, I
think that’s what those two programs may have lacked: the
teamwork approach, and good partnering.

To that end, during development staff meetings, I regularly observed
members of the Senior Administrative Team thanking development
officers for their efforts, collaboration, and good work. In many cases
development officers would stand and thank their fellow development partners publicly. “You’ve got to give people credit for the work they do,” remarked Dan Grafner.

**Have Multiple Relationships with Donors and Prospects**

The philosophy of collaboration and teamwork has also resulted in the pursuit of multiple relationships with prospects. The idea of having multiple relationships with donors is grounded in the concept that continuous relationships strengthen the bond to the institution and increase donor loyalty over time. It also protects the University from losing a cultivation opportunity when a development officer is promoted or moves to another institution. Multiple relationships keep prospects and donors in-touch with the University, interested and informed of the latest goings-on, and invited to many events. Over time, the prospect becomes a valued “friend” of the institution and visa versa.

Jerry May used this example for developing multiple relationships:

> One of the things we’ve done very well over the years is we have utilized the athletic program and athletic activities very heavily. At a school like Ohio State University athletic entertainment is an attractive venue. It’s a mechanism for getting people involved in the institution initially. It’s an opportunity to introduce them to our academics. And we’ve made it clear from the beginning that athletic prospects are also academic prospects. The athletic department has worked very well with us on that and I am very pleased about that relationship. We try to get the word out all the time about the quality of research and education we provide. We do this at President’s brunches and the President’s Club brunches.

Additional examples of multiple relationships with donors and prospects in the Department of Development include those with college-based development officers, regional major-gift staff, and planned giving staff. In many cases, college-based development officers rely on the regional major-gift staff to keep prospects informed, involved, and connected to
the University when the live outside of the state. Planned Giving officers often assist development officers during the cultivation process; however, many times they become the key contact for a donor once they have made a planned gift.

Building on the importance of multiple relationships and teamwork, John Meyer added these thoughts:

> It becomes even more evident when you talk with our colleagues in the Big 10. You recognize that there are some institutions where there are still bloody battles over volunteers and donors because of the [internal] turf-wars among the development officers. We still have competitiveness, but it doesn’t appear to be at the same level of some other institutions.

*Create Roles for Volunteers*

The use of volunteers has been another *best practice* that has helped transform the organizational culture of development at The Ohio State University, as well as enhance its performance overall. “People who want to make Ohio State better, people who have been successful themselves; those are the ones who can be excellent volunteers for us,” remarked Dan Grafner. He went on to explain:

> The key to having a successful volunteer program is obtaining early entrée with them, getting their attention, with the goal of developing a meaningful relationship that leads to involvement, engagement, and commitment.

The more prospects see themselves as *insiders* and the more they are asked for their advice and assistance, the more likely it is they see themselves as connected to the continued success and future of the University.

A strategy used for maintaining the feeling of “insider” is to focus on the strengths and interests of the volunteer. “Make sure they are engaged,” remarked Lynda Heyl. Volunteers can provide important capital, as well
as influence the success of a university’s development initiatives; however, the key in this organization was providing volunteers with meaningful, challenging responsibilities designed to advance the university’s fund-raising priorities. “Some volunteers are skilled at big-picture strategizing, while others will be tactical contributors. In other cases, a volunteer may prefer to just arrange meetings or host events for other prospects,” remarked Tom Hof.

Karen Longbrake added, “The best way to harness the potential of your volunteers is to always make them feel connected to the institution and the priorities.” Ideally volunteers serve as campus-wide leaders through their example of philanthropy and commitment to the institution. That is why it is important to engage them as “insiders” on a regular basis. To that end, in this organization it is extremely important to thank your major-gift volunteers in thoughtful and meaningful ways for their various contributions.

When volunteers are viewed as prospects that can play multiple roles in the success of institutional development initiatives, then opportunities for accomplishment appear to be enhanced considerably. As a result, those volunteers who are engaged and inspired, and who have the financial capacity also become excellent major-gift prospects. “I always say when you recruit a volunteer,” remarked Jerry May,

They are basically giving you a license to cultivate and solicit them. They are basically putting a target on their chest that says “cultivate me and ask me for a gift.” What they don’t even realize sometimes is, in saying that, the part they sort of suddenly realize is, “I’m going to be part of something that’s meaningful and important; I want to be part of this.” That’s part of our psychology. We all want to be part of something really great.
In many respects volunteers can serve as links to past traditions and history for the institution and that connection cannot be overlooked. Often volunteers can provide helpful opinions, perspectives, pride, and motivation rooted in experience, interest, commitment, and involvement with the university. “There are a lot of people who care deeply about the success of this University,” remarked John Meyer. By helping to raise money, promoting the organization, recruiting and persuading others to become involved, sitting on advisory boards and committees, knowing about the needs of the organization, volunteers can play a substantially important role in securing large gifts for the University. Jerry May put it succinctly: “The significance of volunteering is no mystery; it leads to commitment, which in turn leads to major gifts.”

**Redefine roles of the Foundation Board**

Prior to Jerry May’s appointment as Vice President for Development, the Foundation Board was much less effective than it is today. John Meyer noted that during Jerry May’s administration the Foundation Board has changed from,

> a group that nobody could figure out why we bothered to meet with, to a group of people who are fully engaged in one, two, or three different areas of the University. . . . So it’s a much better board than it used to be 10 years ago, both in terms of people who are on it and in terms of what they know they are supposed to do.

Today, the Foundation Board membership is approximately 45 – all of whom have the capacity to make significant financial contributions to the University and have the motivation to play a personal role in cultivating additional major-gifts.
Together, Linda Seitz and Jerry May played an important role in revitalizing the Foundation Board by improving the focus of the group, establishing membership terms, articulating the fundamental purpose of the board and the roles of the members. It is important to note that the individuals recruited for the Board are those who are either close to making a substantially large gift to the University, or those who already have done so. Gary Kitsmiller described the Foundation Board as the key volunteer group for major-gift fundraising at the University.

The type of individuals that serve on the board is remarkable. It’s a group of people with various experiences and interests in Ohio State. . . . They’ve committed tremendous amounts of money on their own and probably leveraged as much money on their own from others including companies for this institution.

As the Senior Administrative Team reshaped the culture of the Development Organization, Linda Seitz and Jerry May took time and talked with each member of the Foundation Board. They wanted to learn about their interests and motivations for participating, as well as ask them what they thought were the responsibilities of the group. May described the findings this way:

Many of them were hungry for a definition of exactly what was expected of them. We [the Senior Administrative Team] agreed that the principal rules and responsibilities for the Foundation Board should have to do with supporting the fundraising program of the institution. So we developed ten rules and responsibilities for Foundation Board members (see figure 4.7); They all have to do with identifying prospects, hosting events, being ambassadors, giving money themselves, helping us manage the assets of the foundation and the assets of the University on an investment committee with the board of trustees, and we ask each of them get involved with at least one important University development initiative.

Linda Seitz explained, “We are very strategic about the Foundation Board and how we enlist them. There has been a significant change in the make up of the Foundation Board since Jerry [May] has been involved.”
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

FOUNDATION BOARD

Roles & Responsibilities

1. Identify, involve and help solicit prospects for the University development programs or a Campaign and Constituent/Project Campaign Components.

2. Become directly involved as a volunteer or as a liaison in at least one Constituent/Project Campaign Component of a University fund-raising program or University-wide campaign.

3. Become involved as a volunteer in regional fund-raising activities for the University.

4. Host or sponsor prospect events and activities on campus and in your area for University Development and its constituent components.

5. Review University fund raising and Campaign planning with regard to its direction, policies, and procedures.

6. Assist in the assessment and feasibility of priority fund-raising projects and Campaign components brought forward by University administration, thus resulting in better understanding of resources, setting realistic goals and timelines, and ultimately receiving endorsement for the Campaign and components.

7. Review Foundation assets and appoint two Foundation Board members to participate in the review of Foundation assets through the University Trustees Investment Committee.

8. Participate in at least one Foundation Board committee to further fund-raising activities (e.g., in areas such as corporate and foundation fund raising, trusts and estates fund raising, annual giving fund raising.)

9. Formally accept gifts to the University given through the Foundation.

10. Provide generous personal support to the University for Selected Capital Projects, as well as annual giving programs.

Figure 4.7: The Ohio State University Foundation Board, Roles and Responsibilities (Institutional reports, June, 2001)
Today the Foundation Board serves to foster the development process (i.e., identify, cultivate, solicit, steward) and the role volunteers play contributes to the advancement of the academic priorities of the University. For this reason, it is important to have development staff working closely with Foundation Board members because of their professional and personal networks.

Each Foundation Board member typically has two prospect managers. One development officer is primarily responsible for cultivating a major-gift for the University, while the other is responsible for managing their volunteerism. Linda Sietz provided the following example:

A Foundation Board member may be a major-gift donor to the College of Business. In that case, Dan Grafner would be the prospect manager. They may also serve on the ad-hoc committees for the Library and the National Major Gift Committee for Chicago. In that case, I would be the volunteer manager. I would ask them to review lists of prospects in Chicago, I would introduce them to University-wide prospects, they'd still help Fisher College with identifying and soliciting people, but they'd also wear the bigger Ohio State University hat as well.

Kathy Donnelley, Director - Corporate & Foundation Giving, described the Foundation Board members as “great advocates for fundraising at Ohio State” and their contributions as “extremely beneficial.” Lynda Heyl described the impact of the Foundation Board as, “incredible in terms of its support of the development effort,” and Dan Grafner expressed his appreciation of the clarity and focus of the group this way:

The Foundation Board is comprised of our very top volunteers and our very top donors. And they know to be on the Foundation Board they are looking at getting or giving a million dollars at least. So they come in with the right expectation; the trustees don’t really have that [expectation].

These kinds of relationships appear to be priceless in terms of the success the University’s development initiatives have enjoyed. Gary
Kitsmiller called it “tremendous affection and enormous respect for this institution;” shared by both the Department of Development and the Foundation Board members. He continued:

We have a number of Foundation Board members that have their favorite areas within the University, and you know, they feel like they are so much a part of it and that has been a tremendous benefit to our fundraising success; it’s a remarkable group of people.

The Foundation Board meets bi-annually on campus to learn about and discuss important initiatives of the University. A typical Foundation Board agenda includes remarks by the President of the University, reports and discussion on topics such as, the undergraduate experience, Living/Learning Programs, college-specific initiatives, the University budget, the Academic Plan, personal recognition of large donors to the University, and other important, interesting, and timely topics.

Create a Centralized/Decentralized Organizational Model

Another best practice that facilitates successful fund-raising for The Ohio State University is a unique centralized/decentralized organizational model. The Department of Development utilizes a combination of centralized and decentralized college-based staffing to maximize its potential for high performance. Gary Kitsmiller explained the benefits of this organizational model.

The best way to oversee a large development organization is to have some type of central management and shared responsibility with college or constituent units. . . . With a centralized/decentralized model, individuals are managed centrally, and this is particularly important as it relates to smooth prospect management.

Joe Bull echoed this opinion, “the coordination of prospect management is really an important best practice. . . . I think the fact that we have one
roof, or one umbrella over all the development officers is huge - Absolutely huge.” Dave McCarthy, Director of Development – College of Engineering, recalled:

I was at private colleges [before this]; we didn’t have this kind of decentralization. Even in the early days when I joined Ohio State, development officers were very protective of their own [prospects] and they were very reluctant to share with one another, and if they did allow another person to approach [their prospect] it was not a pleasant sight. Yeah, it’s been the leadership; the current administration more than the previous administrations; they’ve really worked hard for team-work.

The benefit of this model, as it relates to “high performance” development, is that it keeps the colleges, and particularly the largest fund-raising units (i.e., Athletics, Business, Engineering, and Medicine) focused on both their respective priorities and the priorities of the University overall. Other universities use several constituent-based foundations for their development initiatives, which often results in insular, competitive relationships amongst colleges’ and development staff. For example, development staff and academic leaders can ignore institution-wide priorities because there is little leverage or motivation to make them act any differently. The Ohio State University has only one foundation which is used to support the Academic Plan and other institutional priorities of the University.

Dan Grafner emphatically stated:

I think partnering is the big one; that is definitely the big one, as far as best practices go. . . . . I think we [collaborate] almost better than anybody and the fact that we don’t have a separate foundation where you have development staff employed by the foundation and other development staff employed by the colleges, and they’re going in two parallel lines; I think the fact that we don’t have that is tremendous.
Centralization also means that virtually all development staff, regardless of their location, are hired and paid, promoted and fired, transferred or promoted from central development management. However, many are located in and work with a given college’s dean and faculty. The advantage of this centralized/decentralized model is that development officers have access to key internal academic partners such as the dean, communications and outreach directors, and other key faculty. Karen Longbrake underscored the value of being close to the academic partners for whom she raises money:

There are times when I drop in on the dean for ten minutes or so and accomplish so much more than I could if I weren’t here. So, I would have to say it’s an advantage being this close.

Dan Grafner echoed this sentiment:

Informal conversations with the dean – even if it’s only for ten minutes – can be just as instrumental in your success as the ones you schedule every week.

The second important aspect of this configuration is having a central information-repository from which information is disseminated, maintained and stored. Gary Kitsmiller remarked:

We try to provide a fairly good central support system for everyone. And, in my view, it certainly is very important in the development enterprise to ensure success. We pretty much know what we are doing, and we have excellent staff. Now that doesn’t mean we aren’t trying to improve [our central resources] all the time, but I’m not sure if you wouldn’t categorize [our model] as best practice either.

Organization-wide resources including the Office of Planned Giving, the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving, the Office of Development Communications, the Office of Development Special Events, the Office of Development Research, Merit and Honors Scholarships, Annual Giving, Human Resources, and Alumni Database and Information Systems (ADIS) are available to all development staff. Joe Bull emphasized that,
“Having experts in a centralized area available to development officers, as well as to donors, is a huge asset.” These resources effectively allow the development staff to stay focused on the cultivation of prospects. “Having that kind of resource, that level of professional staff is wonderful . . . . Being able to go there and brainstorm with them, whether it’s about communications pieces, proposals, or a planned gift is tremendous” noted Karen Longbrake.

Focus on Strategic Use of Meetings

Leadership Prospect Group

A best practice that clearly reflected the core values of Jerry May and the Senior Team (i.e., alignment with the Academic Plan, teamwork, major gift focus, collaboration) was the Leadership Prospect Group meetings (LPG). In those meetings the development team worked together by sharing ideas, exploring ideas, developing strategy, and having fun.

The Leadership Prospect Group (LPG) meetings took place three to four times a month and included the Senior Administrative Team and development directors from Athletics; Business; Corporate & Foundations Giving; Food, Agriculture and Environmental Science; Engineering; Health Sciences; Planned Giving; Research, and Veterinary Medicine. Additional development officers were invited also. Their role was to report on and discuss the progress they are making with specific million-dollar prospects.

LPG group discusses on-going and future strategies for soliciting and stewarding current donors and new prospects that have the ability to make major gifts to the University at or beyond the million dollar range. The primary objective of the meeting is to focus on developing or refining gift strategies for multi-million-dollar prospects, particularly those whose
cultivation process may be challenging. John Meyer also views it, “as a mechanism for us to control staff conflict and enhance staff dialogue when it comes down to the thorny issues of prospect management and strategy development.” Jerry May agreed, “We use the LPG to do both prospect coordination and prospect strategy. So I think it’s another form of a best practice we have.”

I attended LPG at least twenty-five times during the data collection portion of this study. Several consistent patterns emerged in both the procedural and interpersonal dynamics of the group. Nearly all of the meetings took place in the Bellows Room in the Faculty Club; however, on occasion they were held in the Rockow Room in the Longaberger Alumni House. A typical LPG Agenda (see Figure 4.8) consisted of the following items: Topics for On-Going Discussion (which always included a review of the Lead Gifts in Discussion document); Solicitation/Strategy Progress (which involved discussions about prospects who are approximately one step away from million and multi-million dollar “asks,” or prospects who have pending “asks” that need to be closed. (These prospects are added to the agenda at Jerry May’s request); and, Brainstorming (which included creative discussions about ways to cultivate new or existing corporate and individual prospects).

In virtually every meeting I attended, the LPG group would exchange insights and ideas until someone asked a question like, “Have you considered this strategy?” The group rarely lacked synergy and possessed a noticeable flow that often resulted in the creation of viable gift strategies in less than thirty minutes.
Figure 4.8: Leadership Prospect Group Agenda examples.

AGENDA
LPG Meeting
June 7, 2001
(No Stein, Bull)

Topic(s) for Ongoing Discussion:
- Review Lead Gifts in Discussion List (All) (Handout)
- Review Foundation Board Members NOT on any Internal Volunteer Committees (All) [hidden text]
- Update on Foundation Board Member Recruiting (May)
- Review Scst Mueller’s Prospect List (All)

Solicitation/Strategy Progress:

Brainstorming:
- Byrd Polar Research (Moss, Meyer) [Rock Repository & Global Environmental Science Program]
  - Richard [hidden text] Stulberg, Miller, J.)
- Sam [hidden text] (Stulberg, Vannelle)
- Thomas [hidden text] Whitfield, Moss)

Next Meeting date will be June 28th 8:00 – 10:00
The Lead Gifts in Discussion document was updated for every meeting and included four sections: lead gifts in discussion; lead gifts completed; in discussion - will not close in 6-months; and, future asks. Each name on the list had a dollar amount, representing the targeted or current “ask” and the area of the University this prospect was interested in helping. This review was almost always the first as, “Do we have a strong prospect manager for this prospect,” or “What are we doing with them?” and “Are all of these leads still alive,” and finally, “Are there any others to add or remove from the list?” By doing this for all of the biggest University prospects, every member of the group was always kept well informed. The pace for this task was usually quick, with the group reviewing every name on the first two sections of the list each meeting. Vice President May would ask clarifying questions such as, “Who are your internal partners?” “What is the prospect’s passion?” “What are your next moves?”

Following the July 27, 2001 Leadership Prospect Group (LPG) meeting, I asked Carol Moss what her impressions were of the process. She explained that although both Case Western Reserve and University of Pittsburgh, her previous institutions, had meetings with similar purposes, neither had the spirit of collegiality that Ohio State’s LPG meeting does.

It’s amazing to see how this group operates. They sit in there and tell each other everything they know about their own prospects, even though they know we’re not always talking about this person for a gift to their college. They share information they’ve gathered from their time here. They really do a great job of working together.

The Solicitation/Strategy Progress part of each meeting is perhaps the best example of the culture of teamwork and the focus of alignment in action. I found the LPG meeting to be a strong indicator of the culture of teamwork and collaboration throughout the Department of Development.
The LPG group is comprised of successful, experienced professionals who share insights and work together on developing effective major-gift strategy for the University’s top donor prospects. There is a strong sense of friendship, collegiality and commitment to advancing the best strategies for The Ohio State University. The group discusses the highest profile donor prospects for the University in a focused, yet relaxed and comfortable way. Dan Grafner, Joe Bull, and John Meyer usually cracked jokes that kept every one smiling; however, the process was never compromised as a result of their humor.

The process for the Solicitation/Strategy Progress segment of the meetings typically followed this pattern: A prospect manager provided an overview to the group about a major-gift prospect whose case included elements of complexity. They also provided supporting and contextual materials for everyone, such as information about the targeted gift amount and area(s) of potential support, research profiles, relative background information, summaries of current “moves” and potential “next moves.” The group would listen carefully.

Usually Jerry May would begin by asking specific and clarifying questions (e.g., “who are the internal partners?” and “who made the last contact with them?”). The group would continue to listen as the process of cultivation was explained further. Soon other members would begin asking provocative questions like, “what role can the donor play as a volunteer?” or “what have the ‘stalls’ and objections been?” or “do we know how much money he really has?” or “have we involved the family enough?”

Vice President May would often pose the question, “how can we help [the development officer] with this case?” Discussions were almost always
thoughtful and productive with various perspectives and ideas presented as potential strategies to pursue. The discussion usually lasted fifteen to twenty minutes. At that point, Jerry May, John Meyer, or Dan Grafner usually reframed the scenario and proposed possible strategies based on the group’s thoughts. Then the group would provide a little more insight and critique. After the final thoughts were shared, Jerry May typically gave directives for next moves and responsibilities.

For example, during a meeting I attended on July 27, 2001, a case was presented in which the prospect was a graduate of the College of Law at Ohio State; however, the group felt like he was also interested in other parts of the University even though he did not do his undergraduate work at OSU. John Meyer made the following statement:

> There are politics here we need to be aware of. We need to give (new dean) Nancy Rodgers a chance with him; otherwise, we could be missing a great opportunity to involve Nancy and show her that Law is a priority of the University’s.

May agreed with Meyer and began to delegate responsibilities to the group:

> Lisa – I want more current research on him; Joe – find out more about his intentions for a planned gift; John – let’s talk with Nancy about ways to approach this; Bruce – talk to Sanfilippo about emerging priorities in the Health Sciences; Dan – we need a partner in business. What are other connections we can consider? (To the group) We need to get more information and consider all of this in a month and proceed from there. We also need to think carefully about what John said.

In another meeting, on April 27, 2001, Doug Stein, Director of Development for the James Cancer Center presented a case in which he was being slowed down by “stalls” from his prospect. The group collaborated for quite a while, offering several insights and suggestions,
including additional ideas for family cultivation. Kathy Donnelley suggested the son be asked to speak to MBA students. Jerry replied enthusiastically, “You hit it on the head; great suggestion.” After about twenty minutes, Vice President May presented the strategy he favored. Here is what he said:

Doug, we have an opportunity to move [the prospect] from six figures to seven figures. Let’s make this work – the minimum ask we make should be $500,000.”

Doug agreed and indicated that he was “ready to move on it.” May then presented the next steps in the strategy.

Alright, I want [the prospect] and his sons to be involved a lot more than they have been. Not only can they be prospects for us, but more importantly they are influencing their father’s decision. Doug, I know you can take care of that. You’ve done a great job on this one. Becky and I will work on getting him seated at Dr. Kirwin’s table for the event. Have I missed anything here?

The **Brainstorming** segment of the LPG meeting was added in March of 2001. This innovation was added by the Senior Team as a tool for exploring creative cultivation strategies for major-gift prospects who were more than one or two “moves” away from an “ask” and/or whose case was difficult to manage strategically. The format was basically the same as the **Solicitation/Strategy Progress** part of the meeting with this exception: the goal was to develop a more fluid, longer term gift strategy for cultivation. Jerry May’s role was slightly different in this segment of the meeting. Typically Vice President May advanced a strategy and relied on the group to critique and shape it.

In the **Brainstorming** segments, I noticed that May was more of a facilitator of the discussion. He still asked several clarifying questions as he developed a contextual understanding of the prospect’s case; however, he was much more interested in following the lead of the group. He
would listen very carefully to everyone’s contributions and usually would ask the question, “What other parts of the University is he or she interested in?” The group would talk more and more until it seemed like enough time had been spent on the prospect and the group moved on to the next item.

The following example from September 28, 2001 demonstrates the value of adding the Brainstorming segment to the agenda. On this day a case was presented by a Regional Major Gift Officer who was beginning to cultivate a family in her region. The group shared many thoughts, insights, and information about the family for several minutes. Lynda Heyl and Dave McCarthy suggested involving the family much more than they had been previously (there were twenty-five OSU graduates in the family). They shared some ideas for doing this. The group talked more. Soon Jerry May suggested the group work backwards from President Kirwin’s priorities and connect them with the areas of interest of the family. Dan Grafner took the lead and began to shape several strategic moves that were later successfully implemented. I witnessed this kind of creativity on several occasions.

I found Jerry May to be very complimentary when he values the contributions of others. He regularly thanked people for the work they do, complimenting good ideas and hard work frequently. As previously noted, May is very focused, highly motivated and expects the same from the development staff. His style of communication reflects those traits and he is without question a very a direct communicator.

The impact of the leadership style of Jerry May on the Development Organization overall is demonstrated by these examples. Several participants in this study explained that development organizations at
other universities are much more guarded with information about prospects and downright competitive. “This does not happen at other schools,” remarked Dan Grafner. Tom Hof described LPG as a best practice for this reason: “The right people are at that table. “We’ve got the right people around the table from a standpoint that everybody knows what is going on and also from a strategy standpoint. It’s wonderful - to have that experience there.”

John Meyer said this:

I think one of the things that we do, as a best practices, is LPG. . . . We’ve learned how to do it, which has made it immensely easier because we’ve had people around here for a long time. It’s a lot easier to have wonderful gift strategies when you have accumulated 300 years of development experience in the room.

Bruce Pontious added:

Those I think are extremely important processes. People have an opportunity to look at and stay focused on major gift prospects, [to understand] where the leadership prospects are, and how we are nurturing them. How are we moving them along? The medical center has its fair share of folks on that list and obviously we continue to work at moving people up to that list as appropriate.

Development officers presenting at LPG or PPG meetings needed to be well prepared. Vice President May has a tendency to ask “rapid-fire” questions initially as he seeks to ground himself in the context of a particular case study. This style can put some development officers on their heels if they are not ready or accustomed to his intense and direct style. Vice President May was not the only one that expected presenters to be well prepared when they were invited to LPG. I found the questions from the group to be equally as direct and to-the-point. A few times I witnessed development officers who were not as well-prepared as they should have been for the meetings. Consequently, they seemed rattled and overwhelmed during the meeting.

190
Prospect Planning Group

Prospect Planning Group (PPG) meetings focus entirely on the top prospects and donors for a particular development constituency. The following pages present examples of the different ways in which these meetings were used, as well as the way the PPG group influences major-gift strategies at the constituent level.

PPG meetings included the development director and/or development officers from the focus constituency. The development staff from the selected area provides an overview of their best prospects and strategies for them to the PPG group. The PPG group consists of, Jerry May, John Meyer, Linda Seitz, usually Dan Grafner, and sometimes one more member of the LPG group. The only agenda is the one presented by the development officer. I found the discussions to be productive and in-depth. The PPG group always offered strategic and tactical advice to the development officers with whom they were working.

Because the objective was to enhance the cultivation and solicitation strategies for the selected area, the format was typically loose and presented opportunities for discussions the development officer needed to have with the PPG group. This process provided the Senior Team an opportunity to focus on the direction of a particular constituency and guide the development officer in ways that may be helpful to them. John Meyer described the process as productive, especially for Jerry May because,

It allows him for a period of an hour, hour and a half, to get fully concentrated on a particular part of the empire, which he rarely can do. Jerry has a tendency to think that if he hasn’t heard anything about fundraising in a certain area in the last 3 weeks, 3 months, or 3 years, his first sort of notion is well, nobody is doing anything. So,
PPG and other things exist to help him understand in his global view that yes, things are happening, people are working, actions are being taken, solutions are being found, asks are being made, outcomes are being generated and it helps him, I suppose, go home at night and sleep better.

Perhaps the most significant impact of PPG is that senior level development professionals assist other development officers from across the university in the creation, critique, and improvement of their major-gift cultivation strategies. These meetings appeared to benefit development officers with crisp, focused feedback, strategic thinking, and encouragement. It also seemed to help the development officers understand the bigger picture in terms of the way their development priorities fit into the university’s academic priorities.

This meeting is important because both senior level administrators and development officers alike have an opportunity to share ideas. It allows both parties to stay focused on major gift prospects, identify and strategize about leadership-level prospects, discuss cultivation techniques, and to evaluate how development officers are “moving” prospects through the development cycle (i.e., identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship). It also provides an opportunity for the Senior Team to further inculcate its guiding philosophy for developing major-gift donors for the University, and subsequently strengthen the culture of the organization.

The first PPG meeting I attended was on January 9, 2001. This meeting focused on the upcoming Library Campaign for renovating the University’s main library - William Oxley Thompson Library. Joe Branin, Director of OSU Libraries, Kaye Madden, Director of the Library Campaign and Shannon Tippie, Development Officer for OSU Libraries were present, along with Jerry May, John Meyer, Linda Seitz, Dan
Grafner, Becky Crowell, and Roger Addleman. Kaye, Joe, and Shannon had prepared a power-point presentation for the group outlining their proposed strategy for the next six-months.

Their plan included: information about their recently completed trips to Penn State University, Dartmouth College, and Duke University to learn about their library campaigns; a goal to bring more donor prospects to campus; facilitating provocative dialogue about the value of having a great library on campus; and finally their plan to disseminate an attractive glossy leave-behind piece about the Library Campaign (see figure 4.9). The glossy handout was well-received by the group. After the Library team completed its presentation, Jerry May respectfully asked, “If I’m a donor, what’s in it for me?” The discussion was lively, with everyone participating. The comments and related dialogue ranged from “the value being involved is to be a part of something great,” to “it’s important to help provide a foundation for the educated people of tomorrow,” to “donor recognition.”

Later, Vice President May asked Roger Addleman to direct the Development Communications staff to begin working on some of the ideas presented in the glossy handout. He then said, “This may be naïve, so the experienced fund-raisers in this room need to help me think this through.” May then presented an idea he called “Twenty-five for Thompson.” He explained that along with the major-gifts phase and annual-giving drive, the essence of the campaign could focus on mid-level donors with the ability to make cash gifts of $25,000 in one lump sum or as a pledge over five years. For example, the major gifts committee would have twenty-five members to help identify, cultivate, and solicit gifts of $25,000 and higher. He then asked for feedback.
Figure 4.9: Library renovation leave behind piece
The group liked the idea conceptually; however, they pointed out that the process could be very labor intensive because the Libraries do not have a build-in constituency base. Dan Grafner and John Meyer indicated the challenge in focusing the campaign on mid-level donors is that it could take the donors out of the donor base for their respective college. Dan Grafner remarked,

“...You’re asking [new donors] to make their first big gift to the Libraries, not their college. A lot of these folks will say ‘I’ve already given’ when the colleges begin to work with them.”

Grafner then leaned over and reinforced this point to me by whispering, “We have to talk about these issues because all of the prospects have to come from the colleges.” Because no one in the group believed a $7-10 million leadership gift would materialize for the campaign, the discussion continued. Linda Seitz suggested that the “Twenty-five for Thompson” concept will challenge “big givers to give to the campaign for the symbolic support.” She continued by offering the idea that some major donors could be asked to share a portion of their gift to support the library campaign. After the conversation slowed, Jerry May began sharing his initial views on potential strategies for the Libraries.

“We need to target all humanities graduates, we need to find new prospects at the $25,000 level, and we need to involve Brit [Kirwin] and Ed Ray as partners. They need to feel like this is their project; otherwise, I think we need to shift to specific discussion of the people Kaye plans to talk about.”

The conversation shifted to specific donors with gift potential of $100,000 and higher. The group then reviewed each prospect in detail, discussing various potential cultivation scenarios. I asked both Kaye Madden and Shannon Tippie how they felt about the meeting afterwards. Both
expressed their satisfaction and enthusiasm in the involvement of the PPG group. Both said they were looking forward to the next meeting PPG for Libraries (which took place November 8, 2001).

A second example of how a PPG meeting was used is from February 8, for the School Architecture. Sue Frost, Director of Development for the Knowlton School of Architecture presented an overview of her prospects and strategies to the group (Jerry May, John Meyer, Linda Seitz, Dan Grafner, Dave McCarthy, and Becki Crowell) for a capital campaign for the Knowlton School of Architecture. The presentation relied on three handouts: a campaign overview (specific goals, needs, naming opportunities, and prospects); a campaign advisory committee list; and, an extensive list of prospects generated by the committee.

Vice President May was very directive in this meeting. He interjected throughout the presentation, adding insights about prospects, suggestions for strategy, and asked several clarifying questions. Together the group formulated three specific gift-strategies for three different prospects she identified. John Meyer pointed out that in the context of her campaign, her campaign volunteers will be very important relationships to maintain. “You will have greater success if their peers are asking [for gifts].” After that, May suggested the group discuss the strengths associated with partnering with the committee members, then review the list of names the committee generated for the campaign.

The group methodically poured over both lists, with Dave McCarthy occasionally providing additional context and John Meyer, Dan Grafner, Jerry May, and Linda Seitz shared several ideas and insights about how to manage both internal and external volunteers and prospects. Near the conclusion of the meeting, Jerry complimented Sue Frost for her
“excellent work.” He went on to say, “I’m thrilled to see so many new names and prospects that aren’t OSU grads. Great job, Sue.” When I spoke to Sue later, she expressed her satisfaction with the meeting and how she benefited from the feedback and advice she received.

A third example of how a PPG meeting can be used is one I attended on May 3, 2001. In that meeting Bill Cloyd, the Director of Development for the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences presented his cultivation strategies for the top ten prospects for the College. The group was small that day (Jerry May, John Meyer, Linda Sietz) and Cloyd was well prepared. The group listened carefully to each case and provided very specific strategic suggestions.

Each of the prospects Cloyd presented had million-dollar gift potential; however, because the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences was not undertaking a college-wide campaign, broad development goals were not in place. Jerry May, John Meyer, and Linda Seitz suggested he work with his dean to establish a strategic fund-raising package. For example, a $7.5 million-dollar package in physics in which, the new Physics Research Building could be named for $5 million, two chairs at $2 million each, and $500,000 for scholarships. The group believed a package would be attractive to prospect because it tied into the 20/10 initiative in the Academic Plan.

The group reviewed all ten of the prospects and provided advice on each one. Jerry May was very encouraging and complimented Bill on his hard work and told him several times he was “doing a great job for MAPS.” At the conclusion of the meeting, May mentioned to the group that he
wanted Dan Grafner at these meetings. “We need his insight.” Overall, the meeting seemed very productive and serves as another example how differently PPG meetings were used.

When I spoke with Bill Cloyd later he told me he was very satisfied and believed the group opened up his thinking about his prospects. He also said he was ready to move forward and felt confident about his instincts and the strategies he had been employing. He received very positive feedback from the group. In conclusion he said, “I would love to come to as many of these as I can just to hear the advice they give other people.”

**Staff Meetings**

Staff meetings were identified as a *best practice* for the Development Organization overall by several of the participants of this study. Staff meetings are held monthly in the Sanders Grand Lounge in the Longaberger Alumni House, a beautiful space with a large fireplace and view of the Olentangy River. Each meeting follows the same format, with Gary Kitsmiller serving as the host. He welcomes everyone, introduces presenters, gives his own “giving report,” and makes humorous closing remarks.

The most fundamental benefit of the staff meeting however, is that it gives the development staff a more global vision of what’s going on in the Development Organization overall, and how it relates to the University itself. A significant amount of information is shared and presented during these meetings, ranging from updates on the progress of the Department of Development’s new IMPACT data base, giving reports (which highlights the organization’s performance for the year, the quarter, etc.), personnel updates, news about special events, and general announcements.
Two specific items that regularly occurred in staff meetings were identified as best practices: The Vice President’s Report, and the various kinds of special presentations the Senior Team arranged for the staff during the meeting. Gary Kitsmiller explained,

The purpose of the special presentations is to provide timely information, or great examples of teamwork that help keep all of us focused on the bigger picture because you do have to, you have to think in terms of day-to-day steps, but you also have to stay focused in a more global way and understand the big picture. So the goal is to motivate you to go back to your college and say “okay what do I need to do to maintain success?”

Special presentations included several case studies on gift cultivation from the staff; a presentation by Senior Vice President for Business and Finance and Chief Financial Officer, Ed Shikirti on Fund-Raising, Investment, and the Endowment; Joe Bull presented on the impact of the 2001 tax act and September 11, 2001 on philanthropy; Associate Vice President – Human Resources, Larry Lewellen and others presented on a Salary Equity Study for the Department of Development; and, Provost, Ed Ray presented on National Rankings and the Academic Plan. Typically, Vice President May linked his comments with the essence of the presenters message.

Lynda Heyl remarked, “I think Jerry’s presentations at the staff meetings are a best practice. I’ve heard people say they were really motivated by those speeches; I think that’s one area where he really shines.” Tom Hof added, “When Jerry May gives his report at the end of the meeting, typically it’s about alignment, it’s about what’s best for the University and the role we play in that.” Kathy Donnelley remarked at the way, “Jerry will talk about the President’s priorities and he’ll sort of map out how we need to be thinking about that.”
May typically gave a speech about the vision and direction of the Development Organization and related the importance of the staff as contributors to the success of The Ohio State University. He often used supporting material to sustain his points, and used specific examples about how other universities and non-profits pursue success. I found his messages to be motivational, even inspirational at times. He challenged the staff to be the “best they could be,” and always seemed to connect the vision for the Department of Development to the academic priorities of the University.

