8-2014

The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University

Marcia Lynn Overby
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a
Public Research University

The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a
Public Research University

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for a degree of
Doctor of Education in Higher Education

by

Marcia Lynn Overby
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Science in Human Resource Development, 2007
University of Arkansas
Master of Education in Workforce Development, 2008

August 2014
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

____
Dr. John W. Murry, Jr.
Dissertation Director

____
Dr. Michael T. Miller
Committee Member

____
Dr. Ketevan Mamiseishvili
Committee Member

Abstract

The changing financial environment of public universities includes competing priorities for state funding. In today's economy, state appropriations for higher education do not always keep pace with institutional need. During periods of declining state revenue, universities endure budget cuts reducing state funding. When tuition dollars cannot be increased further and state appropriations are decreased or flat, public university administrators rely on fundraising to meet their mission, goals, and vision for their institutions. The fundraising program believed to produce the greatest results is a capital campaign. Large and ambitious capital campaigns can help institutions of higher education respond to decreases in state funding, while allowing for institutional growth. A successful comprehensive capital campaign can transform an institution of higher education. However, capital campaigns require strong leadership and teamwork, and goals can be challenging to reach during times of economic hardship. In addition, a capital campaign needs the full support of the board of trustees, system president, and campus chancellor, who recognize that the campaign will be the focus of the campus for five to eight years.

The purpose of this qualitative and intrinsic single case study was to explore and enhance understanding of trustee members' roles, views, and experiences during the University of Arkansas's highly successful capital campaign, Campaign for the Twenty-First Century, which concluded in 2005 and raised over $1 billion. Twelve knowledgeable and prominent leaders of the University of Arkansas and its Campaign for the Twenty-First Century were interviewed for this study. The campus chancellor, campaign steering committee members, and the senior advancement leaders strongly influence fundraising outcomes. The role of public university trustees in a capital campaign has not received much attention in the literature, although, the role of the president has. The role of trustees in a capital campaign for a private university is straightforward because the trustees are selected in large part for their fundraising abilities; however, the role of trustees in fundraising becomes more complicated for public universities that are part of a multicampus system.

Keywords: capital campaign, fundraising in higher education, fundraising leadership, and trustees

Acknowledgements

To Dr. John W. Murry, Jr., my advisor and dissertation committee chair, thank you so much for sharing your wisdom, expertise, friendship, and time with me during my research and writing this dissertation. To my dissertation committee members, Dr. Michael T. Miller and Dr. Ketevan Mamiseishvili, I will forever be grateful for your encouragement and your time toward my completion of this dissertation and degree program. To all three of you, Dr. Murry, Dr. Miller, and Dr. Mamiseishvili, I will cherish the time I was allowed to spend in your classrooms. I enjoyed each class and the journey toward completing this degree. The higher education degree program is a wonderful program because you three make it so.

To my colleagues and friends in the Chancellor's Office, Dr. G. David Gearhart, Ms. Judy G. Schwab, Ms. Gloria Sutherland, Ms. Sally Adams, and Ms. Laura Cate, who supported me with loving encouragement every step of the way, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

To Dr. Daniel E. Ferritor and Dr. John A. White, Jr., who supported and encouraged me, thank you for giving me the confidence to strive for excellence in all things undertaken.

To Ms. Susan Osredker and Ms. Susan Kendrick-Perry, I sincerely thank you for your constant encouragement and for taking the time to read and edit this paper.

To the twelve individuals who allowed me to interview them for this study, I sincerely thank you for your willingness to be open and candid in your answers to my questions and for being so generous with your time and for sharing your personal knowledge.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family.

To my husband, William H. "Bill" Overby III, and son, William H. "Hank" Overby IV, thank you for your support of my education and encouragement for my personal growth. You sacrificed as much as I did throughout my education and I will forever be indebted to you for understanding my drive and desire to fulfill a dream. You are a wonderful family and my best friends.

To my mother and stepfather, Jackie and Jerry Dorman, thank you for your steadfast belief in my abilities and for inspiring me to strive for my fullest potential. I'll be forever grateful for the countless textbooks you purchased for me over the many years of coursework. You are my role models as well as most cherished friends.

To my sister and brother-in-law, Theresa and Danny Farrar, and nephew, Tyler Farrar, you have always encouraged me and listened to my tales of coursework and projects, which I appreciate more than words can express. You, too, are my best friends and role models. I will forever be thankful for your kindness and patience.

To my brother, Jimmy Don Willis, thank you for your encouraging words, belief in my abilities, and pride in my accomplishments.

Finally, to my father, Alex Willis, who passed away in February of 2013, a humble thank you from his daughter.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Funding America's colleges and universities no longer holds the high national priority it once did. Attention has been focused more on the cost of attending college. However, the issue of securing sufficient funding has not gone away. Public higher education's changing financial environment includes competing priorities for state funding (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). "Most state budgets are not doing well and in bad budget times, higher education is often one of the first state spending categories on the chopping block" (Delaney, 2010, p. 1). In addition, state funds eliminated from institutional budgets might not be reinstated or may take years to be fully restored (Delaney, 2010). As a result, when tuition dollars cannot be increased further, public higher education institutions may become increasingly reliant upon alternative sources of revenue, and private giving is one of the promising possibilities (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). The fundraising program believed to produce the greatest results is a capital campaign (Dove, 2000).

Large and ambitious capital campaigns can help institutions of higher education respond to decreases in state funding, and a successful comprehensive capital campaign can transform an institution of higher education (Dove, 2000). A capital campaign is a limited-time, intensive effort designed to raise funds for new construction, renovation, major program operations, and increased endowment (Dove, 2000; Kihlstedt & Schwartz, 1997; Quigg, 1986). However, capital campaigns require strong leadership and teamwork, and goals can be challenging to reach during times of economic hardship (Gearhart, 2006). In addition, a capital campaign needs the full support of the board of trustees, system president, and campus chancellor, who recognize that the campaign will be the focus of the campus for at least five to eight years.

Unfortunately, in today's economy, state appropriations for higher education in Arkansas have not kept pace with institutional needs (UofA, 2004). During a period of declining state revenue, the University of Arkansas (UofA) endured budget cuts reducing the UofA's state funding amount by more than $10 million over a 26-month period (UofA Newswire, 2010). As a public research university, nearly half of the UofA's funding is from state appropriations (UofA, 2008). Higher education in Arkansas experienced a 9.3% decrease in state-appropriated funds for operating expenses from Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 to FY 2009 (Grapevine, 2010). The fiscal challenge for the UofA was how to lessen the impact of the cuts to the budget that threaten its mission (UofA Newswire, 2010).

In 2004, the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) approved a funding model for two-year colleges and the universities, but the state has not been able to fully fund institutions according to the formula. The funding gap—difference between institutional need and current state appropriations—was due to an extended economic downturn (AHECB meeting, 2004, August 6). Therefore, the state's flagship institution has been underfunded for years and has depended on fundraising to help meet the needs of the institution for continued support of its mission. A capital campaign can help with the fiscal challenges when campaign goals and objectives are linked to the institution's strategic planning. Raising an institution's endowment is a worthwhile goal, but the campaign goals must also include funds for faculty research and endowed chairs, which assist with recruiting and retaining high-caliber faculty members. Campaign goals also support student scholarships, buildings, laboratories, and equipment.

Board members in any institution can take on a leading role during a capital campaign (Nicklin, 1995; Trombley, 2007). However, private institutions have more expectations of trustees in gift giving and fundraising than do public institutions (Nicklin, 1995; Worth, 2005, 2012). Private institutions recruit trustee members, whereas public institutions do not. Generally, public university trustees are appointed or elected by others (Ingram & Associates, 1993). When gubernatorial appointments to the board are made, leadership ability may be considered but not necessarily fundraising or gift-giving ability (Nicklin, 1995). When recruiting trustees, having two of the "three W's"—wealth, work, and wisdom—is essential to avoid building a "board of millionaires who make huge gifts but don't work on projects, attend board meetings, or have the experience to monitor campus finances" (Nicklin, 1995, p. 40). For public institutions, desirable characteristics sought in trustees are "financial acumen; legal expertise; lobbying or political skills; knowledge of higher education; and knowledge of areas such as marketing, government relations, athletics, medicine, hospital management, investments, real estate, or physical plan management" (Ingram & Associates, 1993, pp. 305-306). Trustees who volunteer their time or make donations during fundraising efforts might be better stewards (Nicklin, 1995) of the institution's overall budget, funds, and resources because they have a better understanding of all financial aspects of higher education.

Postsecondary education institutions need trustees who understand a capital campaign is a priority for the institution during the extent of the campaign (Gearhart, 2006). Well-functioning teams are essential to the efforts of many aspects of higher education institutions, and fundraising is no exception. The role of institutional advancement and development professionals "is to offer people opportunities to do great things, to challenge and inspire them, and to involve them in activities that make life better now and for future generations" (Ciconte & Jacob, 1997, p. 5).

It is well documented that successful capital campaigns require strong leadership and a dedicated team of advancement professionals (Dove, 2000; Gearhart, 1995, 2006), as well as a strong donor base and trustees willing to support the institution and its mission. There is an abundance of literature on the importance of leadership and well-functioning teamwork in business (Lencioni, 2002; Maxwell, 2001; Sholtes, Joiner, & Streibel, 2003) and in higher education (Bolt, 1991; Flumerfelt & Banachowski, 2011; Spendlove, 2007), as well as fundraising and the use of capital campaigns in higher education (Dove, 2000; Eller, 2010; Gearhart, 2006). The literature lacks research concerning how well public institutions develop and involve their trustees in capital campaign efforts. Books and articles provide insights on how to operate a capital campaign successfully with the support of boards (Dove, 2000; Gearhart, 2006; Worth, 2012), but it is not clear what role trustees at public research institutions should, and actually do, play in the campaign efforts. As a result, public institutions might miss the opportunity to benefit from the fundraising talents of past and current trustees, who should best understand the institutions' finances.

Statement of the Problem

The national trend toward declining state appropriations and increased need for fundraising to stay competitive is a concern for higher education (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008; Delaney, 2010). At a public institution, trustees should understand the financial complexities and challenges of the institution. Trustees must be aware of the impact of challenges to the institution and also make the case for the importance of higher education (Cantor, Howard, Miles, Woolsey, & Yudof, 2011). University trustees might feel ill equipped to understand all of the complexities of the institutions they serve when they begin their tenure on the board. Even though it can take years for trustees to understand all aspects of their institutions, they should be well informed on the institutions' financial health and resource development (Wolverton, 2008). According to a 2008 report, *Advancing Small Colleges, A Benchmarking Survey Update*, by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), college presidents are "increasingly dissatisfied with their board members' fundraising abilities" (Wolverton, 2008, p. 1).

According to Worth (2012), "Unless members are appointed by a governor who happens to place a high priority on private support, it is unlikely that a public governing board will be well-situated to play a leadership role in fundraising for the institution" (p. 2). Therefore, publicly appointed trustees might not include "individuals of affluence, leaders from the business community, or prominent and successful alumni who live outside the state" and who are well suited for the role of fundraiser during a capital campaign (Worth, 2012, p. 2).

Previous research on fundraising in higher education has focused on the roles of effective foundation boards (AGB, 2012; Fraser, 2006; Worth, 2012) and the roles of presidents (Cook & Lasher, 1994; Fisher, 1985; Fisher & Quehl, 1989; Miller, 1991). In addition, books (Chait, 1993; Chait, Holland, & Taylor, 1996; Greenleaf, 2002; Ingram, 1996, 1997; Ingram & Associates, 1993; Legon, 2003) and articles (Payette, 2001; Trombley, 2007) give insight into how successful trustees should operate in fulfilling their fiduciary duties. However, limited studies have explored the unique role of trustees in capital campaigns at public research universities. Duronio and Loessin (1991) discussed trustee participation in their study of 10 institutions, which included public two-year colleges as well as private research universities. Green (2000) explored the fundraising role of female trustees at independent research I universities with a law school. In addition, Kentucky's Bellarmine College surveyed 29 peer liberal arts colleges to explore trustees' involvement in fundraising (Moisan, 1992). According to Essex and Ansbach (1993), trustees have important roles to play in "providing a guiding vision" for institutions during fundraising, as well as "taking an active role in requesting major gifts" (p. 276).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore and enhance understanding of trustee members' roles, views, and experiences during the University of Arkansas's highly successful capital campaign, Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC), which began in 1998 and concluded in 2005.

Research Questions

The research questions were derived from an extensive review of the literature regarding the role of trustees and fundraising in higher education. Questions included the following:

1. What criteria were used when choosing trustees to provide leadership as members of the campaign steering committee?
2. What was the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?
3. What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have before serving on the campaign steering committee?
4. What advice did study participants offer future trustees concerning their roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitation imposed by the researcher included the fact that the study was of a single land-grant research institution. The UofA's CTFC was chosen because the campaign was considered to be a success for the institution and included trustee volunteers on its steering committee. During the campaign in 2002, the UofA received a $300-million gift from the

Walton Family Charitable Support Foundation. At that time, the Walton gift was the largest private contribution ever received by an American public university. Of the $300-million gift, $200 million was committed to establishing and endowing an undergraduate honors college and $100 million was committed to endowing the existing graduate school. An additional delimitation was that not all of the UofA trustees who volunteered as members of the campaign steering committee were interviewed for this study.

Criticism of case study methodology concludes that the findings and assumptions cannot be generalized from the study of a single institution, which is a limitation that flows from the researcher's delimitation of the research design (Creswell, 2008; Yin, 1993). A case study can satisfy the three tenets of the qualitative method of describing, understanding, and explaining (Tellis, 1997); however, qualitative research is subjective (Stake, 1995). Therefore, the researcher's personal biases might influence interpretation of the data collected and can be a limitation of this study. Merriam (2009) cautioned that both the "readers of case studies and the authors themselves need to be aware of biases that can affect the final product" (p. 52).

Significance of the Study

The importance of understanding factors contributing to the role of trustees during a capital campaign is relevant for university leadership including trustees, system presidents, campus chancellors, and advancement professionals. The role of trustees in a capital campaign for a private university is straightforward because the trustees are selected in large part for their fundraising abilities (Worth, 2005). However, the role of trustee in fundraising becomes more complicated for public universities that are part of a multicampus system. Little is known about the roles system trustees assume during the period of a capital campaign in public research universities. Much of American higher education is still partially publically supported, and the majority of the country's 4,400 colleges and 18 million students depend on that support (Loss, 2012). However, philanthropic support is critically important to universities in today's economy. When state support and tuition dollars do not keep pace with increased enrollment and inflation, public institutions find it difficult to be nationally competitive. The challenge of being competitive in teaching, research, and outreach depends on state appropriations and tuition revenue, but institutions have become more reliant on private funds as state funds diminish as a percent of the overall budget. The need to close the gap in state support and institutional need (which includes funds for operations, construction, endowments, and special projects or programs) with private funds will continue to challenge public universities (AGB, 2013).

Fundraising is big business for public research institutions. Trustees, system presidents, campus chancellors, governing boards, financial officers, deans, department heads, and senior administrators might use the findings of this study to define the roles trustees can take on in helping lead a capital campaign and fundraising activities generally. Understanding the working relationship for campaign volunteers might enhance the success of the campaign. Most public research university officials understand the importance of the capital campaign to advance the institution (Gearhart, 1995). Capital campaigns with billion dollar goals are becoming more common for American universities. Public universities are giving private institutions more competition in the philanthropic arena in which private universities dominated in the past (Vestal, 2007). As universities become more "state-assisted" than "state-funded" (Vestal, 2007), the need to raise private funds grows stronger for institutions to stay competitive. With dwindling state support, universities have three choices for increased resource development—raise tuition, grow enrollment, or increase private giving (Vestal, 2007).

Capital campaigns require strong leadership and coordination, as well as chancellor, president, and trustee support. While scholars have focused on trustee members' fiduciary responsibilities to their institutions, and the importance of trustees understanding all aspects of the financial health of the institution (Chait, 1993; Chait, Holland, & Taylor, 1996; Greenleaf, 2002; Ingram, 1993, 1996, 1997), literature of trustee roles during a capital campaign at a public research university is lacking. Becoming involved in a capital campaign, trustees gain a better insight of institutional priorities and the resources needed to fund those initiatives. In addition, working side by side with university administrators in a campaign effort might strengthen working relationships and trust. Trustee involvement in the campaign might also allow for greater understanding of the institution's attempts to be transparent and accountable, which is important in today's higher education landscape. Trustee leadership during a campaign might have a dramatic affect on the fundraising efforts, and might help to foster a culture within the institution of understanding the importance of raising private funds.

Philanthropic giving is important to being competitive in higher education, and can afford the institution to advance in areas where state support is lacking. If, through empirical research, we understand the role of trustees during a capital campaign, it might offer insight to vital roles trustees can play as part of campaign fundraising efforts at higher education institutions. The intent of this study was to inform higher education officials, who are involved in raising funds for the institution, of the roles trustees can assume in the capital campaign effort. Trustees and top administrators in public colleges and universities must use every tool available to help their institutions stay financially competitive and provide quality education and programs, as well as offering opportunities for research for their faculty and students.

Definition of Terms

Several terms were defined to provide consistency throughout the study. *The Glossary of Fundraising Terms* served as the basis for the definitions that appear below (T4S, 2012).

1. Board of Trustees (trustee). The Board of Trustees is the governing body that sets policy for the college or university. At some institutions, they are known as board of regents.
2. Capital Campaign. A campaign to raise substantial funds for a nonprofit organization to finance major building projects, to supplement endowment funds, and to meet other needs demanding extensive outlays of capital.
3. Chancellor. The chancellor is the chief executive officer of the campus and serves at the pleasure of the system president and board of trustees.
4. Cultivation. The process of gradually developing the interest of an important prospective contributor through exposure to institutional activities, people, needs, and plans to the point where he/she may consider a major gift.
5. Development. A term used since the mid-1940s to define the total process of institutional fundraising, frequently inclusive of public relations and alumni affairs.
6. Endowment Fund. A fund established to provide income for the maintenance of a nonprofit organization. Endowment funds generally come from donor-restricted gifts and are limited in use to the purpose originally dictated by the donor. The principal of a permanent endowment must be maintained permanently.
7. Fundraising. Fundraising involves requesting gifts or grants from an individual, corporation, foundation, or other source.
8. Philanthropy. Philanthropy is the practice of supporting, through financial and other contributions, programs and campaigns conducted by charitable institutions.

9. Volunteerism. Volunteerism is the willingness of private citizens to serve voluntarily in fundraising campaigns and in other capacities.

Conceptual Framework

Fundraising, leadership, teamwork, and organizational literature provided conceptual perspectives to facilitate exploration of the role of trustees in a capital campaign (Dove, 2000; Hicks, 2006; Worth, 2012). The researcher views involvement in fundraising events as an activity that includes individuals' personalities, intellects, and values (Buckman, 2010). The research questions that guided the investigation were fashioned from a framework that emerged from higher education fundraising literature. The study included interviews of fundraising professionals, personal observations, and examination of institutional documents (current and archival). The key philosophical assumption, according to Merriam (1998), in qualitative research is based in the "view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds" (p. 6). With the framework to guide this investigation, the main research questions reflect the researcher's interpretation of the views of capital campaign leadership and fundraising success in existing literature, and analysis of relevant literature and concepts that emerged from interviews of trustees, campus administrators, fundraising professionals, and institution-based campaign managers during the study (Hicks, 2006). The UofA's campus and advancement leadership structure was reviewed as well. A theoretical framework was not used to guide this study, but was formed inductively by what was learned during data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2009).

While a theoretical framework was not used to guide the study, several important concepts emerged from the literature review, which provided guidance. Emergent concepts included (a) fundraising is a team effort; (b) the institution's campus president or chancellor is typically the central player on the fundraising team; (c) the campus president or chancellor should focus his/her effort and attention in fundraising on major gifts and administrative leadership; (d) academic quality and institutional prestige are of critical importance in higher education fundraising; and (e) fundraising is institution-, context- and situation-specific (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Cook and Lasher (1994) suggested that higher education fundraising is driven by two forces—recurrent, continuous financial need due to the nonprofit nature of higher education, and competition from other nonprofits, including other colleges and universities, thus reinforcing a tendency toward prestige maximization.

Presidents and chancellors can effectively involve trustees with fundraising responsibilities because "certain trustees often have more clout than CEOs, and should be able to cultivate and solicit their peers of great means" (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 104). Ingram and Associates (1980) viewed trustee involvement in fundraising as not only beneficial to the institution but also to the trustee members:

> The trustee truly involved in fundraising feels a part of the plan, a part of the group pulling together. . . . This can be the greatest pleasure, in my judgment, that trustees can have in their trusteeship [William B. Dunseth, vice president for development, Pomona College, 1978, pp. 24-25]. People who volunteer fill a gap in their lives. To be a volunteer is to be part of a full life. It is rewarding to improve a community, to grow as a person, to make a difference to somebody else ["Monitor Spotlights Harriet Naylor," 1978]. (Ingram & Associates, 1980, p. 264)

Summary

Executive leadership and fundraising in higher education are complex phenomena and are of central importance to public institutions (Cook & Lasher, 1994). To realize fundraising potential, key players, including the system president, campus chancellor, and trustee members, need to understand and effectively interpret their roles. With the shift toward a more philanthropic-reliant culture where private funds can be essential to the mission of public research universities, this study endeavored to provide empirical research for understanding the role of trustees in a capital campaign. To help close the funding gap between institutional need and state appropriations, postsecondary institutions of higher education have come to rely on fundraising. To build for the future, institutions increasingly depend on periodical capital campaigns. Arkansas's flagship public research land-grant university has depended on fundraising and the capital campaign to help with continued support of its mission. The UofA responded to decreases in state funding while experiencing increasing enrollment, and still maintained and improved its level of quality and service provided to students due to its successful CTFC, which concluded in 2005. Leadership is essential to the success of a capital campaign, and trustees can play an important role even at a public institution, which is part of a multicampus system.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This literature review focused on the need for private funds at public research universities, the history of fundraising in higher education, higher education fundraising, and leadership in higher education fundraising with emphasis on the role of trustees in fundraising and as volunteers during a capital campaign. For many of today's public universities, the ability to achieve their goals, mission, and vision can be linked to their ability to raise private support. As the nation slowly improves from a recession, financial concerns continue with the cumulative national debt and the federal deficit, which make it highly unlikely that federal support to higher education will improve significantly in the near future. Federal support provided 73% of funding in the 1960s for university research and development, but only 62% in 2011 (AGB, 2013). Priorities on the state level also continue to prevent higher education appropriations from returning to or surpassing pre-recession levels (Delaney, 2010). According to the Association of Governing Boards of University and Colleges (AGB, 2013) in its *Top Public Policy Issues for Higher Education in 2013 and 2014* publication, the importance of the role of a governing board in the discussions of issues and challenges to today's higher education institutions cannot be overstated. Policy makers on the federal and state levels are scrutinizing both public and private universities more heavily, with calls for more transparency by university boards. Policy makers also call for a better trustee-selection process of public governing boards from the governors who appoint them (AGB, 2013).

Increasingly, public policy issues associated with "cost, price, personnel, and accreditation are going to be played out at the board and institutional level, and they can no longer be addressed primarily reactively or defensively at the federal or state level" (AGB, 2013,

p. 1). The long-term fiscal health of institutions depends on the trustees, presidents, and chancellors who lead them. Trustees and administrators should have an awareness of the challenges higher education institutions are facing. Today's trustees and senior administrators "may need to speak more often and more assertively to policy makers and the many stakeholders of the institution or university system, applying a coordinated and seamless strategy" (AGB, 2013, p. 1). Federal and state budgets remain stressed; and political and regulatory scrutiny, along with tougher accreditation standards, and intensified focus on "governance, operating efficiency, and revenue diversity" (Moody's Investors Service, Inc., 2012, p. 1) are making it more difficult for universities to grow revenue. Given the trend toward fewer state resources and tighter budgets at public universities, leaders rely more on private dollars to fill budget gaps. The need for private support will most likely continue to increase, along with financial pressures of public universities (Worth, 2012).

Most public institutions include the chancellor, vice chancellor for advancement, and the board of trustees in the fundraising process (Overley, 2006). Trustees and university leaders have important and demanding work ahead of them with challenges of today's rapidly changing higher education landscape. The speed of a changing higher education system is no longer "stuck somewhere between sluggish and glacial" (Kirschner, 2012, p. 1), as it was believed to be before government support began to decline in the 1970s and 1980s. Economic challenges can be pressing for public research institutions; and despite the pressures and challenges of an economic downturn, trustees are slightly less engaged in budget review and approval than they were before the recession, and are lacking in their understanding of budgets (AGB, 2011).

A university's budget can be complicated and require time to understand for newly appointed trustee members. Public research universities rely on many sources for their financial support, which include student tuition and fees, government, private donors, investments income, and sale of services. However, each source has its unique opportunities and limitations, which requires a continuing understanding by trustees and administrators of the trends and causative factors at work (Ingram & Associates, 1980). Gaining a complete understanding of the financial factors that lead to the overall health of the institutions is necessary, so that financial strategies and policies can be developed (Ingram & Associates, 1980). The financial health of a university takes time and attention by trustees to comprehend all the nuances of the total budget. Trustees might feel ill equipped to comprehend all of the complexities of higher education even though they understand well the complexities of their own industry's budgets.

Public universities are nearing the 50-50 split on the operating costs of educating students, as 47% of costs in 2012 were net tuition revenue (net tuition revenue is the cash left after awarding financial aid to students) (Kelderman, 2013). The remaining 53% comes from state and local tax support (all state support amounted to 51% in fiscal year 2012), non-tax appropriations (mostly from state lotteries), state-funded endowment earnings, and federal funds allocated to states (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) (SHEEO, 2013). However, the proportion of public institution revenue derived from tuition varies substantially, and public 4-year institutions usually depend on a larger percent of tuition revenue than do 2-year public institutions (SHEEO, 2013).

In some states, such as Ohio and New Mexico, governors have taken greater roles in directing the state-level higher education policy (AGB, 2013). In its fiscal year 2014 budget resolution, the Senate Budget Committee complained about the increasing tuition paid by taxpayers and called for reduction of college costs along with requests for expanding college access and higher completion rates (AGB, 2013). There is concern with the rising cost of tuition and availability of federal student financial aid, which contributes to a less affordable college education for lower- and middle-income families (Gorfine, Ty, & Manteghi, 2013). On the state level, appropriations are increasingly linked to measure of productivity, such as graduation rates and employment rates among graduates. Therefore, fundraising and billion-dollar campaigns are becoming more common in higher education (Ferrell, 2005; Overley, 2006; Padilla, 2005). Rice University announced in June of 2013 that its Centennial Campaign raised $1.08 billion, since its campaign began in 2008. The chair of Rice's board of regents, James W. Crownover, credited two of his fellow board members for their leadership in that campaign, and stated that board members contributed more than $200 million to that campaign (Gardner, 2013). In 2013, Harvard University launched its $6.5 billion capital campaign, after raising $2.8 billion in gifts and pledges during its campaign's quiet phase (Unknown, *Arkansas Democrat Gazette*, 22 September 2013).

History of Fundraising in Higher Education

No institution (public or private) has enough time or staff to raise the amount of money needed to accomplish all of its goals (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Fundraising is not new to higher education, as colonial era colleges were established with funds from private donors and the state (Cohen, 1998). Fundraising campaigns took various forms; but in early campaigns, the president and faculty were the individual solicitors (Cohen, 1998). Princeton's first major fundraising campaign began in 1830, with a top donation of $5,000. Both public and private institutions relied on supportive legislators to fund the institutions through land donations that could be sold. By the late 1900s, philanthropic foundations were becoming more prominent, and the donors' interests were carefully balanced with the needs of the institutions (Cohen, 1998). The first university-related foundation for receiving and managing private gifts was the Kansas University Endowment Association, which was founded in 1891 (Worth, 2012).

Organized philanthropy supported by systematic fundraising developed in twentieth-century America (Cook & Lasher, 1994; Cutlip, 1965). However, in 1641, the first systematic attempt in fundraising for higher education occurred when the Massachusetts Bay Colony sent three clergymen to England to raise money for Harvard University (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Although colleges stayed alive largely due to the personal fundraising efforts of promoter-presidents in the early 1900s and colleges began to use the campaign as a means to raise funds, it was during the twentieth century that institutions conducted the first major organized fundraising campaigns. At the same time, universities hired the first fundraising consultants and appointed the first development officers (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). A number of America's first colleges (such as Dartmouth College and King's College) received some public support, although, the primary source was still private (Fisher & Quehl, 1989).

As philanthropy became essential in the formation of universities (Cohen, 1998), institutional fundraisers argued that college-educated individuals, whether the students were from wealthy families or not, elevated society and contributed to the development of high culture. As the national wealth was growing at a rapid pace, many parts of the country were moving away from being strictly agricultural to business and industry, and research universities were growing with expanded physical plants and library extensions. State legislatures began committing funds on a regular basis as enrollment in public universities began to grow. West of the Mississippi, where public institutions dominated, states provided approximately half of all higher education funds from the 1920s to the 1940s (Cohen, 1998). Federal funding for university scientific research accelerated substantially with the beginning of World War II in the

1940s. Major private institutions began to build sizable endowments with professional fundraising campaigns that brought in funds greater than their annual expenditures (Cohen, 1998).

For public universities, fundraising programs began to appear in the mid-1970s (Cook & Lasher, 1994). In 1974, the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association merged into the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) that serves as a primary professional organization for institutional advancement (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Fundraising accelerated with the development of professional university advancement divisions in the 1980s. For public and private universities, funding continues to come from multiple sources, with state support varying depending on the economy and the overall state revenue. Charitable contributions to higher education in 2010-2011 reached $30.3 billion (AGB, 2013). Of the record $33.8 billion dollars provided to higher education in 2013, two-thirds went to campuses with endowments over $1 billion (Maguire Associates, Inc., 2014).

Higher Education Fundraising

To help build a climate of giving and generate significant private support, development professionals identify prospects, organize solicitation, and manage large numbers of volunteers (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Fundraising and the comprehensive capital campaign efforts can be greatly enhanced with prestigious volunteers, including community and business leaders, major donors, and trustees. Management of volunteers requires paid advancement professional staff, who understand that volunteers need training and an understanding of the values and mission of the institution. Many organizations and institutions rely on volunteers who give of their time and talents to assist in reaching the institutional goals and mission. According to Gearhart (2006), although advancement and development professionals might find working with volunteers to be time consuming and difficult, "few capital campaigns will be successful without the use of volunteers in an organizational structure" (p. 146).

In addition to raising funds, advancement and development offices include professional staff to provide "functions of prospect research, gift accounting, alumni records, information-systems management, data analysis, and related activities" (Worth, 2012, p. 38). All areas are important to the overall fundraising effort. Major gift officers depend on accurate donor information when developing proposals for soliciting major gifts. As the campaign director, the vice chancellor for advancement must also stay in contact with the top volunteers to ensure all are working together and to communicate important information related to the campaign (Gearhart, 1995). Although many administrative details and duties of the campaign can be the responsibility of other senior advancement staff, the vice chancellor for advancement is responsible "for moving the campaign forward on a day-to-day basis" and should "provide analysis of every aspect of campaign activity, plans, and fund-raising potential" (p. 53). Large universities have specialized development officers with expertise in areas of annual and planned giving, and corporate and foundation relations (Worth, 2005).

Key components of a university fundraising program include annual giving, major gifts, planned gifts, and corporate and foundation support (Worth, 2012). Most higher education institutions participate in ongoing fundraising activities with annual giving programs and planned giving programs, which are often run separately but concurrently with capital campaigns (Hedgepeth, 2003; Overley, 2006). Many universities engage in special-purpose campaigns, with the focus on major gifts (Hedgepeth, 2003). Special-purpose campaigns can emphasize a need for erecting a new academic building, renovation of existing buildings, adding equipment (Kihlstedt, 2004), or increasing student scholarship funds or endowed chairs for faculty.

However, comprehensive capital campaigns are broad-based fundraising efforts "involving both major and annual giving and one or more institutional capital priorities—all focused within specific time frames and relying on some level of foundation board involvement" (Hedgepeth, 2003, p. 1). A major premise in higher education fundraising is that the needs of the institution are connected with the interests of potential donors (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Donor gift giving during a capital campaign involves a balance of the donor's interest and the universities priorities (Overly, 2006). The university's advancement professionals should spend the time to get to know and understand the interests of the donors before soliciting major gifts, which include naming opportunities. Major gifts requiring the president's involvement can be $250,000 and above when soliciting an individual, or over $1 million for corporations; however, those numbers vary depending on the size of the institution (Gearhart, 1995). According to Lowenstein (1997), universities should never "underestimate the value to a donor of a named scholarship, professorship, center, building, or room" that can "make a huge difference in securing a commitment" (p. 38).

Although universities have a "built-in (if relatively finite) constituency of alumni" that provides an advantage over other nonprofit organizations, "universities may present less compelling causes than some nonprofits because their missions lack the urgency of many human-service organizations" (Worth, 2012, p. 21). Therefore, universities place a high value on developing and maintaining relationships with donors, which include alumni, parents, and friends of the institution, as well as corporations and foundations (Worth, 2012). Universities make the case that the university's programs are important to citizens of the community because of the economic benefit to the state (Worth, 2012). For most university fundraising divisions, the development office is responsible for fundraising in coordination with the alumni association, and the public/media relations, communication, and marketing offices. Most universities have annual giving programs, which raise relatively modest recurring gifts from alumni, parents, faculty, staff, and other friends of the institution (Worth, 2012). Development professionals who run annual giving programs focus on a giving level of under $10,000 and depend on appealing to broad audiences by sending letters to constituencies, as well as phone and email solicitation. Internet-based communications are becoming more important in reaching out to younger prospective donors (Worth, 2012). Annual giving advancement professionals are usually in a separate unit from those who seek major gifts. In a university environment, each college might have its own director of development (major gift officer) and have a number of support staff, depending of the size of the institution.

Major gifts are defined by a dollar amount set by the institution, but a "commonly applied standard considers a five-year commitment of $50,000 ($10,000 per year for five years) to be a major gift" (Worth, 2012, p. 29). Generally, upper-level advancement professionals, such as the vice president for advancement or a major gift officer for an individual college, solicit donors for major gifts. Major gifts are usually restricted for a specific purpose or program. For this reason, major gift donors are carefully cultivated. It takes time to get to know the potential donors and their areas of interest before asking for a gift. Major gifts can have a "transformational impact on the institution and are among the largest gifts the institution ever will receive" (Worth, 2012, p. 30). Major gift officers also provide solicitation for planned or estate gifts and can have a separate office within the advancement division. One important unit for any advancement division is the records and research area regarding donor or potential donor records.

Although private gifts and endowments have always been important for private universities, they became increasingly so for public institutions (Ingram & Associates, 1980).

The endowment fund produces investment income and is important to an institution whether the institution is public or private. With a greater endowment, universities can rely on more stability and independence (Ingram & Associates, 1980). At private institutions, trustees have long played a major role in helping raise the endowment as board members participate in fundraising in addition to financial decision-making (Ingram & Associates, 1980). However, there is a certain financial utility attached to each gift that is of critical importance, and there is a "vast difference in utility between the estate note for $500,000 executed by a healthy person of age fifty and the certified check for $250,000 handed to the president by a local merchant" (Ingram & Associates, 1980, p. 316).

For institutions within multicampus state university systems, the campus president is believed to be primarily responsible for the campus fundraising efforts (Cook and Lasher, 1994). At some institutions within multicampus systems, the campus leader is the president with the system leader being the chancellor. However, the reverse is true for the University of Arkansas System, whose flagship campus, University of Arkansas (UofA), is the site of this study—each campus has a chancellor who reports to the system president and a governor-appointed system board of trustees. In Gearhart's 1989 study of the relationship between the preparation for and initiation of a capital campaign and integrated and nonintegrated organizational structures at major research universities, he found an integrated university structure to be viewed as more effective in fundraising. With an integrated structure, the offices of development, alumni association, and media and university relations report to the vice president for advancement. With a nonintegrated system, directors of the alumni association or university relations might report directly to the president. According to Gearhart (1989), at institutions following an integrated structure, advancement officers "appeared to be much more heavily involved in campaign activity," and had a "greater base of knowledge about campaign process and confusion about the structure and campaign involvement was minimal" (p. 193). Gearhart (1989) found that the organizational structure "can be a determining factor in building a volunteer network in a campaign environment" (p. 200). Volunteers are an important part of the successful capital campaign effort (Gearhart, 1989). The structure of the fundraising division is also important to the success of the fundraising program or campaign. The advancement division's structure must include not only the president, vice president for advancement, and trustees, but also internal advancement professionals and external business professionals who volunteer to help meet the fundraising goals (Satterwhite, 2004).

An effective fundraising effort and capital campaign includes interaction between three major participants—the campus president/chancellor (used interchangeably), vice president/vice chancellor for development/advancement (used interchangeably), and the board of trustees/regents (used interchangeably) (Overley, 2006). According to Sturgis (2005), the three major participants "must desire a relationship, understand their specific roles, work diligently within their roles, have agreed upon roles, and be mutually supportive" (p. 47). A university's division of advancement is tasked with raising private funds to help reach institutional goals and to support the university's mission and vision. Private funds allow the institution to be competitive in attracting and retaining faculty, staff, and students. However, universities will not be successful in fundraising efforts without a well-organized and strategic plan of action, which includes a clear communication or public relations plan (Overley, 2006). A successful capital campaign public relations plan requires the coordination of the public relations and advancement experts (Gearhart, 1995).

In 2013, Johnson, Grossnickle and Associates (JGA) and the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy reported on gifts with a value of $1 million or more that were received by American higher education institutions between 2000 and 2012. The purpose of the study was to identify the characteristics that help attract major gifts (less than 1/3 of American degree-granting higher education institutions received a publicly announced million-dollar donation during the 12 years of the study). The analysis of the 2013 study explored two dependent variables—number of major gifts and total aggregated value. JGA researchers determined that 1,449 institutions qualified for inclusion in the data set for the study. The 1,449 institutions received a total of 10,501 publicly announced million-dollar-plus gifts worth a combined total of more than $90 billion over the 12-year period. Categorical variables in the year 2000 for the institutions included age of the institution, presidential tenure, and rank per the *U.S. News and World Report*. Of the 1,449 institutions, 250 held Carnegie classification as Doctorate or Research Universities, and those 250 institutions received a majority of the total number and total dollar amount of the gifts (6,009 out of 10,501 gifts received; and $63.5 billion total out of $90.78 billion). Additionally, researchers for the JGA study examined three universities with a history of receiving million-dollar gifts (Arizona State University, DePauw University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology). JGA identified five traits that attracted million-dollar gifts, which included long-term presidents, top rankings, strong alumni support, tenured faculty, and firm financial footing.

One characteristic shared by institutions receiving major gifts was that higher numbers of major gifts were associated with longer presidential tenures and the "president's ability to articulate a powerful vision and connect to donors' motivations have a profound effect" (JGA, 2013, p. 4). JGA's researchers found that increased trustee giving also inspires donor confidence, which furthers the notion that donors invest in established and generous leadership. Second among the characteristics was that top rankings matter as institutions ranked in 2000 by *U.S. News and World Report* received 61% more major gifts through 2012 than those institutions not ranked. JGA (2013) found that inclusion on "Best Colleges" listings does influence donors. Ranked institutions' major gifts showed a 156% increase in the total value of those gifts from 2000 to 2012. "While some higher education observers dismiss national rankings, their impact on million-dollar giving suggests they should be taken seriously" (JGA, 2013, p. 10). The third characteristic was a positive relationship between increased alumni giving and major gifts. The study indicated that a 10% increase in alumni giving was associated with a 0.7% increase in major gifts. With alumni giving, it was found that the age of the institution was also an important characteristic because those founded prior to 1900 received a higher number of major gifts with a greater value over the study period. The fourth characteristic was that institutional commitment to invest in tenured faculty and employee expenses (i.e., the amount spent on salaries and benefits) attracts million-dollar donations. Endowed faculty positions contribute to the positive reputation of the university and help to recruit and retain high-caliber faculty, who enhance teaching, research, and community outreach. The percentage of tenured faculty was associated with the number and value of major gifts. The fifth characteristic noted by the study was that solid financial footing and the institution's endowment value was positively associated with the receipt of major gifts. Additionally, it was found that "an institution's 2001 government funding positively corresponds with both the number and total value of million-dollar gifts from 2000 to 2012" (JGA, 2013, p. 5). Also, institutional type had an impact with liberal arts and doctoral or research universities receiving more million-dollar gifts with higher total values.

Role of the Campus President or Chancellor

Numerous formal studies of the higher education presidency have been conducted beginning with both Schmidt and Stover in 1930. More recent formal studies for the presidency include today's economic challenges (Davies, 2005; Schueler, 2007; Wiser, 2009). Historically, presidents have been the main fundraisers for institutions, and they are key to successful campaigns (Cook & Lasher, 1994). The first formal study on the role of academic presidents in fundraising was Hurtubise's 1988 study of select, small, independent liberal arts colleges and universities. Hurtubise's main purpose was to analyze attitudes of presidents toward fundraising as well as the extent of presidents' involvement in raising funds. Hurtubise (1988) stated that a president "must be involved in and retain final authority over the institution's mission and goals," as well as its finances and fundraising programs (p. 135). Hurtubise (1988) concluded that presidents who believe they are responsible for creating a fundraising culture and climate for their institutions are more successful fundraisers and enhance giving because of their enthusiasm for the institutional goals and mission. Trustees are important to fundraising efforts and must be solicited for gifts and also "trained on how to ask for gifts" (Hurtubise, 1988, p. 133). Hurtubise (1988) wrote that presidents who are successful fundraisers believe the most important role of trustees is in contributing financially to the institution. Additionally, successful fundraising presidents, according to Hurtubise (1988), had clearly written goals. Hurtubise suggested there was a need for future research on how successful fundraising institutions recruit their trustees as volunteers for their fundraising efforts.

In 1985, Fisher provided a chapter on the role of public university presidents in fundraising in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education's (CASE) *Public College and University Development*. However, the first book published on the subject of academic presidency and fundraising was in 1989 (Fisher & Quehl). Fisher & Quehl (1989) reported that there are few reasons that donors give to higher education, which include alumni giving to the institution "out of pride, affection, love, and respect" (p. 118). According to Worth (1993), donors also give out of belief in the institution's mission and the contribution made to greater society. Fisher and Quehl (1989, p. 213) observed that donors who give major gifts to the institution "tend to invest their resources in the president rather than the institution itself." Historically, presidents were too overloaded with other duties to spend great amounts of time cultivating and soliciting gifts (Fisher & Quehl, 1989); although it became more of an expected part of their job duties (Cook & Lasher, 1994). In their report on presidential priorities, Dyson and Kirkman (1989) stated that the percentage of time the president spends on fundraising increases with the lengthened tenure in office.

Literature showed that the campus president concentrates his/her efforts on cultivation and solicitation of major gifts (Altizer, 1992; Cook & Lasher, 1994; Winfree, 1989; Winship, 1984). In Cook and Lasher's 1994 theory on higher education fundraising, the authors indicated that academic quality and institutional prestige are keys to success. Cook and Lasher (1994) stated that presidents must ensure "they have something of real substance to sell to donors whether it is a commitment to maintain quality or a commitment to achieve quality" (p. 23). Cook and Lasher (1994) found that fundraising success is specific to the institution, and that fundraising should be thought of as a team effort and as a dynamic process rather than as a set of rigid rules. The fundraising process, according to Cook and Lasher (1994), "can only be fully appreciated as a dynamic group activity involving a number of interpersonal relationships, role transactions, and social exchanges" (p. 23). Many factors play a role in outcomes since fundraising is a "social exchange, which occurs between donors and institutions" (Cook &

Lasher, 1994, p. 25). Factor-inducing outcomes include "differences in culture, history, tradition, maturity, mission, number of alumni, capacity of the donor base, prestige, academic quality, commitment, effort, leadership style and sales ability of the president and chief development officer, development budget, staff size and expertise, location, support of the local community, etc." (Cook & Lasher, 1994, p. 23).