For example, on July 18, 2000, the meeting addressed the logistics of upcoming events and communication strategies for announcing the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign totals in September of 2000 (see figure 4. 10). When Vice President May made his remarks (I titled them “Look Toward the Future” in my notes), he began by saying, “the success of our campaign has unlocked potential for great public support for Ohio State, and I thank you all.” He focused on the momentum the Development Organization had established during the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign and the positive impact their work had on the University’s academic priorities. He emphasized his pride in their collective accomplishments and encouraged everyone to, “take this time to reflect on what you have accomplished,” and to “consider the dramatic change you have been a part of over the past seven years.”
**AFFIRM THY FRIENDSHIP**

**CAMPAIGN FINAL REPORT**

**June 30, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Receipts</th>
<th>Campaign Goal</th>
<th>Received To Date</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Pledges Acquired</td>
<td>$850,000,000</td>
<td>$1,064,307,566</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gifts/Pledges</td>
<td>$850,000,000</td>
<td>$1,064,307,566</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Planned Gifts Acquired</td>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>166,603,430 *</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Total</td>
<td>$1,000,000,000</td>
<td>$1,230,910,996</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total for planned gifts acquired during campaign is $183,916,514 of which $17,313,084 has been received through estate settlements.

---

**Figure 4.10:** Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign Final Report – June 30, 2000
(The Ohio State University – Office of University Development Institutional Report)
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May described the development staff as a “great competitive advantage for OSU,” and elaborated on several “disciplines” he observed of the staff over the past several years:

1. Exceptional staff teamwork
   “We have the strongest teamwork anywhere . . . . You have opened doors that would have never been available to us without your cooperation and commitment to each other. I hope you will always keep that professional fund-raising ‘discipline.’”

2. Asking
   “This is the greatest strength of this group.”

3. Discovering new prospects
   “The work you have done in this area has been exceptional and I encourage all of you to continue to think carefully about identifying new prospects as we look to the future. Think about new markets like Arizona, Texas, and Colorado. How can we cultivate non-alums and parents of graduates?”

4. Articulating the compelling needs of the University
   “You’ve proven that people give to compelling needs. You’ve done a fine job of expressing those needs by using the Academic Plan; it gives us clear direction.”

5. Superb University-wide cultivation of donors
   “Across the university, you have done an exceptional job of raising money for the most important initiatives.”

6. Utilization of department chairs and deans as internal partners
   “You have involved your deans exceptionally . . . . I encourage all of you to involve President Kirwin as well. He has closed large gifts and is a great resource for us. He is a proven fund-raiser.”

7. Making volunteers insiders of the University
   “We’ve learned that when you treat people as insiders they become insiders, and you’ve done a fine job of that. We have enjoyed some outstanding volunteer leadership during the campaign.”
He concluded by further recognizing the staff as a legitimate competitive advantage in the realm of higher education fund-raising. He added these closing thoughts:

We give personal attention to people in an increasingly impersonal world. This is our strength. We develop lifetime relationships that are meaningful in so many ways; let’s never forget that . . . . Stewardship has never been more important than it is right now. These people have invested in us and now they’re waiting to see if we will keep investing in them. Thank you for your competitive edge; this is our competitive edge for the future.

On January 9, 2001, the spirit of Mr. May’s remarks was on the importance of staying focused on cultivation of major gift donors. He started by citing an article in the New York Times about an extraordinary volunteer who had developed his own “ten rules for making the ‘ask.’” May read the following list of rules:

1. Don’t ask anyone to do what you wouldn’t do;
2. Never send a $1,000 giver to ask for a $1 million gift;
3. Don’t give until it hurts, give until it feels good;
4. Think twice about asking someone who cannot give to be a volunteer;
5. Never set a campaign goal you cannot reach;
6. Never begin a campaign until you have raised at least ½ the public goal;
7. Nobody is insulted by being asked for too much;
8. Sell the excellence of the institution;
9. Be patient (like catching a big fish with small tackle – if you pull too hard, the line breaks); and,
10. The sale begins when the prospect says “no.”

After reading these rules to the group, May passed out a brochure that was used at the Outback Bowl development reception a week earlier. The document outlined various development initiatives, all of which were
linked to the *Academic Plan* of President Kirwin. As the group looked at
the document, which was titled *Insight @ the Outback*, Vice President
May posed the following questions:

- What do we need to keep doing?
- What are the resources we can draw upon?

At first the group was reluctant; however, after a pregnant pause
answers started coming. The development officers offered many
suggestions, and Vice President May wrote them down on a piece of
paper. He then used those notes to address the development staff about
the opportunities each of them has for continued success. May built
upon the list point-by-point. He reminded the group to capitalize on the
national and international reputations of the faculty, the strength of the
*Selective Investment* departments, the excellence of the University’s
undergraduate and graduate programs, the impressive professional
schools, and state-of-the-art facilities. He challenged the group to expose
their donors and prospects more than ever to the exciting achievements,
people and initiatives Ohio State had to offer. He stated:

> Our campaign was important to the future of this university, but
we have more work to do. The contributions many of you made
during *Affirm Thy Friendship* were significant and I am so proud of
those accomplishments, but we have to build upon that success
and stay focused on the things that will continue to strengthen
this university. We need to keep making “asks.”

May then began to highlight several of the University’s broad
development priorities and linked them to the President’s *Academic Plan.*
He talked specifically about the importance of minority scholarships and
explained that the president and provost want more minority
scholarships available to students. He added,

> The future of our country is rooted in our ability to become a more
diverse society and universities play an important role. We need to
work hard at this. Every single development officer in this room
has a responsibility to find minority scholarships.
Referring to the University’s Main library, May indicated that this renovation project was one of President Kirwin’s highest priorities and emphasized that, “People give to quality.” He expressed the importance of developing solid cultivation strategies for partnerships with prospects that see the over-arching value of improving the main library on campus. May transitioned to the one of the broadest academic priorities of the university this way,

The provost talks to me all the time about the importance of endowed chairs. I need everyone’s help with this because if we are going to compete nationally and internationally, we need to attract the best faculty. This is where we can make a difference. . . . The Academic Plan identifies thirteen areas that they believe are on the verge of becoming truly outstanding. Endowed Chairs are an important part of this because as reputations rise, the reputations of all rise.

Although only two examples are used in this section, they convey the essence of the messages Vice President May typically would share with the development staff. May has a natural talent for public speaking. I found him to be characteristically upbeat, positive, and compelling. A tremendous strength of May’s is his ability clearly and cogently to articulate his philosophy through his Vice President’s Address.

The Senior Administrative Team
Vice President May was successful in directing the University’s Development Organization primarily because he was committed to creating a culture that was strategically aligned with the University’s academic priorities; embraced major-gift fund-raising; and, empowered his Senior Administrative Team to play important roles in the organization’s success. The Senior Administrative Team accomplished a significant objective in transforming the Development Organization into a high-performance fund-raising entity. In building the Senior
Administrative Team, May referred to a lesson he learned while at the University of Michigan.

The lesson was to focus on strengths – the strengths of people and the strengths of the organization. We know how strong Ohio State is; the key was building a team where each person would take responsibility for thinking through what they need to do to be successful . . . . I wanted each of them to have meaningful responsibilities, and I did that by focusing on two things: strengths rather than weaknesses, and, as a group, performance.

With the organizational focus on performance, rather than potential, May placed high demands and expectations on his leadership team. In doing so, he promoted a strong emphasis on alignment with university priorities; teamwork; collaboration; cultivation of internal and external partners; focus on major-gift cultivation; and, accountability.

Throughout Vice President May’s tenure, he relied heavily on the Senior Administrative Team to implement and develop “best practices” that embodied his philosophy of high-performance university development.

The Organizational Chart for the Department of Development depicts areas of responsibility and reporting lines for the Senior Administrative Team during the data collection portion of this study and appears in Figure 4.11. The Senior Administrative Team for The Ohio State University Development Organization at the completion of the Affirm They Friendship campaign was comprised of: Jerry May, Vice President for Development and President, The Ohio State University Foundation; John Meyer, Associate Vice President and Director of University Development; Linda Seitz, Assistant Vice President – Major Gifts; and, Gary Kitsmiller, Assistant Vice President – Development Administration.
Figure 4.11: The Ohio State University Office of Development Organizational Chart (01/12/00)
Under the direction of Jerry May, the Senior Administrative Team promoted and engaged in the best practices described earlier in this chapter. The collective leadership of the Senior Team and their commitment to organizational excellence helped to build an impressive development organization that ultimately led to the most successful capital campaign in Ohio State University’s history - Affirm Thy Friendship.

Ambitious campaigns like Ohio State’s Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign, which generated $1.23 billion, highlight the transformative impact of fund-raising for colleges and universities. Figures 4.12, 4.13, and 4.14 illustrate the impressive performance of the Ohio State University Department of Development nationally. While dollar amounts can be impressive in and of themselves, the true measure of the campaign’s success is the actual impact it has made on the priorities of the institution. The success of the Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign allowed the University to make substantial investments toward its future by using contributions to create 493 endowed scholarships and fellowships and 79 endowed chairs and professorships; and dedicate nearly $150 million toward the improvement of learning environments through new and enhanced facilities, laboratories, equipment, and technology and more than $242 million was contributed to support outreach and discovery initiatives, including 269 new endowed research and program funds (institutional reports).
Figure 4.13:
Top Ten Public Institutions, Total Private Support – Fiscal Year 2001
(The Ohio State University – Office of University Development [institutional report])
Figure 4.15 shows the *Competing Values Framework for Organizational Performance* for the Senior Administrative Team. It is important to note, however, that this particular profile represents only the group’s perceptions about their own performance as a leadership team and not necessarily the actual performance of the development organization overall. When studying the profile, several patterns are evident. The group’s highest scores occur in the *Human Relations* quadrant, which suggests members of the Senior Team share a strong sense of commitment and morale with each other, as well as in the roles they play in leading the University’s Department of Development. Linda Seitz put this characteristic into context, emphasizing the openness and camaraderie of the group:

> I have to say that most of the development staff who have been here any length of time would say that this is the best group of people to work with and many people stay because of that . . . . You can turn to your colleagues for nonjudgmental advice and council; it’s great . . . . I think the staff is committed to each other.

The Senior Administrative Team also rated itself highly in the *Rational Goal Model* quadrant, which emphasizes direction and goal clarity, as well as productivity and accomplishment. Many of the *best practices* presented in this study are related to maximizing organizational performance. The focus of the Senior Team since Jerry May’s arrival has, without question been on transforming the culture of the Department of Development into a major-gift fundraising unit. John Meyer described this shift towards establishing new objectives, and clear direction as a fundamental part of the process.
Figure 4.15: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance – Senior Administrative Team
We were not a major-gift focused office before Jerry’s arrival. We hadn’t really harnessed the power of lots of different segments of our office, and we needed to if we were to go to that next level. We didn’t have some people in offices that we needed, so we developed the Regional Major-Gifts position for Linda and reorganized it. Again, we all work as a team, and my 20 year perspective is we have certainly gotten much better and have developed a whole set of best practices - actually directives and guidelines and philosophies around the notion of being a major-gift oriented development office, as opposed to having the [previous] orientation to be an annual-gifts focused organization. We’ve just decided not to invest in being good at some of those kinds of things and being very good at major-gift work . . . . I think [Jerry May] understood very well coming in here what he needed to do, and I don’t think he was surprised by any of it. We have strategically chosen the path of major-gift fundraising because we don’t have the resources to do everything.

The Senior Administrative Team also views itself as moving towards expansion and change, characteristics found in the Open Systems Model. These capacities are rooted in an inventive, creative style of management, in which members of the Senior Administrative Team are expected to recognize uncertainty by observing and analyzing the external environment, identify important trends relevant to their areas of responsibility, and conceptualize and facilitate appropriate innovations to maintain high-performance. Dan Grafner added these thoughts on the innovative nature of the organization:

I think Jerry helped all of us to get away from the philosophy, the pitfall really, so many universities fall into, where you say, “This is how we’ve always done it.” Jerry came in and started saying to us, “You know, maybe we should do this differently.” That’s what John, Linda, Gary, Dave, all of us started doing, and it’s worked.

Figure 4.16 illustrates the composite leadership profile for the Senior Administrative Team. This profile is very balanced; revealing seven of the eight leadership roles at or above 1.0 and each of the top scores coming
Figure 4.16: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Composite for Senior Administrative Team
from a different management quadrant. These leadership roles are 
Director, Innovator, Facilitator, and Coordinator. The benefit of such a 
balanced leadership portfolio is the leadership team does not over 
emphasize any particular role or management philosophy to the 
exclusion of the others. As a result, the group is able to utilize various 
roles, competencies, and philosophies in concert to achieve 
organizational goals. Tom Hof shared these thoughts on the 
complimentary nature of the Senior Team’s leadership.

I like his senior team, in that, he has Gary Kitsmiller, who’s doing 
the infrastructure, he has John Meyer as a manager of all of these 
people, and then we have Jerry who really sets the tone to be 
aggressive and, think big, and focused on what we can do. They all 
compliment each other . . . . I think it would have been very 
difficult if there weren’t two people like Gary and John here . . . . 
They knew the history and that was extremely important - that 
there were two guys like that, who were not unwilling to have a 
new guy come in and change things. Where they had been 
involved, they were willing to say, “ya know this guy has something 
to say.”

Dan Grafner shared these thoughts about the creation of the Senior 
Team and their subsequent responsibilities for moving the Development 
Organization towards strategic expansion and change:

Jerry came in and really formed a team; [He] recognized the 
strengths of John, Gary and Linda Seitz, and some other people, 
and then they went out and hired the “right” people for the 
organization. So you saw the regional operation changing to a 
major-gift fundraising emphasis, and a lot of those people turned 
over. So there was a whole change in the culture of the way we 
thought, looked at things, and used accountability.

Once management roles were defined and development priorities were 
clear, the Senior Administrative Team began working closely with the 
Offices of Development Communications and Special Events effectively to 
communicate and promote the exciting, programs and initiatives of the 
University. These two offices were used extensively for maximizing
formal and informal opportunities to create and maintain momentum for contributing to the success of The Ohio State University. Jerry May explained:

The more we publicize the quality of the students, the faculty, the research, and quite frankly, the contributions the donors themselves are making, the more likely perhaps another potential donor says, “I’ve got to do something too.” Donors who gave can say to themselves, “I made a difference in making Ohio State a stronger university.”

During Jerry May’s tenure, substantive and continuous relationship building was a priority amongst internal and external partners. “Relationship building is essential to our success as an organization and as a university,” remarked Jerry May. In many respects it is obvious that fostering strong relationships with donors and prospects is of great value to the University; however, it is at least equally as important to foster strong relationships amongst the leadership team. In doing so, trust was developed between partners, insights and philosophies were communicated, and meaningful cultivation strategies were developed and acted upon. The following pages will further illuminate the collaborative nature and leadership characteristics of the Senior Administrative Team.

John Meyer, Assistant Vice President, Constituency and Campaign Giving

I guess I would say that the other innovation we made, one that I didn’t have at Michigan, was a position like John Meyer’s. There are schools in the United States that would kill for this one, and I was just lucky enough to have this position kind of slightly open.

When Jerry May arrived to campus, John Meyer’s position was primarily focused on coordinating the college fundraising staff. “He didn’t really tell them what to do,” remarked May, “so I redrew the job description and told everybody that I thought a fundraiser needed to evaluate a fundraiser - with the participation of the Dean of course.” The reason
Vice President May thought this position was important was because he recognized the potential role Meyer could play in terms of providing clear direction to the various college and unit constituencies, evaluating the performance of development staff, and for mentoring new staff. “And so in that sense,” May added, “I asked John Meyer to play a new role; we called it Director of Constituency and Campaign Giving.” He continued:

When we decided to go into the campaign, I needed him to help plan the campaign with me because I knew there would be a lot of academic priorities in each college. But the unique role that John has played as a result of that position is one I would recommend in many management structures. It’s very constructive and frankly one of my favorite things. It’s a unique role.

John Meyer has been working in development for close to thirty years now, and has been with Ohio State’s Development Organization since 1985. Initially Meyer worked raising funds for both the College of Business and the Law School. By the end of the first capital campaign however, Meyer was promoted and moved into a central management role. John recalled,

I moved from the law school into this position that, at the time was some sort of four-runner of what it is I currently do. About a year, year and a half year later, Jerry came here as VP and together we redrew and formalized the position that I hold at the moment.

Today, as Associate Vice President for Constituency and Campaign Giving, John Meyer’s responsibilities are coordinating, planning, and directing a comprehensive fund-raising program designed to meet the academic and non-academic priorities of every college, department, and program within the university. Meyer is also responsible for coordinating and managing strategic major-gift solicitations relating to all areas of the university and for fostering partnerships between major-gift staff and constituent staff on developing individualized relationships and solicitation strategies.
The responsibilities of John Meyer’s position are primarily focused on management roles and competencies found in the *Human Relations*, *Internal Process*, and *Rational Goal Models*. In many ways, the role John Meyer plays as Associate Vice President for Development strengthens the relationship between the college-based development officers and the central administration because responsibilities of the college-based development officers’ are ultimately tied to external relations. It is of particular note that this is accomplished without limiting the management role constituent development officers have in their respective colleges. Development officers remain familiar with both the priorities and the goings-on in their area of responsibility because they are physically located in their constituent area. In this position, John Meyer is expected to manage across functions by fostering and maintaining alignment with each of the dean’s objectives and the overall priorities of the University.

When asked to define the term *best practices* in the context of university development, Meyer put it in the context of Ohio State: “One of things that we do here that seems to work in the context best practices is we have core values and core philosophies that drive us professionally.”

**John Meyer’s leadership**

The *Competing Values Framework for Self-Assessment* for John Meyer is found in Figure 4.17. This profile reveals Meyer’s bias for managerial roles found in the top half of the *Competing Values Framework*. His focus on developing productive teams and spending time with employees who value his insights, and presenting ideas clearly was evident in this study. Meyer’s lowest scores were located in the *Internal Process Model*, home to
Figure 4.17: *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* - John Meyer
the Monitor and Coordinator roles, which focus on documentation, information management, stability, and control. Given the responsibilities associated with Meyer’s position, this initially appears to be an area of challenge.

For example, when comparing the Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment for John Meyer with the Competing Values Framework: View of Others (Figure 4.18), it becomes clear that Meyer’s leadership style is experienced by his peers as much more balanced than he realizes. Although the scores are not as high as in the Self-Assessment profile, three of his four highest rated management roles are still found in the top-half of the profile. The raters also see Meyer as having significantly more influence in the roles of Monitor, Coordinator, and Director. The greatest polarity exists between the Facilitator role and the Producer role. This could mean Meyer’s peers view his greatest impact in the areas of team building, conflict management, and process oriented decision making, instead of actual face-to-face fund-raising.

John Meyer’s greatest strengths as leader are rooted in his abilities to examine, understand, and respond in contextually appropriate ways to the myriad challenges and opportunities faced by the Development Organization. Additionally, Meyer is skilled at articulating and translating the goals and objectives Vice President May emphasizes to the development staff, as well as enjoys a gift for composure in stressful situations. These strengths serve to enhance, as well as balance the leadership style of Jerry May. One of the most compelling and complimentary styles of leadership found in this study existed between Jerry May and John Meyer. Together they have been very successful at motivating the development staff to perform at the highest levels.
Figure 4.18: Competing Values Framework: View of Others - John Meyer
Jerry May is a highly focused, intense, and driven professional, who at times is misunderstood by the development staff because of his passion for achievement, excellence, and perfection. May reflected on this perception,

Some people say, “Jerry’s kind of a tough manager,” well I do that purposely. Others would say “there’s no grace under pressure,” but a driving spirit, pump people up, get people to do something they wouldn’t normally do; that’s my strength. I motivate people.”

In many respects John Meyer has served as a translator and mediator for Vice President May. When asked to comment on the leadership style of John Meyer, May provided the following examples, which demonstrate Meyer’s importance in terms of providing Vice President May with alternatives in management solutions.

A few years ago John Meyer hired someone as a Development Officer for one of the colleges. The performance of that individual had not been impressive to me and I spoke privately with John recommending he either fire or reassign that person. I remember saying, “This is your job and you’re the supervisor, so I’m not going to tell you what to do. But I think this situation is looking pretty touchy to me and I bet you’re not going to be recommending any big raises anytime soon.” John said he thought he could do something with that person. I’m not exactly sure what he said to [the development officer], but sure enough, he made [the development officer] into one of the most productive people on our team.”

When asked if he remembered the example, Meyer did and added these thoughts, which reflect his emphasis on the Human Relations Model. In this case, Meyer approaches the situation from the perspective that people are resources to be developed. As this quote demonstrates, Meyer sees the development officer not only as an important resource, but also as a person to be valued, understood and developed.

Just because someone isn’t productive, doesn’t mean they can’t be productive. Sometimes it means they need clarification of what their
role is. Sometimes they need you to give them some ideas so they can get going, sometimes it means they need support or they need recognition and a pat on the back.

Tom Hof, Associate Athletic Director for Development, Marketing and Club Services, described John Meyer as, “the guy that slows your world down.” He went on to explain that there are times when development officers can become so overwhelmed with projects or prospects, or management issues, or internal politics that they can become unraveled. John is someone many development officers rely on for insight, advice, and counsel when they are faced with challenging situations. The following quotes illustrate Meyer’s ability to fully embrace the core competencies of the Mentor role: understanding self and others; communicating effectively; and, developing others. Tom Hof described the valuable role John Meyer plays this way:

John has the most-ice water in his veins; more than anybody I know. He can sit across from you when you are shorting-out and calm you down; he’s extremely good at hitting right on the issue and giving you good advice. You sit there for about an hour, you walk out and everything is good in the world again. He sets you right . . . . It’s remarkable. It’s really a wonderful resource to have. All of us have been in their confessing our sins and thinking, “I can’t do this; the worlds ending; this is a crisis,” and then when you walk out, it’s not as much of a crisis as it was before. I don’t know if you can say its best practice, but I can tell you from my experience, it’s good to have a person like John who can help you; you’ve got somebody there that gives you good guidance.

Linda Seitz also commented on how calm John Meyer can be,

I don’t know where he takes all that negative energy. He doesn’t internalize it. I swear he’s going to live until he’s 130 . . . . Jerry’s type A and John isn’t. He has a way of calming Jerry down and lets Jerry know when maybe he’s going off in the wrong direction . . . . [John] can calm all of us down - until we get worked up again; then we come back in and he slows us down. He calms everybody down.
John Meyer gave his own example, highlighting his insight into the role he plays for the Senior Administrative Team:

When Jerry says we can’t see the forest for the trees, my role is to make sure we can always see the forest. So when Jerry needs to be talked down, I talk him down and when Tom Hof needs to be talked down, I talk him down too. I just sort of keep everybody focused.

He then gave this hypothetical illustration in which Meyer plays the Facilitator role by focusing on process during meetings:

I’ll say, yeah, there are fifteen things that can happen here, but let’s try to get back to where we need to be. How do we do it? What have we learned from past experiences? And, what are the best ways to accomplish our goals?

Something John Meyer believes is, “when you think you can control everything, you’re making your biggest mistake.” He went on to describe his role with regard to management and leadership in the Development Organization and how he came to internalize this belief. He explained that the underlying objective of the University’s Development Organization is to serve as a mechanism for achieving excellence. “Our fundraising is geared toward making sure the University can get to a place of excellence and continue to be at that level.”

He reflected on his role before the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign and his desire to manage all thirty-three of the development officers in a very personal way, which highlights Meyer’s bias towards the Human Relations Model. What he learned was that although he initially thought he would have influence over his own environment, he did not. Subsequently, he was unable to manage his staff in the way he had hoped.

I quickly found out, “ya know what, you can’t do this.” So at the start of the [Affirm Thy Friendship] campaign when we were
interested in retaining people like Dan [Grafner] and Bruce [Pontious] and Dave McCarthy, and so forth, I knew dividing up the management part of it with some of our senior people, helped them stay put throughout the course of the campaign and allowed for them to have a good professional growth experience.

By sharing the management responsibilities with other senior level development officers, Meyer addressed the fundamentals of the Monitor role: supervising the collective performance of the development staff, while simultaneously embracing the Facilitator role, in which the priority is team building. By empowering senior staff members to broaden their management portfolio, Meyer and Vice President May believed they were increasing the likelihood these managers would stay for the duration of the campaign. For these managers, new responsibilities also meant they would become part of Senior Administrative Team discussions and have input in planning and directing the University’s Development Organization. The benefit to John and the rest of the Senior Administrative Team was that by elevating these development officers into senior-level roles, they were capitalizing on many years of experience, which in turn, helped shape the direction and success of the Development Organization.

John Meyer explained that the organizational model helps him to focus more closely on what he believes is one his primary responsibilities: “finding good new staff, trying to make our current staff as good as they can possibly be; and working the dickens to retain our best people.” As a result, personnel issues consume the vast majority of his time. Meyer noted that when hiring new staff he is “less impressed by somebody who spent twelve years at six different places than with somebody who actually looks like they gained good experience working in two or three places.” He explained that a mistake many young professionals make is
jumping from institution to institution because they miss out on opportunities to enhance their standing within their organization.

When I see somebody who’s been at a university and had three different jobs there, that tells me they were well regarded and they kept getting progressively more important responsibilities. I’m more interested in trying to get those kinds of people than I am with somebody who’s been all over the place.

When asked about how he manages the staff, Meyer said he thinks, “We do fairly well at empowering people.” When asked to clarify, Meyer explained that by hiring good people who are motivated and resourceful, he can rely on their ability to learn about their area of responsibility, know when to seek advice on development issues, and attend staff meetings and other professional development workshops.

That’s pretty good training for working with donors because I don’t have a standard manual to hand out. I don’t say, “Make sure you apply these steps when it comes to relationship building.” So I think one way to find out whether we’ve hired the right people, within reason, is to sort of let them sink or swim. I make sure everyone knows my door is always open and people take advantage of that all the time, and I like it.

Meyer also gave this example about how important it is to give others an opportunity to work autonomously, and use situations when mistakes are made as teachable moments that will serve to enhance that development officer’s future performance.

A lot of people feel lost I think, for much of the first year, but I also think we’re good at letting people learn from their mistakes. Fortunately at a place this large, I can’t think of a mistake somebody could make that would be so horrendous that the university would have to close down. So generally speaking, I view those kinds of things as teachable moments and what I am interested in is staff who are able to take it as a lesson learned and not do it again. . . . I think we allow people to make reasonable errors and mistakes and just think of it as part of the training process and the profession building process. You certainly know when you’ve done something that you probably shouldn’t have.
Meyer explained that the Senior Administrative Team recognizes the need to do more in terms of coaching and mentoring new staff members, particularly as it relates to the challenge of working for such a large university. He explained the value in having such an experienced staff of senior level managers is that all of them will make themselves available to new staff from any area of the Development Organization to share their advice and counsel. Meyer also mentioned that he thinks development officers who establish themselves as valuable members of the organization, should be encouraged and empowered; subsequently, he sees his role as the one who clears obstacles out of their way so they can be productive and successful development officers. He used the following example, which illustrates Meyer’s focus on the Coordinator and Facilitator roles:

The deans are more territorial about prospects than we train our staff to be, and they should be. Unfortunately, sometimes our development staff can get into tough situations where they know what they are supposed to do (i.e., focus on institutional priorities, collaboration, and major-gift fundraising), but they also know that if they do that the dean is going to get angry with them, and so they become a little more territorial . . . . I understand what we’re trying to do, so I’ll attempt to translate our philosophy to the dean . . . . I would rather have them take it out on me or Jerry [May] than on the development officer. We’re the one’s they see as taking their prospect and putting them into conversations with another part of the University.

Commenting on John Meyer’s thoughtful and creative leadership style, Jerry May remarked:

This is not a very scientific business; it’s more an art form. [Referring to me] You know from sitting with us and watching some of our discussions that creating a gift strategy becomes more of an art form; it becomes more of a what do we know; if we go this way we’re likely to run this kind of a risk, going this way and so forth. John is really talented in this way.
I found John Meyer to be someone who considered the context of every situation carefully before sharing his thoughts. For example, in management meetings I never observed Meyer offering quick or impulsive responses. I found his contributions to be considered, thoughtful and always relating to the particular context of the situation and the content of the discussion. On one occasion, I witnessed John cautioning the Leadership Prospect Group to consider what may be going on in the life of a prospect beyond the obvious. The result of this input was evident; the group slowed its pace and began considering an alternative cultivation strategy for the prospect.

On the whole, John Meyer’s leadership style reflects a strong emphasis on team building and the development of people. Most of his time is spent on issues relating to the internal environment, specifically those associated with listening and communicating effectively, as well as facilitating and coordinating organizational initiatives and performance. His leadership style most closely resembles Quinn’s Open Adaptive archetype. Managers with similar profiles to the Open Adaptive tend to record their highest scores in the top four roles of the Competing Values Framework and are often portrayed as very open, reasonable, and easy-going with the potential to be too lenient with their subordinates.

*Linda Seitz, Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts*

During Linda Seitz’s tenure as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts, she was responsible for planning and directing a comprehensive major-gift ($100,000+) solicitation program for individual, corporate, and foundation prospects residing in regions throughout the United States. Her specific objectives in that role were to implement immediate and long-range fund-raising strategies throughout eight regions of the
country to identify, cultivate, and solicit private support for the fund-raising priorities of the university, colleges, and programs.

Additional responsibilities included fostering partnerships between regional major-gift staff and constituent-staff to develop individualized relationships and solicitation strategies, as well as work closely with deans and directors to develop support for fund-raising initiatives in the regions.

*Linda Seitz’s Leadership*

When asked why she chose to move her family from southern California to Columbus, Ohio, Seitz explained,

> When Jerry May was hired, he took a year to look around and decide what changes he wanted to make. . . . He decided he wanted to elevate the major-gift program and make it a real force, a focused fundraising group. And he asked me if I would consider moving my family to Columbus, Ohio to start it up. That was exciting to me. Something I couldn’t pass up. So that’s how it happened.

The *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment* profile for Linda Seitz is found in Figure 4.19. The profile reveals a strong emphasis in the *Human Relations, Open Systems,* and *Rational Goal* models, and relatively low marks in the *Internal Process* quadrant. The *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment* profile for Seitz resembles what Quinn (1988) refers to as a *Conceptual Producer.* Leaders with this profile are seen as conceptually skilled because they work well with ideas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.19: *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* – Linda Seitz
When comparing this profile to the *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* profile (Figure 4.20), a somewhat different image is created. The *View of Others* profile reflects the perceptions of Seitz’s peers and subordinates, which suggests Seitz is viewed more focused on the *Coordinator* role than she may realize. The four highest rated management roles for Linda Seitz were the *Coordinator, Director, Mentor,* and *Facilitator.* The *Broker* role, which is found in the *Open Systems Model,* was the lowest score for Seitz which is in stark contrast to her self-assessment. This profile most closely resembles Quinn’s (1988) *Peaceful Team Builder.* These leaders are skilled at making people feel part of a collective effort, managing conflict, and managing stress and pressure well. In many respects this description fits better than the *Conceptual Producer* archetype.

Linda Seitz’s career in development has consistently been focused on new projects. She began in Ventura County, California at Moorpark Community College, where she served as the institution’s first development officer. She described her career evolution this way:

> My career in fundraising has always been starting new projects. I was the first at the community college. I was the first fulltime director for the Physical Sciences at UCLA and the first fulltime director for the School of Social Work at UCLA. I was also the first California development director for Ohio State. I set up the office and started it, and then I was the first AVP [for Regional Major Gifts]; the first Senior Director of Development here for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. I like to do start up stuff.

Seitz noted that previous to the Jerry May administration the internal organization and the fundraising structure were not well defined. As a result, the major-gift program was not a “value-added” model for University Development. Previous to Seitz’s promotion, regional
Figure 4.20: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Linda Seitz
 development officers were hired for various reasons, ranging from strengths in marketing, alumni relations, admissions, and fundraising. Seitz remarked:

Because they were all coming from different places, the college development staff didn’t know how to work with them, didn’t know what to expect of them, or to ask from them. When Jerry came in he said, this is not going to work and he redefined it as a major-gift program, and brought me in.

Shortly after taking the position, Seitz began to build a staff of her own, embracing initially the roles of Facilitator, Mentor, and Director. From the outset a challenge Seitz faced in reorganizing the regional staff into a major-gift staff was articulating the vision and purpose of the change. Seitz remembered the transition this way:

At that point, many of them were not fundraisers and we were looking for fulltime fundraisers. They knew what the expectations were and they chose to leave; so I got to hire a new staff, all of whom agreed with Jerry’s philosophy and my philosophy.

Seitz went on to describe her initial trepidation in transitioning from Development Officer for the western states to Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts. “It was not easy for me to grow into the role of manager. I was in the field when Jerry asked me to do this.” Seitz went on to say,

Having known nothing about being a manager, I went to what I was most comfortable with, my social work model and it worked . . . . I probably looked for people who would respond to that approach because that was my philosophy of how to get the job done . . . . We all have a different comfort level in being a manager too. We all come from different places.

The model Seitz used fundamentally embraced competencies found in the Human Relations Model, such as communicating effectively; understanding and developing others; managing conflict; participative decision making; and, team building. Seitz not only used this opportunity to build a regional major-gift staff of talented fund-raisers,
she also helped to create a culture that reinforced the philosophy of Jerry May’s vision for high performance. “We focused on the priorities of the University in the truest sense, and we did it through teamwork . . . I helped the regional staff build relationships and bring new business to the table.” She did this by utilizing the competencies of the Coordinator. Seitz was busy redesigning and reinforcing the primary responsibilities of the regional major-gift staff; managing projects and initiatives, such as the Foundation Board and Regional Major-Gift Committees; and, managing across the various constituencies of the University.

Initially, the college-based development officers were threatened by the major-gift staff because they were afraid the regional development officers would “steal” their prospects. It was important in this case for Seitz to act as a Facilitator, Broker, and a Coordinator. Linda explained that, “It took a lot of reinforcing, constant reinforcing [of the college-based development staff].” Seitz emphasized the primary responsibilities of the regional development staff, which were to identify and cultivate new prospects for the University. Seitz also stressed the importance of serving as a valuable member of the Development Organization.

I always said to them, never ask a college development officer “what can I do for you?” because they will say “nothing.” Bring your business to the table and show them what you can do for them and then sit down and talk about those prospects with them. That’s how you will prove your worth to them. They will not automatically accept you as a partner; you have to prove yourself to them.

The unique aspect of the role of a regional development officer is they are expected to generate new business for the institution; however, they are not necessarily expected to turn over the best prospects to the college-
based development officers. Instead they are expected to work closely with Columbus-based development officers at developing effective gift-strategies.

When asked to reflect on her own leadership style, Seitz noted her background in social work and her enjoyment of relating to others and helping them when she can. These values are fundamental to the *Human Relations Model* and served as important cornerstones for the way in which Seitz built and managed her team.

Social work taught me a whole set of ways to operate professionally and do what I like to do. I feel comfortable with those strategies, and I translated that style into building this program. I spent a lot of time developing personal relationships with them because it's important to me.

Seitz explained that the importance of creating personal connections with and amongst the regional major-gift staff is rooted in the uniqueness of their roles within the Development Organization.

Having worked for Ohio State 2,000 miles away in Los Angeles, I knew how the relationships needed to be in order to help the development staff that far away feel a part of the University. I used a style that was very comfortable to me, that was my background and that's how I always did it and it worked.

When asked to define the term *best practices*, Seitz explained that she views *best practices* as day-to-day tactics used to, “achieve the goals that we set for ourselves.” Seitz quickly referred to the Regional Major-Gift program as an example of a structural best practice.

I think we have a great model. In fact I will often get calls from other universities asking me to explain to them how we work so well together and how we deal with these tough issues of collaboration. I'm proud of that.