In Stovall's 2004 case study of the presidents' approach to fundraising at four private and public historically black colleges and universities, he found that although the four institutions differed by type, locale, size, and history, there were several points of commonality. Stovall (2004) found that each president viewed fundraising as essential to their institutions' goals and mission. "Funding for various needs such as new construction and renovation of buildings, endowed chairs and professorships and scholarships were frequently mentioned by the presidents as necessities" and fundraising must be an "integral element of presidents' institutional vision" (Stovall, 2004, p. 134).

Role of University Trustees

In Winfree's 1989 study of the role of persons other than professional development staff in the solicitation of major gifts, he found that although the president was the most important advocate, trustees were more influential with major donor prospects than were the vice president for advancement and other development officers. In Overley's 2006 study of public university leaders as fundraisers, he stated that although presidents must be knowledgeable about major and planned gifts, trustees must also be involved in the advancement process for the fundraising efforts to be comprehensive and successful. The purpose of Overley's 2006 study was to identify fundraising roles of presidents, vice presidents of advancement, and members of the board. "Conceivably, every college or university in America is currently considering a campaign, involved in a campaign, or completing a campaign" (Overley, 2006, p. 123). In Satterwhite's 2004 study of the function of public university presidents in fundraising with capital campaigns less than $100 million, he found that there is a distinct advantage of having a board of volunteers "who could discover and identify with potential donors from a very broad pool" (p. 45). "Trustees often have more clout than CEOs, and should be able to cultivate and solicit their peers of great means" (Fisher & Quehl, 1994, p. 104). The capital campaign steering committee volunteers need the assistance of carefully chosen, well-connected community leaders who possess clout and money and who are willing to invest their resources, time, and talents into the university's fundraising efforts (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Public university trustees "must take responsibility to see that an effective foundation is operating and that, whenever possible, governing board members themselves identify, cultivate, and (when appropriate) call on prospects" (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 103). Trustees, according to Overley (2006), have "vast connections in their communities and throughout their respective states" (p. 127), and can help the president and vice president to identify and solicit potential donors.

Although the basic technical aspects of fundraising are transferable, universities, whether private or public, differ significantly between institutional types (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Trustees for private institutions are responsible for raising funds, with members chosen for their ability to give as well as raise funds (Overley, 2006). In Green's 2000 study of female trustees and their role in fundraising at independent research universities, it was found that boards were "self-perpetuating" as the "most usual way of filling vacancies" (p. 126). According to Green (2000), "boards operate with a committee that identifies potential trustees and supports them throughout the selection process" (p. 126). However, for public institutions, governor-appointed trustees might be chosen because they are community leaders and not because of their financial resources or ability to raise funds (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Although the details of the makeup of public university governing boards may vary, the purpose remains the same, which is to protect the university and its personnel from political pressures, preserve faculty autonomy and academic freedom, and ensure the adequate resources for financial strength and growth (Worth, 2005).

At public research universities, such as the UofA, that are part of large multicampus systems and have governor-appointed trustee members to serve the system of campuses, the system president might not have the opportunity to provide input into choosing new board members. Trustees can be high-profile individuals for a single campus or for the whole university system. Trustees can either be hard-working individuals who help support the mission of the institution and who understand that higher education cannot run on a typical business model, or they can cause great harm to the reputation of the institution. According to Trombley (2007), if trustees are not well informed on all aspects of the financial challenges of the university or if the board chairperson is more loyal to the president than on fiduciary oversight, it could jeopardize the institution. In Arkansas, 17 of 29 governor-appointed trustees for public four-year universities are bankers or have significant ties with banks (Hale-Shelton, 2013). Arkansas's current governor stated that he appoints people who are "honest, good thinkers, that we think are passionate about their respective institution," and the fact that they are bankers "never enters into the decision-making process" (Hale-Shelton, 2013, p. 1A).

Public university trustees are "selected to determine, on behalf of a state's citizens, the direction of the state's colleges and universities in a way that best serves the public interest and assures the effective use of tax funds" (Kimball, 1989, p. 3). However, as public multicampus systems expanded from single campus systems, the role of oversight became more complicated with additional responsibilities for board members (Kimball, 1989). In Kimball's study of whose priorities govern for trustees at one state multicampus university system, it was noted that trustees should not only have an understanding of higher education in general and the missions of the institutions they serve, but also have a "broad perspective" and be "community spirited" (p. 115). Regardless of the need to be community spirited, Kimball found that trustees were not particularly adept at articulating the goals and needs of the university system to the public community. Trustees, who were interviewed for Kimball's study, felt that governor-appointed trustees were much preferred to using a "direct election" of trustees (1989, p. 113). Reasons for opposing the direct election of trustees included the need for raising campaign funds, which might involve "special interest groups" (Kimball, 1989, p. 113). The typical make-up of American university boards of trustees, at the time of Kimball's study in 1989, consisted of mainly elite, upper- to upper-middle-class white males, with an occasional woman or person of color.

A public university president's relationships are numerous, and include trustees, faculty members, students, alumni, donors, journalists, development staff members, business leaders, legislators, foundation executives, and intercollegiate sports fans. There is a widely varying intensity in the relationships—some become intimate and personal, while others are arm's-length and disinterested. Some of the relationships are conducted by mass communication designed to seem personal and direct as with annual fund solicitations. University administrators interact with constituencies (e.g., students, faculty, and staff), and special friends of the institution (e.g., donors) (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). "When the president is asked to make an unacceptable compromise, the institution's integrity as well as the president's is at stake" (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 38). Institutional integrity is not a one-person matter, and the trustees are most important because they are the judges of presidential and chancellor performance and represent the public interest. The fundraising functions are based on personal relationships, which can be ethically charged. The president's and development professionals' characters and competence will be judged as they represent the institutions they serve (Fisher & Quehl, 1989).

Trustees, system presidents, and campus chancellors are expected to have a grasp of the relative importance of each factor of the campus, especially the budgets (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). The campus chancellor, vice chancellor for advancement, and advancement professionals should understand well the institution's goals when seeking and accepting restricted gifts. If the vice chancellor for advancement or major gift officer comes in with a prospective contribution that falls outside the mission of the institution, it is up to the chancellor to turn it down (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Overall responsibilities of governing board members, whether public or private, include being informed about the institution, its resources and financial health, and an understanding of higher education (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). It has been said that public university trustees need to keep their noses in, but hands off when it comes to the managing of the institutions they serve. In Texas, the governor vetoed a bill that sought to rein in some powers of the governing boards of the state's public universities in response to friction between legislators and members of the University of Texas System's board of regents over "micromanaging" the system's flagship institution (Huckabee, 2013, p. 1). Now, more than ever, the future of public universities has many challenges with raising tuition, waning state support, and competition from online education (Perez-Pena, 2013), which requires trustees' understanding of the issues as well as the solutions. According to the president of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, M. Peter McPherson, during times of stress and change, relationships between the administration and trustees become more complicated; and trustees become more tempted to "shift from overseeing to hands-on managing" (Perez-Pena, 2013, p. 1).

The importance of shared governance in higher education cannot be overstated. Failure of trustees (or regents, as they are titled at some higher education institutions) to properly oversee the activities of university administrators, faculty, staff, and students can result in devastating consequences for institutions. An underlying principle of trustee oversight in higher education is that an unchecked monopoly would be a threat to the public good (Ingram & Associates, 1980). A projected $36 million shortfall for FY 2015 for the University of Maine System required the seven campuses to work together to close the budget gap. The cause was speculated to be due to flat funding from the state, rising costs, and flat tuition. The proposed solution required cutting employees (Gluckman, 2014). When shortfalls in the budget are a result of failed oversight, especially if it is due to unchecked spending or criminal activity by administrators or staff members, it can damage the stakeholder's confidence and trust in the institution. Public confidence is not easily restored and can affect future fundraising efforts. However, trustees are not tasked with micromanaging the institution or infringing on academic freedom of the faculty. Fisher and Quehl (1989) suggested that trustee responsibility of ensuring adequate financial resources should strongly mandate the need to act in a fundraising capacity. Overall responsibilities of trustees (public and private) include the following duties:

> (a) Appoint, support, and assess the performance of the president/chancellor; (b) Review regularly and approve the mission of the institution; (c) Approve long-range plans; (d) Approve the educational programs; (e) Ensure the well-being of faculty, students, and staff; (f) Ensure adequate financial resources; (g) Ensure strong financial management (both budget and investments); (h) Maintain the physical plant; (i) Preserve institutional autonomy and academic freedom; (j) Enhance the public image; (k) Interpret the campus to the community and the community to the campus; (l) Serve as a court of last resort; (m) Assess the board's own performance; (n) Be informed about the institution and higher education. (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 102-103)

Advancement and development staff as well as administrators, deans, academic department heads, faculty members, and non-academic department heads are tasked with planning and carrying out the fundraising efforts. Advancement professions should support trustees and others who volunteer to raise funds during a campaign. In addition, the institution must allocate sufficient funds for research and staffing the fundraising effort. Trustees should also show enthusiasm and involvement beyond just attending board and committee meetings. Often, trustees taking volunteer roles in fundraising campaigns can be especially helpful in motivating others. It means a great deal to the institutional campaign leaders, advancement professionals, and volunteers to find trustees are working with them (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). In Nehls' (2011) study of leadership transitions during campaigns at ten colleges and universities, she found that for one institution, the presidential transition pulled the existing members of the board together. In this situation, the board members "realized that they would have to increase their own support, which they did, to demonstrate their own belief in the institution" (Nehls, 2011, p. 100).

Capital Campaigns

Today, billion-dollar campaigns are not uncommon and the University of Virginia announced during its 2013 spring commencement ceremony that its long-term fundraising campaign met its goal of more than $3 billion, from the campaign's beginning in 2004. Today's fundraising efforts and comprehensive capital campaigns are carefully organized and managed. Fisher and Quehl (1989, p. 31) explained that "Prestigious leaders, including college presidents, spearhead the campaign and professional and institutional development officers and consultants stand behind (but not too far)." Comprehensive capital campaigns are standard practice for most institutions, public or private, as the search for financial resources remains a prominent theme in higher education (Balderston, 1995; Cook & Lasher, 1994; Ferrell, 2005; McGoldrick & Robell, 2002; Sevier, 2000). According to Worth (1993), campaigns are "the most visible of today's educational fund-raising efforts" (p. 12) that can "initiate a dramatic, positive trajectory for the institution" (Nehls, 2011, p. 90). A comprehensive, multi-project-driven capital campaign has the ability to "transform an institution" (Bornstein, 1989), although "campaigns are not a means of salvation for ailing institutions" (Rhodes, 1997, p. 7). According to Hendrix-Kral (1995), "By their very nature, capital campaigns offer an opportunity to institute academic change in a system that is notoriously slow to change" (p. 3).

Two forces drive fundraising in higher education—continuous financial need due to the nonprofit nature of higher education and competition from other colleges and universities, which reinforce the tendency toward prestige maximization (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Clark Kerr (1991) stated that fundraising for public and private institutions becomes a mechanism for competitive advantage. In Ferrell's 2005 study of the non-financial elements and factors associated with major campaigns at doctoral-extensive universities, Ferrell suggested that campaigns increase visibility and enhance the institution's reputation, while affording greater constituent involvement. According to Ferrell (2005), campaigns significantly influence the mission and values of the institution, and the growing role of advancement operations is in "creating, charting and navigating the future direction of American colleges and universities" (p. 100). Ferrell (2005) concluded that when university leaders realize the value of a campaign in supporting the mission and values of the institution, they might also realize that a campaign is an excellent means for "creating mission-centered change" (p. 101). Major gifts make the difference between success and failure during a capital campaign, whereas 80% of gifts come from 20% of donors (Overley, 2006). The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) sets guidelines for best practices in accepting and reporting gifts for annual giving and campaigns (CASE, 2009). The capital campaign steering committee volunteers set goals for the institution as well as each college, division, or department while coordinating with department heads and faculty members.

Campaign leadership consists of the university president, advancement and development professionals, and top volunteers of community and business leaders, trustees, alumni, and friends of the institution who volunteer time as members of the campaign steering committee and for individual project committees. The university advancement professionals and staff members, who are salaried employees, manage the campaign and coordinate efforts of the volunteers. Gearhart (1989) found that volunteers were "extremely important to the success of their respective campaigns" (p. 190). In Gearhart's 1995 book published by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) regarding the capital campaign in higher education, he identified six campaign phases. The first phase is commonly known as the "quiet planning phase" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 113). The quite phase requires planning and needs assessment by the internal university leaders and advancement professionals, which can take years to accomplish. The second phase, advance gift phase, is when the campaign is announced to a "small group of benefactors and volunteers, while the major campaign committee is recruited, and the lead gifts are solicited" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 114). The third phase, public phase, is the public announcement of the campaign. The public phase can last several years as major gifts are solicited, and media attention can be an important aspect of this phase. The forth phase, plateau phase, might occur due to volunteer fatigue but might not be experienced during every campaign effort. However, when fatigue occurs, the campaign leaders are tasked with finding solutions to "breathe new life into the campaign" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 114). The fifth and "final phase" of the campaign would be the final push to complete all goals of the campaign and should include "donor-recognition events" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 115). The final phase should be followed by a sixth phase, post-campaign phase, so that the leaders and advancement professionals can assess the success of the campaign and "create a post-campaign plan to continue philanthropic support" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 115).

Harvard University was the first to reach over $2 billion during a capital campaign, when its five-year campaign concluded in 1999 (Worth, 2005). The University of Michigan exceeded their $2.5 billion campaign goal in 2008 when its comprehensive capital campaign closed with $3.2 billion, which at the time was the largest amount ever raised by a public university (Welch, 2009). Comprehensive capital campaigns are "intense efforts to build the financial assets of an institution" (Nehls, 2011), and typically last from five to eight years. Campaign steering committee volunteers coordinate the goals with the strategic plan for the institution to further the mission and vision of where the university administration believes the institution can and should grow and strengthen. The important phases of planning a campaign involve setting priorities; developing campaign strategy; identifying, cultivating, and soliciting prospective donors; setting the standard for other donors through the steering committee members' own giving; and guiding the accountability for and stewardship of campaign results (Hedgepeth, 2003). Hedgepeth (2003) conducted a study for the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) of public colleges and universities, which led to a list of top recommendations for creating a successful campaign. This list included selecting individuals with fundraising capacity, establishing clear expectations, involving board members effectively, and having a clear vision and mission.

Although capital campaigns have become the norm in American higher education, the decision to engage in a campaign must be made with care as well as understanding of the commitment a comprehensive campaign requires of the university leadership and advancement professionals, according to the vice president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), Richard T. Ingram (1980). According to Hedgepeth (2003), leadership by the institutional chancellor is one of the nine best practices identified for a successful campaign, as is the campaign steering committee members' demonstrated leadership. A capital campaign "provides some opportunities that simply do not exist in the ongoing program" (Ingram & Associates, 1980, p. 283). Volunteer leaders, who are part of the campaign steering committee, will often accept assignments with pre-established time limits, which can force a sense of urgency that serves to motivate action. The well-conceived and strategically planned capital campaign creates opportunity for participation and stimulates community enthusiasm and support, which can establish a new, higher plateau of voluntary support for the institution (Ingram & Associates, 1980).

The university leaders need to be prepared to undergo scrutiny by its constituency and volunteers, "especially trustees who will contribute both prestige and funds to the institution" (Ingram & Associates, 1980, p. 284). According to Ferrell (2005), campaigns require a clear vision and "are a mechanism to take stock in the status of the institution, to reflect upon its goals and aspirations" (p. 102), requiring more than the usual academic planning. A campaign planning process includes the "entire institutional stakeholder community" (Ferrell, 2005, p. 102), with a steering committee made up of alumni, community leaders, and trustees, who work closely with the university leaders and advancement professionals. Besides a favorable economy, the institution's reputation among its potential donors and alumni will play a role in a successful outcome for the campaign. In an effort to strengthen the institution with the assistance of a capital campaign, the steering committee sets goals for the campaign in an attempt to eliminate weaknesses in the institution. When recruiting volunteers for any effort, one of the main criteria should be their willingness to be present and engaged in events. With a capital campaign, volunteers need to be willing to lend more than their name to the campaign effort. Volunteers also need to be willing to take part in the planning meetings and the events of the campaign (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Being a volunteer on the campaign steering committee requires early planning with monthly or quarterly meetings. The steering committee should be "composed of persons who not only have philanthropic interest in the organization but who also may occupy senior-level volunteer positions such as chairman of the board, chairman of a supporting foundation organization, or other key volunteers " (Gearhart, 2006, p. 152). The chancellor and most senior campaign development professionals, such as the vice chancellor for advancement, should recruit steering committee members, and this part of the campaign process can take months to accomplish (Gearhart, 2006). An essential part of the steering committee recruitment process is ensuring that all volunteers accept leadership roles and achieve ownership of the campaign. According to Gearhart (2006), "every facet of the effort must have the support and encouragement of the volunteer structure" (p. 151).

The central actors in academic fundraising are the chief executive officer of the institution, volunteers (which can include trustees, college- or program-advising board members, and donors), deans, associate and assistant deans, faculty members, and the advancement or development staff (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Not every department or unit on campus has its own major gift officer. Fundraising depends on intervening forces, which are environmental, institutional, and personal (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Leadership is important to the campaign effort. The system president, campus chancellor, and vice chancellor for advancement provide key leadership to the efforts and should devote a lot of their time toward a campaign. The vice chancellor for advancement and the advancement and development staff provide campaign "information, training, and preparatory work" (Worth, 2012) to volunteers of the steering committee and campus chancellor, when needed.

The nature of capital campaigns is in continuous transition, and new models are emerging, although the essential features will endure (Dove, 2000). The fact that a capital campaign deals with people and their motivations, needs, desires, aspirations, and hopes even more than it deals with formulas, organizational charts, and timetables (Dove, 2000) shows how challenging and complex a comprehensive campaign can be. Dove (2000) included time commitments and support of institutional participants as the number one key component to the campaign success, and considers having a competent staff as number eight on that list. According to Hicks (2006), the measure of success in fundraising is different than the measure of effectiveness since it includes capability and potential as well as dollar totals. Duronio and Loessin (1991) provided conceptual and operational definitions of effectiveness:

> Defined conceptually, fundraising effectiveness is raising the most money with the least amount of expenditures in a manner that enhance the likelihood that current donors will continue their support and that more new donors will contribute. It is enormously difficult to turn the definition into a formula that can be used to answer the question, is our program effective or not? (p. 8)

Importance of University Leadership in Fundraising

Hicks (2006) stated that relationships within the campaign leadership team are complex and ever changing, especially when leadership members changed positions during the campaign; and accordingly, power struggles between key leadership can arise and team dysfunction can affect the overall campaign effort. There are three essential characteristics of successful relationships between the campus chancellor and advancement vice chancellor—expertise, loyalty, and reciprocity (Bornstein, 2000). The campus chancellor has a dramatic impact on the campaign, must support the campaign concept, and must be its strongest advocate (Gearhart, 1995). However, the role of the chief advancement officer is essential to any major gift campaign, and must "provide staff support to the chairperson of the campaign and the president of the institution" (Gearhart, 1995, p. 52). The working relationship between the campus chancellor and vice chancellor for advancement will be important to the overall success for the campaign (Gearhart, 2006).

Fundraising is not an easy task for many institutions and can be stressful. The Bucks for Brains effort in West Virginia is an example of how tough it can be to raise funds in a tough economic climate. According to Williams (2010), the legislation set aside $50 million to stimulate university research; however, institutions, such as West Virginia University and Marshall University, were not able to raise the necessary matching funds. Another example of how stressful it can be was Harvard's President Neil Rudenstine, who took a leave of absence for medical reasons citing the stress of fundraising (Cook, 1997). In response, Robert Hahn, president of Johnson State College, stated, "Mr. Rudenstine's leave of absence suggests that much remains to be done to enlarge our understanding of the perils of academic leadership" (Cook, 1997, p. 53).

According to the literature, leadership and teamwork are important to the success of a capital campaign. A comprehensive capital campaign for a state flagship research university requires strategic planning and deliberate teamwork to succeed (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Immense literature on the topic of leadership and teamwork is available, which covers team functioning, behavior, and success (Lencioni, 2002; Maxwell, 2001; Sholtes, Joiner, & Streibel, 2003). For example, according to Maxwell (2001), because of ego and insecurity, many people try to achieve great things without the assistance of teamwork, which can impede success. In addition, according to Lencioni (2002), it is important to understand the issues that lead to team dysfunction if a team is to be truly effective in working toward a shared vision or outcome. Scholtes, Joiner, and Streible (2003) emphasized, "Teamwork results from a common understanding of the organization's vision and values and a shared commitment" (p. xxiv), and "to succeed, organizations must rely on the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives of a wide range of people to solve multifaceted problems, make good decisions, and deliver effective solutions" (p. 1-1).

Ogungbamila, Ogungbamila, and Adetula (2010) noted that "employees who had positive perceptions of their production work teams were significantly more committed to the workplace than were those who held either neutral or negative perceptions (p. 725)." Each area of development must be treated with the greatest of care and "each individual stands or falls, based on the actions and attitudes of other staff members" (Cooper, 2000, p. 35). Skinner (2010) asserted that the management of resources has become a chronic problem in higher education and is becoming increasingly dire, so campus leaders will need to be more strategic about finances and budgeting, and more engaged in the internal business dynamics of their institutions. Future university presidents will be tasked with fundraising duties more than ever before (Skinner, 2010).

Organizational theorists have proposed that the "special attributes of higher education organizations lead them to adopt unique forms of administrative control and organizational structure" (Grunig, 1995, p. 66). According to Caboni (2010), one of the challenges for higher education fundraising as it progresses is the "lack of inquiry into the fundraising function within the college and university environment" (p. 10). Caboni continued that, recently, the topic of fundraising in higher education has been explored in the literature, which included looking at the president's role. However, literature is lacking on the knowledge fundraisers need to perform their job duties or the dynamics required for successful fundraising teamwork (Caboni, 2010). Development officers "have the potential for causing great harm to the institution" (Caboni, 2010, p. 11) if they are not prepared to perform their duties, and the same can be said for the leadership of the fundraising efforts. Because development officers can have great latitude afforded to them when soliciting gifts, they can accept donations during a capital campaign that can "move the institution in an academic direction in which its leaders had not intended" (Caboni, 2010, p. 10). Thus, leadership needs to be aware of all aspects of gift giving to the institution. Zenger and Folkman (2002) stated that leaders influence the people within their organizations and the external clients they serve. Zenger and Folkman (2002) explored leadership qualities and skills and found that great leaders make a huge difference when compared to merely good leaders, and one organization can have many great leaders. Kotter (1990) described distinct differences between leadership and management skills, and stated "the most obvious of the characteristics [for leadership] that are established before puberty is one related to drive, ambition or energy level" (p. 105). According to Selingo (2013), college presidents need to evolve and cites the American Council on Education (ACE) survey of presidents who reported spending most of their time on fundraising, budgeting, community relations, and planning.

Managing the budget and physical plant of a higher education system allows trustees to find themselves on familiar ground due to their business backgrounds, versus dealing with academic programs, the departmental structure, the faculty senate, and other such issues (Ingram

& Associates, 1980), which might be out of the trustees' normal fields of expertise. According to Ingram and Associates (1980), trustees provide highly useful perspectives, which may be one of their most significant contributions. For the most part, colleges and universities are well served by the men and women who lead them (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). The demands of the university leader's office arise from the need to improve educational quality, verify teaching and research performance, expand educational opportunity, ensure educational success of the students, retrain the national workforce, and foster economic development (Fisher & Quehl, 1989), while ensuring the financial health of the institution.

Volunteers: Role of the Campaign Steering Committee

A campaign steering committee is responsible for the design and implementation of the campaign plan; ongoing communication with constituencies; identification, cultivation, and solicitation of prospects; setting campaign priorities in partnership with the executive and academic leaders; and campaign problem solving and strategic changes as needed, according to Hedgepeth's 2003 study of public college and university foundation boards and how they contribute to campaign success. Furthermore, the campaign steering committee is responsible for seeing that philanthropy becomes ingrained in the "institution's way of life" (Hedgepth, 2003, p. 13). University administrative and volunteer leadership on the campaign steering committee are essential to the campaign effort. At some institutions, the foundation board serves as the campaign steering committee (Hedgepeth, 2003). However, "given the foundation board's responsibility for overall foundation policy, investment management, and other important functions, the responsibility of campaign leadership and management usually is delegated to the board's development committee or to a separately constituted campaign steering committee" (Hedgepeth, 2003, p. 13).

The role of top-performing fundraising professionals is not simply raising money. During a capital campaign, major gift officers will work hand-in-hand with the steering committee members and special project committee members to ensure the goals are met. Major gift officers will support the president, vice president for advancement, and steering committee members who are tasked with cultivation and solicitation of major donors. The fundraising professionals need to understand the goals and mission of the institution and the funds raised should be in support of the mission and vision of the institution in carrying out the "responsibilities for making lives better, creating potential in the lives of its students" (Hedgepeth, 2003, p. 19). Equally important to the university's mission of student recruitment and retention should be supporting faculty research and salaries with endowed chairs to strengthen faculty retention. According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) in its *Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2014*, governors have outlined initiatives for the 2014 session, which included attracting "leading scientists, researchers and professors to universities through endowed department chairs" (AASCU, 2014). University advancement professionals carry out the day-to-day duties and activities of the campaign effort, in support of the steering committee and the campaign strategic plan and goals. According to Fisher and Quehl (1989), fundraising objectives integrate with the academic objectives and are as important as any other function in achieving the mission, vision, and goals and should not be thought of as "separate, or judged by a different (and lower) standard" (p. 35). In other words, mission and vision matter to the fundraising effort and the overall success of the capital campaign, as do clear goals and role expectations of steering committee volunteers and fundraising professionals (Hedgepeth, 2003).

Public University Funding in Arkansas

In Arkansas, the higher education system is larger than the state can easily afford, which is a major funding challenge. According to the UofA's *2010 Financial Outlook* report, only 16% of the state's net available general revenue was allocated for higher education institutions, which included 11 four-year institutions and 22 two-year colleges (there was a total of 44 public and private non-profit institutions of higher learning in Arkansas). At the UofA, the percentage of revenue provided by state funding fell from 31% in fiscal year 2001 to 21% in fiscal year 2011. In 1999, the state appropriation made up about 46% of the educational and general (E&G) budget; although by fiscal year 2008, state appropriations comprised only 24% of the total UofA revenue and 33% of the unrestricted E&G segment of the University's revenue (UofA, 2009). According to Kelderman (2012), state spending on higher education is rebounding in most states, even though state appropriations fell by 11% since 2008. The UofA fared better than many of its peer institutions across the country due to private gift support, which began in earnest with the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC) in 1998. Financial needs affect all businesses, even non-profit organizations and higher education institutions. The UofA receives the majority of its operating income from two sources (a) funds from the State of Arkansas (called state appropriations), and (b) student tuition/fees. According to Brubacher and Rudy (2008), "While endowments and taxes bore the brunt of financing higher education, it would be a mistake to underestimate the importance of student tuition" (p. 308). For the UofA to remain nationally competitive, its state appropriations and tuition revenues must keep pace with inflation and increases in enrollment (UofA, 2008).

Financial State of the University of Arkansas

In 1997, the UofA's goal of becoming a nationally competitive research institution with competitive students, faculty and staff salaries, scholarship funds, and first-rate equipment and facilities necessitated raising private support. Shortly after the UofA began planning its capital campaign, the 2010 Commission was created to make the case to the legislators for increased state appropriations. The 2010 Commission of 92 business, educational, and governmental leaders was tasked with preparing a 10-year plan to position Arkansas to compete with the strongest states in the nation (UofA, 2001a). With leadership at the UofA, there was a push to help Arkansans change their way of thinking with the outdated belief that "We're Going to Be Poor, and We're Going to Stay Poor," as reported by the headlines in *Arkansas Business* (2000), according to *Making the Case: The Impact of the University of Arkansas on the State of Arkansas* (UofA, 2001a).

The UofA's CTFC assisted greatly with the UofA's current vision to be recognized as one of the nation's top 50 public research universities, with nationally ranked departments and programs throughout the institution (UofA, 2012b). Although the CTFC concluded in 2005, the UofA continued to raise private gift support of $590.2 million between 2006 and 2011. The UofA has continued to grow in its number of students and in reputation. In 2011, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classified the UofA as a research university with very high research activity, ranking it with only 107 other universities nationwide (108 out of 4,633) placing the UofA among the top 2% of research universities in the country. In fall of 1997, the UofA enrollment was 15,060 students and grew to 25,341 students by the fall of 2013. The academic programs included more than 200, with 81 major fields of undergraduate study, 81 master's degree programs, 15 certificate programs, and 37 doctoral programs. For the UofA's fiscal year 2011, instructional faculty included 1,087 (full time: 989, part time: 98), and a student-to-faculty ratio was 18 to 1. Research expenditures for fiscal year 2005 were $108 million, which was up from $73.7 million in 1997 (UofAOC, 2005). Research expenditures for fiscal year 2011 were approximately $120 million. For fiscal year 2010, the annual UofA scholarship and fellowship expenditures were over $20 million.

State financial and political support remains critical to the UofA's mission and financial health, and general revenue forecasts remain positive and fluctuations in general revenue distributions were minimal during 2011 (UofA, 2012b). The total general revenue distribution from the state for 2011 was $195.3 million, which essentially restored state funding back to 2009 levels. The estimated total general revenue distribution from the state for 2012 was $195.9 million, which shows the effect of state funding levels remaining virtually flat. In addition, the UofA received $14.7 million in federal stimulus (ARRA) funds in 2011 for a total of $35.2 million since 2009, which provide support for operating expenses, capital projects, and research. The Arkansas Research and Education Optical Network (AREON) project received a $41.2 million stimulus-funded grant to continue construction of the statewide optical network.

Private gift support remains fundamental in meeting the UofA's budgetary needs. In 2011, the UofA recorded $121.3 million of private gift support, which was a 40% increase over 2010, with record highs in both the number of gifts and new pledges as well as number of benefactors. In addition, the condition of the UofA's capital assets was another important measure of the University's overall financial health. Providing and maintaining facilities that create a living and learning environment are vital to recruiting and retaining students, faculty, and staff. However, it is state support that helps the institution hold down the cost of tuition and fees for the students.

The Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) has a funding formula for state appropriations. However, the formula has not been fully funded by the state for years. In 2010, the UofA was underfunded by the state by more than $37.3 million, according to the ADHE's need-based funding formula estimate. For 2013, the funding formula estimate was $75 million behind where it should be (UofA, 2012b). In addition, state budget cuts continued during fiscal year 2008-2009, which widened the financial needs gap. To put this in perspective, in 2006, the UofA would have needed to more than double its $763 million endowment to make up the gap in funding (*Funding the Flagship*, 2008). Unfortunately, the UofA ranks in the bottom third among the universities of the Southeastern Conference (SEC) in the sum of state appropriations and tuition resources available. The leaders of the UofA took steps to combat this ranking with raising private funds and by rightsizing the institution that included growing the enrollment, because the UofA was still one of the smallest of the universities in the SEC (UofA, 2012b). The UofA increased its total enrollment by 20% between 2008 and 2011 with 48% increase in freshmen enrollment. The tuition and fee revenue increase from the growth in enrollment (both in-state and out-of-state) was critical for attracting faculty, maintaining facilities, and increasing compensation in the face of flat state funding (UofA, 2012b). In addition to student enrollment, over the same time period, new tenure-track faculty positions were added to maintain the student to faculty ratio (UofA, 2012b).

Brief Historical Context of Fundraising at the University of Arkansas

The University of Arkansas was chosen because the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-first Century was highly successful and "transformative" for the campus, according to the North Central Association accreditation team in 2007 (UofA, 2007). The UofA has advanced in national rankings since fundraising began in earnest in the late-1980s, when the UofA was a *U.S.*

News and World Report third-tier ranked institution with a meager endowment. By 2004, the *U.S. News and World Report* placed the UofA in the top tier of its rankings of *America's Best Colleges*, and placed the UofA, for the first time, among the top public universities in the nation—one among only 64 universities. In 2012, *U.S. News and World Report's* national survey of higher education leaders selected the UofA as one of the top 10 "up and coming" public universities in the U.S. (UofA Newswire, 2012b). In 2012, the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* fifth annual survey of faculty, staff, and administrators, recognized the UofA, along with only 102 other colleges or universities out of nearly 300 surveyed across the country, in the category of "Confidence in Senior Leadership" (UofA Newswire, 2012a).

Before G. David Gearhart became the UofA's chancellor in 2008, he was the UofA's vice chancellor for university advancement and chief architect of the Campaign for the Twenty-first Century. Vice Chancellor Gearhart and Chancellor John A. White, Jr. provided great leadership for the institution, and according to one administrator, "it was fortunate in timing that we had Dave Gearhart and John White here at the same time, because of what [their] expectations were, about what [they] had seen at other institutions, and [their] recognition of the absolute necessity of private support" (UofA administrator, personal communication, August 30, 2012). In 2004, due to the results of the CTFC, the UofA was ranked in the top four, along with Harvard University, Stanford University, and the University of Pennsylvania, of the nation's most accomplished universities in fundraising. Chancellor White knew when he became chancellor in 1997 "that he wanted to make fundraising a very high priority" (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 18, 2012).

In 1982 before the system president's office moved from the Fayetteville campus to a system office in Little Rock, Arkansas, the UofA hired its first chancellor for the flagship campus. Ray Thornton became the system president in 1984 and oversaw the move of the president's office from the Fayetteville campus to a separate administrative office in Little Rock. Thornton left the presidency in 1990, and B. Alan Sugg became the system president and served until 2011. Under Sugg's leadership, expansion of the university system included five community colleges and the University of Arkansas at Fort Smith. The system also added the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute, the Criminal Justice Institute, the Clinton School of Public Service, and the Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences and Arts during Sugg's tenure. President Sugg was the second-longest-serving president in the university's history.

The first two chancellors appointed to the UofA campus stayed in the chancellor position for only one year each. However, when President Thornton hired UofA's Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Daniel E. Ferritor to be chancellor in 1986, Ferritor provided much needed stability and laid the foundation for the UofA's progress. President Thornton charged Ferritor with two projects and both required considerable fundraising efforts. The first project was to renovate Old Main (a landmark building for the institution that was constructed between 1873 and 1875), and the second project was to build an Arts Center with funds partially provided by a private Foundation. Ferritor led the Old Main campaign to raise over $13 million from private and public sources, and Old Main was restored. Although a private Foundation gave a major gift to be used for the building of an auditorium that would accommodate major touring shows as well as other performing arts opportunities, more funds needed to be raised to accomplish that project goal. Under Ferritor's leadership, the UofA partnered with the City of Fayetteville and the Walton Arts Center was completed in 1992. The only other fundraising campaign for the UofA, before the Old Main campaign, was also for a specific reason, which was a Campaign for Books in the early 1980s, chaired by Frank Broyles, athletics director, and was followed by the UofA's first capital campaign, Campaign for Arkansas, which raised approximately $175 million.

Frank Broyles' name repeatedly came into the conversations during interviews for this study. Broyles became the head football coach for the UofA in 1957 and was athletic director from 1973 to 2007. During his 50 years with the UofA, Broyles was a great fundraiser for the institution. The UofA's athletic department is one of only 20 institutions in the country to be self-supporting (Palafox, 2014). Broyles was one of the UofA's strongest ambassadors for athletics and academic programs. Broyles worked diligently to raise funds to create athletic facilities on the UofA campus that would rival any university in America. Under Broyles' leadership, the athletic department raised funds to construct world-class athletic facilities without using tax revenues. Broyles chaired the Campaign for Books and helped Chancellor Ferritor raise funds for the restoration of Old Main. Broyles also assisted Chancellor White with fundraising and was co-chair of the Campaign for the Twenty-first Century and was a generous personal benefactor to the university's academic programs. Broyles accompanied both Chancellors Ferritor and White during fundraising events and opened many doors to fundraising opportunities during his tenure.

Throughout the 1970s, public universities were thought of as agencies of state government (Worth, 2012). Before Ferritor became chancellor, fundraising was not a common or necessary part of the University of Arkansas. Seventy percent of the UofA's budget was provided by the state, and the rest was tuition driven. Private institutions began raising private funds in earnest in the 1970s. Once it became clear that the UofA had needs that the state budget could not fill, Ferritor hired a new vice chancellor for institutional planning and development in 1989, and tasked that vice chancellor with developing a fully functioning advancement office.

At that time, Ferritor moved the Arkansas Alumni Association under the direction of that vice chancellor. Under Ferritor's and the vice chancellor's directions, the UofA increased annual giving from $3- to $4-million-a-year to approximately $20 million yearly.

President Sugg and Chancellor Ferritor worked well together over the next seven years before Ferritor stepped down as chancellor. Dr. Sugg recruited John A. White, Jr. to become the UofA chancellor in 1997. When the vice chancellor for institutional planning and development retired in 1998, Chancellor White hired G. David Gearhart to be the new vice chancellor for university advancement. At the same time that Gearhart was hired, the UofA's media and university relations division was moved to report directly to the vice chancellor for advancement instead of the chancellor. This change in the reporting structure provided for an integrated structure, which Gearhart studied in 1989. Gearhart understood the importance of the role of the media relations and communication offices during a comprehensive capital campaign.

In 1997, Chancellor John A. White, Jr. came to the UofA from Georgia Technology Institute, where he was dean of engineering. Fundraising was not new to White and he understood that the UofA campus required private funds to move it toward its mission and new vision to become a "nationally competitive, student-centered research university serving Arkansas and the world" (UofAUREL, 2001, p. 3), and to move up from a *U.S. News and World Report* third-tier ranking into the top tier of American public universities. While White was chancellor, the UofA had five goals, which were to strengthen academic quality and reputation by developing and enhancing programs of excellence in teaching, research, and service; to improve the quality and size of the student body; to improve the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students; to generate increased private gift support; and to generate increased public support (UofAOC, 2000). There were many challenges, and White began by asking the system board of trustees to raise standards. It was said that "John White had very high goals set for the University of Arkansas and he wanted it to be successful, and probably the best decision he made as chancellor was convincing Dave Gearhart to come back to Arkansas and be the chief fundraiser and chief development officer" (UofA administrator, personnel conversation, October 18, 2012). When G. David Gearhart moved into the chancellor position in 2008, the UofA's vision was refined to become recognized as one of the nation's top 50 public research universities, with nationally ranked departments and programs throughout the institution (UofA, 2012a).

The UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century

The UofA's capital campaign, the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC), which ran from 1998 to 2005, raised $1.046 billion and brought about great changes for the campus. The campaign was among the largest by a public university and received the largest gift to date for an American public university with a $300-million gift from the Walton Family Charitable Support Foundation in 2002. A large endowment from this Walton gift established the UofA's first honors college, which has since been recognized as one of the top 50 public honors programs in the nation and allows the UofA to compete for top students. Several of the UofA's programs now rank among the best in the country, including Supply Chain Management, Rehabilitation Counseling, Industrial Engineering, and Biological and Agricultural Engineering.

Most significantly, in 1997, the UofA's endowment was $119 million, but by the end of the CFTC in 2005, the UofA's endowment grew to $691.5 million, and to $818 million by Fiscal Year (FY) 2013. The number of endowed positions created through the CTFC included 81 endowed chairs and 51 endowed professorships. The number of endowed scholarships and fellowships increased from 493 to 1,971, and the number of non-endowed scholarships and fellowships increased from 356 to 616. In addition to the $300-million Walton Foundation gift, the UofA alumni contributed 14% of the total raised ($141.3 million), parents and friends contributed 4% ($49 million) corporations contributed 22% ($228.1 million), foundations contributed 40% ($141.1 million), the Razorback Foundation raised 10% ($110 million), and the remaining 10% (103.5 million) came under the "other" category.

Since the end of the CTFC, the UofA's recognition in rankings has increased in many areas. *Kiplinger's Personal Finance*, the *Princeton Review*, and *Forbes* recognized UofA among top 100 values. *U.S. News and World Report* recently ranked the Sam M. Walton College of Business 27th in the country among public undergraduate business schools and 37th best M.B.A. program, and ranked the UofA School of Law 36th among public law schools. In *U.S. News and World Report's* 2015 edition of *Best Graduate Schools*, the UofA's College of Education and Health Professions broke into the top 100 best graduate education programs (UofA, 2014). The Fay Jones School of Architecture ranked 19th in the nation by the *Design Futures Council*, and the Honors College, which was founded by funds given during the campaign, ranked 17th in Overall Excellence in the first national study of leading public honors programs by *A Review of Fifty Public University Honors Programs*. The *QS University World Rankings* listed the UofA Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences as tied for 51st in the world. The CTFC generated thousands of new student scholarships, fellowships, and endowed positions, and almost $300 million in capital improvements.

Private giving cannot take the place of state support in maintaining facilities, paying for utilities, and addressing the basic operating needs of the university. Private giving is almost all given for specific purposes, such as endowed faculty positions, scholarships, and new construction. More than half the campaign's billion dollars went into the UofA's endowment, whose principal cannot be touched and whose earnings are restricted to uses specified by the donors. Almost all the private funds raised during the CTFC can only be used as designated by the donor and not for general operating expenses.

Summary

Universities are receiving less support but more oversight and restrictions from federal and state government officials. While drastic budget cuts for public universities might be behind them, as the nation slowly recovers from the effects of a recession, federal and state funding might include only slight increases or remain flat in the future. The quality and effectiveness of a university can be greatly enhanced by private support. "In today's environment, knowledgeable, committed, and engaged boards are central to the success of colleges and universities" (AGB, 2013, p. 18). Board governance and institutional leadership benefits greatly when all are working together to ensure the institution is able to meet its mission and reach its vision. Large capital campaigns are assisted greatly by a lead volunteer committee for strategic planning, establishing goals, and reviewing lists of names for additional volunteer committee members or potential donors (Gearhart, 2006).

The university's academic quality and prestige are critically important in the fundraising efforts (Cook & Lasher, 1994). An institution's president or chancellor is typically the central player on the fundraising team (Cook, 1997; Cook & Lasher, 1994; Ferrell, 2005), and should focus on the major gifts as well as cultivation of major donors. The fundraising capabilities of the chancellor along with his/her time commitment to the fundraising efforts are important elements of the capital campaign (Bennett & Hays, 1986). The campus chancellor would head the campaign steering committee.

Fundraising is not new to higher education, and public research universities rely on organized philanthropy to fill in for funding gaps, as well as to strengthen the institution and remain competitive. The comprehensive capital campaign depends on great leadership, coordination within the institution, and a strategic plan matched with the institutional mission and vision. Private universities rely on carefully chosen trustees for fundraising and financial gifts; however, public universities cannot depend on governor-appointed trustees to be able to step up at that level of service. Many public university trustees are community leaders and have clout and resources, and in many cases, the talent for fundraising.

While an abundance of literature exists on university fundraising and leadership, these studies do not illustrate the role of the trustees during a major capital campaign within a public research university, which is part of a multicampus system. There are studies that examine the role of a foundation board, or the president/chancellor role in fundraising, but few that examine the role of trustees at public institutions. Based on the literature, this study sought to provide evidence that public higher education trustees can provide leadership and are prepared for the task of serving on the campaign steering committee, while lending influence and prestige to the effort. In 1980, Ingram and Associates wrote that inadequate support of programs can "undermine the future health and prospects of the institution" (p. 325), which still rings true in today's higher education climate. According to Ferrell (2005), a comprehensive capital campaign provides university leaders an "ability to reevaluate, reinterpret, and potentially reinvent an institution's sense of itself in ways that honor its traditions, strengths and mission" (p. 104).

Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the role of trustees during the University of Arkansas's (UofA) Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC). The CTFC concluded in 2005 and raised over $1 billion dollars. A single case study design with in-person interviews of trustees and administrators was used to gain a thorough understanding of the trustee role during the campaign, and was intended to understand the complexity of the single case (Stake, 1995).

Research Design

For this intrinsic, single case study design, the researcher used the naturalistic approach without a predetermined theoretical framework to understand the role of trustees during the campaign. Qualitative research without a predetermined framework produces findings arrived from real-world settings (Patton, 2002). With a qualitative approach, the researcher relied on the perspectives of the trustees and administrators who were the focus of the study, requiring the researcher to conduct the inquiry in as personal and subjective manner as possible (Creswell, 2008).

The researcher attempted to provide the reader with a "depiction of enough detail to show that the author's conclusion makes sense" (Merriam, 2009, p. 210). A flexible qualitative approach for this inquiry included in-person interviews of the capital campaign leaders (administrative and system trustees) to provide a richness and understanding of the data collected (Creswell, 2008). With the researcher's intrinsic interest to understand this particular case, the researcher acted as the instrument for data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2008). Qualitative research, being best suited for understanding and description (Creswell, 2008), allowed for an investigation of perspectives from individuals who were involved in the CTFC. The researcher's constructivist approach enabled the meanings or perspectives of participants to be studied in-depth and the trustees' or administrators' particular words to be used to convey their meanings directly to the reader. Ways of thinking about issues, which may not have occurred to the researcher, are often revealed during the interview process giving the complexities of the real world a chance to surface (Williamson, 2006). For this case study, the researcher used a qualitative approach based on the following features (a) the meaning people construct, (b) how the researcher collected and analyzed the data, (c) how the researcher interviewed and observed university leaders and advancement team members in their natural environments and during the events of the campaign, and (d) how the process yielded richly descriptive information (Buckman, 2010; Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995).

The first feature—meaning people construct—is characteristic of the constructivist approach with a purpose of understanding (Creswell, 2008). The constructivist approach focuses on (a) subjective meaning by participants, (b) explicit researcher values and beliefs, and (c) suggestive or tentative conclusions (Creswell, 2008). Qualitative researchers support the belief that knowledge is constructed rather than discovered (Stake, 1995). For this study, it was important to recognize that the participants constructed their own views of campaign roles and the events in which they took part. During the study's interviews of trustees and administrators, the participants' narratives were of their own making. Using an interview guide assisted the researcher in an effort not to lead the participants in their account of events. With the constructivist viewpoint, we all arrive at our own version of the truth. Our version of the truth depends on how we construct meaning of experiences and understanding of issues or situations depending on our background, culture, and embedded worldview—we all construct our own realities. All reality is a narrative construction in the imagination of individuals, and, at very least, it is a "selective achievement of memory recall; beyond that, recounting one's life is an interpretive feat" (Bruner, 1986, p. 693).

The second feature—researcher as primary instrument and one who collected and analyzed the data—involved treating participants' perspectives and the case's uniqueness as important (Stake, 1995). The researcher considered each trustee or administrator and their perspectives and experiences while involved in the campaign to be important to the findings of this study.

The third feature—interviewed and observed university leadership—was an attempt to understand others' perspectives (Stake, 1995) as well as the trustees' assessments of their roles during the CFTC. The researcher was not only able to interview the leaders of the campaign, but was also able to observe the leaders and events of the campaign during its duration, by way of being a staff member in the Chancellor's Office.

The fourth feature—richly descriptive information—involved interviews of the key leaders and review of archival documents of the campaign and UofA and provided rich information for analysis (Creswell, 2008).

Single Case Study

This case study was an empirical inquiry with a flexible research design to capture the perspectives of trustees' and administrators' real life events. Therefore, this research was best suited for a design known as single case study in an effort to understand a period in time at one institution and the perceptions of individuals involved in the phenomenon (Merriam, 1988), and where multiple sources of evidence were used (Yin, 1984). The researcher attempted to understand the phenomenon through interviews with participants, observations of events, and document review. Case study researchers attempt to seek holistic description, understanding, and explanation (Merriam, 1988) of the phenomenon that cannot be easily separated from their context (Yin, 1984). The researcher sought thick description (Merriam, 1988) of the phenomenon being studied to understand the demographic and descriptive data in terms of cultural norms and mores, community values, and deep-seated attitudes and notions (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). According to Stake (1995), case studies must have boundaries, and according to Merriam (2009), if the phenomenon is not "intrinsically bounded, it is not a case" (p. 41). In fact, Merriam (1998) concluded that the single most defining characteristic of case study research lies in delimiting the object of study. This study was bounded by its focus on the role of trustees during the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century at the University of Arkansas, which was of intrinsic interest to the researcher.

Sampling

Among public higher education institutions, land-grant research universities tend to have the longest fundraising traditions (Hicks, 2006). Since 1871, the UofA has been the state's flagship land-grant university. In 2011, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching placed the UofA in the highest research classification, based on the number of doctoral degrees awarded, grants received, and level of research activity—only 108 of the nation's top universities hold this distinction (UofA Newswire, 2011). The researcher felt that the UofA's journey to holding this distinction began with its CTFC in 1998. Before the campaign began, the UofA's endowment was $119 million, and at its conclusion in 2005, the UofA's endowment was $691.5 million. The UofA's capital campaign, the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century, raised $1.046 billion. Several UofA trustees had roles in the campaign and this study attempted to understand those roles. In fact, the researcher identified the names of at least 17 past, present, and future trustees who were members of the CTFC steering committee. There were more than 100 prominent alumni and friends who assisted with the campaign effort, and who volunteered "their time, talent, and leadership to serve each of the schools, colleges, units, and also to represent regional interests in the University of Arkansas throughout the Campaign as a member of a constituent or regional committee" (UofA, 2001b). Six of those volunteers were current members of the UofA's board of trustees at the time of the campaign.

Maximal variation sampling, a purposeful sampling strategy, was used for this study. Individuals who differed on some characteristic or trait (Creswell, 2008) and who represented a wide range of characteristics (Merriam, 2009) were purposely chosen to be interviewed. The differentiated characteristic in this case was variation of the participants' job titles and their roles in the CTFC. According to Patton (1990), this sampling strategy can be used in a single case to ensure variations in experiences are understood "while also investigating core elements and shared outcomes" (p. 172). The purposeful sample for this study included intentionally selected trustees and those administrators who worked closely with the trustees and who participated in the CTFC in an attempt to develop many perspectives (Creswell, 2008) of the trustees' roles. The sample population was chosen purposefully to obtain rich information (Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002) and included the following individuals who were in key leadership positions (a) four system trustees, (b) past system president, (c) one current and two past campus chancellors, (d) vice chancellor for university advancement (who is currently the chancellor), (e) associate vice chancellor for development, (f) assistant vice chancellor for advancement, and (g) two directors of development (major gift officers from different colleges). The purposeful sample included 12 individuals and their perceptions of trustees' roles to provide a variety of lenses, which allowed for "multiple facets of the phenomenon to be revealed and understood" (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544).

Data Collection

The researcher served as the primary instrument for data collection and analysis through in-depth interviews with trustees and administrators and document review. Emergent design flexibility was used to allow for following whatever direction the phenomenon took the researcher. Inductive analysis approach permitted issues of the case to emerge from the data collected. An interview guide of questions was followed to ensure consistency of approach with participants, but the list of questions varied somewhat depending on the participant being interviewed. As defined by Shelton (2004), the researcher strived to enable a future investigator to repeat the study by attempting to leave an audit trail. The transcribed data was managed with the assistance of a database that included all written correspondence with participants, such as email messages. Transcripts were sent to participants for member checking to ensure the researcher had portrayed the issues as the participants intended. In addition, the researcher kept a reflexive journal during the study. Microsoft Outlook messaging software was used to keep track of schedules of events, interviews, and contact information.

Collection of information for this study included data from two primary sources—campaign-related documents and publications, both archival and current, and interviews of university and campaign leaders and campaign team members at the UofA. The systematic collection of data from multiple data points enhanced validation by triangulation (Creswell, 1994, 2008; Hicks, 2006; Stake, 1995). The systematic collection of data using an interview protocol and processing data with the aid of hand analysis of the data by the researcher increased study reliability (Creswell, 2008).

The collected and analyzed documents consisted of campaign case statements, brochures, organizational charts, campaign newsletters (print and electronic), planning documents, management reports, academic catalogs, 2010 Commission reports, and The Council for Aid to Education Annual Voluntary Support of Education Survey. The researcher transcribed from digital audio files all interview and meeting data. The texts of all interviews were combined into one document to organize materials for coding and annotating (Creswell, 2008).

Researcher as Instrument

Interest in this topic resulted from the researcher being an employee of the UofA Chancellor's Office since 1993, although the researcher began working for the UofA in 1976. This shared background helped gain access to the participants and provided understanding of the participants' experiences, and allowed the researcher to witness the progress of the institution. Fiscal health of the institution before and after the results of the campaign were observed and reviewed during this study. Personal reflections about the meaning of the data were included in the study because the researcher's perspectives and views cannot be kept completely separate from interpretations (Stake, 1995). The researcher was a staff member of the Chancellor's Office during the time of the CTFC, and therefore, felt well positioned to reflect and remark on the larger meaning of the data based on personal interaction with the participants.

Field-Testing

Field-testing of the interview question guide included key UofA advancement professionals. Field-test material was sent to UofA advancement and development professionals including (a) associate vice chancellor for development, (b) executive director of development, (c) several college-level directors of development, (d) director and associate director of constituent relations, (e) director of university relations, and (f) several past and present students of the doctoral higher education leadership degree program. Of those in the field-test group, two directors of development for college deans were interviewed regarding their work with trustees during the campaign—those two interviews were included as part of this study. The two directors of development interviews provided rich information because the individuals worked closely with trustees during the campaign. One of the directors interviewed worked closely with one trustee who was a participant in the study, providing for a triangulation of information. The field-test materials requested feedback on format, content, and clarity of the Request for Participation Letter (Appendix A), Informed Consent Form (Appendix B), Interview Guide (Appendix C), and Member Checking Correspondence (Appendix D), which was sent requesting participation in the study. Because of the field-testing and the feedback received, two questions were added to the interview guide, which focused on how well campaign information was communicated. The two additional questions regarding communication were (a) During the campaign, did you feel that communication from the leadership was timely; and (b) Did communication provide enough background information for the job that you were doing?

The researcher field-tested the audio recording equipment and the interview guide by interviewing two UofA advancement professionals. The professionals (both directors of development for different academic college dean's offices) interviewed understood well the UofA's advancement organizational structure and had expertise and familiarity with UofA's fundraising efforts and the CTFC. The participant interviews took place in a conference room located inside the Chancellor's Office. The confidential field-test interviews were conducted to ensure the interview questions were concise and provided for the collection of rich data.

Interviews

The researcher conducted person-to-person conversations (Merriam, 2009) with trustees and administrators to discuss their experiences and opinions regarding the roles of trustees during the campaign. The researcher felt that the participants were articulate, did not hesitate to speak, and seemed to share their opinions comfortably (Creswell, 2008). Member checking letters and transcripts were sent to each participant to ensure accuracy (Appendix D). Four of the participants returned their transcripts with handwritten notes for correction or clarification to their transcripts. The remaining participants confirmed for the researcher that they had no changes to include.

The UofA's David and Barbara Pryor Center for Arkansas Oral and Visual History provided a high-quality audio kit for the researcher to capture the interviews. The audio kit inventory included (a) Marantz PMD661 Digital Audio Recorder, (b) two Sony Electret Condenser Microphone ECM-88B units, (c) Sony Dynamic Stereo Headphones MDR-7506, and (d) documentation of interviewing instructions and guides. Apple iTunes software was used for converting the recorded interviews from .wav files to MP3 files. The researcher transcribed the MP3 files using *ExpressScribe* software, which is a professional-quality transcription program, using a MAC Air laptop. According to Merriam (2009), verbatim transcription of interviews provides the best database for analysis. The high quality of the recordings assisted with assuring accuracy of the transcripts. After each interview was transcribed, the researcher listened to each recorded interview while reading each transcript to ensure accuracy before engaging in member checking. A *Polycom SoundStation2W Wireless* conference speaker telephone was used for one interviewee who lived out of state—this interview was also recorded and transcribed. In addition, the researcher took notes during each interview as key issues were discussed.

Observations and Observational Field Notes

Not everything can be observed, such as feelings, thoughts, and intentions (Patton, 2002), as researchers attempt to find out what is "in and on someone else's mind" (p. 341). However, part of qualitative research includes observations made while gathering information (Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 2009). As a staff member of the Chancellor's Office, the researcher was part of the everyday working environment of most participants during the duration of the CTFC, in addition to an occasional working relationship with the rest of the participants. The researcher did not observe or participate in direct fundraising events or preparatory meetings during the campaign; however, the researcher did attend celebratory campaign events, and was familiar with the physical environment. The topic for this study was of past events; therefore, the study did not provide for current observation of real life events.

Document Analysis

Document analysis was purposefully chosen (Merriam, 2009) to include material pertinent to the CTFC, as well as the financial health of the UofA over the past 15 years. The main source for document collection included UofA's campaign literature and newswire archival material, which provided for a rich source of information (Creswell, 2008). Brochures and publications regarding the University of Arkansas at the time of the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century to present were examined. Documents included publications intended to make the case for a capital campaign, newswires, and the four publications for the 2010 Commission intended to make a case for state support, among other documentation. Biographical information was gathered for each participant for the researcher to understand their background before scheduling interviews.

Data Analysis

All qualitative data analysis is inductive and comparative in common themes (Merriam, 2009). With inductive analysis, the researcher was searching for patterns, themes, and categories in the data collected (Patton, 1980). Data sets consisted of transcribed interviews, documents, and email correspondence, and were managed with hand data analysis (Creswell, 2008), which was used to enhance rigor of the study. To assist the researcher in analysis, coding was used for data management and retrieval.

To stimulate critical thinking and primary analysis of the data collected, the researcher's observer comments and reflections on issues raised were written in a journal (Merriam, 2009). As suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (2007), emergent ideas and themes where discussed with UofA fundraising professionals to enhance analysis and to "fill in holes of description" (p. 165). In addition, the researcher explored the fundraising and capital campaign literature before and during data collection.

Coding

The coding process in qualitative research helped to prepare and organize the data and assisted the researcher to make sense of the data. The data were divided and labeled with text segments, then checked for redundancy. The text segments, also known as code, were collapsed into themes, also known as categories, according to Creswell (2008). Hand analysis of qualitative data required the researcher to read the data, mark it by hand, and divide it into parts (Creswell, 2008). Coding the data by hand then collapsing the codes or text segments into larger themes or categories allowed the researcher to become familiar with the data, and helped with understanding the varying roles of trustees during the campaign.

Themes

Themes, according to Creswell (2008), are similar codes combined together to form a major idea. For this study, after the data were collected and transcribed from the interviews, the interviews were combined into one database, and data were explored to develop codes as the first step in "preliminary exploratory analysis" to get a sense of the data (Creswell, 2008, p. 250). Part of the first step was to determine if more data collection was needed. For this study, one reoccurring theme, which was evident to the researcher during the interviewing phase of research, was that fundraising on the UofA campus began with Chancellor Daniel E. Ferritor. Therefore, Institutional Review Board approval was requested to interview Dr. Ferritor to collect additional data for the researcher to obtain a better understanding of the institutional fundraising history. Themes derived from the answers to research questions by interviewees described the roles of trustees during the campaign, which provided multiple perspectives, and were confirmed with institutional documents, whenever possible.

Research Rigor

Producing and contributing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner is a concern and goal for researchers (Merriam, 2009). To ensure trustworthiness and rigor for this study, the researcher used strategies, such as triangulation, audit trail, and member checking of interview transcripts (Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 2009). Validity and reliability relates to whether the study's findings are "sufficiently authentic" (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 178) and ring true. Validity and reliability concerns include internal validity, reliability, and external validity, according to Merriam (2009). Internal validity (or credibility) deals with how well research findings match reality and how well the data is interpreted (Merriam, 2009). Reliability, according to Merriam (2009), is the consistency of the findings in the study. External validity concerns the extent to which the findings can be "generalized or transferred to other situations" (Merriam, 2009, p. 234). Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to the concepts of internal validity, reliability, and external validity in terms of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility

In addressing credibility, the researcher attempted to demonstrate a true picture of the role of trustees during the CTFC, which was the phenomenon under scrutiny (Shenton, 2004). Careful attention to conceptualization, data collection, analysis, and interpretation are essential to a credible study. Therefore, credibility for this study was established through (a) interviews of participants who provided varying viewpoints; (b) literature review of higher education fundraising and leadership; (c) document collection from the CTFC which included archival printed materials, electronic documents, news articles, UofA-produced videos and photographs of the CTFC; and (d) observation of the events of the CTFC.

The researcher's credibility was increased by use of triangulation and member checks of the interviews obtained. Data triangulation included the perceptions of participants interviewed formally, as well as perceptions of secondary UofA sources who had development roles during the CTFC and who were interviewed informally to ensure confirmation of the formally interviewed participants' accounts. Member checking guaranteed accuracy by sending interview transcripts to participants for review, comments, and edits. Archival and current UofA documents reviewed also contributed to data triangulation.

Dependability

If this study were repeated in the same context, would it yield the same results? According to Merriam (2009), a better question regarding dependability of the study is "whether the results are consistent [and dependable] with the data collected" (p. 221). Dependability can be problematic for qualitative researchers because "human behavior is never static, nor is what many experience necessarily more reliable than what one person experiences" (Merriam, 2009, p. 221). Techniques, such as triangulation of data sources—using multiple interviewees, and source documents—and an audit trail of collected data can assist the researcher with dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009). The audit trail of processes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) found in the methodology section of this study should lead any researcher to authenticate the findings of the study.

Confirmability

According to Patton (2002), the researcher's biases are inevitable; however, that does not mean that the data collected cannot be confirmed if the research was duplicated. Member checking of all interview transcripts were accomplished by sending text versions of all transcripts to the interviewees, asking for edits or clarification of content, if needed. In addition, the researcher should include his or her own predispositions to the findings of the study (Shelton, 2004), which is a key criterion for confirmability or "objectivity," as described by Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 278). For this study, the researcher did not find what was expected regarding the criteria used when recruiting trustees to be a part of the campaign; however, it was reported as understood from the data.

Transferability

Although qualitative research scholars have written that it can be hard to generalize qualitative findings (Patton, 1990; Yin, 1993), there are methods the researcher can carry out to strengthen their case (Firestone, 1993). For the transferability of this study, the researcher attempted to provide sufficient contextual information and detail of the institution of study

(Shelton, 2004), which allows for the reader to determine whether the "prevailing environment is similar to another situation with which he or she is familiar and whether the findings can justifiably be applied to the other setting" (Shelton, 2004, p. 63). The prospect of transferability should not be immediately rejected, although, each university is unique (Stake, 1995). Qualitative scholars have agreed that when situations are similar to that described in the study, practitioners may relate the findings to their own situations (Bassey, 1999; Firestone, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 2000).

Summary

A qualitative, single case study theory methodology was utilized for this study. Purposeful, maximal variation sampling was used to intentionally select trustees and administrators who were in key positions during the CTFC. The study's focus was on the role of trustees during the campaign; therefore, the researcher conducted interviews of 12 participants, transcribed the interviews, and analyzed the data in an attempt to understand and describe the findings.

A preliminary analysis was conducted to make sense of the data, and was followed by coding the data to develop themes about the role of trustees (Creswell, 2008). Qualitative procedures, such as member checking of interview transcripts, triangulation of data sources, and audit trail, were used in an effort to ensure credibility, dependability, and confirmability of this study; although, the nature of qualitative study required interpretation of findings.

Chapter IV

Data Presentation and Analysis

This chapter presents the data collected and analyzed for this study, which was designed to understand the role of trustees in a capital campaign at a public land-grant research university that is the flagship campus within a multicampus system. The governor appoints the 10 trustees who govern the campuses within the system. Four methods of data collection were used to explain and describe the role of trustees including in-depth interviews, documentary evidence, participation in the setting, and direct observation (Creswell, 2008; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995). This chapter also presents profiles of the participants who were interviewed, along with the research questions asked, data analysis, and coding results.

In-depth interviews served as the primary data source for this study with content analysis of the transcripts. The interviews were accomplished during an 18-week period from August 8 to December 14, 2012. All of the UofA trustees and administrative leaders selected to be interviewed for this study consented to participate. The 12 individual interviews lasted between 26 to 79 minutes, with the average interview lasting 50 minutes. Institutional documentary evidence was reviewed, which included publications from the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC) and the UofA 2010 Commission, among others. The researcher was able to observe the events surrounding the campaign due to working in the Chancellor's Office during the time of the campaign, but the researcher also kept observational field notes compiled during interviews and made journal entries during the period of data collection and analysis.

Description of Participants

For this inquiry, a single case was chosen to understand and describe the role of trustees in a comprehensive capital campaign at a public land-grant research institution. To protect their identity, board of trustee members were referred to as trustee and the various administrators were jointly labeled as administrator. Table 1 illustrates the biographical data of the study participants, which includes position titles, dates in office, gender, and education. Appointment dates to the board of trustees were intentionally omitted to increase the difficulty of connecting individual trustees to the study. Twelve individuals were interviewed, including one individual who served as the vice chancellor for university advancement at the time of the campaign and who has been the campus chancellor since 2008.

Table 1

Positions Held and Educational Data of Study Participants

Title of Position	Dates in Office	Gender	Education
Member of the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees	Year omitted to avoid identifying the trustee	M	Juris Doctor degree from the University of Arkansas
Member of the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees	Year omitted to avoid identifying the trustee	M	Bachelor's degree and Juris Doctor degree from the University of Arkansas, and honorary doctorate from the University of Arkansas
Member of the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees	Year omitted to avoid identifying the trustee	M	Bachelor's degree from Southern Methodist University
Member of the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees	Year omitted to avoid identifying the trustee	M	Bachelor's degree from the University of Arkansas, and doctor of dental surgery degree from the University of Tennessee in Memphis
President of the University of Arkansas System	1990-2011	M	Bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Arkansas, and doctoral degree from the University of Oklahoma

Table 1 (Cont.)