As Seitz began discussing her approach for motivating and keeping staff focused on the priorities of the organization, she noted that the objectives...
for the major-gifts staff were always very clear. She emphasized her belief that everyone on her staff understood their responsibility to identify and cultivate major-gift prospects for the University, messages that seem to reflect an emphasis on coordination and direction. Seitz explained:

I had a very consistent message over the five years I managed the program in terms of what their responsibilities were and what their job was in terms of definition. Because everyone knew what they were suppose to do, I spent a lot of time talking through “next moves” with them – that and clearing obstacles.

When Seitz needed to act as a Monitor, she used formal yearly performance reviews to discuss the previous year and set goals for the upcoming year. In terms of the common goals, regional development officers were asked to target twenty substantive contacts with prospects a month; and involve themselves through partnerships in forty “asks” at $50,000 and above annually. “Those are measurable goals,” noted Seitz, “but it’s never black and white when you do an evaluation with someone.” This discussion did not last long as monitoring the performance of others is admittedly not a management preference of hers. She remarked, “I don’t like looking over anyone’s shoulder; nobody likes that.”

Seitz preferred instead to focus on fostering a collegial, supportive, and resourceful staff and environment that transcended geography. She went on to describe best practices for motivating and focusing the efforts of the Regional Major-Gift staff.

I had to re-create the Regional Major-Gift program. So I would have individual phone meetings with them regularly; I would bring them back to campus three times a year and do a combination of meetings with deans, tours of things on campus, have conversations about regional specific issues, and I spent a lot of time helping them bond with each other.
Seitz considers her leadership style to be one of the factors for keeping good staff in the regional positions. “It’s hard, especially when they are not on campus. So I think if I have to pat myself on the back, I think I’m one of the reasons why they stayed. I give them a lot of attention and I think that makes a difference.” Seitz explained that whenever she attended meetings on campus she took good notes and forwarded useful information to the regional development officers. She wanted her staff to be truly “value-added” in the sense that they knew what was happening on the main campus in Columbus and were able to have informed discussions with prospects.

I think another reason why they stay is because of the way I’ve created the sense of group and they have more of a support system than just me. They don’t feel all alone in the field. They receive the support of the peer group, they receive weekly face-to-face or phone meetings with me, they receive daily e-mails, and I mean there is a whole barrage of ongoing communications.

Seitz suggested that, to a large extent, the way she managed herself became a reflection of Jerry May’s leadership style.

It couldn’t be any other way. My work was always getting modified, and disrupted, changed and refocused, reprioritized and over-loaded. It was difficult. The major-gifts staff on the other hand was very focused on working toward their specific goals and I was the one with big shoulders. I kept a lot of the pressure away from them and protected them from a lot of it, and I did a lot of it without them even knowing so they could continue with fundraising.

Linda Seitz was very effective at protecting her staff from distractions relating to pressures from within the organization. When asked to comment on the intensity of her role as Assistant Vice President, she stressed that “it was very intense, very high pressure, and very busy.” In spite of these pressures, she bragged about how productive the regional
major-gift staff was during the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign. As Vice President May reflected on the strengths of his leadership team, he shared these impressions Linda Seitz:

I think Linda was very effective at achieving her objectives of supporting and developing her [Regional Major-Gifts] team . . . . Linda Seitz is taking a very dominant role in her new role with the colleges [of Arts and Sciences]. The college fundraising staff doesn’t yet see it, but you give me another year or two working with her, and if I can continue to reinforce with her people how important she is to me and the organization, over a time she’ll actually have more impact than she realizes . . . . When Linda was in her major-gifts role, I don’t think the college staff knew how important she was.

**Gary Kitsmiller, Assistant Vice President for Administration**

Gary Kitsmiller is a two-time graduate of The Ohio State University, earning both a bachelor’s degree and an MBA from the College of Business. He has worked for Ohio State since 1970 in a variety of roles either directly under the purview of the Development Organization or in roles that supported the Development Organization. The primary responsibilities for Gray Kitsmiller as Assistant Vice President for Administration relate most specifically to providing human resource management, information services, research, prospect management, and administration support to staff within University Development, which includes finance and budgeting for the entire Development Organization. These responsibilities rely heavily on internal control, a focus found in the *Internal Process Model*.

**Gray Kitsmiller’s Leadership**

The *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment* for Gary Kitsmiller can be found in Figure 4.21. In this profile, seven of the eight management roles are scored at or above 4.5, with the Mentor role receiving a 3.5. Kitsmiller views himself as acting in the *Director,*
Figure 4.21: *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* – Gary Kitsmiller
Producer and Broker roles the most, according to his self-assessment profile. When asked to describe his leadership style, Kitsmiller described a philosophy that has served him throughout his career. He explained that by giving the individuals with whom he works, particularly those he supervises, the tools they need to be successful, along with support and advocacy, he has been able to manage several successful teams. He remarked:

I work hard to hire good people. And when you give them those tools and you're supportive, you don't mess with them or micromanage them, they'll get it done. These are smart, dedicated hard working people. They know they can come to me if they have a problem, or we can sit down and work on problems together if that's the case.

He continued by describing himself as team oriented and focused on mentoring his staff in ways that are appropriate to their needs and professional development. “I think the job of a leader is to support and ensure that the individuals in the organization are successful. My approach tends to be more toward that philosophy.”

Kitsmiller went on to clarify between his preference for people-centered leadership and his need to manage from other perspectives as well. He used the Office of Gift Processing as an example of an area where the fundamental focus is on managing internal processes. “A lot of that is process oriented; a lot of it is setting up procedures and processes and following them. It’s fairly routine and it requires basic oversight and monitoring.” Kitsmiller demonstrates elements of several management philosophies, relying on planning, goal setting, and vision to guide the areas he is responsible for managing; however, he views himself as a leader who prefers to focus on people and relationships.
This is one possible explanation for why Kitsmiller rated himself the way he did on the *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment*, and why he describes himself differently as a leader. Kitsmiller’s leadership style is indeed very focused people with an emphasis on facilitating, directing and producing successful outcomes; however, there is a distinction he makes between what he perceives as management responsibilities (i.e., project completion) and leadership responsibilities which are influential and empowering for people. The *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* profile for Gary Kitsmiller appears in Figure 4.22, and shows only four scores above 1.0. Each of these scores however, represents a management role found in each of the four quadrants: *Facilitator*, *Monitor*, *Innovator*, and *Director*.

Rather than defining the term *best practices*, Kitsmiller chose to describe what he believes is the fundamental principle associated with *best practices*.

> Our entire business is relationship building. The obvious is relationship building with donors, but that’s only part of the puzzle. There has to be relationship building internally with the staff.

Kitsmiller explained that relationship building is the key to building a culture of teamwork and collaboration, which in turn leads to meaningful relationships with donors and prospects alike. These comments represent a solid understanding of the value of developing a meaningful power-base, and fostering a productive work environment. Kitsmiller emphasized the importance of cultivating internal partners, such as deans, directors and the president; however, in the context of his role, he also included fostering productive relationships with the development officers in the organization.
Figure 4.22: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Gary Kitsmiller
You also have to develop relationships within the institution. I'm not sure any one of those is more important than the other. You have to build those relationships particularly with the development officers and key people in the colleges. That has to be developed because they're going to help you raise money; they're part of the product that we're selling and that culture has to be established. . . You want to have people out there that can build relationships, develop a trust. . . . You need someone who views themselves as a professional, because they're going to help me do what I need to do.

Kitsmiller views his domain as the “supportive arm of the fundraising enterprise,” and expressed his satisfaction with quality of his director-level staff. He explained that his management team includes a group that has developed not only their specific skill-set, but also have a solid understanding of the responsibilities and work-flow of the development officers. Gary Kitsmiller has effectively fostered a productive work environment and successfully built a team of collaborative, innovative, and responsive directors who productively manage their own areas of responsibility.

In essence, delegation of this kind allows Kitsmiller to remain involved in monitoring and managing the collective performance of his purview of responsibility without micromanaging his subordinates. As a result, Kitsmiller remarked, “They are so much more productive; and, they’re so much more responsive.” He explained that his directors are forced to learn as much about the business of university development as possible. “Not by me,” Kitsmiller explained, “but by the job itself, because if they don’t, they can’t develop the products that need to support [the organization].”
An advantage Kitsmiller enjoys as a manager is his specific and lengthy experience with The Ohio State University Development Organization. The following quote reflects Kitsmiller’s balance between his need to monitor his staff and their performance with his desire to provide direction and insight intended to enhance their professional development.

I’ve done most of the stuff, so I have a pretty good feel for what they need to do and I can direct them. I don’t stand over their shoulder, but sometimes I just say, “go at it this way, or this is what you need to do; its direction.”

The four areas Kitsmiller supervises are Human Resources, Resource Management, Information Services, and, Research and Prospect Management. Each area has a director that reports to Kitsmiller. The director of Resource Management is responsible for the Development Organization’s budget ($15M annually at the time of data collection) and finances; gift processing (receive, process, acknowledge, and record ~200,000 gifts/year), and general administration of business and operations. When asked about best practices in this area, Kitsmiller sighted the critical thinking skills of the director and the way in which she has trained her staff to solve problems. He remarked at how successful she has been at developing problem solving skills in her own staff. “People don’t usually go to [her] unless they have a problem . . . . She has incredible knowledge of knowing who to call to get things done. That’s an enormous benefit to this organization.”

The director of Human Resources is responsible for approximately 165 FTE staff, both professional and support, including those based in college and constituent units. This director works closely with John Meyer on employment issues and institutional policies relating to fairness, diversity, equity, and so on. In Kitsmiller’s view, one of the
most critical decisions for the organization is the selection, hiring, and orientation of talented people. “Without making good decisions about who to hire, we are not going to operate the organization properly. You’ve got to have the people who will do it properly. “Kitsmiller expanded on this point:

The most important thing that we do as leaders in our organization is to help [new staff] learn our business. If you’re lucky, you find someone that’s got a wealth of experience and knows exactly what you’re doing. We spend a considerable amount of time on [hiring good people], because if we’ve done our selection right, they’ve got all the tools they need to do the job, and really just need to learn about what the entire organization is about.

The director of Information Services is responsible for maintaining the alumni/development data base and information services for not only University Development, but also the Alumni Association and the entire university community. This involves maintaining a data base of more than 780,000 alumni, donors, organizations, and friends; Providing information services for more than 3,000 requests/year from customers throughout the university; maintaining and administering a Local Area Network providing office automation and local data base management applications to more than 300 users; maintaining a central file of vital information on all major donors, major donor prospects, and planned giving documents; providing programming and technical services to maintain and enhance all information systems within University Development. This area is most closely associated with the Open Systems Model, in which the environment stresses technological innovation, adaptation, growth, as well as a focus on assisting the Development Organization in the broadest sense with resource acquisition.
Kitsmiller described the leadership of this director as a *best practice*, noting how tremendously organized she and her staff are with respect to organizing tasks, projects and responding to unexpected situations which present immediate challenges. “Their ability to manage [unexpected situations] is really pretty good,” remarked Kitsmiller, “and I think it stems from their leader. She’s a very organized person, very bright, and knows technology very well and, as I said, knows the fundraising business very well, which is an enormous benefit.

The director of Research and Prospect Management is responsible for producing profiles, briefings, and biographical information on major-gift prospects for University officials, administrators, development professionals, and volunteers; facilitating the effective management of contacts and activities with major gift prospects; and, managing prospect coordination, involving maintaining information (prospect managers, upcoming solicitations, next steps, etc.) in the prospect database; and producing regular and ad hoc reports for development staff. According to Kitsmiller, a *best practice* in this area is “remaining current with technology and trends in the business and using that to manage the whole research side of the equation.”

When asked to comment on the general workflow in his areas of responsibility, Kitsmiller explained that about ten percent of the workflow is spontaneously generated by Jerry May and the other ninety percent is derived from an existing understanding of what needs to be done. “We’re in the business of supporting the operation,” added Kitsmiller.
So, if ten percent of our workload comes from special needs and requests from the VP, or from the president or the Board of Trustees, or the Foundation Board, all of that drives us to do is something outside the box.

Clearly, the primary management responsibilities of Gary Kitsmiller are rooted in a need for monitoring the internal processes of the Department of Development, areas in which Kitsmiller has excelled. However, Gary Kitsmiller is also very skilled at balancing his need to monitor his subordinates, and the collective performance of the various units that report to him with an ability to developing the skill-set and leadership potential of his directors through appropriate delegation of responsibilities. Jerry May had this to say about Garry Kitsmiller’s leadership style:

Gary has done a fantastic job of bringing his people along. We count on those areas a great deal and his people, Eileen, Diane Town, and Judy are great at what they do. That’s a reflection of Gary and his ability to develop people.

Case Study: The Office of Development Communications

The Goals of the Office of Development Communications are to communicate both the “benefits and emotion” of the University with students, faculty, staff, alumni, volunteers, donors, and prospects. This is accomplished by working collaboratively with colleagues across the University in establishing and enhancing communications; marketing Ohio State programs highlighting excellence in teaching, research, and public service; and, through initiating and developing practical communications pieces to facilitate the University’s development of relationships with alumni, friends, businesses, and foundations (institutional document). Figure 4.23 depicts the organizational responsibilities for the Office of Development Communications.
The Office of Development Communications

- **Director** – The director of the Office of Development Communications reports to the Vice President for Development and is responsible for strategic communications and departmental planning, including marketing, new media, media relations, and university relations.

- **Publications Manager** – The publications manager reports to the director of the Office of Development Communications and is responsible for writing, editing and graphic design for print publications, brochures and other materials.

- **Proposals Manager** – The proposals manager reports to the director of the Office of Development Communications and is responsible for writing and editing for gift proposals, news releases, brochures, and other related materials.

- **Director of New Media** – The director of new media reports to the director of the Office of Development Communications and is responsible for management and design of Development’s web site and other new media projects; graphic design for direct mail, event, and other print materials.

Figure 4.23: Organizational Chart for the Office of Development Communications
Roger Addleman has been Director of the Office of Development Communications since 1996. He noted the importance of coordinating with internal partners across the university, “so that we’re thought of as partners and resources for them - team work.” He went on to describe the goals of his office very succinctly:

Our job is to communicate in a variety of ways to the development staff and to our externals about the potential of the University, the impact of the University, and the focus of the University.

Although the Office of Development Communications was widely recognized as an important component to the success of the Department of Development’s fund-raising achievements, Addleman requested that only the qualitative discussions relating to organizational best practices for his area of responsibility be included in this study. For that reason, there is no Competing Values Framework data for this case study.

Best Practices
When asked to define best practices in the context of his responsibilities, Roger qualified his comment this way:

I’m interpreting best practices as effective leadership, participation, and communication . . . those are the three I might say are the major components of best practices for fundraising . . . . I would define best practices as the processes for communication that effectively and efficiently achieve the goals of the [University] and meet the needs of our customers or clients.

Alignment
Perhaps nothing could be more important than aligning every form of communication from the Development Organization with the Academic Plan. This is a fundamental best practice for the Office of Development Communications. Addleman explained:
We don’t change our overall priorities because we are all tied to the President’s *Academic Plan*; that is our overlying sort of Bible . . . . Of course in reality [the *Academic Plan*] covers every damn thing in the University, but Jerry has boiled it down to 10-12 different areas and projects that should be our top priority.

The Office of Development Communications contributes to advancing the donor-cycle: identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship. Roger noted that, “a lot of times we’ll be doing marketing brochures on projects, television commercials, or web pieces,” which all contribute to the dissemination of the institutional priorities and accomplishments. Lynda Heyl added, “The communication pieces make a phenomenal difference.” Examples that relate specifically to the overall *best practices* of creating momentum and alignment are the *Leader’s Report*, *Giving Update* newsletters, and *www.giveto.osu.edu*.

*Leaders’ Report* is a monthly newsletter sent to more than 600 of the University’s top fund-raising volunteers, including trustees, Foundation Board directors, and deans, to keep them informed of the latest news regarding fund-raising efforts, university issues, and their peers’ accomplishments. It includes brief reports, which are presented in the format of a structured letter from Jerry May and were circulated throughout the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign (see figure 4.24 for an example). Each *Leader’s Report* includes a note from Jerry May, university, volunteer, and leadership news; campaign impact and totals; news about new endowments; information about national fund-raising efforts; and, information relating to corporate partnerships.

*Giving Update* is a quarterly newsletter with a circulation of over 45,000 nationwide, including donors; The Presidents Club (the university’s premier donor recognition society); fund-raising volunteers; faculty; and, staff. It features stories about giving to Ohio State by individuals,
Dear Friends,

The five-year "Affirm Thy Friendship" Campaign wraps up in just a matter of weeks. While it will be some time before we have the final figures, we're anticipating a strong finish.

April's total—$9.7 million—gives some indication of the strength of these last few months of the campaign. The June through April total has increased 15 percent over last year. Giving to individual goals of the campaign is also up over last year. For example, giving to faculty support including chairs and professorships totals $14.3 million this year, about 50 percent more than last year. Additions to the endowment total $38.2 million so far, compared with $43.1 million for all of last year. Overall, the campaign total as of April 30 is $1,133,073,042 or 114 percent of the goal.

NEW ENDOWED SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS

Support for students is another area where friends and alumni like you have made a difference. As of the end of April, supporters have contributed $15 million this year—a new record—for scholarships and fellowships, bringing the campaign total to $104.2 million in this important area.

One major component of this campaign priority, the Merit Scholarship Initiative, has raised more than $21 million in gifts, pledges, and planned gifts. That support is allowing Ohio State to attract some of the brightest students in the nation. Not only do these scholarships bring top scholars to the university who might not otherwise attend Ohio State, but they also enrich the academic experience for all students by raising the bar for achievement and by contributing to a more diverse student population.

I would like to extend special thanks to the University Foundation Board and its directors for taking the lead in support of this initiative. Among them are Ralph and Betty Kent of Harbor Springs, Mich., and Durham, N.C.; John and Jeanne McCoy of New Albany; Fred Nickol of New York; and late Foundation Board Chair Bernie Gerlach, whose family and friends established a scholarship fund in his honor at the Fisher College of Business.

Many of those exceptional merit scholarship recipients, as well as other talented Ohio State students, have also had the opportunity to expand on their undergraduate experience thanks to support from Foundation Board Director Rick Deman and his wife, Marte, of California. Rick and Marte have been providing ongoing support to the Richard J. and Martha D. Deman Undergraduate Research Forum in which more than 130 students participated this year. A new development this year was the creation of a medal for the top finishers. David Strauss, assistant director of the University Honors & Scholars Center, presented the first medal to the Demans at the May 18 forum, eliciting a standing ovation from the students in attendance!

Fellow Californians and Foundation Board Director Jim Klingbell and his wife, Sally, are also helping young people to continue their education at Ohio State. The Klingbells, both members of the National Major Gift Committee for Northern California, have established the James D. and Sally Mavko Klingbell Endowed Undergraduate Scholarship Fund to provide undergraduate scholarships to students from Madison High School in Lake County, Ohio.

NEW ENDOWED CHAIRS FOR FACULTY

The Barbara J. Bonner Chair Fund in Lung Cancer Research at the Comprehensive Cancer Center—James Cancer Hospital and Solove Research Institute was established with gifts from C. William Bonner of Powell, Ohio, in honor of his wife who died of lung cancer in 1997. Ming You, currently research director of the Comprehensive Oncology Center at Toledo's Medical College of Ohio, has been recruited to Ohio State to hold the chair.
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Thanks a Billion!

Another Record Year Pushes Us Over the Top, But There’s More to Do

With the achievement of just one year ago less than two years from the “Affirm Thy Friendship” campaign, we have surpassed our $1 billion goal and now have a total of $1.061 billion.

Ohio State joined forces with other public universities to raise $1 billion or more in a single campaign, including the University of Michigan, the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Illinois.

The university raised $941 million—$63 million more than the $878 million goal was set—11% higher than the previous record of $1.01 billion.

Our donors and volunteers are continuing to support the institution and the role it will play in shaping the future of the state and the nation.

“Thanks to all our donors, we are able to continue to make significant progress toward our goal of $1 billion,” said Ohio State President Michael V. Drake.

How the Year Added Up

$153.4 million—$153.4 million in new gifts, including the principal reacquaint of $143.4 million and an additional $10 million.

$40.8 million from alumni—$14.0 million from the alumni of $1.5 million, $26.8 million from the alumni of $26.8 million, and $0.0 million from the alumni of $0.0 million.

$180.5 million—$180.5 million in gifts, including the principal reacquaint of $170.5 million and an additional $10 million.

$43.1 million added to the endowment—$43.1 million added to the endowment, including the principal reacquaint of $43.1 million and an additional $10 million.

$228.1 million in total gift activity—$228.1 million in total gift activity, including the principal reacquaint of $228.1 million and an additional $10 million.

$34.8 million in new net pledges acquired—$34.8 million in new net pledges, including the principal reacquaint of $34.8 million and an additional $10 million.

The Challenge

We’ve reached the $1 billion campaign goal and are now focusing on the next challenge.

Let’s break another record by pushing on to complete the goals for each individual campus and exceed the final million of those schools that have completed similar campaigns.

The University of Michigan, for example, raised $1.0 billion, without meeting all of its initiatives.

Let’s see what we can do.

101% of our $1 Billion Goal

and counting!

Once you’ve reached the $1 billion goal, you can focus on the next challenge.

The Ohio State University

Affirm Thy Friendship

Campaign Update • Summer Wrap Up 1999
Figure 4.26: Affirm Thy Friendship Giving Update – Campaign Wrap Up
corporations, and foundations, as well as stories detailing the benefits reaped by the recipient colleges, programs, faculty, and students (see figure 4.25 and 4.26 for examples). It is a 16-page glossy magazine that includes several short stories about development initiatives across campus, and numerous photographs of volunteers and donors. Jerry May posed the following question and answer to me:

“What is it that people want in a publication [of this kind]?” . . . Giving Update has a clear mission - three purposes, which I think I can articulate. It tells the story of the fund-raising needs of the institution, which can be kind of dry, but it also tells the story of the volunteers who are involved. That’s more interesting to the audience. You get volunteers involved, and other people see them. . . . So it’s an endorsement (i.e., volunteer participation). We make sure we put their pictures and their names throughout this thing and, finally we tell the stories of the donors . . . . We know people don’t read a lot because they don’t have the time; so we include tons of pictures, because you know what? We all love to see ourselves no matter how little of an ego we think we have.

The strategy behind the design is that readers will notices someone they know and respect, read about their involvement, and, as Vice President May put it, say to themselves, “This campaign must be worth my time because these are pretty discriminating people; they’re not going to be involved in just anything.”

www.giveto.osu.edu is the University’s online home for fund-raising news and information. It features recent stories about private gifts; a link to igive, enabling secure online giving to Ohio State; the University Development staff directory; information about popular gift vehicles (i.e., cash, pledges, planned giving); information about The Presidents Club; and a summary of Affirm Thy Friendship, Ohio State’s most recent fund-raising campaign.
In addition to these and other important pieces used to advance the goals of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, the Office of Development Communications continues to develop pieces and strategies for advancing the development initiative associated with the Academic Plan for the University.

**Personalized Communications Pieces**

During the cultivation and solicitation period, development officers frequently interact with prospects and donors face-to-face and use communications pieces as a tool for securing gift agreements. Addleman gave this example:

> We do specific proposals where a donor sees their picture, their name, their building on paper and in a presentation. Sometimes we do a power point and then for [stewardship] our involvement is still there because we'll do something with a picture of the donor signing the check or a picture of the donor being congratulated and recognized by President Kirwin. . . . Those are the things that I think tie our donors into the University, get them informed, involved and engaged.

Bruce Pontius remarked that,

> The quality of communications originating from the Department of Development is the best it has ever been since I've been at Ohio State. The product and focus has become much more sophisticated than in the past.

**Creating Momentum: Campaign Theme**

In September of 1995, President Gee launched what was at the time one of the largest campaigns in the country: the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, with a goal of $850 million. The campaign theme Affirm Thy Friendship is a clear play on the words “how firm thy friendship” which are found in the University’s alma mater, Carmen Ohio (Figure 4.27). “Unlike at a lot of universities, most OSU grads actually know the words to the alma mater,” remarked Jerry May.
I learned Carmen Ohio right away; it is a beautiful song, and the words are fairly touching. I think in general the words have meaning to people that are associated to the University.

By playing on the words, “how firm thy friendship” and naming the campaign *Affirm Thy Friendship*, the University capitalized on the good feelings associated with *Carmen Ohio* and the strength of school spirit Ohio State University enjoys. Roger Addleman put it this way:

> It was subtle. Subtle in that *Carmen Ohio* is a song dear to many Ohio State graduates. And to use it in connection with the campaign; it just seemed to work. It wasn’t crass.

*Carmen Ohio* serves as a powerful link to the pride and tradition of The Ohio State University and its graduates. The alma mater has an identity all its own and is sung consistently at a variety of events in and away from Columbus, including at graduations, alumni events, and by the football team following every game. By using the theme, *Affirm Thy Friendship*, the University capitalized on distinctiveness exclusive to only The Ohio State University. By virtue of the obvious association between the campaign theme and the alma mater, momentum was established early on. Eventually, as May pointed out, “you had people repeating the phrase *Affirm Thy Friendship* all the time - for several years.”

---

Oh come let's sing Ohio's praise  
And songs to Alma Mater raise  
While our hearts rebounding thrill  
With joy which death alone can still  
Summer's heat or winter's cold  
The seasons pass the years will roll  
Time and change will surely show  
How firm thy friendship ... O-HI-O!

---

Figure 4.27  
*Carmen Ohio*, The Ohio State University Alma Mater.
Case Study: The Office of Special Events

The Office for Special Events is responsible for providing event leadership and support for the cultivation and stewardship of University prospects and donors to all staff within University Development and throughout the University. Examples of development special events include those hosted by the President or Vice President Jerry May; focus weekends; Winter College; cultivation opportunities related to football, particularly the President's Box; President's Pre-game events and bowl activities; and building ground breakings and dedications.

Jeff McMahon serves as the director of the Office of Development Special Events and is assisted by a full-time coordinator. Together they are responsible for planning and implementing high-quality development events on- and off-campus that support the cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of major donors. They also collaborate with Development Communications on all communication materials and media, as well as some University-wide special events. Because the staff for Jeff McMahon only includes one other person, Competing Values Framework profiles were not incorporated in this case study; therefore, only a descriptive overview of the unit's best practices and operations will be included. Jeff McMahon explained that Monday morning Senior Team meetings are where he learns about Vice President May’s event priorities. In those meetings McMahon will update the group on progress, share his ideas, or take direction on the objective of something upcoming. McMahon noted:

I'm not raising the money. I'm either before you get it or after you get; I'm the goodwill guy; I know my role. The guests have to have a good time. It’s got to go perfect; if it’s not perfect, then I've got a problem.
Best Practices

When asked to define the term best practices in the context of his job, McMahon put it simply: “planning very carefully, thinking strategically through every detail.” McMahon explained that he likes to work from the “big picture,” delegate appropriate responsibilities, and manage the project as it moves towards completion.

I don’t care how anyone gets from A to B, just so they get there. I don’t like to micromanage; I just want to know that it’s being done. You’ve got to go with the flow. You got to be able to shift gears in midstream in this business or you are lost. I think that’s why it takes a certain temperament to do events, as much as a stickler as I am to detail, and I like everything in writing, in stone, it can’t be that way because you have to have movement in there. It gets frustrating, but some people probably couldn’t tolerate any of it.

The preceding quote illustrates McMahon’s ability to balance the tensions between the Open Systems Model and the Internal Process Model. For example, McMahon is responsible for coordinating and monitoring progress of numerous events each year. These roles require skill in managing projects, designing work, and monitoring progress and performance. These competencies are balanced with a need for flexibility and creativity, skills associated with the Innovator role.

The Role of Special Events

The Senior Team uses the Office of Special Events very strategically in its development efforts as well. It was made clear to me by all four members of the Senior Team that the Department of Development is not driven by special events. In fact, quite the opposite is true. Jerry May explained these events are a fundamental part of the Development Organization’s fundraising approach. The underlying philosophy is as simple as this: the more you interact with key prospects and the more they return to campus, the more they believe they share ownership of the University. The stronger their sense of ownership, the more they call Ohio State
University their own. “When this happens,” noted Jerry May, “the more likely they're going to say “yes” when we ask them for a gift.”

Donor Recognition and Relationship Building

A best practice utilized by Jeff McMahon is using many of these events to recognize a donor’s contributions to the University. “Recognition for individuals can be incorporated into some of those events and it can be done very well,” remarked McMahon, “which is really maximizing your bang for your buck.” In other words, the Senior Team rarely puts forward events simply to generate new prospects or to merely attract groups of people to have a good time. That initiative is left to the constituent units. McMahon used the following example:

You might have eight donor dinners at the president’s house lined up; so, what you might want to do is concentrate on one certain donor and you make that dinner for them and the evening is built around them. All of the guests are friends and family of theirs and people within the university that are associated with them. Cindy and I can put something like that together in six weeks, which is about the window of time that you have to deal with something like that.

Linda Seitz stressed the importance of strategic event planning.

We’re very strategic about who is invited to these events and what the outcomes and agenda should be. We have a donor who just gave $10 million to the Heart Hospital. We need to publicize the gift and plan a VIP sort of event. Those are the kinds of things we want to do.

May asserted that if you cultivate a family over time, several members of the family will begin giving back to the University in one way or another. It could be directed to other areas of the University, or sometimes a collective gift is made to memorialize or honor a family member, and sometimes it manifests itself in volunteerism. Special events can be a very effective venue for cultivation of a family. What is important in
employing this *best practice* is making the family feel like it's their university regardless of who actually attended Ohio State.

One thing I learned while I was at [The University of] Michigan doing principal gifts is you focus on the family. We've developed it to a much larger extent here than I ever practiced it there - but I learned over the years when I did the really large gifts, the 5 and 10 million type gifts, that when a donor makes a gift decision, especially something of that magnitude, they want to talk to their husband or wife of course; and, they want to talk to their adult children. . . . So we started focusing on families as prospects. I've talked about this a lot and I've watched my staff pick it up as well. They have learned that if you are really going to do well with the biggest donors you've got to work with the family. In the end you have more prospects. . . .We're dealing with a couple right now in Columbus where two of the three adult children are now each making major gifts to the University.

The Senior Team routinely capitalized on these and other opportunities by scheduling dinners in advance at the home of the president, and by carefully selecting the theme and objectives of the evening. Jerry May added:

> Most events have a lot to do with solidifying and strengthening relationships with donors, getting other family members involved and, as you know, that is one of my fundamental priorities: family focus and long term cultivation.

When asked about the impact of the events put on by the Department of Development Joe Bull remarked,

> There are a lot of people that intrinsically believe in this place; I'm talking donors, and they love to come back to campus. They love to be a part of what's exciting and happening around here.

Tom Hof commented on how athletics events can serve as a vehicle to interest donors in other areas of the University as well:
While athletics are important and it gives that adrenaline rush, the best donors we have [in athletics], most of them anyway, understand what we’re trying to do here [advance the Academic Plan]; they want this place to be better.

As major-gift donors contributed to the University during the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign many donor-specific events were planned where they were expressed gratitude and reminded of their impact on the future of The Ohio State University. Stewardship of this kind is vitally important as it relates to establishing and maintaining momentum. Gary Kitsmiller remarked:

We were successful in Affirm thy Friendship because we were connecting people with exciting things going on in the institution and we got them excited. We gave people the opportunity to contribute to what they believe in and say, “I want to make this place better and here is how I can make it better.

Case Study: the Office of Planned Giving
The Office of Planned Giving is charged with promoting philanthropy for The Ohio State University by assisting individuals in structuring prudent gift plans that integrate their financial and estate planning goals with their interests in supporting the university. The primary objectives of the staff are to: serve as a central resource for all university colleges and units; provide sample planned gift agreements; perform Income Tax Charitable Deduction Calculations and Cash Flow Analysis; and, provide information through brochures, seminars, and web-based material.

At the time of data collection the office of Planned Giving was staffed by four planned giving officers, one administrative support person and one “key” volunteer. Bull described the responsibilities of his office this way: “We are basically involved with any gift that involves a legal instrument.
That could be a trust, or a will, or a real estate deed, any of those kinds of gifts. Any gift where there has to be some sort of thought about the donor’s tax implications, that’s when our office gets involved.”

The majority of the planned giving staff’s time is spent serving as a service unit to the constituencies and the regional major gift officers. Bull elaborated:

So when they’re working with someone and all of a sudden it becomes a planned gift, I want them to feel comfortable and confident enough to pick up the phone and call us and say, “Hey, look, this is what we’ve got; can you come help me with this one?” That’s where we spend the majority of our time. We are a central resource for the University.

Joe Bull also made a distinction between planned giving and gift planning. Here is what he said:

I think you can look at it two ways. I just gave you the planned giving part of it. The gift planning part of it is, actually sitting down with the donor and really helping them spread everything out on the table, work with their accountant, and work with their attorney, work with their financial planner and try to craft something that works for them, that’s in their best interest.

Organizational Performance Profile
The Office of Planned Giving has been very successful in obtaining deferred gifts for the University. Figure 4.28 reveals the Competing Values Framework Organizational Performance profile for the Office of Planned Giving, while Figure 4.29 shows that Ohio State was rated seventh nationally in bequest receipts for fiscal 2001. This profile is relatively balanced showing only one score that falls below 1.0 (i.e., documentation and information management). In addition to this, both of the orientations for organizational performance found in the Human Relations Model scored above 2.0 (i.e., participation and openness, and commitment and
Figure 4.29
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Figure 4.28: Competing Values Framework Organizational Performance: Office of Planned Giving
morale). In addition to this, the group’s performance appears to embrace the tensions that exist between the Rational Goal Model and the Human Resources Models. These models inherently embrace philosophies of management that are widely considered contradictory. Many of the best practices used by the Office of Planned Giving illustrate the balanced nature of the unit’s Competing values Framework profile.

**Best Practices**

When asked to define the term *best practices* in the context of planned giving, Bull qualified his response this way:

> While there are certain best practices that are universal, there are some best practices that are institutionally specific. I think best practices are institutionally specific because things that work here, wouldn’t necessarily work at Harvard. . . . So, in the context of this office I think best practices are those activities that a) allow us to be effective, and b) distinguish our performance.

**Serving as a Central Resource**

A *best practice* Joe Bull noted was the fact that the Office of Planned Giving serves as a central resource for the entire University Development Organization. As a centrally located departmental resource, donors are not subject to the potential of internal politics that might exist if colleges were responsible for employing their own planned giving specialist. Bull put it this way:

> I think the fact that we have everybody together minimizes the internal politics and maximizes the amount of time that we can actually spend focusing on donors and raising money. Because in the final analysis they are the University’s prospects, not the College of Business or the College of Engineering; they are the University’s prospects.

To that end, the Planned Giving staff has established a reputation for professionalism and competence beyond the simply the Department of Development. The staff frequently works with the Office of the Treasurer,
Legal Affairs, and the Office of the President as well with others. Bull proudly noted:

One of our strengths is that we have been able to really build some strong relationships internally: within the development staff itself and with other units in the university that are important to our job. What we do is intimately tied to the treasurer’s office, because if we get a piece of real estate, they sell it. If we bring in a trust, they manage it. So, we’ve got a really good, trusting relationship with the treasurer’s office and with legal affairs. . . . I think that most folks, whether it’s the president, the provost, deans have confidence that we know what we are doing and we can come in and actually help them. So, I think that’s important best practice of ours.

**Strength and Quality of Personnel**

Something Joe Bull is very proud of is the quality and experience of his staff. In addition to Joe Bull, there were three more planned giving officers on staff: two attorneys, a former bank trust officer (14 years experience), and a Certified Public Accountant. He described them this way:

We have four planned giving officers that I think really have a nice blend of technical expertise and something I just call a development officer mentality, . . . We’ve got a really good blend; I think all of our people love going out and actually sitting down with donors and sitting down with advisors and actually talking and doing that kind of thing. They know that they’ve got to be out and work to be out. I think that’s an incredible strength, that all of our people have that really good blend that we’re all technically competent, but yet we all have that kind of external mentality. And then John [M] is what I would call our permanent volunteer. John just has all these wonderful relationships with so many people and such universal respect from people of that vintage; he’s just a wonderful resource for our staff.