Positions Held and Educational Data of Study Participants

Title of Position	Dates in Office	Gender	Education
Chancellor; and University Professor of Sociology; and Bernice Jones Chair of Community; and UofA System Vice President for Academic Affairs; and UofA System Vice President of Learning Technology	1986-1997 1998-2005 2001-2005 2005-2012 2012-present	M	Bachelor's degree from Rockhurst College, master's and doctoral degrees from Washington University
Chancellor; and Distinguished Professor of Industrial Engineering	1997-2008 2008-present	M	Bachelor's degree from the University of Arkansas, master's degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, doctorate from The Ohio State University, honorary doctorates from Katholieke Universitiet of Leuven, Belgium and George Washington University
Vice Chancellor for University Advancement; and Chancellor	1998-2008 2008-present	M	Bachelor's degree from Westminster College, Juris Doctor degree and doctoral degree from the University of Arkansas
Associate Vice Chancellor for University Advancement	1998-2007	F	Bachelor's degree from Lenoir Rhyne College, and master's degree from Western Illinois University
Assistant Vice Chancellor for University Advancement; and Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration	1997-2008 2008-present	F	Bachelor's degree from Hendrix College, and master's degree from the University of Arkansas

Table 1 (Cont.)

Positions Held and Educational Data of Study Participants

Title of Position	Dates in Office	Gender	Education
Director of Development (Major Gift Development Officer)	2002-2013	F	Bachelor's degree and doctor of law degree from the University of Arkansas
Director of Development (Major Gift Development Officer); and Executive Director of Development; and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development; and Associate Vice Chancellor for Development	2001-2007 2007-2011 2011-2013 2013-present	M	Bachelor's degree from the University of Texas-Arlington

The majority of the interviews were conducted in the UofA Chancellor's Office conference room known as the Heritage Room, which is located inside the Administration Building, room 425. This meeting site was most convenient for the researcher due to the setup of recording equipment used, but was also familiar to the interviewees who were willing to travel to the meeting site. One participant was interviewed in his corporate office at a Fortune 500 company; one participant was interviewed in a conference room of the Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art located in Bentonville, Arkansas; and one interviewee who was retired and lived out of state was interviewed by telephone.

All participants of this study were well-educated and accomplished individuals. Some of the trustees who were interviewed and who participated in the campaign had a history of philanthropic giving to the UofA before the campaign began. There are two buildings located on the Fayetteville campus named for one of the trustees who participated, as well as 141 student scholarships supported by and named for the individual. However, this is only an example of the level of support this particular trustee has given the UofA over the years, both before and after becoming a member of the UofA board of trustees. Another trustee, who was interviewed, chaired one of the CTFC's committees a few years before becoming a member of the UofA board of trustees, which gave him a unique perspective. He and his family had a long tradition of support for the institution and had major programs and buildings on campus that are named for family members. The trustee members contributed greatly to goals of the campaign and the list of their contributions will be expanded upon in this study's findings section. The two major gift officers who were directors of development for two of the eight colleges on the UofA campus were interviewed during the pilot test phase of data collection. The two interviews provided rich information and became a part of this study. Each of the directors worked with and supported a trustee during their college's fundraising efforts of the CTFC.

Description of the Single Case Institution

The University of Arkansas was chosen because its Campaign for the Twenty-First Century was highly successful and "transformative" for the campus, according to the 2007 accreditation team (UofA, 2007). The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools accredits the UofA. The UofA has advanced in national rankings since fundraising began in earnest in the late 1980s, when the UofA was a *U.S. News and World Report* third-tier ranked institution with a meager endowment. By 2004, the *U.S. News and World Report* placed the UofA in the top tier of its rankings of *America's Best Colleges*, and placed the UofA, for the first time, among the top public universities in the nation—one among only 64 universities. In 2012, a *U.S. News and World Report* national survey of higher education leaders selected the UofA as one of the top 10 "up and coming" public universities in the U.S. (UofA Newswire, 2012b). In 2011, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching elevated the UofA to the highest possible classification of the nation's universities, which put the UofA with the top 2% (108 out of 4,633) of universities nationwide. In 2012, the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* fifth annual survey of faculty, staff, and administrators recognized the UofA, along with only 102 other colleges or universities out of nearly 300 surveyed across the country, in the category of "Confidence in Senior Leadership" (UofA Newswire, 2012a). In 2004, the UofA was ranked in the top four, along with Harvard University, Stanford University, and the University of Pennsylvania, of the nation's most accomplished universities in fundraising.

Research Questions

This study was developed to explore and understand the following research questions related to trustee roles during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century:

1. What criteria were used when choosing trustees to provide leadership as volunteers of the campaign steering committee?
2. What was the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?
3. What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign steering committee?
4. What advice was offered for future trustees concerning their roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?

The researcher asked each study participant a total of 11 open-ended questions, listed on the interview guide in Appendix E. Follow-up questions were asked of interviewees when warranted for clarification or understanding. A different set of questions related to the history of fundraising for the UofA campus was asked of past chancellor Daniel E. Ferritor, and a different set of questions related to his work with chancellors and trustees was asked of past system president B. Alan Sugg.

Data Analysis

The research questions for this study covered four broad categories and served as the framework for coding and analyzing the data. Although there are no set guidelines for coding data (Creswell, 2008; 2012), there is a process for segmenting and labeling the interview text to form broad categories (also known as themes) in the data. The researcher followed Creswell's steps in coding and analysis of the data. First, the data were coded in each interview text, then, the codes were collapsed into various themes for this study. Additionally, observations were recorded during and after each interview and when transcriptions of the interviews were completed, and themes began to emerge early in this process.

The researcher's data analysis utilized Creswell's 2012 coding model by first conducting a preliminary exploratory analysis of all transcripts, documents, and field notes to get a general sense of the data. Second, the researcher went through each interview line-by-line and coded text segments of the data in each transcript using short phrases to describe the meaning of the text segments. According to Creswell (2012), text segments are sentences or paragraphs in the data that all relate to a single code or phrase. After all of the text in each interview was coded, the researcher made a list of all codes and reduced the list of codes to eliminate reiteration and to reduce the list into a manageable size. In addition, the researcher coded for descriptions as well as themes, because in a case study, the researcher needs to provide a thorough description of the setting and the individuals involved. The transcripts were examined multiple times to ensure no themes were overlooked and to assist with description of events (Creswell, 2012). Going back through the transcripts after the list of codes was established allowed the researcher to identify and highlight quotes from participants to support the themes that emerged from the coded text.

One major theme, which became evident to the researcher early in the interview process, was that fundraising began in earnest on the University of Arkansas campus under the leadership of Chancellor Daniel E. Ferritor in the late 1980s. As a result of this finding, the researcher obtained Institutional Research Board approval to interview Dr. Ferritor for a full understanding of the fundraising history of the UofA. Ferritor's service to the University of Arkansas System did not end with his chancellorship in 1997. Ferritor recently served as the vice president for academic affairs for the University of Arkansas System Office in Little Rock, and is currently its vice president of learning technology.

Coding Results

Reporting of the findings for this study was based on the four research questions and a combination of seven additional questions, which were asked of trustees or administrators, depending on each participant's position during the time of the campaign. Therefore, some questions were altered slightly to accommodate the interviewee. To assist in the readers' understanding of the transcript data and to guarantee the respondents' anonymity, bracketing was used. Bracketing was used to replace the name of a specific [program] or to omit the name of a specific [trustee] or [administrator]. Every effort was made by the researcher to accurately reflect the data without altering the true meaning of trustee or administrator responses. For clarity, the following section was organized by the research question, emergent themes and sub-themes, and the responses by trustees and administrators.

Research Question 1: What were the criteria used when choosing trustees to provide leadership as members of the campaign steering committee?

One major theme emerged regarding the importance of trustees having an affinity for the UofA campus, and for their ability to influence others to give to the campaign. However, as illustrated in table 2, there were also four sub-themes that emerged from the data.

Table 2

Emergent Theme and Sub-Themes from Research Question 1

Research Question 1:	What criteria were used in choosing trustees to provide leadership as volunteers of the campaign steering committee?
Major Theme 1:	Trustees were chosen because of their affinity with the UofA campus and because of their ability to influence others.
Sub-Theme 1:	Consideration was given to the trustees' financial capability and their ability/willingness to participate.
Sub-Theme 2:	There did not seem to be much of a challenge with recruiting trustees; although, some trustees had an affinity with other campuses within the system, so those trustees were not targeted to be a part of the campaign.
Sub-Theme 3:	Some trustees had the financial capability but did not participate.
Sub-Theme 4:	An important aspect when raising funds is feeling comfortable in the role, which has been undertaken.

Major Theme 1

For the most part, trustees were chosen because of their affinity with the UofA campus and because of their ability to influence others to give financial support. The first theme to materialize from the interview transcripts related to Research Question 1 was that UofA leaders did not recruit UofA system board of trustee members to serve simply based on the fact that individuals were members of the board. Individuals who were chosen to serve on the steering committee were chosen because they were known to have an affinity to the flagship campus and because they had the proven ability to influence others who might have the capability to give financial support to the campus. Administrators interviewed for this study felt that one of the most important aspects of choosing steering committee members was to choose individuals who have a connection with the campus. Not all of the UofA trustees were graduates from the UofA campus.

There are six 4-year universities, five 2-year colleges, and six other units under the UofA system. The 4-year universities include the University of Arkansas (main campus), University of Arkansas at Little Rock, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, University of Arkansas at Monticello, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, and the University of Arkansas at Fort Smith. In addition, the 2-year institutions include Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas, University of Arkansas Community College at Hope, University of Arkansas Community College at Batesville, Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas, and the University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton. Other units include the Division of Agriculture; Arkansas Archeological Survey; Criminal Justice Institute; Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences and Arts; University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service; and the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute.

In response to Research Question 1, only the perspectives of administrators were sought and included in the research.

Administrator 1 indicated that the key administrators believed it was a good idea to have most trustees who had a tie to the Fayetteville campus on the steering committee:

> My recollection is that we proceeded to ask them, not so much based on their resources, which is first and foremost the way to do it, but based upon their attachment to and their involvement in the University as an alumnus, or some other close criteria. . . . Some of the trustees are on the board for other campuses, obviously, and have an affinity to other campuses, and not Fayetteville. We weren't as interested in asking those because we didn't want to insult their loyalty to some other institution or some other reason that they were on the board. So, we pretty much left it to those who had alumnus closeness to the institution. We thought that we needed people attached to the campaign that can report back to the governing board, to keep them informed about what we are doing and how we are involved.

Administrator 2 summarized the recruitment process and expectations of trustees who were steering committee volunteers:

> There were individuals who were on the steering committee, but again, being on the steering committee didn't necessarily mean that they were going to step up and give significantly. Whereas, a private institution it is pretty well understood that [trustees] are going to be helping financially for the institution. . . . There were trustees on [the steering committee], but not because they were trustees, but rather because they were well respected statewide and they would have some influence.

Sub-Theme 1

Financial capability and ability/willingness to participate. The capacity to give and raise funds must be an important consideration when recruiting steering committee members, and the classic standard that members be "recruited for 'work, wealth, and wisdom' still requires that at least some of the directors be recruited primarily for their philanthropic capacity" (Worth, 2012, p. 64). A few administrators made clear that the foremost criteria typically used when choosing a member of a campaign steering committee would be based on their capacity to give. Although, it was important for the UofA administrators to choose individuals with financial capability, it was also important to choose individuals who would be present and provide leadership throughout the campaign. The conventional wisdom is that you should ask potential steering committee members for a gift before recruiting them to be on the committee; however, trustees who volunteer to be members of the campaign steering committee are more apt to give after they "are fully entrenched in the campaign and have been convinced that it is an extremely worthwhile effort" (Gearhart, 2006, p. 151). It is important to be clear that a gift request will be forthcoming but it need not be before the volunteer has agreed to engage and commit their time and has shown an interest in being a fully participating steering committee volunteer (Gearhart, 2006).

Administrator Responses

One of the trustees interviewed had a long history of giving financial support to the campus. This trustee was a volunteer on the campaign steering committee and he chaired one of the college-level campaign committees and gave the lead give to that college effort at the multi-million-dollar level. In a discussion regarding this trustee, administrator 1 concluded:

> The reason he was in those campaign leadership roles wasn't because he was a trustee, it was because of what his financial potential was to give, and so he was asked to be the chair of a committee not because he was a trustee.

Administrator 1 added a perspective on the importance of the ability to influence others versus giving a large gift to the institution:

> Several of [the trustees] understood that to agree to serve means you are going to step up and do something financially. I think that, in general, the people who agreed to serve on the steering committee understood that. There were some who thought that we wanted them on because of their name and reputation, and that's certainly true. . . . It was based on their potential for participating in the campaign. . . . We understood that [one trustee] wasn't going to give a match, but he could have influence and he could help us make "the ask" of people because he had been asking for support for his political campaigns for years. He had a very good understanding of who the people were. He was very close with [a family, who gave significantly] and having [the trustee] on our committee would help with respect to [that family]. So, there were reasons that we would have had people in the general category of governing boards or politicians, if you will, to be there.

Administrator 2 suggested that trustees were recruited more for who they are as influential individuals, rather than, because they are trustees:

> I think they recruited them because of who they were as individuals. They were successful in business and industry, and they were leaders already. I think being on the board was just a plus because it added prestige to the steering committee and it added credence to the fact that these University of Arkansas board members would be willing to take the time and effort to come in and help with the University when they were the governing board. This speaks to the quality of board members who stepped in and served on the committee and I would also say that the quality of our board of trustees has so much to do with the success of the University because they supported leadership other than trying to direct leadership. In other words, they were a support system for the chancellor.

In discussing how one trustee, who gave significant financial support, became a volunteer of the campaign steering committee, administrator 3 speculated:

> He got involved because of a campaign project that was going to happen, not because he was a board member. But when you think about it, most of the people the Governor appoints, generally, have an interest in the Fayetteville campus or they have graduated

> from there. So because of their leadership capability and position, they likely were going to be good candidates for the campaign committee as well.

Sub-Theme 2

There did not seem to be much of a challenge with recruiting trustees. The chancellor and vice chancellor for university advancement, along with several key campaign leaders, chose and asked individuals to be members of the campaign steering committee. The campaign leaders did not ask all of the system trustees to be members of the steering committee and none of the interviewees could recall that they were turned down by any of the trustees who were asked to be a member of the steering committee. However, some of the trustees who agreed to take part in the steering committee had concerns about being present at all of the scheduled meetings, especially if they had to travel from out of town, and some were concerned that they would not be able to give at a level which might be expected of them or that they would be capable of giving.

Administrator Response

Administrator 1 remembered the recruitment process for steering committee volunteers:

> Actually, there really weren't too many challenges. I don't remember any of the board members that we recruited turning us down. There may have been some concerns about attending the meetings plus attending board meetings. But, most of them, if not all of them, were very enthusiastic about being on the committee and wanted to be a part of it.

Sub-Theme 3

Some trustees had the financial capability but did not participate. At least one trustee who was considered to be extremely wealthy did not participate in the campaign for his or her own personal reasons, which are not known to the researcher. According to Gearhart (2006), "In public institutions, the governing board is often formed through political appointments, and the board members may have little or no interest in philanthropic endeavors" (p. 167).

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 remarked on trustees who did not participate in the campaign in any capacity:

> We had some who graduated from here, who were on the board of trustees, and who were very wealthy, and for their own individual reasons chose to sit out of the campaign. They didn't participate at all. I don't know if [one particular trustee] ever gave—if he did it was a very small gift. But, he never stepped up in a way that he was capable of stepping up. He and his family, I think, still had some resentment about the [naming of a building on campus]. It had a carry-over effect. . . . There were individuals who were on the steering committee, but again, being on the steering committee didn't necessarily mean that they were going to step up and give significantly. Whereas, a private institution it is pretty well understood that you are going to be helping financially for the institution.

Sub-Theme 4

An important aspect when raising funds is feeling comfortable in the role, which has been undertaken. The following illustrate administrator responses to the question of challenges when recruiting trustees to be a part of a capital campaign. In order to ask others to give, one should feel comfortable in that role. Not all of the trustees who participated in the campaign felt comfortable in that role because they could not give at the six to seven-figure level, and therefore, played much smaller roles on the steering committee and in the campaign than did others.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 speculated on the trustees' comfort level in the role of fundraiser during the campaign:

> Probably the biggest challenge would be those trustees who are on the committee and who may not have the resources to do very much, and might feel a little inadequate. Typically, you set up a committee of peers. You try to have people who can give at a generous level and know that they are in the company of other people who can give at a generous level. There is something to be said for not mixing people who don't have resources with people who do. I think most of the people who we had on the committee are of a sophisticated level that a lot of people don't know if they have resources. In other words, they are business people or professional people and [the UofA advancement professionals] might be the only ones who know if [the steering committee members] have a big estate or if they have resources. It probably, in this instance, doesn't matter.

> Some people will tell you that with campaign committees you probably should not put anyone on there that can't make a high six- or seven-figure gift. I don't completely subscribe to that for a public university. I think that probably works better with a private institution. I would certainly have members of the board at a private institution composed of people who have wealth. It is hard to do that with a public institution because you don't decide who is on your board—the state does that. . . . I think there may have been a couple of cases where the board member did not have the resources, or did have them but wasn't of a mindset to make a major gift, and may have felt not up to the task, but there weren't many instances of that. Some of our trustees gave very generously to the campaign. Since you are not necessarily put on the board of trustees because of your wealth—some of them are because they make political contributions, but some are on there because they have a close affinity or affiliation with the Governor—you cannot expect all of them to give at a high six- or low seven-figure level of giving and sometimes when they don't, they may not feel as valuable to the committee as they would like to be.

Administrator 2 remarked on trustees' comfort levels in participation of the campaign:

> I'm sure that everyone was asked to what degree they wanted to participate, and if a trustee was on the campaign steering committee and chose not to participate, without a doubt there was a good reason—alliances with another campus, for example, or another campaign.

Summary of Research Question 1: Some trustees were natural candidates for recruitment to be volunteer leaders on the campaign steering committee because of their proven track records of giving to the campus (this list of potential steering committee volunteers included past and present trustees). The UofA was fortunate to have trustees who gave of their time, talents, and funds before the campaign began. Several trustees participated fully in identifying and soliciting donors as well as giving financially in the multi-million-dollar level.

Research Question 2: What was the role of trustees who served on the campaign steering committee during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?

One major theme from the data was that the roles varied with the individual trustees who were volunteers on the campaign steering committee. Additionally, there were two sub-themes, which emerged from the data.

Table 3

Emergent Theme and Sub-Themes from Research Question 2

Research Question 2:	What was the role of trustees during the campaign?
Major Theme 1:	The roles varied with individual trustee members.
Sub-Theme 1:	Some trustees would have been raising money for the UofA whether or not the campaign was ongoing.
Sub-Theme 2:	Trustees were included in the decision-making that determined the dollar amounts for the goals for the campaign, but not necessarily the priorities of the programs/projects.

Major Theme 1

The roles varied with individual trustee members who were volunteers on the campaign steering committee. Several of the trustees involved were fully participating members of the campaign steering committee and brought not only prestige and influence to the campaign, but also assisted greatly in accomplishing the institutional fundraising goals, which included asking for gifts in the six- or seven-figure range. Individual trustee members gave not only of their time and talents, but also gave generously of their funds.

Trustee Responses to Research Question 2

Trustee 1 was a fully participating member of the steering committee and assisted solicitation of gifts:

> My role was to kind of be a cheerleader and to be a coordinator of trying to get information out and working with the [UofA development] staff. . . . I would send letters to corporations and reach out to people and would make calls with [the vice chancellor for university advancement] and [chancellor] to critical people. It was probably eight or ten joint calls with them. I was an active fundraiser in the background. I was sending letters with my signature, and I was going out and making calls and to "close" with [the chancellor and vice chancellor for university advancement] with significant contributions with up to seven figures. As trustees, our obligation is to talk about the realities of the system and not get caught up with being on the board of trustees. We are supposed to be good-will ambassadors.

Trustee 2 concluded:

> I think the role of a trustee who is on the campaign [steering committee] is to inform, and in fact, be the sales person. You know, these are the things we are trying to do. This is

> what the funding from state funds and tuition can get done, but for us to do other things, we need to get things in place to give our students a chance to succeed.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1, who worked closely with one trustee during the campaign, said of that trustee:

> [The trustee] . . . had a lot of connections throughout the state, and so he got us in front of many of the right people to talk about giving. You know, he opened the door. So, [the trustee] was not afraid to open a door to help in a way that needed to be. [The trustee] made some calls—not only phone calls, but some personal visits to perspective donors—so he was very engaged in that process. [The trustee] was engaged in that process with [the dean of the college] and [with the director of development for the college]. . . . I think for the most part, when the asking came around, it was primarily left in the hands [of the development professional], of course. We were the team working together on the campaign. Many times, [the trustee] either set up a visit or made a phone call that opened a door for us to go in, but there were two specific times I do remember where [the trustee] was involved in making "the ask."

Administrator 2 speculated on what the role of a trustee should be during a capital campaign:

> I think it depends on the trustee. If a trustee has resources, then we hope that they will make a commitment. We hope anyone who is on the campaign committee will do something, but they should do it at a level of their own circumstances. We don't expect somebody who doesn't have resources will give a million-dollar gift, by any means, but if they have the ability to do that and have an abiding interest, then we hope that they will. I also think that it is a way to keep the lines of communication open with the system and with the trustees, in general, because they can report back the importance of the campaign. Things like naming opportunities, and if somebody gives us a big gift for a building or a college or something like that, then they will have intimate knowledge of what we are trying to do. So, I think that is important to have several members who have a tie to the campaign.