Donor responsibilities are divided according to areas of expertise, seniority, and pragmatics. For example, Jim, who is a former trust officer, and MaryAnn, who is an attorney, focus much of their time on six figure gifts with an emphasis on $500,000 gifts and above. Additionally, they are responsible for office publications, brochures, newsletters, and
other materials of that kind. Chris, the CPA divides his time between working on smaller gifts, monitoring issues relating to probate, and as the information officer. Joe Bull spends his time working with the largest donor prospects, with a focus on seven figure and higher gifts in addition to his management responsibilities. He added these thoughts:

I kind of have a hybrid job. I have the donor work and then I've got the managerial work. . . . So I do very little, if any, kind of cold calls. . . . It doesn't make a lot of sense from a purely organizational perspective for me to be doing a lot of work on $5,000 dollar gift annuities. Now, for the person that's doing a $5,000 gift annuity, that is a very significant gift. That person needs to be treated with respect and dignity, but it never requires as much time in some ways, as a $5 million dollar gift and so from a purely organizational perspective it makes no sense for me to do that. So we try organizing ourselves in a way where I only deal with gifts that are, maybe not always, but I only deal with donors that have 7 figure potential. . . .

External Relations
Another best practice identified by Joe Bull was what he characterized as very good external relationships. He elaborated on this thought by noting the importance of developing trust with decision makers and others with significant influence on donor prospects, such as attorneys, financial planners, and family members who often help donors determine the nature of their estate planning. Bull expanded on the importance of establishing a reputation as honest and ethical.

I want them [donors and prospects] to know they can come here [the Office of Planned Giving] and find people who know what the heck they are talking about and know they are going to work with them and not work against them in their best interests. I think the strength of our external relationships in that regard is a best practice that I'm proud of.

Neil Legacy
A very interesting best practice utilized by the Office of Planned Giving is the Neil Legacy. Once a year luncheon or reception is held for members of the Neil Legacy where they are thanked for their generosity and
reminded how important they are to the University and its future. Fundamentally the Neil Legacy is a stewardship tool used to thank donors, particularly those who have not made significant cash gifts throughout their lifetime, but who have made arrangements to include the University in their estate plans. “This is our way of saying we know that we’re in your will, you’ve told us that, we won’t tell anybody about it,” remarked Joe Bull.

Vice President May described it as something he had never seen before and credited Joe Bull and his team along with some other people for coming up with the concept. “We thought there were a lot of people who have Ohio State in their will,” remarked Joe Bull, “but they don’t want anybody to know about it. So we gave them an opportunity to be part of a group called the Neil Legacy.”

**Joe Bull’s Leadership**

Joe Bull is a three-time Ohio State University graduate, earning a bachelor's degree, a master's in Sports Management, and a jurist doctorate by 1985. Following graduation from law school, Bull was married and moved to North Carolina to work as a planned giving officer at Duke University. A year later he moved to North Carolina State University as the Director of Gift Planning and Executive Director of the NCSU foundation. While living in North Carolina, Bull started an Ohio State Alumni Chapter in the research triangle. During this time Bull got to know Dan Heinlein, the Director of The Ohio State University Alumni Association. In 1991 Heinlein asked Bull to return to Ohio State to manage the campaign for the construction of the new Alumni Center on campus.
The decision to leave was difficult and Bull and his wife relied on the “crystal ball” method of decision making Bull remembered it this way: So, finally I said to Kathy lets think about this in a different way; lets take two steps back and just pull out a crystal ball and make a determination based on 5 years from today. So we asked the question: will we be better off having stayed in Raleigh for five more years or having spent five years in Columbus? We kind of looked at each other and said, “We’re moving.” It became apparent there weren’t opportunities for our growth beyond where we were at NC State, and we knew in five years we were going to be much better off at Ohio State.

Three years later, in 1994, Bull was approached by Linda Seitz and asked to consider the position of Director of Planned Giving. He was interested, noting the recent hiring of Vice President May and his influence on the organization overall. As I learned, the previous Director of Planned Giving did not share the same fundamental approach to planned giving as Vice President May; however, May focused his energies initially on transforming the culture of the major-gift staff towards embracing his philosophy of high-performance development. Subsequently, the Office of Planned Giving was one of the last units May addressed in terms of philosophical and functional changes. Bull remembered his move to Planned Giving this way:

I was in a situation where I really felt uncomfortable applying given my relationship with Dan. So I wasn’t going to apply. . . . I was actually, honestly able to say to Dan that Linda Seitz came to me, because Jerry had just hired Linda for the AVP job and she came to me and said, “I want to talk to you.” and I had said, “look Linda I would be interested, but I’m not going to apply. I’m going to need to be able to honestly say to Dan that you came to me. If you can’t come to me and say you’re interested, then I’m not going to apply. And so she did, and we started talking and boom, boom, boom. I started this job the Monday after Christmas in 94, so essentially January 1, 1995, I took this job.
Figures 4.30 and 4.31 show the *Competing Values Framework* leadership profiles for Joe Bull. As Joe Bull’s *Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment* reflects, he places a greatest emphasis on his contributions in the *Facilitator, Innovator, Producer, and Broker* roles. Bull does not see himself as a *Monitor* of others, and explained why he does not feel the need to focus in that area when he said:

> I'm not much of a manager of monitoring things internally. I know it’s important and you’ve got to have somebody who’s accountable, but the bottom line is, if I spend too much time doing that - we’re not out raising money.

This profile suggests Bull is focused almost exclusively on the external environment; however, when comparing Bull’s Self-Assessment profile (Figure 4.30) with the perceptions of his peers, subordinates and his own comments there are differences. A much more balanced leadership profile is revealed. Joe Bull’s *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* profile illustrates balanced portfolio where scores are clustered together ranging from a low score of .727 for the Director role to a high score of 1.47 for the Facilitator role.

Joe Bull’s Leadership profile reflects a relatively even distribution of scores amongst the eights management roles. Managers with this type of profile are seen as highly effective because they can play all of the roles. Joe Bull is no exception to this perception.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.30: Competing Values Framework Self-Assessment – Joe Bull
Figure 4.31: Competing Values Framework View of Others – Joe Bull
His management style originates from the Human Relations Model and moves into other areas as needed. For example, Bull has hired a talented staff of professionals who are capable of monitoring their own performance, productivity, and quality. Bull elaborated:

I try to be very unautocratic because I’ve got three people who work here that are very bright, talented, independent and very capable of coming in and saying it’s been nice but I’m out of here because I got a better job offer. So I think in that scenario I treat them differently than if I had a pot full of problems.

Bull described his fundamental approach to leadership as grounded in the molecule of management approach, which focuses on the different roles one must play given their relationship to others at any given time. For example, In Bull’s case there are different roles he plays as a manager of his staff, as a member of the LPG group, as a subordinate to the vice president, and roles he plays with externals such as prospects and other attorneys. “I see myself as someone in the Human Relations Model,” remarked Bull, “where you are teambuilding, developing people, communicating effectively.” Bull explained that over the course of his career his management style has changed from a one-size-fits-all approach to an approach that values people and context. This is how he explained it to me.

Failure is the most effective teacher; so yeah, I have changed. I’ve gone from a kind of one-size-fits-all to [a philosophy where] you deal with each individual situation as that situation warrants, and each person as he or she warrants it. It takes longer to do that but it’s better for everybody and its more fair in the long run. It kind of goes back to Spike Lee: do the right thing. . . . I should treat Jim differently than I treat Chris and Chris differently than I treat MaryAnn. I should do that. If I’m not doing that, then I’m not being genuine. Because they have their own individual skills; they have their own individual experiences. Some are better at one thing than the other and for me to treat them all like drones is unfair to them. Now that’s not to say that we don’t all have common goals, but the issue is how do you deal with the journey to reach the goal.
and not the goal itself, that’s the function of the manager and I used to treat all the journeys the same and I don’t now.

Joe Bull is one of the most popular and colorful members in the Department of Development. He is regarded by many of his peers as positive, upbeat, funny, creative, and even loquacious; however, there is little doubt he is considered an exceptional and committed professional. In many respects Joe Bull is part of the fabric and culture of the Department of Development because he is widely regarded as team-oriented, collaborative, and interpersonally skilled as well as technically proficient. Joe Bull has noticeable charisma and is one of the informal leaders in the Development Organization.

The most widespread story circulating about Joe Bull’s collaborative, team-oriented nature related to the acquisition of University’s largest cash gift in its’ history. Praising Bull and the contributions he made in securing the gift, Vice President May had this to say:

Joe needs to get credit for that; he doesn’t get credit on the dollar line, but he gets credit on the quality line. Joe sat here at this table [in Jerry May’s office] with [the donor] and spent a lot of time working with him on details and clarified issues to the point where [the donor] realized he no longer needed to do the planned gift.

“I guess that’s sort of how the gift to the Law School started out - with planned giving being highly involved,” recalled Dave McCarthy, “Then it went a different direction, and Joe respected the donor’s decision and didn’t fight to get them back into the planned giving scoreboard. . . . I think that’s interesting, because it did take a lot of time and teamwork to do that.
When asked to describe his role in securing this gift, Bull recalled proudly that he had worked very hard on the gift noting that originally everyone involved, including the donor, believed a planned gift was the best way to make a transformational gift to the University. This is how Bull described his participation:

I worked an awful lot on that gift because at one point we thought it was going to be a series of trusts and then we started running the numbers, and I'm working with [the donor's] financial people; I'm working with [the donor's] legal people and as it started filtering out, it became obvious that as part of his tax planning, obviously cash is better for the University but as we kept going forward, it became more and more apparent that it was beneficial to [the donor's] tax circumstances, in addition to being beneficial to us that he make a cash gift instead of a gift through a series of trusts.

Many of his peers commented on Joe Bull’s ability to put prospects at ease very quickly. Jerry May described it this way:

It’s so important for our planned giving prospects to feel comfortable, and Joe can meet someone for the first time and gain their respect and their trust within minutes. It’s quite impressive and it’s so important.

Dan Grafner added these compliments:

I’ve always been comfortable with Joe in those meetings [gift planning discussion]. He knows how to be the expert without coming off as someone who’s not interested in doing the right thing. He lays out the scenarios; he answers their questions; and, he speaks up if there is even a hint of miscommunication. He’s good.
Case Study: Corporate & Foundation Giving

As Director of the Office of Corporate & Foundation Giving, Kathy Donnelly’s primary responsibilities focused on developing relationships as well as securing the support of corporations and foundations for the benefit of University-wide priorities. More specifically, Donnelly and her staff were expected to accomplish several objectives, including identifying and cultivating new corporate or private foundations whose interests and potential for giving supported university priorities. The staff was also expected to strengthen and nurture existing relationships with key corporate and foundation executives; partner with key volunteers, alumni, faculty, and constituency development officers to solicit funding from corporations and foundations; and, provide recognition and additional exposure for corporate and foundation donors.

During fiscal year 2001, the year these data were collected, The Office of Corporate & Foundation Giving was responsible for securing $64,245,463 in private support from corporations and foundations across the United States. Figure 4.32 shows that only four other universities raised more money from these sources.
Top Ten Public Institutions
Corporate Giving – Fiscal Year 2001

Michigan State: $117.00
U of Washington: $67.00
U of Minnesota: $68.00
Ohio State: $65.00
UC-San Fran: $60.00
Rutgers: $58.00
U of Cincinnati: $53.00
U of Texas, Austin: $53.00
U of Utah: $51.00
Penn State: $48.00

Figure 4.32
Top Ten Public Institutions – Corporate Giving – Fiscal Year 2001
(The Ohio State University – Office of University Development Institutional Report)
Donnelley attributes this success to the quality of the University and to the excellent opportunities for partnering with industry. She also noted the excellent “track record” the University has established with its existing partners.

Donnelly went on to explain that typically during meetings with corporate and foundations prospects she discusses the academic priorities of the University and its accomplishments. In these meetings Donnelley also stresses how much the University generates in research dollars on an annual basis; what percentage of the budget is state-funded; and, explains the importance of private funding to the University’s on-going success.

I also make the point that 92% of the fortune 100’s has had some sort of involvement with Ohio State. I don’t want them to think we’re just an Ohio-based Midwestern university. I want them to know we’re touching industry across the United States in the fortune 100’s and, particularly if that company sees themselves as one of those fortune 100s, they should want to know more about what we’re doing in their respective area of interest.

Gary Kitsmiller pointed out that the successful “track record” with industry also reveals something very positive about the careers Ohio State graduates secure in industry. He noted that many of the students who were recruited from Ohio State over the years have, for the most part, done very well within those organizations. Their professional success contributes to strengthening the overall reputation of the quality of the University and its graduates. In turn, this leads to continued recruitment of alumni, as well as enhances opportunities for partnerships such as sponsored research. “You develop a reputation,” remarked Kitsmiller, “which may be the most important aspect for success.” He continued:
Plus the fact that you have graduates that are doing well within these corporations and foundations and find themselves in positions where they can leverage gift activity back to Ohio State. Corporations typically are not that philanthropic. There’s a quid-pro-quo for almost every gift, but it always helps to have that link. You need the link, and then the link will help identify what’s important to the corporation to support.

**Kathy Donnelly’s Leadership**

The *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* for Kathy Donnelly appears in Figure 4.33. Her profile reflects what she sees as a strong emphasis on the *Facilitator, Mentor, Innovator,* and *Director* roles in leading the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving. Figure 4.34, which is Donnelly’s *Competing Values Framework: View of Others,* shows a much different leadership profile. In this profile, Donnelly’s peers rate her above 1.0 in only three categories (i.e., *Facilitator, Coordinator,* and *Director*) and below zero in the *Monitor* and *Mentor* roles. When asked to describe her leadership style, Donnelly had this to say:

> I try to keep everybody apprized of what everyone else is doing, and what’s really funny is we try to have staff meetings, but it seems to me we already know what the other people are doing without the staff meeting because we’re communicating a lot . . . . I go in and say good morning to everybody everyday and I ask, “Do you need me for anything?” So that gives everybody an opportunity to talk to me about what they are involved in and if they get involved in something tough, they feel the comfort to come in and sit down and talk with me. So I think I kind of touch base with everybody on a daily basis.

This quote suggests a focus on the importance of communicating effectively, a competency associated with the *Mentor* role. Later, Donnelly provided more insight into her management style. For example, this quote accents her comfort in clearly directing her staff to stay focused on targets and characteristics associated with the roles and competencies of the lower-half of the *Competing Values Framework.*
Figure 4.33: Competing Values Framework Self-Assessment – Kathy Donnelley
Figure 4.34: Competing Values Framework View of Others – Kathy Donnelley
I think I'm very good at coordination. I also think I allow people to express themselves. They know I will say, “Well this is what we’re here for and even though that’s a good idea or I’m enjoying the conversation, we’re still here for this reason.” I feel very comfortable doing that.

Later, when discussing the importance of working with external partners, Donnelley made these comments, which highlight her focus on blending the roles of *Facilitator*, *Director*, and *Coordinator*.

This office is very strategic and planned. Our moves are well thought out. . . . Communications is also so important; you've got to stay in touch. Keep everyone apprised - keep everyone in the loop. That’s critically important. That speaks to credibility. Because it’s easy to eliminate us, we have to be credible and to be credible and valuable we have to add value to the process through communication. By keeping everyone in the loop I can count on them to keep me apprised of where we are. That’s important internally and externally.

**Best Practices**

When asked to define the term “best practices” in the context of her responsibilities as Director of the Office of Corporate & Foundation Giving, Donnelly offered this response:

In the context of this job, I think best practices are the ways you communicate what’s important and what needs to be done to the faculty, the staff, and to the donors.

Donnelly explained that the reason communication is so important to her leadership style is because the Office of Corporate & Foundations Giving is a unique unit in that the staff is expected to operate in the same way as major-gift officers as well as serve as a clearing house. As a result, Donnelley also views herself as a *Broker*. Her management style reflects an understanding of the reciprocity that exists between corporate and foundations partners and the University and her role in communicating the goals and objectives of the University to potential partners. Donnelly put it this way:
Here’s the challenge, it takes a little while for [corporate & foundation partners] to understand what the function of this office is, because actually we’re fundraisers and sometimes they don’t understand that we are also brokers. So it’s critically important for us to educate them about how we are value-added in the sense that it’s to their advantage to interact with us. We can open the doorway and save everyone a lot of time. Basically, I say, “Do you want every faculty member and every college approaching your foundation?”

In many respects the advantage for potential corporate and foundation partners and prospects alike is that Kathy and her staff can serve as the “face” of Ohio State. The benefit to the University is that by “personalizing” the institution, trust can be fostered with key members of the prospective donor’s organizations. In essence, Donnelley and her staff are responsible for presenting ideas; building and maintaining a power base; and, negotiating agreement and commitment from corporations and foundations. Subsequently, Donnelly can inform prospective donors of interested faculty on campus, arrange for substantive meetings with the “right” people, and generally use their time effectively. In addition to this, Donnelly’s staff can assist faculty with access to some corporations and foundations that may otherwise ignore their requests for meetings. Donnelley stressed the importance of credibility in her role as Broker.

Actually it comes down to my credibility [and the credibility of my staff] because we won’t be able to go to these folks if we’ve wasted their time. So we’ve got to make sure we’re on target with everything we do. We can’t get them back on campus if we’ve wasted their time.

Donnelley went on to explain that because her office does not a have a “product,” they rely on the strength of relationships and communications. “I try to build these relationships to the point that our corporate partners and our faculty both feel comfortable about what is going to happen.” In essence the best practices Donnelley employed
during her tenure were all rooted in improving, enhancing, or fostering communication to either internal or external partners for the purpose of cultivating major-gifts for institutional priorities. I found Donnelley’s personal style to be quite strategic and focused on brokering mutually beneficial relationships between donors and the University.

The following best practices reflect Donnelley’s strong emphasis on competencies most closely associated with the Director role and their intersection with competencies found in the Broker, Facilitator, and Coordinator roles. These orientations reflect each reflect her commitment to relationship building and strategy.

*Managing Development Activity for the Office*

According to Donnelley, direction and productivity are best accomplished through structured, yet flexible goals. She explained that her staff has to provide a service to both the University and to its potential partners. Donnelly focused a significant amount of her energy evaluating the unit’s progress in terms of developing relationships that lead to private support. The following quote underscores the importance Donnelley placed on understanding the fundamental role of the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving and the value of a working with a talented staff:

> We broker the expertise and opportunities available here on campus with the priorities and needs of the corporations and foundations we work with . . . . It’s really a team concept and I think that’s what makes our team so good. Forgive me for using football as a metaphor, but everybody can’t be the quarterback and we understand that. There are good passing quarterbacks, and there are good running quarterbacks and all the other things that they do. So you have to know what your weaknesses and your strengths are and then you build a staff around you that can either enhance those competencies or pick-up your weaknesses. I’ve been very fortunate to have a good group surrounding me.
In terms of managing development activity for the office, Donnelley spends a good portion of her time identifying the most prominent corporate and foundation donors for renewal and/or continued activity (possibly in other areas of the University). This is accomplished by compiling lists of the previous year’s donors and meeting with her staff to discuss appropriate strategies for successful cultivation. Donnelley explained that as a manager she is always clear with her staff about which of them assumes specific responsibilities, to whom they are to report, and with whom they are to partner.

Overall development activity was under her purview and therefore, in the broadest sense, everyone reported to Donnelley. However, she preferred to assume primary responsibility for cultivation and solicitation of corporate partners while her Assistant Director was responsible for cultivating and soliciting foundations. When asked about the types of gifts she pursues, Donnelley explained that,

On paper, our goal is to raise gifts of $100,000 or more from corporate donors, and private and community foundations. Given the fact that we’re a centralized office, in practice, we try very hard to concentrate on gifts of a million dollars or more.

To that end, Donnelley set an office-wide goal to participate in ten University-wide “asks” of $1 million or more. Donnelley explained that she maintained a working list of million-dollars plus prospects that she reviewed quarterly with her staff. This list was also reviewed monthly with the Leadership Prospect Group.

**Supporting Current or Emerging Priorities**

Donnelley explained that a fundamental role of her office is to add value to the University’s special and/or emerging initiatives. Donnelley aligned her focus on the University’s priorities and generated prospect lists for the various initiatives. As appropriate, she followed up and managed the
process. In other cases, she facilitated the process by introducing academic leaders to potential corporate and foundation partners. “I try my best to meet with each of the development officers and their deans twice a year to get a handle on what their priorities are, and I keep project reports” remarked Donnelley.

*Building Relationships with Corporate and Foundation Executives*

I’m always trying to find ways to strengthen relationships with our corporate and foundation executives, and one of the best ways to do this is to shoot for 12 “hits” a year. A ‘hit” is what Donnelley refers to as a relationship building activity. This can include a phone call, a visit, or a scheduled meeting of some kind. Donnelley also challenged her staff to expand its list of primary contacts by creating opportunities to market the university’s core competencies. Her staff was expected to schedule at least one new contact per month.

*Engaging Key Volunteer and University Leadership*

Donnelley explained that the best way to involve leadership in the cultivation and solicitation process is to have at least one key leadership volunteer involved in each of the million-dollar “asks.”

> I want to have a key corporate volunteer to participate in campus visits; I want them to host these executives in ways that are appropriate to what we’re doing. The other thing is getting President Kirwin involved along with faculty to go on visits to corporations and foundations.

*Cultivation Activities*

Donnelley noted three specific strategies she expected her staff to embrace. The first cultivation activity Donnelley mentioned was what she referred to as “executive briefing.” These are notes and letters that include copies of articles in which the executives are spotlighted in articles as well as other materials as attachments. A second cultivation
activity Donnelley stressed was the importance of inviting at least two executives to campus for each home football game as guests at the President’s Pre-game Brunch. The third cultivation activity Donnelley promoted was her expectation that she and her assistant director each schedule at least twenty-five campus visits with prospective corporate or foundations donors annually to participate in campus tours, meetings with faculty, and discussions of potential gifts to the University.

A best practice for the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving is getting prospects to campus. In doing so, Kathy and her staff can facilitate campus visits that include meaningful interaction with faculty. The challenge for Donnelley’s staff has been in narrowing the agenda to include topics that are interesting and relevant to the prospects, while in some cases, simultaneously introducing them to new areas of the University. “We do not want to waste their time,” remarked Donnelley, “because they won’t come back if we do.”

A standard practice for Donnelly was to always forward a copy of an agenda to the corporate or foundations guests in advance of their campus visit. This was done to provide the corporate or foundations prospects with an opportunity to comment on what they liked or what they wanted to add before they came to Columbus. If there were research areas or faculty members they wanted to meet with or learn about, Donnelley added them to the agenda. She gave this example:

When we start building a relationship with a company, I try to get [the prospects] in front of various different college units - depending on their strategic business plans. Our belief is that if you want it to be done, its being done on the Ohio State Campus. . . If they can be exposed to various different units of the University, it might stimulate some thought; they might say, “[Ohio State] is a great place for us to begin partnering.”
Effective Communications

Another best practice Donnelley discussed was the importance of effective communications. Donnelley described communications as perhaps the most important of the best practices she relies on. With regard to internal communications, Donnelley focused on keeping development officers informed, as well as John Meyer and Jerry May. Contact reports were always submitted quickly and copied to the appropriate internal partners and staff. Donnelley also reported on substantive development activity during the weekly Senior Team meetings. Quarterly progress reports reviewing million-plus prospects were also submitted to John Meyer and Jerry May.

The value Donnelley places on effective communication is expressed in advice she gave her staff: “I told my group we should have a minimum of eight people involved in any [cultivation strategy for a] big donor.” Donnelley went on to explain that the better informed her internal and external partners are, the easier it is to manage relationships and raise money for the University. She went on to give this example,

Keeping people in the loop takes some time, not silence. Since I have two dynamically different customers [i.e., faculty and corporations or foundations], I have to think about them both. What’s going on internally? Then I have to switch hats and think about my external customer: What are they doing? What are they concerned about? How can we partner? Then I think, “Okay let me call my external customer and be very honest.”

Case Study: Medical Center and Health Sciences

The primary focus of Bruce Pontious as Assistant to the Senior Vice President, Health Sciences Medical Center and Health Sciences development is to lead efforts to secure private support from individuals, corporations, and foundations for important Medical Center and Health Sciences programs and initiatives. These responsibilities include
managing a staff of development officers representing all components of the Medical Center (i.e., School of Allied Medical Professions, the School of Public Health, School Biomedical Science, graduate program for Master’s of Health Administration), and all the hospitals, including The Arthur G. James Cancer Center and Richard J. Solove Research Institute, The Richard M. Ross. Heart Center, and the Colleges of Optometry, Nursing, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine.

The organizational model used for the Medical Center and Health Science Development Organization reflects the University model in that it is decentralized and also centralized. Development officers work in their respective areas learning what they need to learn about the programs, initiatives, and fund-raising priorities. Additionally, staff is engaged in partnering with the “key witnesses” in their area and is responsible for creating their own major-gift strategies. From there the development staff reports to Bruce Pontious and has the opportunity to brainstorm and collaborate with Pontious and other Health Sciences and Medical Center development officers on strategy, tactics and related fund-raising discussions.

During the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign, Medical Center and Health Science Development were asked to raise $215,550,000 for important initiates. At the conclusion of the campaign, Pontious’ development team had raised $302,046,647 – more than $85 million beyond their goal and provided funding for 29 new endowed positions. The ongoing challenge, as Pontious described it, is to continue to recruit and retain motivated, talented, autonomous professionals to work in his organization. Pontious added,

> It’s worth the effort and time to find outstanding professionals, who are competent and capable and who really want to succeed. From my standpoint managerially, I don’t look at it as management, but rather a partnership.
The *Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance* profile appears in figure 4.35 and reflects the perceptions of organizational performance of development staff under the supervision of Bruce Pontious. This profile suggests that the group shares a sense of collective confidence and dedication to each other. The two highest scores for the group both appear in the *Human Relations Model*, which orients itself towards participation, openness, commitment and morale. The group also scored highly in the areas of innovation and adaptation, as well as in the area of productivity and accomplishment, orientations found in the *Open Systems Model* and *Rational Goal Models* respectively.

Pontious explained that the focus of the organization is exclusively geared towards identifying, cultivating, and soliciting major-gifts for the Medical Center and Health Sciences. In that respect they are grounded in the *Rational Goal Model*, in which direction and goals are clear, and productivity and accomplishment are essential. The Medical Center and Health Sciences development unit relies on the Department of Development to maintain responsibility for cultivating annual gifts. Pontious put it into perspective when he said:

> We have subscribed to and continue to subscribe to the University's focus on major gift activity. The annual fund is done by central . . . by and large we are a major-gift operation; therefore, the practices employed in my mind revolve around the most effective implementation of those major-gift activities and operations. A lot of that comes from Jerry May. So we do a lot of things operationally that are very much geared towards major gifts and not geared at all towards annual funds.

*Best Practices*

When asked to define the term *best practices* in the context of Medical Center and Health Sciences development, Pontious offered this insight: “Best practices are the focus and function of your operation.”
Figure 4.35: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance – Medical Center and Health Sciences
Alignment with Academic Priorities

A best practice Bruce Pontious discussed was the improved alignment that exists today in Health Sciences and Medical Center as compared to when he began working for the University in 1987. Pontious told a story of how he introduced himself to all of the department chairs upon his arrival and began discussing the fund-raising priorities as they were shared with him for each of their areas. He found that hardly any of them knew what the priorities were, and several disagreed with the one’s that had been selected for their areas. “I knew we had a major problem, because in a partnership I need those key leadership people to be on the bandwagon pulling in the same direction,” remembered Pontious.

As Pontious began to conceptualize the structure and direction of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign for the Medical Center and Health Sciences, he knew he must involve the stakeholders in the campaign: the faculty and administration. As Pontious recalled,

We approached Affirm Thy Friendship campaign much differently; it was more participatory, there was much more a grass roots engagement, and determining what the priorities were was a much better process.

The benefit to this approach was that the development staff for Pontious had a clear understanding of what they were raising money for and because the faculty had participated in the process of determining the priorities, they were much more inclined to serve as “key” volunteers for the initiatives. This best practice embraces orientations associated with both the Rational Goal Model (i.e., direction and goal clarity) and the Human Relations Model (i.e., participation and openness).
Major-Gift Focus
Another important best practice employed by the Medical Center and Health Sciences development team is it focuses on major-gift cultivation exclusively. Pontious explained the significance of shifting organizational resources towards fully supporting major-gift fund-raising initiatives this way:

If you have limited resources from a financial and/or human resource perspective, it mandates that you must be major-gift focused regardless of what your institutional objectives might be. Yes, I know it would be nice to have perhaps an expanded annual fund program for the medical center and we may get to that someday in a more comprehensive way; however, by virtue of our resources, it’s even more imperative that we be major-gift focused.

Pontious referred to the Giving Pyramid, which advances the philosophy that 5% to 10% of the donors give 90% to 95% of the money during a campaign, in stressing the value of working with donors and prospects with the potential to make the largest gifts. In fact, because of the tremendously ambitious goals set by Dr. Fred Sanfilippo, Senior Vice President for Health Science and Chief Executive Officer for the OSU Medical Center, there is little choice in focusing on only the prospects with major-gift potential. Pontious remarked: “There is great prestige associated with being recognized as one of America’s best hospitals.” In this respect, the best practice of focusing solely on major-gift cultivation is rooted solidly in the Rational Goal Model, in which productivity and accomplishment rely on clear direction and goal setting.

In order to maintain this hard-earned reputation Dr. Sanfilippo must be able to recruit talented faculty and physicians from prominent universities world-wide. “We’re on route to make Ohio State one of the finest academic medical centers in the nation,” added Pontious. What this means however, is Pontious and his development staff are counted upon to cultivate gifts that not only support important existing
initiatives, but are also relied on for securing gifts that generously fund endowed faculty positions and research agendas for the purpose of recruitment.

*Medical Center and Health Sciences Planning Group: Partnering, Teamwork, and Strategy*

A best practice Pontious is proud of is something quite similar to the Leadership Prospect Group that the senior administration uses on a weekly basis. He described the process as advantageous for everyone involved because in many ways, the development officers can stay focused on major-gift cultivation strategies and tactics because they are sharing ideas, insights, and perspectives that may open up their thinking. The group also serves as a think-tank in which development officers who are facing stalls, objections, hurdles, and other challenges can seek advice. “I work on a regular basis with all the staff on a one-on-one basis,” noted Pontious, but we also come together in a group: One from a health sciences perspective and one from the medical center perspective. We have our own version, which we are getting started up again since the campaign.

The development teams for Health Science and Medical Center convene every other month to discuss prospects and related strategies; however, the meetings also serve to establish trust, collaboration and maintain a common bond for each group. The Health Sciences group, noted Pontious, typically focuses on information sharing, specifically things that would benefit everyone in the health sciences center, prospect strategy, idea sharing and prospect evaluation. The Medical Center group focuses much more on common prospects because, according to Pontious, there is significantly more overlap in the medical center than there would be in a college like dentistry for example. As he put it, “you
like to think you have people on your staff that at any given time could step into your shoes as the manager and basically do the job. Those are the kind of people that I like to have on the team.”

An important difference between these meetings and LPG meetings is that these groups are looking at prospects that may not have the giving capacity of the typical LPG prospect (i.e., $1 Million and higher) and they are often solidly Health Sciences or Medical Center prospects. In LPG meetings, prospects are usually very close to making a significant gift and are possibly interested in multiple areas of the University. In many respects this best practice embraces many of the competencies found throughout the *Competing Values Framework*.

**Strategic Use of Special Events**
The best practice of strategically using special events evolved out of necessity and reflects the groups’ ability to adapt and develop their own rubric for participation, orientations associated with the *Open Systems Model* as well as the *Rational Goal Model*. I learned that medical centers have a tendency to undertake numerous special events throughout any given year. This emphasis on special events was born of an old tradition in community hospitals across the country that embraced high profile events such as formal balls and dinners in which the community’s elite would socialize and celebrate in support of an important local initiative. Given this propensity for events, Pontious posed this question to himself: how do I make our participation value-added? In other words, Pontious and his development team must remain committed to major-gift work, and they must also participate in several “command performances” a year.
“I think there is a definite place for special events,” explained Pontious; however, to best address the challenge of spreading his staff too thinly, he resolved to utilize them as a strategic best practice. “We don’t avoid them necessarily, but we try to minimize our involvement in events that don’t advance our common goals: major-gift fund-raising.” To address this challenge, Pontious developed a tiered system for determining the objectives for staffing special events and the level and focus of development service for the event. This approach utilizes each of the competencies associated with the Coordinator role: managing across functions; designing work; and, managing projects. This is how Pontious explained the process:

What we’ve tried to do is find different tiers or levels of development service, so we described to our people in a broad sense that there are basically three levels of service that we can potentially provide.

The Full Service tier supports the identification, cultivation, and solicitation of prospects as it relates to participating in a special event. In these cases the development staff will identify VIPs for the invitation list and staff them during the event; provide prospect research and briefings to key internal partners beforehand; engage in additional prospect identification during the event; and provide appropriate follow-up with prospects and donors in attendance. The development staff will also assist in the creation of additional events that build awareness and communicate the message, the vision, and the priorities of a particular development initiative.

The Mid-Service tier may include some of the services described previously; however, the extent to which those services are provided depends on the number of major-gift prospects and donors that will be invited as well as the uniqueness and purpose of the event. The
Consultant tier is limited to providing direction and advice on how to have a successful event by inviting the right kinds of guests, how to present ideas and initiatives to them, how to follow-up with them.

While recognizing and honoring the unique heritage of the hospital and health care industry, Bruce Pontious has tried to keep Medical Center and Health Sciences administrators focused on the most important and cost effective approach to fund-raising, and that’s major-gift fundraising. To that end, Pontious has implemented the tiered service concept as a rubric not only for advising his staff, but also for educating his internal partners on the importance of return on investment. Bruce Pontious summed it up this way:

In the top two levels [full-service and mid-service tiers] we might bring actual dollars to the table to support the event, but we wouldn’t always. It depends. . . . If a special event comes along, and we don’t have a choice, we will say, here’s our level of service; here is how we can support you. Basically we can provide you with some consulting-type services, but essentially if you want to pull this off you will have to orchestrate it and find the resources because we don’t bring budget to it.

Bruce Pontious’ Leadership
Bruce Pontious received a Bachelor’s degree in vocal performance with a minor in piano from Heidelberg College in Tifton, Ohio in 1972. Following graduation, he worked for Heidelberg for seven years and completed a Master’s degree in College Student Personnel at Bowling Green State University. After receiving his Master’s degree, Pontious was promoted to Director of Alumni and Church Relations. During that time he played an important role in kicking off the Heidelberg campaign and subsequently became involved in development.
Later Pontious moved to United Church Homes, which is a long-term health care organization that owned and operated full service retirement communities. Pontious excelled professionally and after approximately ten years, he was promoted to Senior Vice President for Development, Populations, and Marketing in the corporate office. Although Pontious was not looking for a career change, an opportunity at Ohio State presented itself. An administrator in The Ohio State University Medical Center who knew Pontious professionally explained he was putting together a development program for the Medical Center and wanted Pontious to build it. That was 1987 and Bruce Pontious has been at Ohio State ever since.

The *Competing Values Framework* leadership profiles for Bruce Pontious are located in figures 4.36 and 4.37. You will notice that in his Self-Assessment profile he has placed strong emphasis on four management roles: *Facilitator, Mentor, Producer* and *Broker*. The *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* shows a similar profile with the highest scores occurring in the *Facilitator, Monitor, Producer*, and *Broker* roles. This finding reflects Pontious’ basic approach to managing his team. He put it this way:

> We truly are philosophically more of a partnership than we are in a managerial or boss/employee relationship. I certainly try to give people a lot of commensurate authority and autonomy with responsibilities . . . . It’s important to provide a rich opportunity. I sometimes view my job more as one of creating a conductive environment and sometimes that means that there are obstacles in the way [for my staff]. My job is to help eliminate or find ways around some of those impediments so that they can be the most effective professionals that they possibly can. They have all the skills, but sometimes they are not in a position to make some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.36: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment – Bruce Pontious
Figure 4.37: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Bruce Pontious
things happen. If I can bring a little weight to remedy [the situation], then that’s what I want to do. The reason this approach works for Pontious is because he has intentionally hired development officers that he believes are highly motivated, autonomous, and collaborative. In many respects Pontious has found an almost perfect balance between the competencies associated with the *Facilitator* role, such as team-building with competencies like fostering a productive work environment, associated with the *Producer* role. For example, throughout the interviews Pontious emphasized the importance of working productively and maintaining focus on major-gift cultivation; however, he balanced this with an interest in developing his staff individually as well as working hard to create and maintain a culture of collaboration and teamwork amongst the staff.

In addition to this, Pontious is committed to serving as a *Broker*. He is has been politically astute, persuasive, influential and has maintained the external legitimacy of the development unit. For example, he has used his position in conjunction with his interpersonal skills for clearing away obstacles that inhibit his teams’ performance. He also understands the importance of building an internal power-base, as he has focused on working closely with academic partners in developing fund-raising plans for the Medical Center and Health Sciences.

Pontious recalled that early in his career he focused his energies almost exclusively on the competencies associated with the *Rational Goal Model*. He believed the expectations from his staff were that he was supposed to be the strong leader who spent a lot of time envisioning the direction of the unit, developing strategic plans, and setting goals for everyone.
Pontious did this to the exclusion of building meaningful professional relationships with his staff. As he reflected on his own maturation as a manager Pontious shared these thoughts:

I've come to realize your greatest assets are in fact all the people that you surround yourself with and you need to be listening to them and their strategic perceptions as much as you need to be banking on your own capabilities. . . . there is no exact scientific chemical formulation here, its an art and you have to realize that over time as a manager there are interpretations of your role, so you quickly lose credibility when you bring inflexibility to your management style that says, “look, this is how you do this job and if you are not willing to do it that way then you’re not going to fit on this team.”

Something Pontious tries very hard to do is constantly provide positive as well as constructive feedback one-on-one. He bases his suggestions and feedback on his own observations and interactions with his staff. In this respect, Pontious is effectively acting in the Monitor role; however, by virtue of his approach to providing insights, direction, and constructive feedback, he is also serving as a Mentor committed to developing his staff. This is how he described the process:

I have regular time set up with all the staff for one-on-one conferences both in the medical center and health sciences and it’s very much characterized as our meeting. It’s not my meeting with them, it’s our meeting and they’ve heard me say that many times.

The significance of creating an environment that values people within the context of high-performance is that the staff is empowered to pursue organizational objectives while also pursuing their own goals. In this way, Pontious is uniting the orientations of both the Rational Goals Model and the Human Relations Model. Pontious explained that he tries to understand the professional aspirations of his staff and help them accomplish their goals by providing opportunities to advance their careers. In this role, Pontious helps with skill building, provides training opportunities, and co-creates individual development plans.
I want to know how this job can be most gratifying to them, and what they perceive their strengths to be. Then we work in partnership to provide opportunities along the way. . . . Not everybody wants to become a vice president; not everybody wants to be a manager, and that’s not necessarily what we push people to do. I think you do a disservice by suggesting, moving, manipulating people into positions that you think are right for them. I’d rather find what works best for each staff person and tailor the opportunities accordingly. I do my very best to provide that kind of environment.

In many respects, this approach to developing subordinates also embraces the philosophy of participatory management. For example, the way in which Pontious organizes his group’s strategic meetings suggests his understanding of the importance of fostering collective effort, building cohesion, and establishing teamwork. The meetings are fundamentally designed to facilitate group problem-solving and provide a forum for participation, and openness. These competencies are associated with the Facilitator role. It is important to note however, that Bruce Pontious is not unwilling to challenge his development teams to increase their productivity and strive for ambitious personal and organizational goals. Each development officer understands clearly the fundamental processes essential to high-performance fundraising and Pontious expects his staff to embrace those processes and produce. What is unique is the way in which Pontious blends the fundamental competencies of the Producer and Facilitator roles. This is how Pontious explained his process:

You have to look at [the situation] and bring it down from the macro to the micro level, and you have to continue to do that as it applies to the assignments and the responsibilities of each individual staff member. So I don’t levy heavy [demands] across the board: these are your individual goals take it or leave it. They know that major-gift is defined in a certain way. In order to do good work we talk about what they think are responsible expectations and we’ll come to some general agreed upon
targets and we’re off running. That’s generally how I do my visioning and planning and directing. Once we’ve agreed upon goals, then, yes we’ll keep coming back to them and I’ll keep pushing them to achieve.

Pontious emphasized throughout the interviews the critical role the culture of teamwork and collaboration plays in the success of an organization. In his view, in a complex institution such as Ohio State University, development officers and administrators depend on the collaborative nature of their colleagues in order to be truly successful.

Case Study: Department of Athletics

Tom Hof serves as the Associate Athletic Director for Development, Marketing and Club Services, for The Ohio State University. His responsibilities include coordinating, planning, and directing a comprehensive fund-raising program designed to meet the academic and non-academic priorities of the Athletic Department and managing a large staff of employees. During The Affirm Thy Friendship campaign Tom Hof and his staff raised $115,820,623, which is approximately 140% of their $90 million goal.

Tom Hof, who is one of the few second-generation fund-raisers, began his career at Illinois State University as Director of Annual Giving. After three years, he moved to the University of Cincinnati where he served as the Director of Development for the College of Law. Hof explained his career goals this way:

My ultimate goal was to be in senior leadership at a university whether it’s athletic leadership or vice president of development. I knew from the beginning; I recognized obviously that fundraising was going to play a huge role in my career. I didn’t know it was ever going to get to this point in my career, but I knew how important private revenue was to the life blood of a university. That’s what I wanted to learn and I knew what it meant to get
involved with it. So there was something to reach for and I knew from an athletics administration standpoint that fundraising would move me up the ladder.

In 1991 Hof was recruited by John Meyer to join the Ohio State University Development Organization and lead the campaign to build the current building housing the College of Law. The agreement between Hof and Meyer was that when the first opportunity to move into senior-level position presented itself, Meyer would consider him a lead candidate for the position. At the conclusion of the Law School campaign, the position for Director of Development became available and Hof was interested. As John Meyer looked back on the promotion of Tom Hof to Director of Development for the Athletic Department in 1995, he remarked:

> When Athletics decided to become a major-gift operation, it was clear that Tom was the best person to do the job and it was a job that he had always been on the look out for, so putting him there was again, a happy coincidence. We had a new athletic director and I had just the right person on staff [Tom Hof].

Initially Hof’s responsibilities were exclusively development. He had a staff of one other development officer who was responsible for administration of the Buckeye Club and two administrative assistants. His role was to create a climate of major-gift fund-raising for Athletics, which to that point had been primarily focused on annual gifts. The first big project for Hof was the Jerome Schottenstein Center and Value City Arena. As Hof began to build momentum and demonstrate success, University Development, as Hof put it, “knew that putting more resources in athletics was going to pay more dividends.” As a result, Hof promoted the director of the Buckeye Club to Major-Gifts Officer and hired more staff. Since that time Hof’s staff has grown to include several major-gift officers as well as additional development positions. Figure 4.38 shows the organizational chart for the Athletic Department’s of Development Staff.
The Ohio State University
Department of Athletics Development Organization

- Associate Athletic Director for Development, Marketing and Club Services: Major-Gifts and Administration
- Assistant Athletic Director for Development: Major-Gifts
- Director of Development Campaigns: Major-Gifts
- Director of Development Services: Major Gifts Stewardship
- Director of Special Gifts: annual giving
- Director of Annual Giving (Buckeye Club)
- Director of Gifts Management: gift processing and budgeting
- Director of Premium Seating
- Administrative Office Associate
- Administrative Associate
- Administrative Associate

Figure 4.38: The Development Organization for the Department of Athletics.
Because the development organization for Athletics has grown as much as it has, Hof lamented that he has less time for direct one-on-one fundraising and contact with donors and prospects. He maintains a portfolio of prospects that includes people he has developed strong relationships with and continues to cultivate and steward them; however, he described the shift in focus this way:

The fun part of the job is working with the donors and getting to know them and finding that connection. That’s what keeps you energized. You can get so caught up in all of the management things; so I try to make sure I force myself to get out as much as I can.

**Tom Hof’s Leadership**

The leadership style and career aspirations for Tom Hof have been to a large extent influenced by his father’s career in higher education and by managers he has admired throughout his career. Hof explained that because his father was a Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs, with additional responsibilities for athletics and public relations, he felt compelled to pursue a similar career. He admitted that throughout his career there have been times when he has asked himself “what’s the next move?” Hof gave this perspective:

Because of my personal background, I’ve always thought, “you’ve got to move up.” My Dad was the vice president of a university and I always thought, “Okay, now I’ve got to go on to be the Vice President or I’ve got to be the Director of Athletics.” That’s where I get a little bit torn right now. Personally, I’m not the Athletic Director and I’m not the Vice President. Isn’t that where I’m supposed to be? . . . . It took me a while to figure out that being the number two at a place like Ohio State is the same as being number one at a lot of other places, and there are an awful lot of reasons why you wouldn’t want to leave Ohio State. It’s really interesting from a career standpoint. . . .
Figure 4.39: Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment - Tom Hof
The Competing Values Framework: Self Assessment for Tom Hof appears in figure 4.39 and shows his perceptions of his leadership style. As a reminder, all of the participants completed the Competing Values Framework surveys before any of the interviews were scheduled, nor were the survey results compiled until after all of the interviews were completed. Based on this profile, Hof believes he spends the greatest deal of his energy in the Facilitator and Producer roles, both of which are opposite preferences. Only the scores found in the Internal Process Model, the Coordinator and Monitor roles fall below 5.5.

What this suggests is Hof spends little time monitoring the performance of his team or managing departmental projects. However, as we talked more it became clear Hof responded to the Competing Values Framework survey from the mindset of what roles he wishes he could spend the majority of his time doing. For example, during an interview in which Hof had a copy of the Competing Values Framework document (see appendix K), Hof made the following comment:

I see myself in more of the Human Relations Model from a day-to-day standpoint of management. I think that characterizes my style; but, as I made notes to myself, the three I find that probably made up my style the most were the human relations model, the rational goal model and then the internal process model. I didn’t find as much in the open systems model. What is interesting though is that there are things in there that you start to think about. I thought to myself, “We ought to have more of that and that [pointing to the Director and Broker roles] in our organization.

This verbal description is different from the Competing Values Framework profile in an important way: the roles Hof believes he places the least amount of emphasis on is reversed. So the question remains, what is the preference for Hof and what is his emphasis?
Figure 4.40: Competing Values Framework: View of Others - Tom Hof
The Competing Values Framework: View of Others profile for Tom Hof is found in figure 4.40 and shows that his peers and subordinates experience his style differently as well. This profile however, is much more balanced than either the self-assessment that Hof completed or the comments he made during the interview. In this case, Hof is experienced as having skill in all areas of management, with six areas scoring higher than 1.0.

Hof’s highest and lowest appear in the Human Relations Model, while his highest rated quadrant is the Internal Process Model, which is congruent with what Hof was discussing in the interviews. Hof’s lowest scores, the Mentor and Director appear diagonally from one another, as do his remaining high scores. This finding would suggest that Hof is, in most cases skilled at moving between the polarities of competing management roles. As Hof talked more about his own management in the context of the Competing Values Framework, he remarked on the benefit of studying the quadrants, particularly as it relates to the difficulties associated with moving into a management position with a large staff. He noted that unless you have studied management in college, you are often left to your instincts and the influence of others on your leadership style. Typically development officers have a very small staff, if they have one at all. In that respect, one’s focus is on personal motivation, organization, and productivity. Hof described it this way:

The thing that I find the most difficult in this job is dealing with the management issues, because for a long time as a fundraiser, you are really only working with yourself. You may have dean, but you are not managing people for the most part. You have donors and things to do but you are kind of just a one person shop. No one trains us to be managers; all of a sudden you just acquire a staff. Personally, I’ve always felt awkward when people say, “what’s your management style” because, I’m not sure. You don’t know there’s a framework for leadership, so you almost do it on the
run and you take it from bosses that you've been around. This was interesting to actually put it into some kind of category [Competing Values Framework].

The leadership style of Tom Hof is in fact varied. He described his preference for the Facilitator role and the Producer roles simultaneously, noting he expects his team to be productive, action-oriented fund-raisers. In this context, Hof works hard to foster a productive working environment for them by managing conflict when it arises, and building consensus. He shared this example, which also involves competencies of the Coordinator role, such as designing work and managing projects. Hof described the situation this way:

> There are times when misunderstandings occur between development officers. I've got an issue right now that I am struggling with desperately. It's a complicated situation where I probably need to go in and sit down with one of our guys and tell them there is a significant overlap in their responsibilities and the responsibilities of the new person we added. . . . I want people to feel good about the organization; I want them to walk away feeling like they are contributing and that we're all together as a unit and a team. I've redistributed some of the basic responsibilities to accommodate the new DO and it threw a wrench into something that this other person had done for 20 years. . . . So, that's an area that is more difficult for me, because I come from the consensus perspective and now it's a management issue for me.

As Hof reflected more on the way he would like to see his management style evolve, he noted his preference for combinations of the orientations and competencies of the Competing Values Framework. Hof noted his own preference for flexibility and long timelines; however, he recognizes that he also respects prefers certainty as it relates to managing the development team. He remarked:

> I like the consensus building, the input from other people and that kind of thing, but also I need to know that things are getting done and that you have a timeline for achieving your goals. I'm accountable for what we're going to get done. . . . You know, I'm finding myself in a strong boss role more as this place grows.
Hof built on this point by mentioning a meeting he had scheduled with members of his development team for later that day to discuss important events, projects, and others issues relating to football season. He explained that even though he had delegated various responsibilities to the staff, he needed them to come to the meeting and give him an update on their progress. “I need to know that we're ready for this; otherwise I can’t sleep at night. So I guess I do have a need for certainty,” added Hof.

As the conversation continued Hof talked about the challenge of balancing management role such as *Mentor* and *Director*. Something Hof tries to do is create a supportive, participative environment where his staff knows they can come to him and talk about anything. He shared his belief that the staff feels comfortable coming to him and expressing their thoughts and concerns, a practice Hof stressed that doesn’t always occur in every organization. “So, I think I’ve fostered good relationships individually with the people I work with; now I try to balance that with my role to see to it we achieve.” The way Hof elaborated on this point was by admitting that he has ideas and preferences about the way things should be done, which he bases on experience and professional insight. He talked about balancing this desire to tell folks what to do specifically with his desire to allow them to have a voice and a sense of autonomy. Hof added:

I'm not as much of a task master as probably I need to be. Sometimes I need to push. Again that's difficult, but there are times when that probably is necessary.

He credited Andy Geiger, the Athletic Director for Ohio State University, for teaching him the importance of creating an environment that allows people to feel they can come to him with ideas, concerns, accomplishments, challenges and always be taken seriously. Integrating
this insight with his desire to find balance between the Mentor and Director roles, Hof added these comments:

I know I don’t have all the answers, so it’s my role to direct this place the best that I can and utilize the talent that’s at the table and present . . . . I try to build on the relationships with everyone here so they feel they have a voice and that they are comfortable with discussing positive and negative things that we run into. So that’s kind of where I was going between those two things.

Another example Hof shared about the challenges of balancing the Director role and the Mentor role related to focusing on the people that make up his staff at the expense of taking a lot of time for planning. Hof explained that the demands of working for the Athletics Department can be so demanding from August to March (i.e., football and basketball season) that his staff will become overwhelmed. To that end, Hof believes it is much more important to make time for the staff and check in on them. They each have the opportunity to discuss the most pressing issues, including planning if appropriate; however, as Hof put it:

I’m looking at the future as much as I can, but at some point I think the staff starts to fry because the activity level is so high. We have our goals; we just don’t spend time planning. So, I try to get enough time individually with them and make sure that my people are okay.

Throughout our meetings Hof talked about his desire to do more planning for the organization; however, due to the stressors on the system and their ability to continue raising millions of dollars each year, Hof does not spend as much time visioning and planning as he would like. He remarked:

Maybe all highly energized organizations struggle with this, but the area I find difficult is the planning, the introspection, and the evaluation. You almost don’t do it . . . . I’ve been thinking about it [planning] recently, because I don’t think we’re where we could be in some areas, but we keep raising more and more money and our numbers look wonderful. People are relatively happy with
everything that’s going on, but it gnaws at me a little bit that we could be better here.

Organizational Performance

The Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance profile graph is not available for this case study; however, the best practices for the Department of Athletics Development Organization will be presented and analyzed through the lens of the Competing Values Framework.

Best Practices

When asked to define the term best practices as it relates to the Department of Athletics Development organization, Tom Hof shared this definition: “It’s the process of benchmarking yourself against what would be considered excellence in your field.”

Organizational Philosophy

The best practice Hof wanted to talk about first was the impact of the organizational philosophy on the success of the development team’s efforts. “From an athletics development standpoint, an important best practice would be the philosophy behind why we’re here raising money for this athletics department.” Hof went on to describe the misperception that he believes many people hold about athletics, which is that it goes no farther than entertainment.

Our underlying philosophy as to why we’re out there trying to raise money is not strictly to get a great football player in here so that everyone is happy in Ohio Stadium; that’s a byproduct really. What we’re trying to do from a best practice standpoint is recruit the best athletes and provide them with an academic and athletic experience that allows them to develop so that when they walk out of here they can be productive people. That’s kind of what we are looking at.

There is no question that football is an important element of the culture and spirit of Ohio State University. It is hard to ignore the long tradition
of success on the gridiron, the legend of Woody Hayes, Archie Griffin’s two Heisman Trophies, the majesty of Ohio Stadium, and of course the University’s six football national championships. However, as Tom Hof explained, football is only a glimpse into the mission of the Department of Athletics. “That’s a portion of what we do,” stressed Hof,

We do provide entertainment opportunities for our alumni, friends, and students, but when we look at it from the standpoint of why we are out there raising money, it is to provide the best possible experience for the 800-900 student athletes that we are responsible for.

The organizational philosophy for Athletics is firmly rooted in the direction and goal clarity as means for acquiring external support and resources as an end. Hof continued to explain that they choose innovations that use many of the same philosophies as the academic units on campus. In other words, the Department of Athletics wants to provide the best opportunities and educational laboratories for their student athletes. Of course, in many cases those laboratories are venues for competition, such as Ohio Stadium, The Schottenstein Center, Bill Davis Stadium, and Larkins Hall. Hof explained that they want to provide the student athletes that come to Ohio State with the best opportunities for expressing their natural talents in the same way the academic units on campus strive to cultivate the talents of students who are gifted in the arts and sciences.

We look at our coaches being our faculty and so we want to hire the best coaches that we can to enhance that experience for student athletes. We also want to provide the resources for them, so that’s where our scholarships and those kinds of things come into play. Andy Geiger’s whole philosophy is to allow that young person whether they’re a fencer or a football player to pursue their talents because obviously, if they’ve gotten to this level, they’ve got a special talent.
Involvement of Coaches as Volunteers

Another innovative best practice Hof identified was the involvement of coaches in the development process. Hof explained that he and Andy Geiger met with all of the athletic coaches and talked to them about their role, in essence as Brokers, in achieving the development goals for their particular areas. “I think we do a pretty good job of involving our coaches, which we think of as our faculty.” This approach has been particularly helpful in the Olympic Sports Campaign in which the Athletics development officers have tried to include coaches from Olympic sports from the beginning of the campaign. The approach has also proven effective with the basketball, baseball, and football programs in terms of raising money for athletic scholarships and facilities. Hof added that previously athletics has not utilized coaches enough in the cultivation of major-gifts. “So I think this would be considered a best practice.”

Hof gave this specific example which highlights the advantage of including coaches in the development process:

Last week I took Andy Geiger and Jim O’Brien to New York to play golf with one our big donors. There is that celebrity; a dean can be a celebrity, but not quite in the same way as in the athletics world. So I think that is something that we’ve really worked hard on, recognizing them and utilizing them as creatively as we can.

Using Athletic Resources and Special Events for Cultivation

As best practices go, it is hard to imagine a better way to excite prospects about the programs in athletics than taking them on road-trips with the team, inviting them to bowl games, or NCAA basketball tournament games, or other “behind-the-scenes” events. These kinds of unique
opportunities for donors and prospects serve as an important innovation that without question creates excitement and fosters commitment for those who are invited. Tom Hof described it this way:

If you’re into sports, athletics development is really fun. There is camaraderie, particularly around the football program. If you are traveling with the team, you have police escorts and adoring fans all over the place; you are in the big time. You are strutting with the coaches and players and you are getting treated like kings. We take our donors and it’s a real rush for them.

Hof talked about the “additional toys” they have and how important it is to be creative and utilize the resources in athletics. For example, because the Athletics Department has a suite for all of its sporting events, Hof and his staff can invite fifteen to twenty donors one or twice a week for men’s and women’s basketball or hockey as well as other events. As a result, numerous “cool” cultivation opportunities are available to the development staff. Hof put it this way:

We can engage our prospects by making the most of our resources. I can take a prospect to football practice right on the sideline if I know that will excite them. I can take them on a bowl trip; I can take a group to the Arizona football game. We went out early and took a group; we golfed and did those kinds of things this year we’ll go to UCLA. In general, we have so many events and we have a lot of resources that we can use at our disposal.

Creating a Director of Development Services Position

By creating a position with primary responsibilities for stewardship of major donors, Hof believes they have developed a new best practice for the organization. “That’s something I’m really happy about,” smiled Hof. He remarked on the emphasis the development team has placed on cultivation and solicitation for so many years without putting the same kind of energy into stewarding donors. He continued:

I would say this is a best practice that will help us distinguish ourselves from the other charitable organizations in the community. We’re all in competition and obviously I want us to stand out so that when it comes time again, they are going to be so
engaged with athletics because we’ve thanked them so well and taken good care of them. I look at it as the Ritz Carlton treatment. If we can do that for them, then they are going to have a hard time saying “no, I’m not going to do this for athletics,” because they’ve gotten to the point where they say, “you guys have been so good to me, I have to help.”

The Director of Donor Relations position integrates orientations associated with the Open Systems Model and the Human Relations Model. Fundamentally, the creation of this position is an innovation that serves to solidify feelings of goodwill between donors and the Athletics Department. This is accomplished by appointing a people-oriented professional to the role who has the ability to foster even stronger relationships with donors that ultimately lead to continued commitment and support of the Athletics Department, and in some cases other parts of the University.

Case Study: Fisher College of Business
As Associate to the Dean for Development and External Affairs for the Fisher College of Business, Dan Grafner’s primary responsibilities are developing, coordinating and directing a college-wide fund-raising and external affairs program. Grafner manages a staff that includes nine coordinator or director level professionals, three office associates and three graduate students. Areas of responsibility for the unit include development, donor relations and stewardship, alumni affairs and special projects, and marketing and communications. Grafner reports to the dean of the Fisher College of Business, as well as to John Meyer, Associate Vice President for Development. Among others things, Grafner and his staff are expected to accomplish several objectives, including identifying and cultivating new prospects, cultivating major-gift prospects and securing major-gifts that advance the development needs of for the College of Business. Figure 4.41 depicts the Organizational Chart for the Office of Development and External Affairs.
Figure 4.41: Fisher College of Business Development/External Affairs Office 1999-2000 Organizational Chart
Following graduation from Ohio Northern University, Dan Grafner pursued his Master's Degree at Bowling Green State University in Student Affairs Administration. After receiving his degree, Grafner briefly worked as a substance abuse counselor. In 1978 Grafner returned to his Alma mater and accepted a position at Ohio Northern University as Director of Alumni Affairs and Parent Programs. Grafner remembered this position fondly, describing it as a great place to begin a career in institutional advancement. He described his experience this way:

It was a great start for me because they had colleges of law, engineering, business, pharmacy and arts and sciences. I got to work with multiple colleges and multiple kinds of graduates while I was there. It was a small enough college that you could understand how everything is integrated, while still doing your job. That’s a lot harder at a place like Ohio State.

The next move for Dan Grafner was another familiar institution to him: Bowling Green State University. In this role he was responsible for major-gift fund-raising; however, Grafner found the donor base to be limited in comparison to Ohio Northern. He was attracted to Bowling Green because of its rolling mission as a regional college and he had every intention of staying there for several years. One reason was he had begun working on a Ph.D. at the University of Toledo because he believed if he was going to pursue a career in higher education that it was important to do so. Grafner, however admitted he was surprised at the differences between donor bases for the two colleges. This is how Grafner explained it:

I was really surprised when I started because the breadth and depth of the donor base wasn’t there. Donors at Ohio Northern were different; they had pursued different careers by and large and had experienced
success in more areas than some of the Bowling Green grads. This was a teachers college for years. There were no professional schools. They were doing God’s work and not making a lot of money doing it. So, it was tougher to raise money.

Grafner stayed at Bowling Green for two-and-a-half years before moving on to Ohio State University in 1984. His first assignment was to lead the fund-raising program for the Lima branch of Ohio State. He did this for six months before being asked to supervise all four of the University’s branches, which he did for another year. After proving himself, Grafner was promoted to Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine – a position in which he excelled and held for three-and-a-half years before moving to the College of Business.

When Grafner started his job in the College of Business he reported to an interim dean for one year. During that time he managed only himself and a half-time administrative associate. A year later when Dean Joe Alutto was hired things changed dramatically for Grafner and the college. Dean Alutto was hired to transform the College of Business in a national leader. His vision included focusing on creating strong, innovative programs supported by state-of-the-art facilities and attracting prominent faculty. In 1995 the initial groundbreaking ceremony was held for what would become the Max M. Fisher College of Business, a six-building, 390,000 square foot campus. Grafner remembered the transition in leadership this way:

Joe got the job and the world changed; we started the project [i.e., building the Fisher College of Business campus] almost immediately. . . . It can be considered by some as empire building, but the nature of how we built it was like the Ohio Northern model I had come from. . . . Today we have an integrated unit and
personally it has offered me opportunities I never thought I’d have. Every year has been remarkably different than the last and there are no opportunities to get stale.

**Organizational Performance**

Under the direction of Dan Grafner, the Fisher College of Business was tremendously successful in achieving its fund-raising goals. For example, during the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign $95,267,160 was raised from gifts and pledges and eight endowed faculty positions were created. This success allowed the University to complete its most ambitious multi-building project in its history and established the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University as one of the few fully integrated business campuses in the country. The success of the campaign has helped to transform the national reputation of the college and propel the graduate and undergraduate programs firmly into the *U.S. News and World Reports* Top 20.

The *Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance* profile can be seen in figure 4.42 and reveals the perceptions of several of the individuals who make up the Office of Development and External Affairs for the Fisher College of Business. The profile shows all but one of the team’s high scores falling in the *Open Systems Model* and *Rational Goal Model*. This conveys the group’s strong emphasis on external relations for the college, as well as the emphasis they place on commitment and morale, a characteristic of the *Human Relations Model*. These findings are not surprising given the fundamental objective of both Dean Alutto and Dan Grafner: create a constituency that supports the organization because it’s worthy of their investment.
Figure 4.42: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance
**Best Practices**

When asked to define the term best practices in the context of the Office of Development and External Affairs, Dan Grafner provided this definition: Relationship and reputation building in concert with major-gift fund-raising for the advancement of the college. Grafner shared the following thoughts:

> We have to be effective communicators from all levels and perspectives. That means from print to web to very aggressive, focused and strategic media relations plans. We have to have an aggressive discovery and stewardship program for major-gift donors. We are responsible for liaison activities for our alumni and for a variety of special projects that are driven by endowments. So given our context, that’s how we define best practices.

**Academic Leadership and Vision**

The best practice Grafner discussed first was the important role the vision and leadership of Dean Alutto has played in the success of the development program and the college overall. Grafner explained that Dean Alutto came to Ohio State with a very ambitious plan for success and intended to make the College of Business one of the best in the country by the time he left the University. “It starts with academic leadership,” stressed Grafner. “If you don’t have academic leadership with a vision, and the ability to articulate priorities that grab the hearts and minds of donors, then good cannot happen.”

This compelling ambition coupled with an equally compelling case for support served as the foundation for the success of the development objectives for the college. Grafner also credited Dean Alutto with committing significant time and energy to the development priorities of the college by making himself available to visit with donors and prospects alike. Dean Alutto was willing to provide the Office of Development and
External Affairs with the resources they needed to be successful as well. Grafner continued:

   He’s the kind of leader who takes risks and can deal with ambivalence and uncertainty as it relates to donors. He’s ambitious and he’s not afraid of big challenges. That keeps people from becoming complacent. . . . That’s what he’s done to me. A year form now - I just don’t see what the next thing is and I need to talk to him about my life because he’s made an adrenaline junkie out of me.

*Integrated Institutional Advancement Model*

Recognizing the need for additional resources and an organizational model that would integrate the college’s external relations needs, objectives, and management, Grafner approached Dean Alutto about creating a different organizational management process. By creating an integrated institutional advancement model, Grafner believes he and his colleagues became a high-performance development unit that is “the envy of many on campus.”

*The Integrated Institutional Advancement Model* is designed to be Seamless, Synergistic, Efficient and Logical and illustrates orientations found in the *Internal Process* and *Rational Goal Models*. For example, in this organization Communications, Development, and Alumni Relations work together to advance the mission, vision, and values of the College. As a result, these units collectively play a more prominent role in leading the College of Business in its advancement mission than they would individually. Grafner pointed out the benefit when he pointed out: “Compartmentalized units can be less efficient in achieving goals; whereas, the integrated model consolidates brain power, skills, and resources.”
The other important aspect of this organizational model is that it is driven by a Plan of Action. By using a Plan of Action, priorities, roles and responsibilities are clear to everyone in the organization and across the college. As a result, the group’s work-flow and focus can be defended because the priorities of the dean are what drives the action plan. To that end, the action plan can provide the staff with a sense of purpose within and across identified priorities. Grafner provided additional insight:

Our focus is on resource development for the College, as well as representing it to our external publics, like faculty, students, staff, alumni, the community, the country; all of it. So the key question you have to ask yourself is: What is it we want to accomplish?

In this case, Dan Grafner and Dean Alutto have worked very closely together identifying key priorities for the College and designing strategic plans to address advancement objectives. As Grafner explained it, “the efficiency of the model is rooted in clearly identified priorities, and it’s rational because the staff is now the best group to accomplish the advancement objectives of the College [i.e., fostering relationships, heightening exposure and fund-raising].” Accountability is also heightened in this model because the priorities are very clear. Faculty understand what initiatives the dean wants the development and external affairs staff to pursue and staff members know what their role is in accomplishing stated objectives.

The critical factors relating to successfully implementing an organizational model like this one include the involvement of the dean and other academic leaders as internal volunteers; regular assessment of the organizations progress; an integrated budget; and, a managing director. This is how Grafner explained it:

Dean Alutto asked me to reinvent the office, so in that regard it was a pivotal moment for us that turned out to be a real best
practice for the college. The key for me as the managing director was to learn about all of the positions, the people and their strengths and weaknesses. Our next step was developing a plan that involved everyone in ways that were meaningful to them and beneficial to the college. So that’s how we started.

Dan Grafner’s Leadership

Leadership of Managing Director

Although Grafner did not identify his leadership as a best practice, it became apparent to me that his leadership was indeed a best practice for the organization. The role he played as managing director for the Office of Development and External Affairs was vital to the success of the organization and the college. The Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment profile and View of Others profile are located in figures 4.43 and 4.44. Grafner’s Self-Assessment profile reflects his belief he spends a significant amount of time using the entire portfolio of management roles with some exception for the Monitor.

The View of Others profile shows Grafner’s management style as his peers and subordinates perceive it. This profile graphically illustrates those perceptions and reveals high scores in each of the Competing Values Framework quadrants. Grafner received two scores above 1.0 for the Innovator and Broker roles which are found in the Open Systems Model. Other scores above 1.0 were the Facilitator and Director, while the Coordinator role received a .975 score. This distribution of scores suggests a balanced portfolio of management practices and behaviors.

Many of the participants in this study mentioned how much they appreciate Dan Grafner and admire the contributions he has made in terms of their own professional development. This quote by Tom Hof
Figure 4.43: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment – Dan Grafner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.44:** *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* – Dan Grafner
illustrates the strength of Dan Grafner’s abilities to embrace each of the roles in the *Internal Process Model* and the *Rational Goal Model*. Tom Hof, whose organization has grown considerably as well, has been trying to emulate the management and organizational approach used by Grafner. Hof shared these thoughts about him:

"I am trying to un-blur the lines over here because we’re kind of falling all over each other. So now I’ve been looking at various structures and I’m kind of taking off on what Dan Grafner’s done over at the College of Business. He has a vision for where he wants to take the organization and he’s done that. I’ve been very impressed."

These comments by Karen Longbrake illustrate Grafener’s abilities to act as a *Mentor*, *Innovator* and *Director*. As Longbrake reflected on her experience at Ohio State, and stressed the importance of working with and learning from Dan Grafner. She explained that Grafner trained her well as a development officer and that it was time to begin relying on his guidance and insight to help her improve her skill as a manager.

"I need to spend more time with Dan because Dan is very good. I love just strategizing and bouncing ideas off of him. . . . That was one thing I felt like Dan did a good job of, he took me out [on development appointments] and I watched him a few times, until he said, “okay, you know what you need to do, go ahead and do it.” . . . . Another thing I learned from Dan was you have to give people the leeway they need so they don’t feel like you’ve got your finger on them all the time. I tried that; it’s not a good thing. I never liked feeling like I was being micromanaged. That was the one thing I really liked about Dan, he didn’t do that."

While reflecting on his own management style, Grafner described himself as a blend between adaptability and accountability. He sees himself as creative as it relates to major-gift cultivation strategies and encourages his staff to take advantage of the opportunities to do so. “Opportunity is one of the most important things we strive for in our working lives,” remarked Grafner.
Elaborating on this point, Grafner added these comments which reflect his preference for innovative and creative thinking, as well as personal development:

We all need opportunities to realize our potential. That could be anything really, but in the context of this place it’s an opportunity to be a part of something meaningful, and be an essential part of something pretty remarkable actually. More than that though, it’s an opportunity to challenge yourself to reach your potential or develop your career. That’s what I mean.

Preparing staff for their next career move was something, Grafner described as an obligation of his. This approach reflects his skills as a *Mentor*. He explained that as individuals on his staff demonstrate high performance, he rewards them by adding responsibilities to their portfolio that will foster career development. Grafner believes the benefit to the organization is considerable because as an employee who is recognized in this way will stay until the right opportunity presents itself to them. In the meantime, they are engaged, motivated, valued, and contributing in new and more substantial ways to the success of the college.

That’s a commitment I think you have to make to your people. I want to commit to their professional development because it makes us all better and when the right opportunity comes along they are prepared and can embrace the challenge in their career.

Grafner’s commitment to developing his staff is something he takes very seriously; therefore, he also raises his expectation for their performance. He fully expects his staff to work productively. In fact, Grafner wants his staff to demonstrate competencies in the *Producer, Innovator* and *Monitor* roles. “This is a great place to work if you’re willing to come in each day and work hard and have no excuses for not being successful.” He expects his staff to work independently as well in collaboration with each other developing ideas and strategies for prospects and projects. “I don’t
like to micromanage,” remarked Grafner. “I’m trying to maintain an autonomous environment here, but I do expect you to come to me with updates and schedule meetings where we’re discussing your people.” This comment illustrates the dual focus he places on the competencies found in the bottom-half of the Competing Values Framework. He continued: “I don’t have to invent an idea necessarily, but I have to be able to put them into context and add perspective.”

Something else Grafner stresses to his staff is the importance of staying focused on organizational priorities and responsibilities, while not getting nervous about making mistakes. This comment of Grafner’s clarifies his philosophy which reflects an integration of the roles and competencies found on the left-hand side of the Competing Values Framework. Grafner explained:

I like to manage by potential, not surveillance. I also know people learn from experience, so I reward them when they are doing well and I hold them accountable and provide corrective feedback when they are not.

As Grafner elaborated on his management approach, for developing subordinates, he highlighted a fundamental challenge he faces in doing so. This is how he described it:

I have to find ways to stay out of their way, while also keeping control of information and in control of projects because I’m ultimately accountable. This is not a democracy; these people are not working for themselves. I’m the boss; make no mistake about it. But I want to be a boss that nurtures the talent and moves the college forward. That’s what I’m trying to do.