Administrator 3 commented on one steering committee member who was not a trustee at the time of the campaign, but became a trustee a few years after the end of the campaign:

> We went to him to head up the corporate and foundation relations and had no idea that he was going to be as strong a member as he was. He read everything; he had ideas; he initiated certain projects; he had no problem picking up the phone and calling donor prospects. We thought his position and his name certainly would lend us the credibility we needed, but we had no idea he would be as involved as he was. He was not on the board at that time, but I think he has always been very involved in the institution.

Administrator 4 worked closely with one trustee who chaired the committee for one particular campaign program and gave generously toward its goal:

> [The trustee and major gift officer] went on visits together. [The trustee] would introduce [the major gift officer] to people. . . . [The trustee] is very professional and very business-like, and he doesn't want anyone to believe that we are just having lunch, when, in fact, we are going to be asking them to make a major gift to the [program]. He is very good at making sure that there are no false pretenses—the way any fundraising professional would.

Administrator 4 went on to explain trustee involvement in donor solicitation:

> [Trustees] can ask for a gift, if they want. [With the trustee] role, I think, that [the administrators] have carved out a really good place for them, and [one trustee] wasn't at the same level of activist as [another trustee] was. . . . [The trustee member I worked with] did [identify potential donors], and he was actively engaged in soliciting those individuals. He stepped up and provided the leadership that an ideal campaign committee member would, by providing not only his initial leadership gift to the [program] but identifying other people who were qualified major gift donors and working with [the director of development for the college] to solicit [gifts] on behalf of the [program]. He is a good fundraiser. His comfort level at one point was $1,000. His comfort level now, I think, is $1 million. And some of that may be relevant to him having led at that level. You know, you can always ask someone to do as you have done. That is why, with a campaign committee, you have to have people who have made lead gifts before. If [the trustees] are going to ask somebody to make a lead gift, they must have done it already; otherwise, there is going to be a psychological barrier.

Administrator 5 summarized his thoughts on the role trustees should play in fundraising:

> Any trustee who comes on to the board, really, should have an obligation to do everything they can to try and help the University of Arkansas and the whole university system to be successful. Different board members bring different strengths to the table. Some are wealthy, some can help monetarily and some cannot, but then, they have other attributes. They may have political connections, or it may be that they are just good solid folks who want to support [the UofA].

Sub-Theme 1

Some trustees would have been raising money for the UofA whether or not the campaign was ongoing. Several of the participating trustees had long histories of fundraising and giving to various programs/projects for the campus, and would have been raising money for the campus even if a campaign was not ongoing at the time. Those trustees were a natural choice to be invited to be members of the steering committee.

Administrator Response

Administrator 1 indicated that one trustee was active in UofA fundraising before the campaign began:

> [The trustee's] involvement with us was incidental to the campaign. I don't think it was because of the campaign. He would have been doing those things in support of [a particular program] whether or not we had a campaign because he was just trying to support [a particular director].

Sub-Theme 2

Trustees were included in the decision-making, which determined the dollar amounts for the goals of the campaign, but not necessarily the priorities of the programs/projects. The steering committee members did participate in the decisions regarding dollar amounts and the guidelines by which gifts were accepted and counted during the campaign; however, they did not participate in setting the priorities for the campaign or evaluating the overall performance of the development team and campaign success.

Trustee Responses to whether they participated in setting the goals and priorities of the campaign.

Regarding the question related to goals and priorities, trustee 1 stated:

> I was part of that goal [setting]. [UofA fundraising professionals] and the committees were the ones who kind of set it. We got the buy-in on it, but that was what we wanted to do.

Regarding the question related to goals and priorities, trustee 2 said:

> I would say to a very small extent because most were set before I was added to the committee.

Regarding the question related to goals and priorities, trustee 3 commented on the goals of the campaign, which were raised several times during the campaign:

> I know [administrators] came in with a goal of X and they came back in later and said, "Well, let's raise it to Y," and everyone just went along with it.

Administrator Responses

Regarding the question related to trustee participation in setting goals and priorities, administrator 1 stated:

> Really not to any degree, other than, just as participants on the committee and the way that others were. I think that when any individual would speak out in any of our meetings that other members of the steering committee weren't listening to them because these were trustees speaking—they were just members of the committee. I don't think they were given any more attention by the members than any other member would have been given because they were trustees.

Regarding the question related to setting goals and priorities, administrator 2 said:

> To the extent that they were on the committee—the committee made the decision about the goal, and they made the decision about the projects we were going to go after. We gave them all that material and suggested what we thought was right, but they ultimately made the decision about what the campaign committee goals and objectives would be, and particularly what the monetary goal would be. To the extent that they will be on the committee, they will very much be engaged in that activity.

Summary of Research Question 2: Matching trustees with their comfort level of participation and areas of interest are important elements to a successful campaign much in the same way donors are matched with areas of interest for their donations. The advancement professionals provided guidance and support to the steering committee members and provided the necessary background information and paperwork associated with the campaign.

Research Question 3: What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign steering committee?

The UofA campaign administrators offered fundraising training to campaign volunteers, and the advancement professionals worked hand-in-hand with the steering committee volunteers.

One major theme and one sub-theme emerged from the data related to prior fundraising experience or training of the trustees.

Table 4

Emergent Theme and Sub-Theme from Research Question 3

Research Question 3:	What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign steering committee?
Major Theme 1:	None of the trustees had what could be considered formal training. However, the UofA provided fundraising/development training when needed. All of the participants were experienced fundraisers on some level.
Sub-Theme 1:	There is a benefit to board members who participate in a capital campaign in gaining a deeper understanding of the institution.

Major Theme 1

None of the trustees involved had what could be considered formal training. The UofA provided training when needed; however, all of the participants were experienced fundraisers on some level. The UofA development professionals assisted trustees who worked on the steering committee and were available for guidance in all aspects of the roles and duties in which trustees undertook. Two of the trustees interviewed for this study worked closely with college-level directors of development. In addition, the two directors of development who were interviewed for this study worked closely with trustee members who were helping to raise money for programs associated with the directors' colleges. The steering committee members were well staffed by the UofA advancement professionals.

The trustees who were interviewed for this study had previous fundraising experience, which helped them to assimilate quickly and effectively to the roles they undertook during the campaign. Whether the experience was raising funds for political campaigns, the community, or to start his or her own business, trustees' experiences and abilities translated to the confidence to take on responsibilities of a comprehensive capital campaign at a public research university.

Trustee Responses to Research Question 3

Trustee 1 recollected that he had no formal training but felt well prepared for being a member of the campaign steering committee:

> I received none, but I've been asking for money for a long time in my life, and people have been asking me for money for a long time in my life. You know, 20/30 years of me asking people and people asking me, so in a sense that is a form of training.

Trustee 2 recalled that he read Chancellor Gearhart's two books on higher education fundraising:

> I guess I was self-taught, besides reading the Chancellor's book—his first book. Then, I read his second book, too. When I started making gifts of my own, [a UofA advancement professional] was the director of planned giving. He and I were friends, and he kind of educated me of the various opportunities and how they can be done, so I learned a lot from [him], and did several different gifting programs that he suggested. I guess that I have sold stuff all my life. . . . They taught us that you wouldn't make a sell, until you made "an ask." And that is fundraising—you have got to make "an ask," and you've got to make a relationship. I've found it helpful that I think a fundraiser, a lay fundraiser like myself, it helps that people know that you have also contributed—you kind of lead by example. I guess that was my basic background or training before [the UofA fundraising professional] got a hold of me before the campaign. [He] told me that I was chair of the [program] committee of the campaign. I started out thinking I would chase every $100 contribution I thought I might get, and [the UofA fundraising professional] took me aside and said that 80% of your money will come from 20% of your donors. And [he] . . . said that you are not going to raise $5 million chasing $100 contributions. You have got to spend your time and energy on larger contributors.

Trustee 3 commented on his level of training:

> None with an organized campaign . . . I had been involved in political campaigns and raising money for that, but it is kind of a different animal. I had to do a little bit of fundraising for my business when I started it, too.

Trustee 4 remarked on his level of training and experiences:

> I raised money for the Boy Scouts, and I raised money for the camp for the Girl Scouts. I was chair of the finance committee for the Central United Methodist Church before then. I don't recall that we had a big fundraising thing, but just the ordinary budget type things. So, to that extent, I had some experience, but no training. You call your friends and ask them to give to the Boy Scouts, that is what it amounted to.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 observed one trustee who fully participated by identifying and soliciting donors:

> I don't believe that [the trustee I worked with] had too much [fundraising experience], but he has obviously been on a number of other boards—statewide boards—but I don't know to what level he did much fundraising with them. I recall as we were going through the process of what is the role of volunteers in fundraising in a campaign, he was pretty candid that he was new to a lot of this. You know, he welcomed our staffing and the way we brought him along in the process.

Administrator 2 specified that the fact that trustees were community leaders was important:

> Typically, these people who get to that level of the board tend to be pretty involved in their communities, so they have probably done some fundraising associated with that. The truth of the matter is that we will do some training of members of the committee. We are not going to give them a list and say, "Go call on these people." We will be with them every step of the way. We will be engaged with them, so it is not that they will need to be fully cognizant of how to go about and do a campaign because that will be staff driven.

Administrator 3 observed while working with one trustee during the campaign:

> This is the most professionally organized campaign that [the trustee] had been involved in. He had been involved in fundraising before, especially community-based things that helped fund the [community projects]. [The trustee] attributes his ability to ask anyone for anything to the time when he was very young and sold Bibles door-to-door. He said if you can sell Bibles door-to-door, you could do anything. He said you just have to know that you'll not get it unless you ask. And when you ask, don't let people tell you no because you know you have some common ground. There is something there that you have in common.

Administrator 4 observed and worked with a different trustee than Administrator 3, and commented:

> As a member of the board of trustees, he was very involved in helping to build the [complex] in the state of Arkansas through [another institution within the UofA system]. He was very engaged in how private funds would impact that [complex]. He was very savvy about it. I don't know the degree to which he made major gifts to those efforts, but I do know that a big point of pride that also defines him is his service on the board of trustees and building that [complex] in the state, so they could provide a higher level of service to all of the citizens. [The trustee] has always been on nonprofit boards. For probably 50 years, he has been in [a civic organization] and had been a lead donor to the [club's] initiatives, so he has always been a philanthropist, and his passion is the [UofA program], so that kind of dictates where he wants to dedicate some of his wealth.

Sub-Theme 1

There is a benefit to board members who participate in a capital campaign in gaining a deeper understanding of the institution. A public research university, such as the UofA, has a large and complicated budget with state and private funds, along with student tuition/fees. University budgets can take some time to understand, and a large institution has many departments and units, which further complicate the overall understanding of the institution, especially for trustees of a system who have more than just one campus to govern. Each of the four trustees interviewed for this study believed that working on the steering committee for the campaign assisted them with their understanding of the institution on the whole, and this included seasoned veterans as well as those who were new to the board at the time of the campaign.

Trustee Responses to the interview question asking whether trustee participation in a capital campaign was beneficial to better understanding of the UofA main campus.

Trustee 1 insinuated that volunteering as a campaign steering committee member could benefit trustees' policy- and decision-making for the institution:

> I think that background and experience would be important in trustees' policymaking and decision-making going forward. I had an advantage, because I was [able to be] present. I think that helped me stay motivated because I got invited to a lot of things and I tried to attend everything I got invited to and still do. I think all 10 of the trustees need to be invited to be on the steering committee of the campaign, and to be encouraged to show up where people could see them. They need to be [seen] carrying the flag. I think it is imperative that they carry the flag and be leaders in it. Now, it will be hard to get some of them to devote the time to do it.

Trustee 2 was newly appointed to the board of trustees when he volunteered to be on the campaign steering committee:

> It was a very educational experience for me. . . . As a trustee, I could see college units, like alumni affairs and others, and I could see how successful they were at raising their money. It was kind of an interesting insight to see what the supporters of the University

of Arkansas were supporting the most. Obviously, athletics was very successful, but so was the College of Business, and the Fulbright College did well.

Trustee 3 concluded that his role in the campaign helped with his understanding of the institution and its financial needs:

> It helped me to understand what the University was trying to do with their goals. It helped me to understand why state appropriations weren't sufficient for what we needed to do and the need for tuition increases, which some of the trustees were very reluctant to do.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 speculated whether trustees volunteering was beneficial and on the importance of raising private funds:

> I think sometimes that if [trustees] are vested in some way and helping as a volunteer, it helps them understand the bigger issues of what [administrators] face day-to-day. It is so critical in what we are doing that we raise private support, and [trustees] have to understand that. We aren't moving forward in the way that we want to without private support. [Trustees] ought to be there to say that this is important for us to be a part of this because of that. I'm advocating that [trustees] ought to be out there raising money for these programs because there definitely are needs that the state is not able to meet, especially facilities. So much of what is happening on campus right now, obviously, we have gotten some help through bonding and facility fees, but there is a great deal of private gift money in all of these buildings going up right now. As a trustee, you are committed to seeing the University be the best it can be, and so if it comes as a matter of a major capital campaign effort, then so be it. . . . Most major institutions across the country are relying more on private support. We definitely need [the trustee members'] backing as much as we can get it.

Administrator 2 observed and commented on trustees' volunteering to be on the steering committee:

> I also think that [trustees] see things actively happening [at the UofA]. They see that we're a campus on the move. I think they talk with faculty, staff, and others involved with the institution, and I think they want to be a part of it. I think that this is a way, maybe, to not show favoritism as a board member but to show favoritism as a campaign committee member. So, it gives them an avenue to be very enthusiastic when, you know, on the board they have to be a little less partial, if you will.

Administrator 2 added that it is difficult to have a complete understanding of each campus under a multicampus system:

> I think the way we are organized at the University of Arkansas System does not always give trustees a fair opportunity to know the campus like they should. I could argue strongly for this campus having its own board for the University of Arkansas. In a perfect world, your board would be concerned with the issues that affect one institution that is the flagship. I think having [trustees] on the committee is valuable for them to see the kinds of things that are happening at the institution. It can also be a negative in that sometimes a board member will hear about something and then go back to the president of the university and say, "They really need this, this, and this." Then, all of a sudden you have the president of the university [system] all stirred up. So, you have to be careful that when you articulate your needs that it doesn't get interrupted as though you are lashing out at the system or the president or that it's not an issue where you are [unhappy with] the way things are organized. One example of that would have been that at the last campaign, there were some people who wanted to have two committees of agriculture—a system committee and a campus committee. They were getting real close to doing that, and we felt that one committee would be better. I discussed that with the system president and UofA chancellor and they didn't disagree. What we did was get [a trustee] engaged, and he helped make it happen, but it could have gone the other way. I think you run a little bit of a risk in having trustees engaged, but realizing they have general authority over the whole institution, they may take the ball and run with it in a way you don't want them to. You just have to monitor it, I think.

Administrator 3 suggested that volunteers of the campaign gain a greater appreciation of the campus:

> [Being a campaign steering committee volunteer, gave trustees] a greater appreciation for the University. [The trustees] were impressed, as were the people of Arkansas. [Steering committee members] would come from out-of-state and serve on the steering committee, and put their hearts, souls, and money into this program. It impressed [trustees] very much that what we have at the University of Arkansas is very special and, by gosh, I'm going to be a good board member and do everything I can to support that. It is part of a contagious feeling that just happened throughout the whole campaign and I think it is what's happening today and will continue to happen for many years at the University, in terms of its success.

Administrator 4 commented on the importance of a strength and weakness assessment and strategic plan to address those weaknesses, which is part of the duties of the steering committee:

> I think that an institution should spend the time (and it should come out of a strategic plan) to generate a needs statement—a case statement for support that states that this is what we need. It's not superficial along this line, but it really is up to the leadership to go down and say, "Why do we need that? What is going to happen when you get this? Why is that important?" I think a campaign often helps everybody benchmark against peer institutions, against institutions where they would like to be, how are we tracking on that, and it asks the question, "Are we as good as we can be?"

Summary of Research Question 3: Although none of the trustees had formal fundraising training, they all had some experience with raising funds. As business leaders, trustees understand the need for evaluation and strategic planning. UofA fundraising professionals worked with the trustees and provided the needed training and guidance to assist the trustees in their roles during the campaign. There was a benefit to the trustees and the institution for trustees being members of the campaign steering committee. The trustees learned a great deal about the UofA and its ongoing projects and programs and the priorities and goals of the campaign. This gained knowledge allowed the trustees to better fill their roles as representatives for the institution. It also helped with their understanding of issues related to the need for raising tuition and fees, and the need for private funds that assist in programs when state funds are lacking.

Research Question 4: What advice can you offer to future trustees concerning trustee roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?

One major theme, which was reiterated throughout the participant interviews, was the need for the steering committee members to be present during meetings and events, and two sub-themes emerged from the data as well.

Table 5

Emergent Theme and Sub-Themes from Research Question 4

Research Question 4:	What advice can you offer to future trustees concerning trustee roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?
Major Theme 1:	The importance of showing up and being engaged in the effort, in addition to matching trustees with areas of interest.
Sub-Theme 1:	The campaign leadership strived to communicate information to its team leaders to help them accomplish the goals of the campaign.
Sub-Theme 2:	Communication challenges where bridged by a trustees who was a committee co-chair

Major Theme 1

It is important for steering committee members to show up and be engaged in the effort, in addition to matching trustees with their areas of interest on campus. The importance of being present and engaged cannot be stressed enough in a comprehensive capital campaign effort. Volunteers of the steering committee need to be present and fully engaged in the effort to make a difference in the final outcome. The UofA administrators were not interested in having a volunteer who was present in name only; they needed individuals who were willing and able to contribute their time and energy to making the campaign a successful one for the institution.

With the campaign committee volunteers, it was important to match them with their areas of interests at the UofA, much as one does with the potential donors. It can be time consuming; however, it is an essential step in the process of running a successful capital campaign. Therefore, volunteers' commitment to the campaign effort was enhanced greatly when the volunteers were alumni and had an affinity for the campus.

Trustee Responses to Research Question 4

Chancellor Gearhart wrote two books on fundraising and trustee 1 recommended that the first thing steering committee volunteers of a university capital campaign should do is to read those books:

> Read David Gearhart's two books. Some of [the trustees] might have had some experience raising money for their local chamber of commerce, or United Fund, or something like that, but I doubt if any of our trustees had ever been involved in a major campaign like the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century. . . . I think it becomes doubly important for philanthropic support because the state revenues are stagnant. I would suggest that every trustee be given a copy of Dave Gearhart's second book, and give them a test on it to make sure they read it because it was a great help to me. I think that somebody ought to send a copy of [the] second book to the trustees and ask them to read it because I learned a lot from it. If you read it and study it some, it gives you a road map on how to do it. It sure cuts down on mistakes and wasted time and effort.

Trustee 2 advised that being a volunteer during the duration of the campaign, from start to finish, is helpful for a full understanding of the fundraising effort:

> From my standpoint, I'd say, "Make sure you are involved from the beginning." I wasn't on from the get-go. I think the board would be and should be a critical part of anything like that because they know or should know which critical areas need money.

Trustee 3 suggested that understanding the needs of the institution and the goals of the campaign are key to being an effective steering committee volunteer:

> I think mainly what they ought to do is learn what the goals of the campaign are and how that can help the University and the state as a whole. If they can put together in their own mind a good story of why people ought to support the campaign, and what it is going to accomplish, and what it will do for the state, then they will be in a position to really help, not only with the money raising, but with legislators and all the other constituents that you have.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 speculated on the difficulty trustees who govern multicampus systems face and the importance of trustee support for the flagship institution:

> With a system-wide board, [trustees] have to think very broadly about every campus in the system, and think about how every college is growing and how the University is growing, and whether they are getting the support they need. On the other hand, I think it is good for the trustees to recognize the role of the University of Arkansas—it is the flagship; it's the land-grant university. I say for them to show their support and be active in supporting the campaign here, sends a pretty strong and clear message about where the University is in terms of being the flagship and the land-grant. [Trustees] may choose to support UAMS or another system institution, but for me, [trustee support of the UofA] is a pretty important signal because I think it's the public's view. The public thinks of the board as a UofA-only board, but no, they are not. The trustees being behind the campaign and showing support in any way that they can sends a pretty clear message about where the University really stands within the state, and as it should be the premier land-grant research institution. I think [trustee involvement in the campaign] shows that they believe what we can do with the campaign.

Administrator 2 advised that trustees should be prepared to fully support the campaign effort if they plan to make a commitment as a volunteer:

> I don't think they should sign on unless they are prepared to sign up. The campaign is very clearly about the goal to raise private support for the University. If trustees are going to do that, they should not view that they are there as trustees. They should view

> that they are there as individuals who are going to step up and support the institution. That is a very bottom-line oriented position. I don't think they should carry over, frankly, into the campaign their hats as trustees. I think there needs to be a separation between the role and responsibility of trustees, and then, the role and responsibility of a steering committee for a campaign.

Administrator 3 reiterated the importance of volunteers being present and involved:

> I think coming to the meetings is important. Attendance is important—don't be there in name only. If you take it on and agree to do it, then be there. I think when a trustee is approached and they don't really have an abiding interest in your campus, if they are interested in some other campus, then probably, they shouldn't be on the committee, and you should respect that decision. They should feel free to say to you, "That's not really my interest and I'll help you, but I'm not really wanting to be terribly engaged." I think that is probably the right thing to do. I think that trustees can be very important in accompanying deans and development people on calls. To be able to introduce somebody as a trustee of the governing board can be a powerful thing. To take, particularly, the chairman of the board on a call—I've done that a number of times—can be very helpful. The team on the big solicitations can be very important—you know, who you have in that room. People who have money and resources like to gravitate to the highest level. So, I've done solicitations with the system president, and I've done solicitations with the board chair. To be able to say "I'm here with the chairman of our board to tell you how important your support will be to us" can have a pretty dramatic impact.

Administrator 4 repeated the theme of volunteers being engaged and involved in the campaign efforts:

> It is so important to be engaged. Not just in the campaign itself because I don't think it has to be de facto that you're a leader at the trustee level and you'll also be an active campaign leader. I think there's a place for involvement. But as a leader for the institution, I believe that you have to really be engaged in the place and that you know what the case for support is and why it is important, and be able to talk about it. You should be able to understand periodic reports that will update you on whether it is working, and if it is not working, then what is happening. So I think the leadership role of the board member is to do the due diligence as a board member, to understand the case, and really question some of these things. If there are any questions about whether going down this road is going to get us to where we need to be or improve us scholastically, or whatever it is academically, then they need to feel like they are not rubber-stamping us. They need to be engaged, and in doing so, they'll be able to tell the story and help guide the future direction, if they understand the case for it.