Perhaps the best example of Grafner’s skills as manager capable of moving between all of the Competing Values Framework management roles is the way in which he introduced and implemented his concept of an Integrated Institutional Advancement Model. The impact of this
model in conjunction with Dan Grafner’s leadership has been discussed throughout this section. However, the extent of his abilities to act as an Innovator and Broker has not been discussed. In order for Grafner to influence the reshaping of the organizational model, he needed to demonstrate competencies in each of the management these roles and he did. Grafner thought creatively about a model he believed would work, grounded it in a philosophy he believed would appeal to Dean Alutto (i.e., Rational Goal Model) and present his idea clearly. As the idea was received, Grafner negotiated commitment in terms of reciprocal expectations for the dean and himself, as well as negotiated an integrated budget and new responsibilities for his team.

The next step involved integrating the Human Relations Model, Internal Process Model, and Rational Goal Model. In this situation Grafner utilized the Facilitator and Mentor roles to garner commitment and support from staff he would soon be supervising, by incorporating a strong focus on team building, conflict management, and effective communication. Grafner was successful in this endeavor because he approached from a teambuilding orientation in which he highlighted opportunities for collective success without putting people in direct competition with each other.

The next objective for Grafner required his ability to operate as a Coordinator and Director by sharing his vision for the team and designing a structure for the organization linking roles, responsibilities, projects, and individual and organizational goals. Grafner explained his role as managing director this way:

My responsibility is to capitalize on strengths of the team and raise money for the College’s development initiatives. The best way I know to do that is by creating an environment that is supportive and focused on collective goals and objectives which I call the plan
of action. The two really big things I'm accountable for are obviously, the amount of money we raise each year and maintaining a productive work environment.

The model has been so successful that deans from other colleges have visited to discuss the process, structure, work-flow, and foundation for the college's success. Lynda Heyl shared this example:

Dan had the deans over to show them their shop and explain what they do in fundraising, and talk about how and why they've been successful. He told them about who does what, and the budget, the importance of the dean's involvement in their success. Then he looked them right in eye and said “success does not just come by itself; you have to make a big investment in it.” Dan shared this with me later: one of our Associate Deans said, “oh yeah, that's what Lynda keeps telling us.”

The truth is, the model is a great innovation, but without strong leadership it may not work and also has the potential to become a dysfunctional organization. Dan Grafner is a leader with the ability to balance his desire to develop subordinates in a very productive way with his need to accomplish very ambitious organizational goals. He has done this by investing in the quality of his people and challenging them to take on substantive, meaningful roles that build both their portfolio of skills but also enhance the organization. Dan Grafner has demonstrated the capacity to embrace and pursue long-range as well as short-range goals successfully. He is skilled at taking multiple perspectives when addressing challenges and opportunities alike; however, perhaps most importantly, Dan Grafner is a leader who can balance the needs of people with the needs of the organizational high performance.

Jerry May, who thought very highly of Dan Grafner had this to say about Grafner’s ability to provide leadership:

You know, you can't really make people do very much. They have to want to do whatever it is you're asking them to accomplish, and
Dan Grafner has been able to make people feel important and valued over there [Fisher College of Business]. They know they’re part of a great college and they all have something to do with it. Dan is a tremendous leader because his people respect him. They have confidence in him; they believe in him; they know where he’s coming from. A lot of people believe in him too. . . . Dan has a great situation in Fisher. He has a broader span of control with both the college and in our organization, but that might not be enough. We might have lost him by now.

Vice President May was right. Dan Grafner needed a new, more challenging opportunity in his life. In late 2002, Grafner accepted a position at The University of Cincinnati as Executive Director and Vice President for Development.

Case Study: College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Science

As Director of Development for the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Science (FAES), Lynda Heyl is responsible for managing the fund-raising needs of one of the largest college in the University. More specifically, Heyl leads college-wide efforts that include securing private support from individuals, corporations, and foundations for important college programs and initiatives, with special emphasis on OSU extension, Ohio 4-H, the Agricultural Technical Institutes (ATI), and the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC), as well as other special initiatives of Vice President for Agricultural Administration and Dean of the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Science.

Heyl manages a staff of four other development officers. One development officer lives in Wooster, Ohio where ATI and OARDC are located. She is responsible for raising money for both of those areas. Two other development officers are responsible for the Ohio 4-H campaign and OSU extension. Lynda is responsible for all aspects of
major-gift fund-raising for the college’s development priorities. Her assistant director is responsible for identifying and cultivating major-gift prospects in the $25,000 to $50,000 range, with specific attention on the Olentangy River Wetlands Education campaign.

Under the direction of Lynda Heyl, FAES has enjoyed considerable success in the development arena. For example, during the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign, Heyl’s development team was given a goal of $65.4 million; together they raised $78,175,150 for college-wide priorities and established three new endowed faculty positions by the conclusion of the campaign.

Organizational Performance
The Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance profile is found in figure 4.45 and reflects the perceptions of the FAES development team relating to their own organizational performance. This profile is very interesting. In spite of the group’s success, they have given themselves a negative score (their lowest) in the area of growth and resource acquisition. Curiously, the FAES development team’s highest rated orientation for performance is found in the area of productivity and accomplishment. These orientations are located next to each other in Quinn’s Competing Values Framework; however, they are associated with different management philosophies. A possible reason for the FAES team’s differentiation between their effectiveness in these two presumably related areas could be that collectively they see innovation and brokering as quite different activities than planning, organizing, and working productively. This could be an influence of the leadership style of Lynda Heyl. As her Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment profile reveals (figure 4.46), Heyl places a strong emphasis on the Producer and Director roles. She likes setting productivity goals for her
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commitment, Morale</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Innovation, Adaptation</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participation, Openness</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>External Support, Resource, Acquisition</td>
<td>&lt;.288&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Documentation, Information Management</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Productivity, Accomplishment</td>
<td>1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stability, Control</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Direction, Goal Clarity</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.45: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance
staff, as well as for herself and believes in using quantification as a means for evaluation. An equally interesting finding is the group’s highest scores occur diagonally from each other, a phenomenon that is rather infrequent. The Competing Values Framework suggests that orientations, competencies and management roles located directly across from each other represent contrasting ideals. The FAES Organizational Performance profile illustrates the group’s perception they embrace the polarities that ostensibly exist between these seemingly disparate management philosophies. Several of the FAES development team’s best practices however, reflect strategies and tactics that represent the Internal Process Model and the Rational Goal Model.

Best Practices

When asked to define the term best practices in her own words, Lynda Heyl offered this characterization: “Best practices; I think best practice would be the methods and strategies that work.” Using this succinct definition as a starting point, Heyl described several best practices she believes have a positive impact on the performance of her development organization.

Ambitious Goal Setting for Donor and Prospect Contacts

Lynda Heyl believes strongly in the value of goal setting and identified it as a fundamental best practice for her development team. Heyl explained that ambitious goal setting is important in facilitating the success of the development unit. “Numbers of calls, numbers of solicitations,” she remarked, “I think setting high goals are really important to your success, but being realistic is the key.”

For example, Heyl encourages all of her development officers to set ambitious goals for the number of contacts they make each week with
donor prospects. The expectation is clear because, as Heyl noted, she underlines the benefits of striving for significant numbers of contacts: the more contact a development officer has with prospects, the more opportunities there are for successful relationships and gift cultivation. Lynda shared this example:

One of the best practices this office has always focused on is donor contacts. There is the 20-25 a month University standard, but what I’ve always asked my development officers to do is twelve contacts a week. What I’ve said to them is “when you’re first coming in your going to be groping for those twelve, so your going to end up calling people who have already made gifts and just introducing yourself and going out to see them.” If you can get twelve appointments a week, before long you’re rolling so well you almost don’t have to call people because they’re calling you. . . . My goal was always twelve a week and that’s what I tell new people, I say, “I don’t care how you do them, but get twelve done a week or shoot for it because that will help you significantly over the years.” So they know the expectation.

Understanding the FAES Donor Base

One of the most important best practices for the College of FAES is understanding their donor base. Lynda Heyl explained that the culture associated with donors to their college is more relaxed and informal than for some of the other colleges on campus. Heyl described it this way:

Our donors tend to be a little bit lower key. They have wealth; it’s in their land. They don’t drive fancy cars and dress in fancy clothes typically. In fact, several just told me that they don’t feel comfortable with [Winter College] and the atmosphere (i.e., the Ritz Carlton).

Giving to the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences is also a part of the culture. For example, FAES has more than 420 endowments, the most of any college on campus. The college also ranks second to only Athletics in annual gift receipts, which illustrates the volume of donors to FAES. As Lynda Heyl explained the nature and
characteristics of the donor base, she emphasized the dearth of multimillion dollars donors; however, she highlighted the amount of mid-level major-gift prospects.

In terms of the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign, understanding the donor base proved invaluable. The initial goal for the college was $55 million, which worried Lynda at first; however, as the campaign continued and the donors and prospects became more intimate with the vision, objectives, and needs of the college, the goal was increased to $64.5 Million because the donor base could support this goal. One of the reasons why Heyl believes the campaign was so successful for the college was because the alumni feel connected to the college and wanted to support the programs from which they graduated.

Working with volunteers became an important element of understanding the donor base during the campaign as well. By presenting a case for support to the key volunteers and explaining to them the magnitude as well as the potential impact of success on the college, Heyl and the development team capitalized on the enthusiasm and commitment of some of FAES’ best friends. Lynda had this to say about the importance of knowing how to work with volunteers:

> To be really successful, we need donors to take ownership of the college and its priorities. We did it during the campaign and we do it today; we worked very closely with them on our long-term strategy. They’re part of the [donor] culture we were talking about before. . . . Ultimately, we benefit from those folks because they care so much about the college.

*Meetings*

Another *best practice* used by the FAES development team is an hour-long monthly conference-call meeting which involves all of the team members in conversations about fundraising goals, initiatives, strategies,
and achievement. Heyl explained that the meetings help to establish a more global view of the college and the University overall. The benefit, as Heyl described it is in focusing on the goals and objectives of the college as they relate to their specific areas of responsibility. Heyl continued, “I want everyone to think in terms of next steps that are connected to the big things we need to accomplish, like the 4-H Center and the Wetlands, and endowed positions – those kinds of things.” Meetings like this can help team members explore ideas and shape their development strategies and tactics.

**Lynda Heyl’s Leadership**

The *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* profile for Lynda Heyl appears in figure 4.46. This profile shows Lynda Heyl’s perceptions about how she employs the eight potential management roles in her position as Director of Development for the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences. Her profile reveals an extremely high emphasis on the *Director* and *Producer* roles which are found in the *Rational Goal Model* and a strong emphasis on the *Innovator* role as well. It is evident that Heyl believes her management efforts are spent primarily focusing on the external environment working toward maximizing productivity and moving towards expansion and growth.

When comparing this profile with the *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* (see figure 4.47), it is clear Heyl’s peers and subordinates do not experience her management style in the same way. For example, her highest rated management roles are *Monitor, Facilitator* and *Coordinator*. When examining this profile it appears Heyl’s energies are spent utilizing roles geared towards establishing and maintaining continuity much more than she may realize. In both profiles the *Broker* received the lowest score.
Figure 4.46: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment – Lynda Heyl
Figure 4.47: Competing Values Framework: View of Others – Lynda Heyl
Lynda Heyl is a highly committed manager who is dedicated to achieving the development objectives she is charged with accomplishing. She is clear with her performance expectations with her staff and anticipates results from them. Throughout our interviews Heyl made several comments about maintaining productivity. In doing so, she has relied on the management roles found on the bottom-half of the *Competing Values Framework: Monitor, Coordinator, Director, and Producer*. For example, while describing the importance of ambitious goal setting in the context of the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign, Heyl was clear that the last thing you want to do is fall short of your fund-raising goal. The following remarks by Lynda lend insight into her preference for managing from the *Internal Process* and *Rational Goal* models.

I mentioned to Dr. Moser that we needed to go over our goal. I have no problem setting a high goal, but you’ve got to be realistic when you do it because you don’t want be five cents under your goal, otherwise it looks like you failed.

One of the areas Lynda has been working on is to increase and improve her communication with her staff, particularly those who are located in Columbus. She explained that she coordinates a “huddle” everyday, in which everyone talks about the top three things they are going to accomplish for the day. By getting this kind of quick update on the team’s planned activities for the day, Lynda is able to monitor the individual and collective performance of the development group. The advantage for everyone, as Heyl explained,

> [is] we all know what’s going on. Sometimes the staff doesn’t know what has come through the door from the donors and if we let them know so and so has called, and they will need this and this, it really helps our process. . . . I think the more contact you have with your group the better you can bring things up and share information.

There are scheduled one-on-one monthly meetings with Heyl, where development officers and Lynda discuss top prospects or development
projects together, as well as update her on their contacts for the month. The group tries to attend the University Development Staff Meetings together, and also have a monthly conference call because the staff is spread out.

With her out-of-town staff, Heyl is working towards some kind of daily contact. For example, in describing a challenge she is having with one of her development officers

I’m trying to do one-on-ones with [the development officer], and I’m trying to increase the number of e-mails I do with [the development officer]. I’ve encouraged [the development officer] repeatedly to call me with questions, but I’m not succeeding with this one. Just run things by me, it just helps to talk it through with someone else.

Later, when asked if her style has changed over the course of her career, Heyl commented on how she has become less intense in her pursuit of impressive development numbers.

I took the standpoint that if our college gave me a goal, I had to reach that goal regardless of the human cost, including my own health. No matter what, I was going to get this done.

Overall, Lynda Heyl’s management style is characterized by a focus of the roles found in the Internal Process Model and the Rational Goal Model. She is very competent at monitoring personal, collective and organizational performance, as well as challenging her staff to work productively by managing their time and staying focused on donor contacts. Heyl uses communication in a variety of ways with her staff. For example, she holds monthly individual and group meetings with her staff in which information is shared by all and direction is provided by her. Heyl provides structure for her staff by coordinating day-to-day operations via a “huddle” and also prefers to know what her development team is doing with regard to identification and solicitation of donors.
Lynda Heyl's was the only participant who talked specifically about the adverse impact of her previous management style on her own health and the subsequent benefits of intentionally striving to change. Her previous management style reflected what Quinn refers to as a *Drowning Workaholic*, in which they score particularly low in the *Facilitator, Mentor, Innovator,* and *Broker* roles. These managers are often considered obsessive about work, sensitive to criticism, unable to delegate authority, bogged down with detail, and overly formal in relating to subordinates. Heyl described her transition this way:

I think I've have a better balance now. I've delegated some of my responsibility because of my health. I've also passed the point where I'm now saying, “in order to reach this goal, these are the resources that I need.” . . . . Our consultant said to me, “you either have to scale back your activities or hire more staff, because you are killing yourself and your staff.” That tells me something.

Her current goals for transitioning her management style focus on developing more of an emphasis on the *Mentor* and *Facilitator* roles, in which she will facilitate team building, decision making, and conflict management by utilizing competencies such as communicating effectively, developing subordinates, and understanding herself and her staff better. She recognizes that her managerial transition has gone from a management profile that resembled a *Drowning Workaholic* to a portfolio that utilize more roles, competencies and orientations from the *Competing Values Framework* quadrants.

This finding is of particular importance because it illustrates a breakthrough for Lynda Heyl. By virtue of her ability to reflect and analyze the competing demands of her professional career against her health and personal responsibilities, Heyl changed without compromising her personal or professional accomplishments.
**Case Study: The College of Veterinary Medicine**

Karen Longbrake serves as the Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine. She is a graduate of the Ohio State University College of Education and has been employed as a development officer since 1995. She began her fund-raising career at Ohio State University in the Fisher College of Business under the supervision of Dan Grafner, Associate to the Dean, Fisher College of Business where she worked for three years before being promoted to Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

As Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine, Karen Longbrake’s primary responsibilities focus on developing, coordinating and directing a college-wide fund-raising program for Veterinary Medicine. More specifically, Longbrake manages a small staff of one major-gift development officer and one administrative support person. During the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign Longbrake was responsible for achieving a goal of $24,000,000 for college priorities. By the conclusion of the campaign, Longbrake had successfully raised more than $30,000,000. She reports directly to the dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, as well as to Bruce Pontious, Director of Development for Medical Center and Health Sciences. Longbrake explained she and her staff are currently expected to accomplish several objectives, including identifying and cultivating new prospects for the college via a program she referred to as the “grateful client network;” cultivating major donor prospects for the new *Core Academic Building* for the college; and raising money for other priorities of the dean.

Longbrake remarked that initially the second development officer for the college was expected to focus exclusively on identifying and cultivating grateful clients only; however, added Karen,
Once the building decided to go up the dean realized we really need to have this second person doing both things: working on developing a grateful client network, and also doing major-gift fundraising.

Longbrake went on to describe the strength of the College and its consistent ranking in the top 10, as well as the impact a new facility will have on the overall quality of the programs offered. The new Core Academic Building (which is completed now) houses college faculty and staff, as well as state-of-the-art classrooms, laboratories, and library.

Figure 4.48 depicts the Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance profile for the College of Veterinary Medicine development unit. It is important to note that three of the four raters Longbrake recommended as having insight into the performance of her unit do not work with her on a day-to-day basis. This profile reflects the impressions of organizational performance by that group, which included Longbrake’s results. A strong emphasis on the Rational Goal Model is evident, which includes an orientation for productivity, accomplishment, direction, and goal clarity. Additionally, emphasis is placed on resource acquisition and external relations. The profile suggests the development unit for the College of Veterinary Medicine is productive in terms of fundraising, while possessing a weak internal structure often characterized by participation, openness and teamwork.
Figure 4.48: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance – Veterinary Medicine
Best Practices

When asked to define the term *best practices* in the context of her roles and responsibilities as Director of Development for the College of Veterinary Medicine, Karen described *best practices* as “the over-arching strategies that support the donor cycle (i.e., identification, cultivation, solicitations, and stewardship).” As she elaborated, Longbrake commented on several specifics she believes are *best practices* that have contributed to the success of her fund-raising program; however, she stressed the importance of consistently marketing academics. She put it this way: “The bottom line for all of these *best practices* is telling the story. We have great students; we have great faculty; and, we have a great college.”

*Alumni communications and events*

The *best practice* Longbrake discussed first was the importance of communicating with alumni. She noted that for the College of Veterinary Medicine, tracking graduates is not as difficult as it is for other Colleges within the University. “We have the lowest percentage of lost alumni and we have good addresses for 99% of them,” remarked Longbrake. She explained that this connection to alumni is manifest in two ways:

We stay in contact with them and we let them know what’s going on, and what we’re doing well . . . . The other reason is we let them know they’re important to us, and I think they let us know where they are because they want to participate in the activities that we have here and they want to support the college.

In addition to these reasons, a strong sense of camaraderie exists for graduates of the College due to the sequencing of their curriculum. Cohorts of students are developed early on and students take nearly all of the same classes as they work toward their degrees. Longbrake noted:

There just seems to be a real brotherhood, sisterhood. They’ve been through a lot in those four years . . . . They really seem to be invested in each other, even the older ones. They want to see the
younger ones make it. They say when they hire graduates, they prefer hiring Ohio State graduates, not just because of their loyalty to Ohio State, but because they really feel like they are better prepared.

**Effective Partnering with College Alumni Society**

The Alumni Society for the College of Veterinary Medicine has served as an important advantage for Karen. To that end, an important *best practice* for Longbrake is capitalizing on opportunities to strengthen relationships with graduates with donor potential by identifying, cultivating, soliciting, and stewarding prospective donors as well as current donors to Veterinary Medicine.

Each year eight to ten alumni events are hosted by the college. Information regarding these events is always posted on the Vet Med webpage as well as in *Speculum*, the College alumni magazine. Events include several receptions at national veterinary meetings and conferences, alumni weekends and reunions with tours, football game tailgate parties and an annual scholarship brunch for donors and recipients.

**Effective Participation in Annual Alumni Weekend**

Each autumn the College of Veterinary Medicine Alumni Society hosts an alumni weekend. The event starts on a Friday with a cocktail party, dinner and an auction. On Saturday there is a barbecue tailgate party and a Buckeye football game. A *best practice* for Karen has been to attend and participate in all of the Alumni Weekend Events. Approximately 200 guests attend the Friday events and the tailgate party usually attracts 400 guests; this includes alumni without tickets. Longbrake added:
They just come because they get to see their friends. They’re not necessarily drawn in by the football game. It’s something fun; we have it outside; it’s usually early in the season when the weather is still nice.

The annual auction generally raises between $30,000 to $40,000 for initiatives important to the College. Longbrake explained that the Alumni Society is always trying to come up with ideas that advance the quality of the College and cited the auction as one of the effective strategies they use. They raised enough money to buy a $20,000 dollar piece of video equipment which is used to film surgeries that can then be put it on the web for students watch. “This kind of commitment is what I try to tap into,” remarked Longbrake. “I try to convey to them that they can help in so many ways by providing for the students.”

_Receptions at Strategically Selected Conferences_
Longbrake explained that another effective best practice she and her dean employ together is strategically selecting the best professional conferences for hosting alumni receptions. They base their decisions on criterion such as, geographic concentrations of graduates and conferences with the likelihood of large attendance. “We do a lot of things to stay in front of them and we do these receptions every year and typically we’ll get 100 people,” noted Longbrake. Receptions are free for alumni to attend and are hosted by Karen and the dean, or another representative of the College. Each reception also has a segment where the dean or his designee will officially greet everyone and speak about the College.

Longbrake explained that each year her goal for alumni receptions is to cover the United States effectively by having events in regions of the country where substantive contacts with graduates and potential donors
alike are assured. For example, a reception is often held in Orlando, Florida, one or two of the western states, and wherever the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) conference is held. The AVMA conference is the often the most well attended; typically 200 guest attend this reception.

For Karen, a best practice such as effective partnering with the College Alumni Society provides her with access to numerous graduates and potential donors, as well as allows her to pursue the fundamentals of development (i.e., identify, cultivate, solicit, and steward prospects) on behalf of her efforts for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

*Using Alumni Newsletters and Magazines*

Another best practice that advances Longrakes development agenda is the ways she uses the College’s Alumni Magazine, *Speculum*. Fundamentally, the magazine is used by the College administration to tell “the story of the College.” Longbrake uses the magazine to include general information about giving to the College and for specific stories about development initiatives she wants to which she wants to draw attention. Longbrake also uses the magazine as a leave-behind piece for prospects when she visits them. She explained, “It’s nice to be able to leave them something about the college they can look at when I leave. It’s just one of those things I like to do.”

At the time of these interviews, Karen was working with the College staff to develop a quarterly newsletter for alumni to supplement *Speculum*, the alumni magazine that is already circulated twice a year.
That magazine is used to communicate with everyone we have a good address on. There are updates on the new building and scholarships. Things like that . . . Not only do we send it to our alumni, but we also send it to anybody we put on our major-gift list; so, that’s one way we can stay in contact with our grads twice a year.

Working with Regional Major-Gift Staff
Longbrake emphasized the benefit of partnering with the regional major-gift staff and identified her collaborations with them as a best practice. She explained that early in her career she used to get nervous about working with the regional major-gift staff because they had more development experience than her; however, Longbrake explained, as she gained experience she also gained confidence in her style and abilities to raise major-gifts. Today, she views the members of the regional major-gift staff as important partners in her success. Karen shared this anecdote about her partnership with one of the regional major-gift development officers she works with frequently.

Linda and I worked together last week in Dayton calling on someone in the area. She mentioned to me that I was one of the few DOs (i.e., development officer) who work with her on a regular basis. I was really surprised to hear that because I think it’s been a real benefit to this college and to me personally as far as the fundraising goes. I think you can get so many good ideas from other people.

A benefit of this type of regular collaboration with region major-gift staff is that the development priorities for the College of Veterinary Medicine are being advanced more frequently than if Karen worked alone. Therefore, prospects receive more attention, develop multiple relationships with the University, and potentially fell closer to the University as a result. Longbrake noted, “I think it shows when we go down her prospect list. She knows who my people are and who the big prospects are in the area.”
Weekly Staff Meeting

A best practice Longbrake employs in terms of managing her staff is holding a weekly meeting in which she outlines goals and objectives for the group. Longbrake explained that a weekly meeting helps the staff stay focused on the short-term goals that need to be accomplished. She added, “I think I’ll probably be a little more structured with [our new development officer] as far as looking at specific goals.” Longrake explained that she wants to provide an environment for the new development officer that is both structured and flexible. She remarked,

    In my mind I’m thinking, “You’re a responsible adult, you know how to do it.” So by being a little bit more structured and still remaining flexible and letting people feel comfortable enough to go out and make their own mistakes without me looking over their shoulder all the time, that’s a better situation.

Karen Longbrake’s leadership

The Competing Values Framework leadership profiles appear in figure 4.49 and 4.50. The Competing Values Framework Self-Assessment shows high marks in the Producer, Monitor, and Innovator roles; whereas, the Competing Values Framework: View of Others profile shows the highest management marks in the Facilitator, Monitor, Coordinator, and Producer roles. Although both profiles show high scores for the Monitor and Producer roles, it is hard not to notice how differently they look when compared to each other. One possibility for this discrepancy may be related to challenges associated with the physical environment Longrake and her staff shared as well as, what many would consider, challenges associated with transitioning into a management role for the first time. Here is what Longbrake had to say:
Figure 4.49: *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* – Karen Longbrake
Figure 4.50: Competing Values Framework: View of Others– Karen Longbrake
It’s been interesting for me because this is my first fore’ into management and I’m still learning how to motivate people, especially with the difference between civil service and professional staff. I mean there’s a difference; but in this environment it’s been difficult.

The work environment for Longbrake and her staff at the time of these interviews was a large room with three desks. A challenge Longbrake faced was that her administrative assistant thought she was treated differently than the other development officer in that she was responsible for tasks and duties, while Longbrake and her assistant director were talking on the phone and making plans to visit people. Longbrake discussed the challenge she faces in supervising both a full-time development officer and an administrative assistant candidly:

I think it will be okay when we move into the new building because you’re in different offices but . . . my assistant felt like a secretary, which is what she was hired to do. She didn’t like that role, and that was very difficult for me because, what can I do, I mean that’s what your job is. . .

Longbrake lamented she does not want to have to worry about these kinds of issues; however, because of space issues and inherent interoffice dynamics she did.

For me, it’s been a dilemma; the environment here is not real conducive for good management of people. . . . When we’re all three here everybody hears everything everybody is saying, so there are just no secrets and everything is out in the open.

Longbrake admitted that she struggled with how to manage her assistant. She knew her assistant wanted more professional responsibilities, so Longbrake allowed her to take a greater role in
developing and managing development publications. Ultimately, Longbrake needed her to assist her more than she was. She remarked:

It’s very difficult to say without sounding condescending, because it’s not that I personally thought of her differently, but this is your job. We need you to file; we need you to do the letters, the correspondence. We need you to do the checks, and she didn’t want to do it. That became very difficult because she saw us coming and going as we please, out seeing donors; that’s what she wanted to do, but that wasn’t what she was hired for; that’s why she left.

As Longbrake reflected on her experience at Ohio State, she mentioned the importance of working with and learning from Dan Grafner. She explained that Grafner trained her well as a development officer and that it was time to begin relying on his guidance and insight to help her improve her skill as a manager.

I need to spend more time with Dan because Dan is very good. I love just strategizing and bouncing ideas off of him. . . . That was one thing I felt like Dan did a good job of, he took me out on development appointments and I watched him a few times, until he said, “okay, you know what you need to do, go ahead and do it.”

Time management and focus on priorities
As Longbrake thought more about the best practices that enhance her individual performance as a development officer, she noted her personal commitment to time management and focus on development priorities.

I try to sit down every morning and say, “here are the things I need to get done this week.” I list the most important things and kind of cross them off as I go. I think you set goals so you can at least see them and keep them fresh in your mind.

Karen commented on the challenges associated with distractions, such as people stopping in the office to say “hello,” and others requesting help with projects that do not support development. An effective best practice for staying focused on development priorities and for using time wisely
for Karen is to go on donor visits two to three times a week, three of the four weeks in a month. Her rationale is she maintains her focus on raising money by making sure she is out of the office, while providing enough office-time for administrative responsibilities such as follow-up and planning.

I think those are good things: to start sitting down and planning and thinking about where we are going here. How are we going to get to the end of the building, and when that’s done where are we going after that.

Case Study: College of Engineering
As Director of Development for the College of Engineering, Dave McCarthy’s primary responsibilities focus on developing, coordinating and directing a college-wide fund-raising program. More specifically, McCarthy manages a small staff that includes two other major-gift development officers and one corporate and foundations gifts officer as well as an administrative support person. McCarthy reports to the dean of the College of Engineering, as well as to John Meyer, Associate Vice President for Development. McCarthy and his staff are expected to accomplish several objectives, including identifying and cultivating new prospects, cultivating major-gift prospects and securing major-gifts that advance the development needs of for the College of Engineering. During the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign McCarthy was charged with raising $160,000,000 for College of Engineering priorities and another $14,000,000 for the School of Architecture. At the conclusion of the campaign Engineering had raised $188,347,675 and added 11 new endowed faculty positions, while Architecture raised $20,112,675 and added two endowed positions.

Dave McCarthy has spent most of his career in university development. His career began at Ohio State in 1972 where he was hired initially to work in the annual-fund. He remembered there were only eight full-time
staff members in the Department of Development at that time: five of which were assigned to cultivate major-gifts. McCarthy’s particular responsibility related to community campaigns. In this role McCarthy enjoyed both face-to-face and telephone interactions with donors and prospects alike. Two years later McCarthy used his experience to accept a position as Director of Development at Centre College in Kentucky where he started a national program for annual giving.

Alumni were very proud of the college and as a result the annual giving program flourished. McCarthy stayed in this position for two years before moving to Oberlin College in Ohio. After two years in annual giving, the administration at Oberlin asked him to direct their capitol campaign. At the conclusion of that campaign in 1983, McCarthy accepted a position at Ohio State University once again. This time he was the Director of Development for the College of Engineering, a position he has held since 1983.

Organizational Performance
The Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance profile for the College of Engineering is found in Figure 4.51. The profile shows the group’s highest scores occurring on the left-hand side of the graph which suggests a strong orientation towards the internal workings of the unit and strength of the group. Although the group is charged to raise money for important college-wide initiatives, it appears the group has embraced McCarthy’s tendency towards developing relationships and facilitating performance by providing the appropriate balance between challenge and support. McCarthy provided this example:

The people in our group all have that internal drive to succeed and I have to trust them to have that drive. I have to sort of let them go and when I see they’re not meeting their potential, then step in there and make suggestions. I look for ways to help them achieve.
Figure 4.51: Competing Values Framework: Organizational Performance – College of Engineering
Half of the Engineering team’s high scores are opposite their lowest scores – or competing values. The other half embraces the inherent tensions between competing values. For example, the group’s orientation for direction and goal clarity is found in the Rational Goal Model, and their emphasis on commitment and morale, values is associated with the Human Relations Model. The same relationship exists between the group’s high scores in the Open Systems Model (innovation and adaptation) and scores found in the Internal Process Model (stability and control).

Best Practices
When asked to define the term best practices, in the context of development for the College of Engineering, McCarthy shared this view: “It would be an activity that is done very professionally, one that reflects well on the university, the college, and on the development organization. It’s an effective and efficient activity.”

Using Teamwork and Multiple Relationships to Cultivate Corporate Gifts
The best practice Dave McCarthy mentioned first was teamwork, noting specifically the importance of collaborations with internal development partners. For example, there are several situations in which the College of Engineering and the College of Business will be cultivating gifts from a corporate prospect. In those situations, explained McCarthy it is vital to work closely with the development staff from the College of Business, as well as with the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving and in some case with the regional major-gift staff as well. By embracing the general values, such as innovation, adaptation, and resource acquisition which are found in the Open Systems Model, the College of Engineering in concert with other colleges on campus are maximizing the likelihood of receiving corporate support for their development objectives. McCarthy used interactions with Ford Motor Company as an example:
Business and Engineering are working very closely together and we’re not trying to out do one another. It’s a very good situation really, because Ford is pleased we’re interacting as an institution rather than as competitors. From Fords perspective, they don’t have two colleges bickering or undermining each other. From the business and engineering perspective, you’re really maximizing your contacts and potential with Ford.

Relationship building of this kind is beneficial to all parties involved because corporations have an opportunity receive exposure for their philanthropy, benefit from sponsored research, and recruit quality graduates from several of the colleges on campus. From a college standpoint, multiple relationships serve to strengthen the overall relationship between the University and the corporate prospect, provides more opportunities for contact and exposure to the important initiatives across the University, and provides students with opportunities to learn about and work with potential employers.

**College-Specific Corporate Relations Position**
A very important best practice established by McCarthy was the creation of a college-specific corporate relations position. The position is held by Paul, who has several years of industrial experience as well as worked for the Ohio State University Research Foundation (OSURF) before joining Engineering. “We enticed Paul to come from the Office of Research to join us because I thought he had all the right criteria for the position and turns out it was a good decision, he’s worked out nicely,” explained McCarthy.

The College is doing a mush better job with their corporate relations because now they have formalized corporate partnerships, something
they did not have before the creation of the position. McCarthy noted that Engineering had five or six working partnerships and another five or six in coming along. He went on to say:

The addition of Paul has been a real plus for us because he has many years of industrial experience and he came from the OSURF part of the university, so he knows the players there, he knows the terminology, and now he has a situation where he can sort of put his arms around the area he represents. Before he had to represent the whole university, now he just has to represent the College of Engineering.

*Teamwork: Using the Regional Major-Gift Staff to Cultivate Private Support from Individuals*

Another *best practice* McCarthy identified was working closely with the regional major-gift staff. The value in utilizing the talents and insights of the regional major-gift staff lies in their assigned area of responsibility and ability to visit prospects more often than the development staff for the College of Engineering. Because the University promotes teamwork, these kinds of partnerships are common. For example, when development officers collaborate to secure a gift, both parties receive credit. To that end, McCarthy sees the relationship as an opportunity not worth missing. McCarthy put it this way:

We have very good situations going on in California, Detroit, Chicago and Florida areas. The regionals’ know more about the people in those particular areas, but they know less about what is going on in the colleges. So our strengths compliment their weaknesses and vise versa.

*Football Tailgate Parties*

“The consensus in our office,” remarked Dave McCarthy “is that the events are good examples of best practices.” The College of Engineering uses events as an important tool for identifying, cultivating, and stewarding individual and corporate prospects. The College puts on
events associated with home football games, where they attract 400 to 600 guests. Beyond the sheer number of attendees, these tailgates are effective because:

We have a good loyal base group of people that come back for that and it’s a good way for our faculty and the dean to interact with major prospects.

Alumni/Faculty Relations
Another best practice utilized by the College of Engineering development staff is cultivating alumni/faculty relationships. Many times graduates and faculty will remain in contact, particularly when they have an opportunity to benefit mutually from the relationship. For example, often graduates will be asked to help recruit for their companies and have the opportunity to, at the junior level, serve as internal champions for Ohio State. As those advocates are promoted through their organizations, they find themselves in positions where they can personally influence the philanthropic decisions made by their institution. “We facilitate that long-term relationship wherever we can,” noted McCarthy. For example, during a typical football season a reception is planned for the alumni recruiters on the Friday night before the football game. The recruiters that come back can network each other and attend the football game the next day. McCarthy described the benefits this way:

We make them feel very good about giving this time to the University. If we make it a very positive experience for them, then they may become good prospects to start with when we need to get back into the company and look for help internally. So it’s the good job we do [academically] with the undergraduates, that creates the initial loyalty to OSU.
Dave McCarthy’s leadership

The *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* profile for Dave McCarthy appears in figure 4.52. This profile illustrated McCarthy’s perception that he spends the majority of his time and energy positioning the College of Engineering competitively in the external market. All of the management roles found on the right-hand side of the graph received scores at or above 5.0; whereas, only one of the management roles on the left-hand side of the graph received a rating above 5.0: the *Facilitator*. McCarthy’s profile also reveals that the quadrant with lowest two scores, the *Internal Process Model* is opposite the *Open Systems Model*.

When the *Competing Values Framework: View of Others* is examined (see figure 4.53), McCarthy’s profile reveals a different emphasis. In this case, McCarthy’s peers and subordinates view his management style as much more focused the *Human Relations Model* as well as on the roles of *Innovator* and *Director*. As the two of us talked more about his management style, McCarty began to emphasize his preference for working with people, particularly his staff. He expressed the importance of sharing information with the group and working with them individually to understand their style and how he hopes to help each of them in terms of their ambitions. As McCarthy thought about each of his staff, he made these observations:

Sue is in [the School of] Architecture, but there isn’t enough challenge for her. So we’ve asked Sue, and I think she likes the idea, to get involved with corporate relations and work with Paul. It helps her professional growth and she does a good job [regardless of what] she takes on, and she and Paul work well together. So she’s helping with [corporate partners].
Table 4.52: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment profile for Dave McCarthy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.52: Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment profile for Dave McCarthy**
Figure 4.53: Competing Values Framework: View of Others - for Dave McCarthy
In describing another staff member and ways to help him advance his career, McCarthy shared these insights:

This is an important move in Les’ career because he hasn’t had constituency experience before. Now he has a base of operations, and an obligation to this one area and to its ultimate success. So this is going to help Les become more easily recognized member of the [University] team. In this last year he’s had some wins so we’ve moved along with some 7 figure asks that look like their going to get funded, we haven’t gone public yet, but I’m very confident. . . . Les has got Mechanical Engineering, but some of the Mechanical Engineering interests also overlap with what Paul and I are doing. So we are sort of complimenting what he does, and involving him with some of our ongoing relations.

In describing Carrie, who does alumni relations and special events, McCarthy explained that she is interested in gaining development experience. Although her responsibility for special events and alumni relations consume a lot of her time, McCarthy is committed to “getting her a little more and more involved with development by exposing her to what we do.” McCarthy also added:

I understand that everyone in the group is relatively new, all were brought in within the last 2-3 years and they are still learning about the college and how things work. Only Les has real development experience here [at Ohio State]. Sue brought development experience from Florida, so they’re all needing a little bit of direction.

McCarthy went on to explain that he believes his staff is capable of managing themselves and their respective areas of responsibility and therefore does not have to micromanage them. He does however make sure every one is performing to their potential. “I have make sure they are working as efficiently and effectively as possible. So I let them go and when I see they’re not meeting their potential, then step in and make suggestions.”
When asked to describe the evolution of his management style over the course of his career, McCarthy remarked that, “It’s pretty much the same; it’s been that way, unless the situation called for the dominant person stepping forward and issuing orders, for the most part it’s been the human relations model.”

Case Study: Merit Scholarships

Until approximately twelve years ago, The Ohio State University (in compliance with the law) admitted all students who applied for admission. In the early 1990s the University implemented a “selective admissions” policy, with a University-wide focus of improving the quality of incoming students, as well as enhancing the quality of academic offerings, and increasing opportunities for students to engage in research and outreach. The goal of “selective admissions” was to attract the most academically talented students of Ohio. Later, during the 1994-95 academic year, Ohio State went a step further by implementing a “competitive admissions” policy. This change, along with many others directed to enhancing the academic reputation of Ohio State, has had dramatic and measurable outcomes on the reputation of the university.

The Merit Scholar Initiative was developed to address the University’s specific objective of recruiting the most talented students in Ohio as well as across the country. Sue Cavenaugh was asked to direct this initiative and did so until she retired from the University at the conclusion of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign. “It was a commitment from the very top,” remarked Cavenaugh, “if we want to have a strong undergraduate program, we’ve got to have some of the top students in it and in order to recruit them, we have to have scholarships as a part of it.” The Office of Academic Affairs stressed the importance of raising money for Merit
Scholarships because it was going to be an important tool in improving the quality of the student-body. John Meyer added.

So many really smart kids didn’t know that we had strong academic programs. They thought we had football, and their parents knew that historically we took any student who had a high school diploma.

Inherent challenges in starting the new Merit Scholars development initiative were that the University had no prior history of raising money strictly for merit scholarships on a University-wide basis. As a result, there was neither an existing nor an identified donor-base. Initially, because this was a University-wide project, there was no one office responsible for guiding the process. “So I was asked to move to working full time on the Merit Scholarship initiative and truly it was great fun,” noted Cavanaugh, “I felt very lucky that I ended up working with University Honors and Scholars Center.” Because the Merit Scholarship initiative is staffed by only one person, Competing Values Framework profiles were not incorporated in this case study; therefore, only a descriptive overview of the unit’s best practices and operations will be included.

According to Jerry May, if you ask the finest high school students what their determining factors are when choosing a university they will tell you its academic excellence and scholarships. For that reason a huge emphasis was placed on endowing Merit Scholarships. There are four categories of giving opportunities for the Merit Scholars Initiative. The Presidential, The Medalist, and The University Scholar include students who demonstrated the potential for high academic achievement though their ranking in the top 3% of their graduating class and achieving an ACT score of 29 or higher. Each of these scholarships is given for four
years, as long as students maintain a 3.2 GPA and are working towards a degree. The Distinguished Scholar Scholarship is given only to National Merit and National Achievement Finalists ranking in the top 10% of their high school graduating class.

**Best Practices**

Cavanaugh described *best practices* in the context of her job as focus on her key responsibilities as development officer, which she categorized as simply to identify, cultivate, solicit, and steward donors to the merit scholarship initiative. This definition is evident when examining the best practices Ms. Cavanaugh employed during her tenure as Director of Merit Scholarships. “I always went into meetings with agendas,” remarked Cavanaugh, “not to hand out, but normally I would write it out for myself know what I want to accomplish.” In the most fundamental way, Sue Cavanaugh had to rely on her commitment and focus; however, she also depended on her resourcefulness, creativity, and autonomy to be successful. She was staffed with only a half-time secretarial assistant; therefore, she needed to be intentional about her strategies, tactics, and objectives.

I was very much on my own most of the time and went I went out to visit potential donors I was really representing the program as well as development. For some of the colleges the dean will go along, I didn’t have that. Not that we would have never developed to that stage, but of course I had so many purely cold calls to make.

Fortunately, development officers are not evaluated purely on the amount of money raised in a year, but rather on the number of substantive contacts with donors and prospects. Because the Merit Scholars Initiative had no previous history John Meyer decided that a published goal for the merit scholarship initiative was not necessary
during the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign. In any event, Cavanaugh was successful in establishing the Merit Scholarship Initiative as an important and valued University priority.

**Strategic Planning**

Cavanaugh identified strategic planning as a best practice of hers, particularly as it related to starting the program.

> It occurred to me that Ohio State has lots of different graduates, lots of different needs, and people often like to support someone who is like them. So I asked for a download of alumni who had graduated before 1970 with honors and who had been identified through *Prospect Power 92*, which was a program that Ohio State had purchased that was to identify alumni in our base who were more likely to have wealth.

Cavanaugh used the lists to identify geographic regions of the country where she believed individuals with the potential to be top prospects were located and began planning trips to those areas. She described the importance of focusing on time this way:

> Another part of my focus is on time in terms of what do I want to accomplish this year, this month, this week, this day, this morning, this hour, this next 10 minutes. I think that’s critical in our profession - staying focused in the moment.

Strategic planning of this kind reflects orientations found in the *Internal Process Model* and *Rational Goal Model*. Cavanaugh utilized information management strategies to help create direction for herself and the program as a means for identifying potential prospects for the initiative. This best practice reveals Cavanaugh’s preference for direction and goal clarity as methods for fostering productivity and success. Cavanaugh’s style and competencies in the *Rational Goal Model* led to other best practices that supported and enhanced the impact of her strategic planning, such as teamwork, cultivation of volunteers, and communications pieces.
Foundation Board Support

Cavanaugh recognized the importance of the volunteers on the Foundation Board and successfully pursued the opportunity to speak directly to them about the significance of the Merit Scholars Initiative. She recalled:

I worked hard to get in front of the Foundation Board. It was obvious to me that we needed someone in the Foundation Board to be interested in this project. I went to a Foundation Board meeting during a morning session and explained to them that this was a University wide initiative that was to attract students in the top 3% of their high school classes and also national merit and national achievement scholars . . . I told them Bowling Green and Toledo both had more national merit scholars in their freshman class than we did because they recruited them when we weren’t.

As a result of that meeting Cavanaugh recruited her first major donor and key volunteer. Interestingly, he wasn’t at that meeting; however, he carefully read the minutes and requested a meeting with Ms. Cavanaugh. Later that year, when Vice President May was assigning each Foundation Board member a development officer, Cavanaugh was pleasantly surprised to see herself partnered with the volunteer she had met previously. The expectation was to visit Foundation Board member at least three times a year in their homes. Cavanaugh remarked:

It was wonderful because he and his wife had three homes. They were in North Carolina in the spring and fall, and Harbor Springs, Michigan in the summer and Long Boat Key, Florida in the winter and I was assigned to him.

While Cavanaugh’s focus on competencies in the Rational Goal Model serves as an important dimension of her management style, it is the combination of these preferences with her ability to act as both an Innovator and Broker that led to success in developing and growing the Merit Scholars Initiative.
By embracing the *Broker* role, Cavanaugh was able to use the role of the Foundation Board member effectively, by asking him to review lists of prospects in each of the areas where he owned homes, host donor receptions, and make a personal gift to the project. “He ended up being one of my top 5 donors.” Cavanaugh found herself in a much better situation following her partnership with her “key” volunteer because she had more opportunities to meet with viable prospects on behalf of the *Merit Scholarship Initiative*. Cavanaugh set regular goals for herself relating to number of contacts a month and the best places to travel. I looked at where some of my donors lived like [the Foundation Board member] and arranged meetings in those places most often.

Sue revisited the value of focusing in the moment, as she discussed meeting with donors and prospects.

> People tell us what we need to know if we listen, and too often [development officers] get too tied up in what they want to say next; they rehearse this little speech in their head and aren’t hearing. Sometimes a prospect is subtle and sometimes their right in your face, cues, that you need to pay attention to. That’s why focus is so important.

*Communications*

Another important and innovative *best practice* that benefited the Merit Scholars Initiative was the use of strategic communications pieces. This was particularly important because as a new project, Cavanaugh was working with a limited budget. She would use the services of the Office of Development Communications for press releases of major donations to the Initiative, as well as, targeted the Campaign Update Newsletter because, “it was a nice publication and it went to the right audience for me.” Cavanaugh recognized the importance of using communications pieces that already were in production and that went to large groups of
Ohio State donors. “I was always thinking about something that could be in there and I would try to think about story lines that were interesting.”

Another communications piece Cavanaugh used effectively was the back cover of the Alumni Magazine. She explained,

> When I first started, [the Development Organization] had purchased regular space on the back of the Alumni Magazine for development ads. The first call I got was when someone who was supposed to have ad ready didn’t get it done; they said we need something, but we need it today. I was lucky enough to have just finished a poster with the communications and we used it. It was a nice break for me.

Cavanaugh was able to use the space three more times and highlighted the impact donors have on real people by including in each ad a picture of the donor and the recipient of their scholarship. “It was a best bet for me because we got the word out to lots of people.” She knew which donors enjoyed exposure and used these magazines and newsletters to generate publicity in mutually beneficial ways.

**Stewardship**

A *best practice* in stewardship for Ms. Cavanaugh was to connect donors with recipients because “that’s really why [donors] are doing it.” Typically effective stewardship varies by donor. Because the Merit Scholars program was small, Cavanaugh was able to develop thoughtful stewardship strategies. She explained,

> I could figure out what I thought was best for people and do it . . . . So as I said, I had donors who were very interested in publicity and I would think about ways to accommodate them. I asked some to be in brochures; I asked some to be on the back cover of the Alumni Magazine. I had other people who preferred a lower key thank you, so I did that too.
One stewardship lunch stood out for Cavanaugh. It was when she invited a student who had received a named Distinguished Scholarship to have lunch with a member of the donor’s family. The student was so thrilled with her award that she told them, “When I received the letter that said I was to have scholarship, I was so moved I put it on my refrigerator so I could always think of her.”

The best practices as well as managerial style of Sue Cavanaugh clearly reflect an emphasis on roles, competencies, and orientations associated with the Open Systems Model and Rational goal Model. Cavanaugh used innovative ideas as well as self-monitoring to foster a productive working.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Discussion
This study sought to examine the best practices, organizational performance and leadership characteristics of a high-performance university development organization in the context of a state university having five separate campuses, eighteen constituent colleges, and several research centers, as well as a high-profile athletics department.

Defining fund-raising effectiveness can be difficult because as Duronio & Loessin (1991) point out, it is “multifaceted and complex and has a great deal to do with the context in which the fund-raising occurs.” As discussed previously in the literature review, Duronio and Loessin (1991) conducted research designed to highlight effective fund-raising programs in their particular institutional contexts. In doing so, they concentrated on describing the most significant institutional characteristics that positively influenced fund raising for each of the colleges and universities they studied. Given this foundation, the best way to illustrate organizational “best practices” for The Ohio State University Development Organization overall was to first provide a meaningful context for which the University garners its private support, as well as present the basic characteristics of effectiveness for the Development Organization in particular. Figure 5.1 summarizes these characteristics.
Characteristics of The Ohio State University

- Land-Grant, Research 1 University;
- Presidential leadership is strong;
- Institutional Commitment to Fund-Raising is strong;
- Resource allocation somewhat uneven at constituent level;
- Definition and communication of institutional niche and image an ongoing process (top-tier academics/athletics);
- Institutional fund raising priorities and policies well defined.

Characteristics of The Ohio State University Department of Development

- Chief Development Officer’s leadership is strong;
- Senior Administrative Team’s leadership is strong:
  - Emphasis on management of the fund-raising program;
  - Centralized/decentralized model;
  - Strategic planning and goal-setting in alignment with “Academic Plan;”
  - Team culture promoted and rewarded.
- Major Gift ($50,000 and higher) emphasis;
- Entrepreneurial fund-raising promoted at constituent levels;
- Volunteers’ play important role in major gift cultivation;
- Staff commitment to institution is stable;
- Fund-raising history creates momentum for success.

Figure 5.1:
Characteristics of Fund-Raising Effectiveness for The Ohio State University
(Data collected and analyzed between 2000-2003)
To that end, defining high-performance in the domain of higher education fund-raising relied upon integrating the following definitions:

- A high-performance team significantly outperforms all other like teams, and outperforms all reasonable expectations given its membership (Katzenbach and Smith 1999, p. 92); and,

- High-performance higher education development organizations are those whose actual performance exceeds predicted fund-raising results (Duronio and Loessin, 1991).

The Ohio State University successfully exceeded its fund-raising goals and predicted results in its last two major capital campaigns and effectively outperformed other “like teams” (i.e., similar land-grant research universities and peer institutions); hence, their development organization was selected as the focus of this research.

Focus of Research
The research foci for this study apply to The Ohio State University Development Organization as a whole and to twelve sub-units of the organization. The twelve development sub-units that were studied included:

- Senior Administrative Team (i.e., Vice President and Assistant Vice Presidents for development);
- The Office of Corporate and Foundation Giving;
- The Office of Planned Giving;
- The Office of Development Communications;
• The Office of Development Special Events;
• The Fisher College of Business;
• The College of Food, Agriculture & Environmental Sciences;
• The College of Veterinary Medicine;
• The Department of Athletics;
• The College of Engineering;
• Medical Center and Health Sciences; and,
• Merit Scholarships.

The purposes of this study were to facilitate an understanding and identification of:

- the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leaders in each of these twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as perceived by members of the organization;

- the “best practices” currently in use by the leadership of Development Organization and by each of the twelve “high performance” development sub-units at The Ohio State University;

- the leadership characteristics and patterns of behavior of the managers of the Development Organization and the leadership in each of these twelve “high performance” sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s Competing Values Framework; and,

- the organizational effectiveness of the Development Organization overall and for each of the twelve “high-performance” development sub-units as conceptualized and measured by Robert Quinn’s Competing Values Framework.

Discussion of the Results
The leadership of Vice President Jerry May was perhaps the most important and influential characteristic of effectiveness for The Ohio State University Department of Development and its success during his
tenure. Vice President May demonstrated the cognitive and behavioral complexity to use multiple frames of reference and translate his insight into purposeful action. The result was a fundamental cultural change in the Ohio State University Development Organization. Vice President May accomplished this transformation by carefully listening and assessing before he introduced and implemented his philosophy of “high performance” fund-raising, clearly articulating his expectations for organizational performance, and creating a senior leadership team of experienced development professionals who were charged with improving the performance of the University’s development program specifically as it related to successful cultivation of major-gifts.

The Vice President’s Competing Values Framework profile reveals very high scores in each of the four managerial roles found in the Open Systems and Rational Goal Models, emphasizing his strong focus on the external environment and performance. Additionally, Vice President May recorded high scores in the Coordinator, Monitor, and Facilitator roles, which are found in the Internal Process and Human Relations Models.

Briefly, the Competing Values Framework advances the conception that organizational leaders possess a behavioral repertoire unique to their cognitive complexity and experience. In other words, behavioral repertoire reflects the breadth and depth of the kinds of managerial perspectives and roles a leader can translate into action. Therefore, a broad portfolio of leadership roles improves the likelihood of an organizational leader behaving effectively given the unique circumstances of any situation. Behavioral repertoire suggests that more effective organizational leaders incorporate more leadership roles, and incorporate them to a greater extent than do less effective leaders.
The *Competing Values Framework* is structured around three dimensions reflecting the seemingly competing and contradictory beliefs people hold about how organizational performance is best attained:

- Organizational structure - Is there more of an emphasis on stability and control or flexibility and change?
- Organizational focus - Is there more of an emphasis on the internal or external environment when thinking about people and responsibilities?
- Temporal focus - Are criteria for performance evaluation keyed primarily to organizational processes (means) or to program outcomes (ends).getFieldMissingValue.

In combination, these aspects of organizational focus, structure, and time embody a conceptual framework that provides four basic models that each represent plausible orientations towards organizational effectiveness and potential high performance. These models are: *Internal Process, Rational Goal, Open Systems, and Human Relations*.

One does not have perfectly to emphasize all of the leadership roles of the *Competing Values Framework* to be an effective and valuable organizational leader. In this study, dynamic leadership was needed in order to assess organizational and individual strengths and weaknesses, portray a vision for success, establish roles, and create structure for development and implementation of “best practices.”

For example, Vice President May’s initial focus upon arriving to Ohio State was an internal one, manifest in monitoring, coordinating and facilitating organizational change. His first objective was to develop an understanding of the existing organizational processes, attitudes, and philosophies of the staff of the development organization. May was able
to play those roles successfully. He then utilized additional competencies and roles found in the Open Systems Model and Rational Goal Model: Innovator, Broker, Producer, and Director. Each of these managerial roles is focused primarily on external opportunities. For example, the Open Systems Model is defined in terms of organizational survival and expansion and the Rational Goal Model is focused on the productivity and results (Quinn, 1988).

Vice President May also empowered others to take on managerial and leadership roles ultimately creating a balanced leadership profile utilizing all four quadrants in the Development Organization. Subsequently, by establishing credibility with his staff, institutional leadership, and with university donors and prospects, May moved toward initiating additional best practices that advanced fundamental orientations found throughout the Competing Values Framework. Jerry May’s Competing Values Framework profile appears accurately to reflect his abilities to perform in seemingly paradoxical ways: he is an inspirational and visionary leader, gifted at presenting ideas and fostering change. He is politically astute, persuasive, influential, and skilled at maintaining external legitimacy, as well as proficient at simultaneously monitoring collective, organizational and personal performance, holding himself and others accountable to organizational goals, and a builder of teams.

During his tenure, Vice President May initiated a systematic methodology for change that maximized efforts toward the effectiveness of major-gift cultivation for important institutional priorities, specifically those relating to the University’s Academic Plan. With the help of the Senior Leadership Team, a clear, consistent message emphasizing Vice President May’s guiding philosophy of alignment with academic priorities and focus on major-gift cultivation was communicated to the University’s
development staff and academic leaders on campus. Structures, processes, innovations, and emphases were implemented to foster numerous *best practices* that supported May’s philosophy.

As Associate Vice President for Constituency and Campaign Giving, John Meyer’s responsibilities are coordinating, planning, and directing a comprehensive fund-raising program designed to meet the academic and non-academic priorities of every college, department, and program within the university. Meyer is also responsible for coordinating and managing strategic major-gift solicitations relating to all areas of the university and for fostering partnerships between major-gift staff and constituent staff on developing individualized relationships and solicitation strategies. The responsibilities of John Meyer’s position are primarily focused on management roles and competencies found in Quinn’s *Human Relations, Internal Process, and Rational Goal Models*.

Meyer’s leadership style is described as balanced with an emphasis on the roles found in the *Human Relations* and *Open Systems* models. Meyer was also seen as having influence in the roles of *Monitor, Coordinator, and Director*. John Meyer’s greatest strengths as leader are rooted in his abilities to examine, understand, and respond in contextually appropriate ways, as well as, at articulating the goals and objectives Vice President May emphasizes to the development staff. These strengths serve to enhance, as well as balance the leadership style of Jerry May. In many respects, John Meyer has served as a translator for Vice President May and together they have collaborated closely to develop methodologies, organizational structures, and best practices and then communicate them to the development staff.
John Meyer’s leadership style reflects a strong emphasis on team building and the development of people. Most of his time is spent on issues relating to the internal environment, specifically those associated with listening and communicating effectively, as well as facilitating and coordinating organizational initiatives and performance.

During Linda Seitz’s tenure as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts, she was responsible for planning and directing a comprehensive major-gift ($100,000+) solicitation program for individual, corporate, and foundation prospects residing in regions throughout the United States. Her specific objectives in that role were to implement immediate and long-range fund-raising strategies throughout eight regions of the country to identify, cultivate, and solicit private support for the fund-raising priorities of the university, colleges, and programs.

Additional responsibilities included fostering partnerships between regional major-gift staff and constituent-staff to develop individualized relationships and solicitation strategies, as well as work closely with deans and directors to develop support for fund-raising initiatives in the regions. The Competing Values Framework data for Linda Seitz showed that in her role as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts she was skilled at making people feel part of a collective effort, managing conflict, and managing organizational stress and pressure well. Seitz particularly embraced competencies found in the Human Relations Model, such as communicating effectively; understanding and developing others; managing conflict; participative decision making; and, team building.

The primary responsibilities for Gray Kitsmiller as Assistant Vice President for Administration relate most specifically to providing human resource management, information services, research, prospect
management, and administration support to staff within University Development, which includes finance and budgeting for the entire Development Organization. These responsibilities rely heavily on internal control, a focus found in the *Internal Process Model*. Although his responsibilities were aligned closely with roles and responsibilities found in the Internal Process Model, Kitsmiller’s leadership style was very focused on people and their professional development. Gary Kitsmiller demonstrated an ability to balance his need to monitor his staff with a capacity to develop their potential, as well as manage the collective performance of each of the units that reported to him.

The composite *Competing Values Framework* profile for Leadership for the Senior Administrative Team profile was very balanced. Seven of the eight leadership roles measured received scores at or above 1.0 and the top four scores coming from each of the four *Competing Values Framework* quadrants: *Director*, *Innovator*, *Facilitator*, and *Coordinator*.

The Senior Administrative Team’s highest scores were found in the *Human Relations* quadrant, suggesting members of this Team share a strong sense of commitment and morale with each other, as well as in the roles they play in leading the University’s Department of Development. Additionally, the Senior Administrative Team scored highly in the opposite quadrant, *Rational Goal Model*, which emphasizes commitment to direction and goal clarity, as well as productivity and accomplishment. This finding suggests that the participants remained committed to both high-performance in the context of organizational achievement and to the development officers as people in terms of helping them enhance and their skills and pursue their career goals.
The Senior Administrative Team also demonstrated characteristics found in the *Open Systems Model*. These capacities are rooted in an inventive, creative style of management, in which members of the Senior Administrative Team are capable of recognizing uncertainty by observing and analyzing the external environment, identifying important trends relevant to their particular areas of responsibility, and conceptualizing and facilitating appropriate innovations to maintain high-performance. These were important skills because throughout Vice President May’s tenure, he relied upon the Senior Administrative Team to implement and develop “*best practices*” that embodied his philosophy of high-performance university development.

The benefit of such a balanced leadership portfolio is the leadership team does not over emphasize any particular role or management philosophy to the exclusion of the others. As a result, the group is able to utilize various roles, competencies, and philosophies in concert to achieve organizational goals.

**Process Best practices**

1) *Establishing credibility and assessing structure and personnel*: Recognizing the potential for the University’s Development Organization to be highly successful, Vice President May upon his arrival began working towards establishing credibility with the existing development staff and other university leaders. He spent his first year learning about and adjusting the organization’s structure and personnel. May believed it was important to understand the organizational philosophy, structure, and culture first-hand from the perspective of the University development team.
His initial focus was on understanding and then analyzing the system carefully, finding strengths to be built upon and weaknesses to be eliminated. Vice President May accomplished this over the course of several months by meeting with various small focus groups of 8 to 12 people. This was done systematically, and in doing so Vice President May was able to meet with all of the development staff and engage them in substantive conversations about their perceptions of the programs and processes used in the organization in a relatively short period of time.

This approach provided valuable traction for May because he developed rapport with the staff and he gained valuable insights into the culture, structure, mind-set, and effectiveness of the organization. By establishing credibility and assessing structure and personnel, May was able to take his first steps toward effectively building a high-performance organization.

This best practice potentially could apply to any size or type of higher education institution with a new administrative officer. The end result likely will manifest itself in personal credibility if time is taken to listen carefully and then accurately use the perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of the organization and its personnel, and the culture, morale, and effectiveness of the organization rather than ignore the information once generated.

2) *Fostering focus, motivation, expectations, and accountability:*

The process of fostering focus, motivation, expectations, and accountability proved to be a key for successful and meaningful organizational change at The Ohio State University. Fundamentally, Jerry May and his Senior Administrative Team promoted an atmosphere that embraced “change” as an opportunity for greater success rather
than a threat. This best practice was evident in a variety of ways, serving as the foundation for developing many of the other “best practices” in the organization.

Vice President May’s ability to effectively communicate his vision for success for the Development Organization overall, as well as articulate specific goals and expectations for each of the development sub-units and supplementary programs that comprise the organization and his ability to use a team process in focus, motivation, expectation, and accountability were key elements in this best practice. The team included both the Senior Administrative Team and additional senior-level leaders of the Leadership Prospect Group.

Soon job descriptions were redrawn to reflect a clear focus on major-gift cultivation. Additionally, all development officers regardless of their positions (i.e., annual giving, planned giving, corporate & foundations giving, or major gifts) were asked to increase the number of formal “asks” (i.e., solicitations they made). The motivations for this were rooted in the desire to shape the culture of philanthropy at Ohio State by inspiring both the donor-base and the development staff to invest in the success of the University.

Although the specifics of roles, assignments, and practices at The Ohio State University do not generalize broadly because they are context specific, the transferability of this best practice is worthy of analysis. The essential process of fostering focus, motivation, expectations, and accountability is manifest by articulating a vision for the future of the organization and working to attain alignment with that vision with a team process. A similar process could result in methodologies that are appropriate to virtually any institution of higher education. As long as
the process involves communicating specific roles and assignments, philosophies, and practices that support the performance and goals of the organization, then it is likely that this best practice can prove beneficial to the organization. The need to create and communicate specific roles, personnel assignments, philosophies and practices within an institutional context is the key component to this practice.

3) **Empowering a Leadership Team:**
Vice President May assembled and empowered a leadership team whose balanced portfolio of managerial competencies helped successfully to articulate May’s vision of success and transform the organization into a “high-performance” organization. The Senior Administrative Team and Leadership Prospect Group operated in a collegial rather than hierarchical fashion. They crystallized consistency with their vision, responsibility, and accountability for themselves in their sub-units. Teams were improved throughout the sub-units.

In this circumstance, Vice President May simultaneously served as both *Facilitator* and *Coordinator* by working with various groups, fostering teamwork and cooperation, and by placing the “right” people in the “right” positions, as well as creating new work teams and sub-units. These management strategies and behaviors emphasize the cohesion, morale, and stability May’s emphasized upon his arrival to the University.

The value of empowering a leadership teams was in their collective efforts to promote similar values, articulate the vision, and participate in the creation and achievement of organizational and sub-unit objectives and goals. The impact of a compelling vision for the future can fall flat if
leadership does not utilize the “vision” as a tool for creating specific and concrete strategies and tactics for realizing the intent of the “vision” itself and utilize teams throughout the organization to get this done.

To that end, the transferability of this particular best practice is limited to its’ underlying concept: promoting values, articulating a vision, and using leaders to staff teams, create and achieve organizational and sub-unit objectives and goals. Therefore, it seems to be to create and empower a leadership team charged with specific organizational responsibilities, managing specific sub-units, and articulating and reinforcing the importance of focus, motivation, expectations, and accountability.

The empowerment of a leadership team is an important procedural best practice; however, the creation of one depends to a great extent on the size and structure of college or university’s development organization. Almost every large major university and college in the country could develop a similar leadership team similar to the one described in this study; however, specific variations would need to be made to accommodate for the institution and personnel that comprise the development organization.

Alternative models depend upon the size of the institution. Smaller private liberal arts colleges could have only one team, the development director, a few staff and chairs of departments. In this case, the director could be leading each department’s fund-raising efforts, as well as those of the total institution. Creating specific responsibilities, managing efforts in clear and consistent ways, and employing focus, expectations and accountability that match the context of the institution seems to be a best practice that would apply broadly.
4) Keeping talented staff:
The Development Organization at The Ohio State University retained talented staff during Jerry May’s tenure as Vice President. The Vice President and the Senior Leadership Team achieved this objective through the creation of “ladders.” At this institution the term “ladders” refers to the addition of substantive additional roles and responsibilities to one’s portfolio.

The benefit of utilizing ladders allowed members of the Senior Leadership Team and Leadership Prospect Group to expand their level of influence in the development organization. Thus, talented, experienced development professionals were permitted to increase their own roles in development program. In the case of less experienced, yet talented staff, the same principle applied: portfolios of responsibility were enhanced allowing greater interaction with the leadership team and larger roles within their units. Subsequently, “ladders” also stimulated the emerging capacity for high-performance in the organization.

A priority for most organizational leaders is keeping talented staff. The challenge however often lies in the ability of leadership to create meaningful career advancement opportunities within the organization for the most valuable members of the staff. The specific practices described in this study probably would be transferable to most development organizations with the exception of those units that are only two and three person operations. In small liberal arts colleges, for example, except for two or three development staff members, academic department chairs, and faculty play roles similar to sub-unit staff in large universities. Ladders would not be incentives to faculty and academic administration because their mission and rewards are found elsewhere.
This best practice therefore obviously depends on the particular characteristics and context of the institution. Expanding roles could include supervising other development officers from other colleges and constituencies and participation in senior leadership meetings at large universities. In addition, increasing the responsibilities for talented development officers, in many respects is also publicly acknowledging the contributions and value of that person.

Substantive Best practices

1) Focus on major-gift cultivation and formal “asks:”

As Vice President May redirected the organizational focus towards major-gift cultivation with an emphasis on gifts of $100,000 or more. His assessment of the performance of the development program was that the University had been missing opportunities to cultivate large gifts by not focusing enough time and resources in this area. To that end, all development officers regardless of their positions (i.e., annual giving, planned giving, corporate & foundations giving, or major gifts) were asked to increase the number of formal “asks” (i.e., solicitations they made) and directed to focus on cultivating donors who could make gifts of at least $25,000 and with an emphasis on $100,000 or more.

The transferability of this best practice to other institutions depends on several factors, including whether the vice president for development wants to focus on major-gift cultivation at the expense of the annual giving program. For small programs with small budgets, the focus on major-gift cultivation may revolve around on-campus visits, telephone communications and letters to potential donors. For smaller development programs it may also be unrealistic or unproductive to move away from a primary focus on the annual-giving because of the
tradition and culture of annual donations from graduates. Another consideration is the size of the available development staff and the budget for traveling to visit and cultivate major donors in person on multiple occasions. For most colleges and universities, however, the largest percentages of donors come from private gifts from a small portion of the donor-base. In this respect, it is important to implement a system that focuses on major-gift cultivation and formal asks, and this may require tweaking commensurate with the context and environment of the institution.

2) **Align with academic priorities of the University:**
Vice President May emphasized the importance of Aligning the University’s development objectives to the academic priorities of the University, stressing the need to be “value-added” to the academic leadership of the University. Subsequently, the fund-raising initiatives and underlying philosophy for the Department Organization reflected and supported the University’s most important priorities. The advantage of aligning University-wide, college-specific, and departmental fund-raising priorities to the University’s *Academic Plan* resulted in consistency and collaboration between development staff and academic leaders in the pursuit of excellence.

This best practice was implemented by having each academic college as well as other constituencies such as the Department of athletics submitted their priorities for fund-raising. Next Jerry May and John Meyer met extensively with the president, provost, and academic deans to determine specific institutional priorities that would become development priorities.
The next step in aligning the institution’s development objectives with University academic priorities involved creating a clear and compelling case statement outlining fund-raising priorities that emphasized the academic impact and transformational potential of philanthropic gifts to Ohio State. Hence, academic leaders and development staff were consistently and collaboratively communicating the same vision for excellence and development staff transmitted this into marketing statements focused on academic and transformational impact that might attract gifts.

Perhaps the most fundamental and potentially transferable best practice identified in this research is the importance of strategically aligning development objectives with the academic priorities of the institution. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways; however, the most important aspect of this best practice is directing resources towards the most important and fundable elements of an institution’s academic plan. Of course, this assumes there is an academic plan. Thus, candid conversations with academic leaders (with and especially without an academic plan) about the priorities that will appeal to the existing donor-base are essential.

3) **Cultivate internal partners:**

The practice of cultivating internal partners, particularly academic leaders was an essential element in the transformation of the Ohio State University Development Organization into a “high-performance” major-gift focused program. The president, the provost, and the deans are some of the most important partners development staff had as volunteers. Vice President May and his leadership team articulated the importance and value of personal involvement by academic leaders and other “key” partners. May, as well as many other participants in this
study stressed the point that relationships between the development organization and with “key” academic partners in concert with strategic and specific alignment of development goals with academic priorities are essential components to success and productivity. Further, Vice President May expected development officers to communicate clearly with their deans and other academic partners that their visits and continued contact with potential donors were essential to the successful cultivation of major-gifts.

This is an important point. Vice President May believed that, “the amount of time the President puts into fundraising is directly proportionate to the amount of dollars raised.” This judgment was echoed by many of the participants of this research. Hence, one of the most effective innovations developed at this institution was a fundraising program for deans at the beginning of the Affirm Thy Friendship campaign. The objective was to clearly communicate with deans the value of participating in fund-raising and the relationship between their involvement and their success in raising money. It is likely that when a president, provost or dean describe their vision for the institution or particular constituency face-to-face with a prospect, that the message has greater impact and meaning than if it had come from a development officer only. Hence, by explaining the important roles academic leaders can play in cultivating major-gifts for their college, this vice president and staff introduced them to a philosophy of “high-performance” development.

All of these characteristics may be transferable to a wide range of colleges and universities. If major-gifts do increase with building such relationships and the direct involvement of key academic officers, As was the case in this institution, and increasing major-gifts a goal, then,
development officers should attempt to cultivate strong working relationships with their “key” academic partners and help them operate as an extension of the “key” academic partners’ leadership and power (Halton, 2002). Hence, strong credibility with the president or chancellor of a college or university, as well as, respect and good standing with the vice presidents and trustworthiness with the deans and other academic partners all seem important and transferable as a “best practice.”

4) *Emphasize the importance of collaboration and teamwork*:

Today many development organizations are arranged in ways that foster (sometimes unintentionally) a culture of competition between development units. The Ohio State University Development Organization however, emphasized the importance of and operationalized collaboration and teamwork. At all levels, senior leadership, prospect managers, and activity managers, activity managers, and across sub-units, visits were made to prospective donors regardless of the nature of the goal of solicitation. This reinforced partnering at all levels and decreased a development officer’s tendency to want to “own” a prospect. Credit was given equally for all levels of participation on contact report forms and columns were added to list partners who went on appointments together. This eliminated the need for each development officer to fill out reports for the same appointment and also served to reinforce the partnering concept. It forced development officers to work together on developing next steps.

Performance reviews were changed to reward partnering and collaboration, rather than individual or competitive practices, such as hiding effective practices, ideas, or insights. Hence, development officers were expected to share information, *best practices*, and ideas, and insights amongst each other, as well as visit prospects together when
appropriate. Participants reported that because information sharing and collegiality became a part of the organizational culture, many strategies emerged that benefited both the University as a whole and constituent-based priorities.

This *best practice* seems transferable to virtually any organization large enough to have teams of staff. A key process in implementing this philosophy is developing a system that expects and rewards partnering and collaboration. For example, in this study multiple credits were awarded for collaborative gift solicitations and donor cultivation and purely individual efforts were called into question. By rewarding collaboration, senior leadership can communicate clearly the value it places on the culture of teamwork.

5) *Have multiple relationships with donors and prospects:* Another best practice emphasized by the Senior Administrative Team was the importance of having multiple relationships with donors and prospects. This practice is grounded in the concept that continuous and varied donor relationships with “key” faculty, administrators and development officers ultimately strengthens the bond between the donor and the institution; thus, increasing donor loyalty over time. Multiple relationships with donors and prospects also protected the University from losing cultivation opportunities when development officers were promoted to different areas of the University or when they moved to other institutions. The genesis of this best practice is rooted in the previous best practice of collaboration and teamwork amongst the development staff, while simultaneously shaping the culture of philanthropy at Ohio State by inspiring the donors and prospects alike to invest in the future of the University.
The transferability of this best practice to different kinds of colleges and universities depends on the size and type of institution. For example, in large universities not every prospect will have the opportunity to get to know the president; however, in organizations structured similarly to Ohio State, there are numerous opportunities to interact with deans and faculty, as well as with development officers from across the university (e.g., regional major-gift staff, planned giving officers, senior administrators). Development officers from smaller colleges (public and public) typically can introduce all major-gift prospects to the president of the institution and academic representatives. In any event, in this study it was beneficial to develop meaningful relationships between donors and prospects with several appropriate members of the development staff and the “key” academic partners. Ultimately, multiple relationships kept prospects and donors in-touch with the institution, interested and informed of the latest goings-on, and invited to various events. Over time, a reciprocal friendship develops between prospects and the institution.

6) Create roles for volunteers:
The use of volunteers has been another best practice that has helped transform the organizational culture of development at The Ohio State University, as well as enhance its performance overall. Several of the participants in this study commented on the importance of engaging volunteers in initiatives and projects that they feel passionate about supporting. The benefit for the University has been that many volunteers provide important resources in the form of time, money, networks via personal and professional relationships, and enthusiasm and conviction for the priorities of Ohio State. The key appeared to be providing volunteers with meaningful, challenging responsibilities that
both advance the university’s fund-raising priorities and connect with the passion of the volunteer. The result is that volunteers become “insiders” at the University.

Creating roles for volunteers is important because these are the friends and advocates for the institution who live in communities across the country. They serve as important informal leaders who can articulate the institution’s mission, vision, values, and academic priorities because they are institutional “insiders.” Additionally, these individuals are asked to help identify and cultivate additional prospects for important institutional initiatives as well as provide credible feedback from outside of the college or university. Volunteers also are prospects. When volunteers with financial capacity to be major-gift donors become engaged in and inspired by the institution they also become potential prospects for major-gifts.

The transferability of this best practice depends to a great extent on the degree to which the development program is staff driven or volunteer driven. In either case, most development organizations rely on some kind of volunteerism. To that end, it seems important to identify initiatives for volunteers that pique their interests and present opportunities for involvement in meaningful ways. By helping to raise money, promoting the institution, recruiting and persuading others to become involved in fund-raising, sitting on advisory boards and committees, knowing about the needs of the institution, volunteers can play a substantially important role in securing large gifts for the institution. Therefore, the likelihood of successful transfer of this practice seems promising.
7) **Redefine roles of the Foundation Board:**

This *best practice* is an extension of the preceding innovation. The Ohio State University Foundation Board serves to identify, cultivate, solicit, and steward the relationships with major-donors. In this study it appeared to be important to select members to this who were either close to making a substantially large gift to the institution, or those who already have done so. Hence, both the creation of such a board at a public institution and the selection criteria appear to be important considerations. Development officers worked closely with specific Foundation Board members because of the Board members’ professional and personal networks.

Volunteer boards can be very helpful in terms of advancing institutional fund-raising priorities if there are assigned significant roles and substantive responsibilities. Each Foundation Board member at The Ohio State University typically worked with two prospect managers on the staff. These development officers were primarily responsible for cultivating a major-gift for the University, while the other sought volunteers for additional University fund-raising projects.

The transferability of this particular *best practice* is dependent upon the existing role of the institution’s trustees and the existence or creation of such boards. For example, in many private colleges and universities, institutional trustees play a significant role in the development process similar to their Board at Ohio State University; however, for public colleges and universities whose boards may not have the expectation and/or culture of supporting development priorities, the creation of a Foundation Board or redefinition of trustee’s responsibilities may be valuable as it was for Ohio State University.
Create a centralized/decentralized organizational model:

The advantage of this best practice is in its integration of two seemingly competing schools of thoughts on how to organize. The Ohio State University model utilized the integration of centralization and decentralization by physically placing college-based development staff in the colleges and locating initiative-driven development staff centrally. In addition to this, organization-wide resources including the Office of Planned Giving, the Office of Corporate and Foundations Giving, the Office of Development Communications, the Office of Development Special Events, the Office of Development Research, Merit and Honors Scholarships, Annual Giving, Human Resources, and Alumni Database and Information Systems (ADIS) were both centrally located and available to all development staff.

In this model, staff members, regardless of their location, are hired and paid, promoted and fired, or transferred by centralized development leadership and management. The advantage of this centralized/decentralized model is that college-based development officers develop relationships with and know the needs of important internal academic partners such as their dean, college communications staff and outreach directors, and other “key” faculty members, while also enjoying access to important centralized resources. Therefore, the transferability of this best practice depends on several factors such as whether the leadership in development believes a marriage of the two perspectives is valuable, and whether the staff is large enough to deploy across campus as well as remain centralized.
9) Use of *Focused Meetings and Groups Focused on Strategy*:

At Ohio State University the strategic use of meetings is an essential component for creating and maintaining a high-performance development organization. The findings of this study reveal that guiding values for the development organization were alignment with the *Academic Plan*, teamwork, major gift focus, and using collaboration in relating to potential major-gift donors. Vice President May utilized several kinds of meetings while at Ohio State to foster these values; however, three types of meeting in particular emerged as *best practices*: Leadership Prospect Group, Prospect Planning Group, and staff meetings. Leadership Prospect Group focused on University-wide prospects with million-dollar potential, and Prospect Planning Group focused on the highest-profile prospects and initiatives for a particular college or constituency. Staff meetings were also important because the college-based development staff usually left with a more global vision of what’s going on in the Development Organization overall, and how it relates to both their particular area of responsibility and the University overall. Two specific and regularly occurring items in staff meetings were identified as *best practices*: The *Vice President’s Report*, and the various kinds of special presentations the Senior Team arranged for the staff during the meeting.

Special presentations included several actual case studies on issues relating to development. Whereas, Vice President May’s address typically conveyed and reinforced the vision and direction of the Development Organization by relating the importance of the staff as contributors to the on-going success of The Ohio State University. He often used supporting material to convey his points, and made use of specific examples about how other universities and non-profits pursue success. Jerry May was an inspirational public speaker who challenged his staff to push...
themselves to achieve even more than they had already achieved while consistently connecting his vision for the Department of Development to the academic priorities of the University.

The transferability of this best practice relies on the characteristic strategies of the senior leader and the willingness of organizational leaders to structure meetings in ways that assure they are focused on the core values and objectives of the institution and developing strategies and tactics to that end.

**Summary and Implications**

In order for the best practices described in this research to be effective, the organization needed sophisticated leadership. Cameron (1986), Quinn, (1988 & 1996), and Torbert, (1987, 1991, 1998) all identify organizational leaders as “a” or “the” key ingredient achieving organizational success and high performance. Behavioral and cognitive complexity seems to be needed by effective organizational leaders. The findings of this study suggest that leadership, particularly the leadership demonstrated by Vice President Jerry May and the Senior Administrative Team appeared to be diverse and they were complex themselves. They may be the foundation for achieving high-performance for their development organization.

Torbert (1991) and Quinn (1988) have advanced the concept that leaders who have the capacity to recognize, interpret, and effectively respond to paradox and incorporate what appear to be contradictory concepts. This staff used innovative strategies to embrace paradox. Again, they engaged in cognitively and behaviorally complex ways that served to transform the organization into an increasingly dynamic, effective, and valuable asset to Ohio State University.
In studying effectiveness in colleges and universities, Cameron (1986) asked, “What accounts for the improvement of organizational effectiveness over time in colleges?” He reported three findings:

- Institutions that improve in effectiveness over time have an infusion of new leadership and vision at the top as well as continuity and stability among top administrators;
- Improving institutions emphasize and reinforce internal morale issues among institution members, while simultaneously reacting to external demands and are sensitive to market issues; and,
- The major predictors of improving effectiveness overwhelmingly are factors under the control of managers.

The results of this study also suggest that each of these factors were present in The Ohio State University Development Organization throughout the tenure of Jerry May. As Quinn and Cameron (1996) point out, understanding paradox and using paradoxical perspectives can influence and augment our thinking about organization and management. Paradox can help some individuals who are complex enough in their thinking to become energized and develop higher levels of performance (Ford and Backoff). Understanding and responding appropriately to complexity has considerable positive impact on both the management and leadership of institutions of higher education, and in this particular case, on the Development Organization at The Ohio State University. The ability to capitalize on paradox and utilize multiple frameworks of reference reflected the behavioral and cognitive complexity of the Vice President, the Senior Administrative Team and the Leadership Prospect Group.
For example, development officers and those in senior leadership positions were expected successfully to cultivate internal and external partners, prospects, and donors; advance the academic goals of the University; balance the unique demands of a centralized and decentralized organizational model; promote a culture of productivity while simultaneously fostering collaboration and teamwork; and cultivate major-gift prospects while also developing smaller prospects with major-gift potential for the future. Rather than viewing the complexity of the environmental demands on the organization in an “either/or” orientation, the Vice President and his leadership team were capable of embracing the complexity of their environment, assessed their challenges, developed goals, advanced new philosophies for major-gift fund-raising, and effectively created a new organization with new best practices that embraced “both/and” thinking and achievement.

Without formally knowing about the Competing Values Framework, the Senior Administrative Team for the Ohio State University Development Organization successfully addressed three fundamental challenges to practitioners described by Quinn, et. al (1996):

- use multiple frameworks and perspectives for understanding the organizational environment;
- use orientations and competencies associated with each of the four management models; and,
- integrate the diverse competencies described in the Competing Values Framework in responding to the myriad challenges and opportunities inherent in the environment.

These competencies occurred as a function of experience and cognitive complexity of these leaders without references or knowing of Quinn’s Competing Values Framework. Hence, experience and cognitive
complexity may be the essential factors in this kind of leadership, regardless of knowing or not knowing about research and theories that describe their kind of leadership. Further, as indicated previously, the *best practices* that emerged from this study may be transferred to similar university development organizations and possibly to smaller organizations with adaptation.

Particular focus was placed on understanding the organization’s guiding *best practices*, which were identified as - commitment to major-gift cultivation, emphasis on teamwork and collaboration, and commitment to alignment of development objectives to academic priorities of the University. These *best practices* were identified in each development sub-unit studied in this research. The magnitude of these fundamental *best practices* was enhanced when combined with unit-specific innovations and *best practices* addressing specific characteristics unique to the culture, environment, staffing, budget, and development goals for each of the high-performance development sub-units studied and were discussed extensively in Chapter 4.

Anchoring unit-specific innovations to alignment, collaboration, and major-gift cultivation played a critical role transforming The Ohio State University Development Organization into an innovative and productive major-gifts focused program – one that has become essential to the success of the institution. Several *best practices* that contributed to advancing development priorities of the University included, various types of strategic planning meetings, utilizing internal and external volunteers, and relying on central development resources, such as the services provided by the offices of planned giving, corporate and foundations giving, special events, and communications.
The Senior Administrative Team developed a process for annual review of major-gifts development officers that examined his or her interactions with volunteers, faculty, or development staff who interact with major donor prospects, as well as their willingness to collaborate with members of the entire institutional development organization: annual giving, planned giving, corporate and foundations giving, and other constituencies. O’Brien (1993) advances the importance of fostering teamwork and creating criteria for evaluation to that end. The value placed on collaboration was reinforced by developing new ways to evaluate collaboration and reward those development officers who utilized opportunities for teamwork while advancing university priorities.

To summarize, the findings of this research effectively serve as a validity study of the *Competing Values Framework* because Jerry May embraced and utilized a broad and comprehensive portfolio of leadership competencies.

Upon arrival to Ohio State University, Jerry May played internally focused leadership roles found in the *Competing Values Framework* until he felt comfortable with the direction, performance, and abilities of the organization and its’ senior leaders. At that point, he began to settle into externally focused leadership roles and preferences that were more natural to him, while relying on others in senior leadership positions to perform in internally focused roles in an on-going basis. As a result, the organization maintained a balanced leadership portfolio over the duration of Vice President May’s tenure.

The findings of this study also emphasize the interaction between the *Competing Values Framework* Leadership profile for Jerry May and the creation and on-going life of “best practices” once leadership has
changed. It seems that Vice President May’s *Competing Values Framework* style had significant impact on the *process best practices* utilized by the organization; however, will these best practices continue once he leaves? For example, dynamic meetings such as LPG and PPG seem to be depended upon May’s facilitation and vision for their benefit. Will these meetings continue to have benefit once Vice President May leaves the organization? Other *best practices*, both process and substantive, seem to be less depended on May because they were adopted and internalized by members of the organization at all levels. Will these *best practices* continue to benefit the organization once May leaves?

The qualitative data suggests that broad ownership emerged for *substantive and some process best practices* and were not solely dependent on the leadership style of Jerry May. In time, staff members and organizational managers saw that they worked, bought in and fostered ownership in the best practice itself.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies**

It is important to note that very little scholarly research has been conducted examining the leadership characteristics of administrators in higher education development organizations. No research was identified that focused specifically on Chief Development Officers, their administrative teams, or development professionals in general that employed the *Competing Values Framework*.

- This study only examined ten development units. In the future it would be interesting to study every unit of the organization to
understand what the high-performance units are doing in terms of *best practices* and leadership versus the practices and leadership characteristics of lower performing units.

- This study only examined the *best practices*, organizational performance, and leadership at The Ohio State University, a land-grant, research 1 institution. Future research could explore *best practices*, organizational performance, and leadership of other colleges and universities. By doing so, the results could help our understanding of “*best practices*” at religious universities, liberal arts colleges, and prestigious private universities.

- There was no way to be certain that the *Competing Values Framework: Self-Assessment* instruments were completed from the perspective of “how I am” versus “how I want to be.” For example, all of the members of the Senior Administrative Team perceived themselves as high in the same external areas as Jerry May. These perceptions could be accurate, or they could be perceptions of “how I want to be.” Others perceived these senior members differently than these self-perceptions.

- Because the difference between high-performance organizations and low-performance organizations may be a function of managerial leadership, the *Competing Values Framework* can be used to consider the following:
  - Develop heightened insight into organizational tendencies, practices, leadership, and values;
  - Harness synergistic tensions that exist in seemingly competing managerial roles and philosophies;
  - Focus on innovations and creativity;
- Foster desirable cultural change;
- Facilitate the creation of a shared vision for success;
- Communicate organizational expectations and goals;
- Improve strategic planning for the organization overall and for its' sub-units;
- Develop high-performance teams and leaders;
- Improve performance-management methods, such as evaluations;
- Enhance overall performance.
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APPENDIX A

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Productivity, Accomplishment
Flexibility

Innovation, Adaptation
Growth, Resource acquisition

Commitment, Morale
Participation, Openness
Documentation, Information management
Stability, Control

Production, Accomplishment
Direction, Goal clarity

HUMAN RELATIONS MODEL
OPEN SYSTEMS MODEL

INTERNAL PROCESS MODEL
RATIONAL GOAL MODEL

Control
APPENDIX B

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: COMPETENCIES AND LEADERSHIP ROLES
1. Understanding self and others
2. Communicating effectively
3. Developing subordinates

1. Building teams
2. Using participative decision making
3. Managing conflict

1. Monitoring personal performance
2. Managing collective performance
3. Managing organizational

1. Managing projects
2. Designing work
3. Managing across functions

1. Visioning, planning and goal setting
2. Designing and organizing
3. Delegating effectively

Flexibility

External

Internal

Control

HUMAN RELATIONS MODEL

OPEN SYSTEMS MODEL

RATIONAL GOAL MODEL
APPENDIX C
PARTICIPATION LETTER REQUEST
June 12, 2001

Dear __________:

I am an Ohio State University doctoral student from the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership in the College of Education. As part of my dissertation research, I am conducting a study exploring the best practices of high-performance and the characteristics of leadership in a university development office.

The purpose of this study is to facilitate an understanding and identification of the “best practices” and leadership characteristics currently in use by ten “high performance” development sub-units at The Ohio State University and of the organization as a whole. I have met with Jerry May and John Meyer and have received permission from them to study the organization. Together we identified your office as a high performance unit; consequently, I would like to ask you to participate in this research.

If you agree to participate, I will contact you to arrange three interviews and ask that you complete the enclosed sixteen-item questionnaire about your management style. For your convenience I have included a self-addressed label so that you may return your questionnaires to me via campus mail. I will also ask staff members who represent functional layers of your unit to provide their assessment of your management style using the same questionnaire. Each interview will last between thirty-five minutes and an hour and the questionnaire will take no longer than 5 or 10 minutes to complete. I will tape record and transcribe each of our interviews. Because your participation in this study will not be anonymous, you will have an opportunity to read my transcriptions and clarify any inaccuracies in my reporting of our discussions, as well as add any pertinent contextual information to the interview write-up.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw your consent at any time during the study. It is important to remember this study will focus on the successful practices used in the offices and leadership styles used by development officers. I do not believe there will be anything threatening to you in any of these interviews.
In order to better understand high-performance, leadership, and university development your help is essential to this study’s success. I would greatly appreciate your participation.

If you have any questions, please call James Azzaro (688-4582), John Meyer, Assistant Vice-President for Development (688-3250), or Dr. Robert Rodgers, Professor of Educational Policy and Leadership (292-7700).

Sincerely,

James Azzaro
Doctoral Student
Educational Policy and Leadership

Robert F. Rodgers
Associate Professor
Educational Policy and Leadership
APPENDIX D

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: SELF ASSESSMENT
Competing Values Leadership Instrument: Self-Assessment

Listed below are some statements that describe management behaviors. You should indicate how often you engage in these behaviors. Please use the following scale to respond to each statement. Place a number from 1 to 7 in the space just before each of the items.

Very Infrequently  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Frequently

In doing my job, I

1. listen to the personal problems of subordinates.
2. meticulously review detailed reports.
3. influence decisions made at higher levels.
4. do problem solving in creative, clear ways.
5. clearly define areas of responsibility for subordinates.
6. display a wholehearted commitment to the job.
7. facilitate consensus building in work-group sessions.
8. protect continuity in day-to-day operations.
9. compare records, reports, etc. to detect any discrepancies in them.
10. show empathy and concern in dealing with subordinates.
11. set clear objectives for the work unit.
12. search for innovations and potential improvements.
13. work on maintaining a network of influence and contacts.
14. insist on minimum disruption to the work flow.
15. reflect high motivation for my role.
16. encourage participative decision making in work-group sessions.
APPENDIX E

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Competing Values Organizational Effectiveness Instrument

Listed below are some statements that describe organizational performance. You should indicate how often they occur in your unit. Please use the following scale to respond to each statement. Place a number from 1 to 7 in the space just before each of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Infrequently</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

_____ 1. The work process is coordinated and under control.
_____ 2. Participative decision making is widely and appropriately employed.
_____ 3. Rules, procedures, and formal methods guide work.
_____ 4. The goals are clearly understood by most members.
_____ 5. The work effort is usually intense.
_____ 6. There is a stable, predictable work environment.
_____ 7. Innovation is stressed.
_____ 8. There is a positive interpersonal climate.
_____ 9. Quantification and measurement are key parts of the work environment.
_____ 10. Consensual decision making is encouraged.
_____ 11. Outsiders perceive it as a vibrant, high potential unit.
_____ 12. Creative insights, hunches, and innovative ideas are encouraged.
_____ 13. It is easy to give an explanation of the overall objectives of the unit.
_____ 14. There is a constant striving for greater accomplishment.
_____ 15. Employees feel as though they really belong to a unit.
_____ 16. The unit has the image of a growing, dynamic system.
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CONCENT FORM
Research Consent Form

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  Protocol No. __________

Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research

I consent to participating in research entitled **Understanding a High Performance University Development Organization: Leadership and Best Practices.**

*Robert F. Rodgers (Principle Investigator)* or authorized representative *James Azzaro (Co-Investigator)* has explained the purpose of this study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue my participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I agree to have my interviews audio taped and understand that transcriptions will be provided to me to make any changes or corrections that I find necessary. I understand that my own name and the office in which I work will identify me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily.

Signed: ___________________________  Date: ________________
(Research Participant)

Signed: ___________________________
(Principle Investigator or Authorized Representative)
APPENDIX G

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: VIEW OF (MANAGER’S NAME)
Competing Values Leadership Instrument: View of (_________)

Listed below are some statements that describe management behaviors. You should indicate how often the person you are describing engages in these behaviors. Please use the following scale to respond to each statement. Place a number from 1 to 7 in the space just before each of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Infrequently</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In doing my job, this person

_____ 1. listens to the personal problems of subordinates.

_____ 2. meticulously reviews detailed reports.

_____ 3. influences decisions made at higher levels.

_____ 4. does problem solving in creative, clear ways.

_____ 5. clearly defines areas of responsibility for subordinates.

_____ 6. displays a wholehearted commitment to the job.

_____ 7. facilitates consensus building in work-group sessions.

_____ 8. protects continuity in day-to-day operations.

_____ 9. compares records, reports, etc. to detect any discrepancies in them.

_____ 10. shows empathy and concern in dealing with subordinates.

_____ 11. sets clear objectives for the work unit.

_____ 12. searches for innovations and potential improvements.

_____ 13. works on maintaining a network of influence and contacts.

_____ 14. insists on minimum disruption to the work flow.

_____ 15. reflects high motivation for my role.

_____ 16. encourages participative decision making in work-group sessions.
APPENDIX H
PARTICIPATION LETTER REQUEST #2
June 12, 2001

To:

From: James Azzaro, Doctoral Student, Educational Policy & Leadership

Re: Research Project: Understanding a High Performance University Development Organization: Leadership and Best Practices

You and other members of the university development organization have been asked to complete the enclosed 16-item questionnaire entitled, Competing Values Instrument: View of Others in conjunction with dissertation research conducted by James Azzaro. I have received permission from Jerry May and John Meyer to study the organization and have received approval from the Office of Research Risks and Protection to conduct this study.

If you agree to participate, I ask that you to answer each question with Linda Seitz in her role as Assistant Vice President for Major Gifts in mind. The questionnaire should take no longer than ten minutes to complete. The information you provide will be confidential and you will not be identified by your responses. The data will be summarized with the responses of others who complete this instrument describing the management behaviors of those you have evaluated to create a profile of her leadership and management characteristics.

I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience so that you may return your questionnaires to me as soon as possible. In order to better understand high-performance, leadership, and university development your help is essential to this study’s success. I would greatly appreciate your participation. If you have any questions, please call James Azzaro (688-4582) or John Meyer, Assistant Vice-President for Development (688-3250)
APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW #1
Interview #1

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself.: How long have you been in development? How long have you been with Ohio State?

2. What are the primary responsibilities of this office?

3. Tell me about your particular role in this office. What are your responsibilities?

4. When you think about the term ‘best practices’ in a professional context, what comes to mind? How would you define it?

5. When you think about the term ‘best practices’ employed by the university development organization as a whole, what comes to mind? Take a little time to write down some of your ideas on a piece of paper. I’ll ask you to consider each of your ideas one at a time, and we will talk about each one.

6. Why are these ‘best practices’ on your list?

7. When you think about ‘best practices’ used in this unit of the organization, what comes to mind? Take a little time to write down as many of your ideas on ‘best practices’ in this unit as you can on a piece of paper. I’ll ask you to consider each one at a time, and we will talk about each one.

8. Why are these ‘best practices’ on your list?

9. When you think about the Affirm Thy Friendship Campaign, why do you believe the campaign was so successful?
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW #2
Interview #2

1. Are there any other ‘best practices’ you’ve thought of since last time we talked? If so let’s discuss them at this time.

2. Dunronio and Loessin conducted a research study of ten high performance higher education development organizations. In that study they found that the following characteristics were present among the schools studied. (see attached list of characteristics)

3. How many of these characteristics stand out as best practices that are used by the Ohio State University development organization? Please tell me more about each item that applies to OSU.

4. How do the best practices you’ve identified at the university level enable you to successfully perform in your office?

5. Are there any characteristics that aren’t on the list that you believe are unique to Ohio State?
Characteristics of Institutions

• Presidential leadership: University Presidents were enthusiastic about fundraising and effectively articulated the institution’s mission and case for support to all internal and external constituents. They believed fund-raising was a major responsibility of their position and provided strong leadership for fund-raising initiatives. They also relied on the fund-raising expertise of the chief development officer and development staff (p. 198-199).

• Trustees’ participation: Trustees were donors to the institution and participated in the identification and solicitation of donors. They also set institutional policy that supported fund-raising (p. 200).

• Institutional commitment to fund-raising: Resource allocation was appropriately sufficient for meeting fund-raising goals and there was an acceptance of the need for fund-raising on campus (p. 200-202).

• Institutional niche and image: An understanding and communication of what the institutional niche and image is and what the institution stands for in the higher education community was clearly articulated (p. 202).

• Institutional fund-raising priorities and policies: The fund-raising policies were reflective of the overall missions and goals of these institutions and fund-raising goals accurately reflected the potential for fund-raising success. Fund-raisers at all of these institutions agreed that institutional priorities for fund-raising were essential to fund-raising success (p. 203-204).
Characteristics of Fund-raising Program

• Chief development officer’s leadership: Chief Development Officers were articulate, professional, and ethical representatives of the institution and fund-raising field. They were effective leaders who successfully created strategic fund-raising plans to implement programs focused on the specific needs of the institution, and committed to, and designed for, long-term benefit to their institution. They worked closely with the president, trustees, and development staff to carry out the strategic plans for their institution. They understood the fund-raising history of their institutions and built on the success (and lessons learned) from previous capital campaigns. They established formal fund-raising programs (annual, capital, major, and planned) and employed a fund-raising team with balanced and appropriate responsibilities. Most, but not all, of these presidents encouraged volunteer participation in fund-raising (p.204-213).

• Information and communications systems: This was the strongest management area across the ten institutions. Fund-raisers emphasized that good systems to collect, store, retrieve, and disseminate information were essential for effective fund-raising. Additionally, fund-raisers identified the importance of good communication across organizational levels, with fund-raising colleagues, within the development office, with the rest of the institution, and with external constituents (p. 216).

• Staff commitment to institution: The researchers found strongly committed staff members at every institution; however, they did not always find a strong commitment to the institution itself. What they did find were staff members who were committed to professional excellence, to improving their own personal work skills, and to the success of their programs (p. 219).
Interview #3

Attached you will find a chart and descriptions of four contrasting, yet complimentary models of management (Human Relations, Open Systems, Rational Goal, and Internal Process) with eight corresponding management roles. Please take a few moments to read and reflect on each of the models and their related management roles so that we can talk about them in the context of university development.

- Given these four models and the context of your portfolio of responsibility, how would you characterize your particular management and/or leadership style?

- Do you prefer any model(s) more than the others? Are there management roles that come naturally to you? If so, are those the roles you use most often or do you use others? (Why or why not?)

- Are there times when you manage and/or lead using non-preferred models or roles? If so, in what situations do you use them? How difficult is it to use these non-preferred models or roles?

- In what ways has your management and/or leadership style changed over the course of your career? Did you have different management preferences early on? Was your management style as balanced as it is now (or is it less balanced now)?

- How do you believe these models apply to the university development organization as a whole? Do you believe the organization effectively uses each of these models and roles? (How so?) How about during the *Affirm Thy Friendship* campaign? (Please give examples.)
HUMAN RELATIONS MODEL

1. Understanding self and others
2. Communicating effectively
3. Developing subordinates

EXTERNAL

1. Building teams
2. Using participative decision making
3. Managing conflict

INTERNAL

1. Monitoring personal performance
2. Managing collective performance
3. Managing organizational performance

1. Managing projects
2. Designing work
3. Managing across functions

Control

OPEN SYSTEMS MODEL

1. Living with change
2. Thinking creatively
3. Creating change

External

1. Building and maintaining a power base
2. Negotiating agreement and commitment
3. Presenting ideas

1. Working productively
2. Fostering a productive work environment
3. Managing time and stress

RATIONAL GOAL MODEL

1. Visioning, planning and goal setting
2. Designing and organizing
3. Delegating effectively
**Rational Goal Model:** The basic means-ends assumption in this management approach is the belief that clear direction leads to productive outcomes; consequently, there is a continuing emphasis on processes such as goal clarification, rational analysis, and action taking. This perspective is very achievement oriented and tends to emphasize logical direction and the initiation of action toward the accomplishment of stated objectives. Here we find a preference for short time lines and high certainty, as well as a need for independence and achievement. People with this outlook tend to have a single purpose or focus when making decisions. Their decisions are made rapidly and once they are made, the decision is final. The organizational climate is rational economic and decisions are driven by considerations of “the bottom line.” In the rational goal model the ultimate value is achievement and profit maximization. The manager’s role is to be a decisive “**Director**” (key competencies: visioning, planning, and goal setting; designing and organizing; and delegating effectively) and a task-oriented “**Producer**” (key competencies: working productively; fostering a productive work environment; and managing time and stress).

**Internal Structure Model:** The basic means-ends assumption is based on the belief that routinization leads to stability. The emphasis is on processes such as definition of responsibilities, measurement, documentation, and record keeping. Here the preference is for long timelines and high certainty, with a need for predictability, security, and order. This is accomplished through systematic examination of externally generated facts that focus on the organization as it is today. The objective, when using this model is to obtain the single best answer or optimal solution. The organizational climate is hierarchical, and decisions are colored by existing rules, structures, and traditions. The ultimate value is efficient work-flow, and the manager’s job is to be a
technically expert “Monitor” (key competencies: monitoring individual performance; managing collective performance; and managing organizational performance) and a dependable “coordinator” (key competencies: managing projects; designing work, managing across functions).

**Human Relations Model:** In this model the key emphasis is on commitment, cohesion, and morale. The means-ends assumption is that involvement results in dedication to the organization and the key values in this model are participation, conflict resolution, and consensus building. Here the preference is for long time lines and low certainty. The organization takes on a team-oriented climate in which decision making is characterized by team involvement and the sharing of multiple perspectives. There is a high tolerance for individual exceptions, spontaneous events, and behaviors because situations and circumstances are more important than general rules. The manager’s job is to be an empathetic “Mentor” (key competencies: understanding self and others; communicating effectively, and developing subordinates) and a process-oriented “Facilitator” (key competencies: building teams; using participative decision making; and managing conflict).

**Open Systems Model:** In the open systems model, the organization is faced with a need to compete in an ambiguous as well as competitive environment. The means-ends assumption is that continuous adaptation and innovation lead to the acquisition and maintenance of external resources. Key processes are political adaptation, creative problem solving, innovation, and the management of change. The key criteria of organizational effectiveness are adaptability and external support. Here the preference is for short time lines and low certainty, and the need is for variation, risk, excitement, and growth. People in this
mode tend to have an idealistic orientation. They rely on internally generated ideas, intuitions, and hunches. They also tend to analyze problems, cues, or messages from a multiple and dynamic perspectives. The organization has an innovative climate and is more of an “adhocracy” than a bureaucracy. Risk is high and decisions are made quickly; adjustments are made while in action. In this environment common vision and shared values are very important. The manager is expected to be a creative “Innovator” (key competencies: living with change; thinking creatively; and creating change) and a politically astute “Broker” (key competencies: building and maintaining a power base; negotiating agreement and commitment; and presenting ideas).
APPENDIX L

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW #3
Interview #3

• How skilled are you at focusing on broad visions for the future (open systems model), while also providing critical evaluation of present plans (internal process model)?

• How skilled are you at attending to relational issues (human relations model) while simultaneously emphasizing the accomplishments of tasks (rational goal model)?

*Human Relations Model questions*

• When a person starts a new job here, what kind of help and training is received?

• In terms of job performance, how do they know if they are doing well?

• What are the most important rewards and benefits people receive in this unit?

• How much cooperation and teamwork exist in this unit?

• Overall, how much commitment do people have to their jobs in this unit?

*Internal Process Model questions*

• What is the workflow like in this unit? (Where do you get your work from, and where does it go when you have finished with it? and how is it coordinated?)

• What are the most critical kinds of decisions made in this unit and how are they made?

• Overall, how efficient is your unit (do you operate on long or short timelines)?
• How much emphasis is placed on rules and procedures in the unit?

• Overall, how efficient is your unit?

Rational Goal Model questions

• What kind of planning takes place in this unit?

• What are the objectives of this unit?

• Does everyone agree on what these objectives are?

• Do these objectives ever change? (Why?) (How often?)

• How intense is the work effort?

• Overall, how productive is this unit?

Open Systems Model questions

• Of the various outside demands made on this unit, which are the most critical (e.g., new priorities, donors, market, supervisor, etc)?

• How predictable are those demands? Are they always they same, or are they always changing?

• How flexible is the unit, how well does the unit adjust to change? (Can you give an example?)

• What do outsiders think about this unit? What is its image or reputation?

• From what external source does the unit get the most criticism?

• From what external source does the unit get the most support?

• In terms of resources (that is, money, equipment, staff, and so n), how rich or poor is this unit?

• Overall, is this unit growing, staying the same, or declining?
APPENDIX M
COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK FORMULAS
View of Self Formulas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number 1</th>
<th>Number 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Facilitator</td>
<td># 7</td>
<td># 16</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mentor</td>
<td># 1</td>
<td># 10</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Innovator</td>
<td># 4</td>
<td># 12</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Broker</td>
<td># 3</td>
<td># 13</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Producer</td>
<td># 6</td>
<td># 15</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Director</td>
<td># 5</td>
<td># 11</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator</td>
<td># 8</td>
<td># 14</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Monitor</td>
<td># 2</td>
<td># 9</td>
<td>____________/ 2 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View of Others Formulas

The Facilitator
# 7  ____
# 16  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.1) / 1.2 = ____

The Mentor
# 1  ____
# 10  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.6) / 1.5 = ____

The Innovator
# 4  ____
# 12  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.3) / 1.1 = ____

The Broker
# 3  ____
# 13  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.6) / 1.4 = ____

The Producer
# 6  ____
# 15  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 5.1) / 1.2 = ____

The Director
# 5  ____
# 11  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.2) / 1.1 = ____

The Coordinator
# 8  ____
# 14  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 3.9) / 1.0 = ____

The Monitor
# 2  ____
# 9  ____
Total _____ / 2 = (_____ - 4.0) / 1.0 = ____
Organizational Effectiveness Formulas

Participation, Openness
#2 ____
#10 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 3.6) / 1.2 = ____

Commitment, Morale
#8 ____
#15 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.2) / 1.1 = ____

Innovation, Adaptation
#7 ____
#12 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.0) / 1.1 = ____

External Support, Growth
#11 ____
#16 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.5) / 1.3 = ____

Productivity, Accomplishment
#5 ____
#14 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.6) / 1.1 = ____

Direction, Goal Clarity
#4 ____
#13 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.4) / 1.1 = ____

Stability, Control
#1 ____
#6 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.1) / 1.0 = ____

Documentation, Information Management
#3 ____
#9 ____
Total ____ / 2 = (____ - 4.5) / 1.2 = ____
APPENDIX N

COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROFILES
Director Role

Producer Role

Innovator Role

Mentor Role

Facilitator Role

Monitor Role

Coordinator Role

Director Role

Broker Role

Producer Role
APPENDIX P
COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK: LEAERSHIP – AS OTHERS SEE IT