Administrator 5 discussed the benefits of volunteers giving a gift to the institution and the feelings associated with that:

If they have not given a major gift, they should because it feels great. It could be a capstone to their service to the state. I'm not talking about transformational gifts in a sense that it will change the way the University works; I'm talking about the way it changes how someone thinks about himself or herself. If they have not made a major commitment, I think they would feel differently after making a major financial commitment.

Sub-Theme 1

The campaign leadership strived to communicate information to its team leaders to help them accomplish the goals of the campaign. The vice chancellor for university development, who was the chief architect for the campaign and who is now the current chancellor, understood well the need for communication. He established a proven record of giving timely information to all of the team leaders and staff involved in furthering the mission of the institution. All of the interviewees felt that communication was timely and well done throughout the campaign.

Trustee Responses to Research Questions related to how well campaign information was communicated to steering committee members.

Trustee 1 observed that the administration of the institution kept the steering committee volunteers well informed throughout the campaign:

> They were pretty good about keeping everyone advised with what was going on and what they were doing.

Trustee 2 summarized his feeling that he was well informed throughout the campaign:

> One, or sometimes all [of the campaign leaders], would come to the unit committee meetings when we had our campaign committee together to talk about what was going on in the campaign and kind of keep everybody up to speed. I never felt like there was a lack of communication, like something was going on that I didn't know about, and we covered a lot of ground. I never recall a time when I thought, "Oh, I didn't know that was going to be happening."

Trustee 3 recalled that he also felt well informed throughout the campaign:

> It seems like we were getting updates all the time.

Administrator Responses

Administrator 1 remarked that there was a good flow of communication throughout the campaign:

> [With the campaign leaders], I felt there was a very good communication flow.

Administrator 2 concluded that the campaign leadership understood the need for sharing information and the importance of having a well-informed campaign team:

> [The campaign leaders] feel very strongly that we are only as good as the information we have.

Administrator 3 identified steps taken during the campaign to ensure adequate research and communication was achieved regarding potential donors:

> Research was a very important part and I think it helped with communication. We would go into sessions where we would look at names of individuals, and we would just go through and rank (we would have columns) whether they could make a $100,000 gift, a $200,000 gift, or $250 million—just go through and see what you think, and it is never easy for anybody to do that, and they have to trust that you are going to keep their information completely confidential.

Administrator 4 remarked that the steering committee volunteers were updated on the campaign progress throughout the effort:

> I do know that the trustees were keenly aware of and beautifully informed about the campaign and its progress. Mainly because we had so many programs and joint recognition things that went on all across campus and all across the country, basically. We have donor prospect strategy meetings, and we were at the same table [with the campaign leaders and trustees] at the same time.

Sub-Theme 2

The Division of Agriculture, which reports directly to the UofA System President and the UofA's Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences, which reports to the UofA campus chancellor, had challenges at times. Even though the Division of Agriculture is part of the UofA System and the Bumpers College is part of the UofA flagship campus, they had a combined goal for both and worked together to reach that goal. The director of development for the Division of Agriculture and the director of development for the Bumpers College worked together during this effort. The committee co-chairs for the combined effort included a co-chair who was a trustee and was helpful in bridging that gap in communication, along with the help of the two directors of development. The Bumpers College and the Division of Agriculture were unique because they had a combined goal, and each had its own director of development, and the committee for that effort had co-chairs. The trustee who was a co-chair of the committee was helpful in working in tandem with both the college and the division, and assisted greatly in making that partnership work well for the campaign effort. The final amount of $98 million raised well exceeded the original combined goal of $69 million.

Administrator Response

More than one administrator discussed the issues with the Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences and the Division of Agriculture. One trustee was co-chair of the combined committee for the two units and that trustee assisted to bridge the communication gap and coordinated with the administration. Administrator 1 recollected:

> It is relevant to this discussion the unique situation with the college and the division of agriculture—it presented some challenges, at times. On the division side, there is a vice president for agriculture, so the dean of the college has a duel report to the provost of the UofA as well as the [system] vice president for agriculture. No other college has that type of arrangement, so we had to be very clear about expectations and balancing the relationships, which, quite candidly, was not always very strong. What we didn't want to do, especially related to our campaign committee or our co-chairs, was to have a sense that there was some fragmentation. Like the college was going to do this, or the division was going to do that—we wanted a very uniform and all in lock-step together [campaign], but sometimes behind the scenes that was not always the case. The good thing about the [campaign co-chairs], was that [the trustee] very much understood how agriculture was set up. He got that there were times when we were challenged with what is college and what is division and how does this whole thing work and relate to the campus—he was really good at how it all relates. A lot of it just came down to maintaining those good relationships, but there were times when it wasn't always smooth sailing.

Summary of Research Question 4: It was important to the campaign that volunteers with an affinity for the UofA were recruited and attended meetings and events, as well as obtained the knowledge to understand the goals and priorities of the campaign. It was essential that the steering committee members were committed to reaching the goals of the campaign, and therefore, gave generously of their time and talents. Communication can be key to the success of any undertaking as complicated as a comprehensive capital campaign.

Summary

The individuals selected purposefully to provide the richest data for this study were all gracious enough to agree to be interviewed. Gathering the perceptions of trustee members, system president, past and current campus chancellors, and the campaign advancement professionals, provided for a triangulation of data. One of the reasons the researcher wanted to look at this topic was because with private funding becoming more important to public institutions, the researcher feels that trustees should have a better overarching understanding of the financial picture at public institutions than they do now.

It was said of the CTFC by one of the administrators interviewed that reaching the billion-dollar campaign goal was one of the most important events that ever happened in the history of the University of Arkansas. Regarding the tremendous changes the campaign brought to the institution, it was said not only the faculty, staff, and students of the UofA, but also everybody else throughout the state of Arkansas realized fundraising could be an ongoing major part of the University of Arkansas. "The private funds have made the difference of what the University of Arkansas used to be and what it is today" (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 18, 2012).

The four questions which served as the framework for the collection and analysis of the data (a) criteria used to recruit trustees to the steering committee; (b) the role of trustees during a capital campaign; (c) the fundraising experiences of the trustees; and (d) advice for trustees who plan to participate in a capital campaign, provided an understanding of the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century. The central theme related to the role of trustees was that it varied greatly by each individual trustee. Some of the trustees were fully engaged in the campaign and worked closely with the campaign leadership, while others were members of the steering committee, but were not actively involved in asking donors for gifts.

The principal themes related to the fundraising experiences or training of the trustees was not as varied, as none of the trustees had formal training, other than what the UofA leaders provided. However, each had experiences with fundraising on some scale before agreeing to become a member of the steering committee. It might have been simple fundraising in the community, or for a political campaign, or for their business endeavors, but those experiences translated well to their volunteer work with the CTFC.

The major themes regarding advice for trustees who volunteer to take on a role during a campaign were related to being able to be present and involved in the activities of the campaign, not simply being a name on a list. One trustee suggested that campaign volunteers would gain value in reading Chancellor Gearhart's 2006 book, *Philanthropy, fundraising, and the capital campaign: A practical guide.* Another trustee suggested that understanding the goals of the campaign is an important factor for successful volunteering. Fundraising deals with relationships; therefore, respondents focused on the need to match individuals with areas of the campaign in which they felt passionate, or at least felt strongly, that the need was important to the mission of the institution. Comprehensive capital campaigns are a team effort and communication and well-informed team members can be key to success.

Chapter V

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine and understand the role of trustees, who volunteered during the University of Arkansas's (UofA) Campaign for the Twenty-First Century (CTFC). The individuals interviewed for this study discussed their various roles and offered advice for future trustees who volunteer to serve their institutions during major fundraising efforts. The participants purposefully selected to be interviewed for this case study included four governor-appointed system trustees, the past system president, two past and the current campus chancellors, and four senior-level fundraising professionals. A major objective of this research was to provide readers with rich findings regarding the role that system trustees who serve a multicampus system might undertake during a comprehensive capital campaign to help make the campaign successful. The main objective for this chapter was to present analysis and interpretation of the findings, which will be discussed along with connections with the existing literature, and conclusions. This study's limitations and recommendations for future research will also be presented.

Overview of the Study

Qualitative research methods were utilized in data collection and analysis for this study. The researcher used content analysis of interview transcripts, member checking to ensure accuracy of interview transcripts, observations, and printed UofA documents to provide a triangulation of data. The findings of this inquiry were organized according to the four research questions that provided the framework. Each of the questions will be presented in this chapter, as well as a summary of the findings that emerged during data analysis. Qualitative research methods and approach of analysis vary; however, the research questions for this study covered four broad categories for coding and analyzing the data. The categories included (a) criteria used when choosing trustees to serve on the campaign steering committee, (b) the role of trustees during a capital campaign, (c) prior fundraising experiences and training of the trustees, and (d) advice for future trustees who plan to participate in a capital campaign.

Research Question 1: What were the criteria used when choosing trustees to provide leadership as members of the campaign steering committee?

There was one main theme and four sub-themes to emerge from the data in response to how the administrators recruited trustees to be members of the campaign steering committee. The major theme was that certain trustees had an affinity for the flagship campus and had the ability to influence others. The first sub-theme was related to the trustees' financial capability to give and their willingness to participate. A second sub-theme to emerge was that there were not many challenges with recruiting trustees as there were several members of the board with long histories of giving to the flagship campus. The third sub-theme was that although there were some members of the board who were alumni of the campus and were known to be wealthy, they did not participate in the campaign, which included not giving toward the goals. The fourth, and final, sub-theme was related to the comfort level of the trustees in their own ability to undertake the task associated with raising millions of dollars and their willingness to invest the number of years one would need to commit to the campaign effort.

Research Question 2: What was the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?

There was one major theme and two sub-themes related to the role of trustees during the campaign. The major theme was that the roles varied by trustee member due to their level of comfort in the fundraising role and their ability to lead by example. The first sub-theme to emerge from the data was that some of the trustees would have been raising funds for the campus regardless of whether a campaign was ongoing. The second sub-theme was that the trustees were included in the decision-making that determined the dollar amounts and goals for the campaign, but not necessarily the priorities of the programs/projects, and the steering committee members did not participate in the evaluation of the campaign at its conclusion.

Research Question 3: What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign steering committee?

In addressing the study's third research question, the participants highlighted one major theme and one sub-theme. The major theme was that although trustees did not have what could be considered formal training, other than that received from the UofA advancement professionals, they had participated in fundraising on some level in their histories. Each trustee had raised funds for an effort in their professional careers as business and community leaders. The sub-theme to emerge from the data was that trustees believed there was a benefit to volunteering on the steering committee in their gaining a deeper understanding of the institution.

Research Question 4: What advice can you offer to future trustees concerning trustee roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?

There was one major theme and two sub-themes related to advice offered to future trustees who volunteer to help lead a capital campaign in the higher education environment. The major theme was the importance of being committed to the role as a volunteer, and being present at committee meetings and events of the campaign. In addition, being engaged in the effort was related to matching trustees with their areas of interest. The first sub-theme was that communication is essential to the success of a campaign, and leadership should strive to keep the steering committee members informed of all aspects and during each stage of the campaign. The second sub-theme was that trustees should assist in bridging any gaps in communication to help keep the efforts on track with goals.

Discussion of the Findings and Conclusions

This study offers empirical research to assist in understanding the unique role of trustees during a capital campaign at a public research university within a multicampus system. To stay competitive with peer institutions, and to strengthen and grow, public universities depend on private funds. Trustees should be aware of the financial state of the institutions they serve. Trustees should understand well the increased need to raise private funds to achieve the mission and reach the vision of the university. According to Worth (2005), in reference to private universities, "Whatever else a board may accomplish, if the trustees fail to maintain the institution’s financial soundness, they will have failed to meet their most fundamental responsibility" (p. 1). The same can be said for public universities. Public universities are increasingly turning to the capital campaign to raise private funds; therefore, this research provides timely exploration of the trustee role during a capital campaign. Given the complexity of today’s higher education challenges and the increasing use of the capital campaign, trustees who volunteer to assist in fundraising for a public university might appreciate guidance and understanding of the roles trustees can undertake for a campaign steering committee. Discussion of findings and conclusions drawn from the interview data is presented in this section.

Although not intentionally, this single case study became more than a study of the role of trustees, it also became a study of the campus chancellor during a capital campaign at a public research university, which is part of a multicampus system. Since the researcher has worked in the Chancellor's Office since 1993, she purposely did not focus on the role of the chancellor. However, she found that the campus chancellor is essential to the effort. In 2013, when researching what characteristics make a higher education institution more likely to receive million-dollar gifts, Johnson Grossnickle and Associates (JGA) identified five traits that attracted million-dollar gifts including long-term presidents, top rankings, strong alumni support, tenured faculty, and firm financial footing. JGA (2013) found that longer presidential tenure is associated with higher numbers of million-dollar gifts. The UofA increased fundraising efforts for the campus after Daniel E. Ferritor became its chancellor in 1986. Chancellor Ferritor was chancellor from 1986 to 1997, Chancellor White from 1997 to 2008, and Chancellor Gearhart from 2008 until present. Gearhart was UofA's vice chancellor for university advancement from 1998 to 2008, throughout the duration of the CTFC, and before becoming its chancellor. Ferritor was the third chancellor for the UofA campus and the first chancellor to have longevity. Ferritor provided much needed stability for the campus. Before Ferritor, the first two chancellors appointed to the UofA campus stayed in the chancellor position for only one year each.

Even though million-dollar donations have the ability to transform higher education institutions, less than one in three degree-granting U.S. institutions received a publicly announced million-dollar donation from 2000 to 2012, and far fewer received multiple million-dollar gifts (JGA, 2013). Additionally, institutions ranked in *U.S. News and World Report* received 61% more million-dollar gifts between 2000 and 2012 and the value of the university's endowment corresponded to "both the number of million-dollar gifts received by the institution and the total value of those gifts" (JGA, 2013, p. 6). The "president's ability to articulate a powerful vision and connect it to donors' motivations will have a profound effect on million-dollar-gift success" (JGA, 2013, p. 4), and so does the percentage of tenured faculty. A key finding of JGA (2013) was that the percentage of tenured faculty is associated with the number and total value of million-dollar or more gifts. According to JGA (2013) study results, institutions with a higher percentage of tenured faculty attracted more million-dollar gifts. A 10% increase in the tenured-faculty percentage is associated with a 0.4 % increase in the number of million-dollar gifts, and with 1% increase in the total value of those gifts. Additionally, an increase in the average board giving is "associated with an increase in the number of million-dollar gifts received" (JGA, 2013, p. 6).

Fundraising is about teamwork, and building trust and relationships. During Sturgis's (2005) study of team fundraising relationships with trustees, president, and vice president of advancement, it was noted that many institutional leaders did not "want to participate in surveys nor have their board members involved with survey research" (p. 172). Fortunately, the UofA chancellor did not object to the researcher interviewing trustees, past chancellors, any member of the campaign steering committee, or members of the senior-level advancement team. Administrators and trustees who were interviewed for this study talked openly and candidly about their experiences during the campaign, which included challenges related to relationships between trustees and advancement professionals who worked closely together on specific project goals. One trustee and a major gift officer had dissimilar views of how to accomplish the goal for one college. This team had to learn to work together and ended up working well together, although it took some time to get comfortable with each other. In this case, a more senior-level advancement professional stepped in to explain to the trustee the reasons behind the major gift officer's point-of-view. The trustee and major gift officer were both interviewed for this study and both spoke highly of each other, after acknowledging issues they had to overcome. Being able to work in a true team environment is not always easy; however, it is essential to the overall effort during a campaign. Another trustee managed to help bridge the gap in communication between a division and college, which had a combined goal with two major gift officers working toward that combined goal. This trustee was instrumental in ensuring the success of the combined goal.

Scholars (e.g., Cook, 1994; Cook & Lasher, 1994; Caboni, 2010) frequently agreed with Fisher and Quehl's 1989 book, *The President and Fund Raising.* The literature supports the theory that the campus president is the leader of the capital campaign and key to its success and that teamwork is essential. There was agreement that it is the president who is pivotal but only if he/she has the full support of the trustees and vice president for advancement. The vice president for advancement must have a competent team to support all fundraising efforts, especially during an intensive campaign. Communication is important to an effort as large as a multi-year, comprehensive capital campaign. Communication and relationship building skills are necessary to being good at raising funds and are essential for being productive team members. Fundraisers need to be able to communicate on a personal level with potential donors and stakeholders and build solid relationships with members of the university community. Therefore, university and media relations are essential to a campaign, as are donor records and research, as well as the alumni association, and corporate and foundation relations.

The UofA donor records existed in 1998 at the beginning of the CTFC but were far from ideal. Trustees and administrators interviewed for this study spoke of the importance of accurate and up-to-date donor records and the work required for that area of campaign planning. With the UofA's first campaign that raised $178 million in the 1990s, the campaign steering committee members reviewed lists of donor prospects, according to one of the interviewees, who volunteered on both campaigns. However, those early donor records were much less detailed or researched than donor records are in today's fundraising environment. Under the direction of Vice Chancellor Gearhart, beginning in 1998, the advancement records department expanded and became more sophisticated. During a search for alumni members who would be potential donors for one of the programs with a multi-million-dollar goal during the CTFC, a trustee searched through the UofA yearbooks to identify prospects, because records for that specific demographic were nonexistent. "They also went through the annuals to refresh their memories and through records they had, and we ultimately came up with a list of [alumni]" (UofA trustee, personal communications, August, 29, 2012). In those early years before the beginning of the CTFC, according to one UofA administrator, "A lot of times we didn't know basic information about when they graduated . . . [or] how old they were" (UofA administrator, personal communications, October 8, 2012).

One of the five traits for a million-dollar-ready institution is to have strong alumni support (JGA, 2013). When Ferritor hired a new vice chancellor to set up the advancement division in the 1980s, he moved the alumni association under the direction of that vice chancellor and hired a new director of the alumni association with a focus on alumni cultivation. At the beginning of the alumni association reorganization, alumni's giving was approximately $2 million annually (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 29, 2012). However, in 2014, for the first time ever, the UofA's alumni association awarded more than $1 million in scholarships. The UofA advancement team raised $121.3 million in 2011, and $103 million in 2012. The UofA's endowment in 2013 was $818 million and its goal is to reach an endowment of $2.5 billion by 2021. One of the five traits for a million-dollar-ready institution is to have firm financial footing that includes the institution's endowment.

During the literature review, the researcher found no argument against the notion that philanthropy was based on relationships. In fact, donors who give major gifts to the institution "tend to invest their resources in the president rather than the institution itself" (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 213), which was true for the CTFC. During the CTFC, there were two substantial gifts from the Walton Family Charitable Support Foundation. The first was in 1998 during the campaign's quiet phase for $50 million to endow the College of Business. With this $50 million gift, the Walton family asked the dean of the college as well as the chancellor to commit to stay in their positions for at least five years. The second gift for $300 million was given in 2002 and it was the largest gift received by an American public university at the time. With the $300-million gift, the Walton family again reaffirmed its request that the chancellor commit to another five years as the UofA's chancellor. Because the Walton Family Foundation's $300 million was a matching gift, the UofA fundraisers were highly motivated to raise the private funds to match that gift, which they did before the campaign concluded in 2005. The confidence shown in the UofA and its administration by the gift helped with morale, and gave a much-needed lift to the campaign effort. More than one trustee and administrator interviewed for this study agreed that the $300-million gift announcement generated much excitement and energized the steering committee volunteers and the advancement professionals. "I think the Walton's $50 million pre-gift to the [business college] and the $300-million [matching] gift created a lot of energy, a lot of momentum" (UofA trustee, personal communication, August 29, 2012).

In addition to relationships and teamwork, academic quality and institutional prestige are also essential to the fundraising effort (Cook & Lasher, 1994) and presidents who believe they are responsible for creating a fundraising culture and climate for their institutions are more successful fundraisers (Hurtubise, 1988). Changing a culture is difficult, especially the culture of an entire institution and state. With the UofA's vision to be nationally competitive, there was a push to help Arkansans change their way of thinking with the outdated belief that "We're Going to Be Poor, and We're Going to Stay Poor," as reported by the headlines in *Arkansas Business*

(2000), according to *Making the Case* (2001). The UofA administrators understood that there needed to be a cultural shift.

The success of the CTFC helped shift Arkansans' way of thinking and instilled the belief that the UofA could become a premier institution. During the time of the campaign, one of the UofA's top five goals was to raise private gift support. At the beginning of the CTFC, the economic conditions and outlook in Arkansas were not going to allow for furthering the UofA's growth without private funds. With each major gift in support of the UofA's vision, the future showed more promise in being able to reach the goal of becoming nationally competitive. In 2013, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* identified the UofA as the 13th fastest growing university in the nation in its report of fastest-growing campuses from 2001 to 2011 (AHE, 2013). Without the $300-million matching Walton gift, the UofA would have had more difficulty in establishing its undergraduate Honors College and expanding the Graduate School. The Honors College was established with a $200-million endowment and the Graduate School was endowed with $100 million from the Walton gift. Part of the Honors College endowment ($30 million) was used to establish 20 new endowed chairs for faculty and $10 million was used to establish 20 new endowed distinguished professorships. An additional $15 million created a matching fund for endowed faculty positions. Part of the Graduate School endowment ($24 million) was used to establish eight new graduate faculty endowed research chairs. The research chairs allowed the UofA to recruit top-notch faculty members. According to JGA (2013), as the ranks of top-notch faculty increase so does the total number and value of major gifts.

A university's endowment is important as it produces investment income and affords the institution more stability and independence (Ingram & Associates, 1980). Years before public universities began to concentrate on building endowments, major private institutions began to build sizable endowments that brought in funds greater than their annual expenditures (Cohen, 1998). The million-dollar-ready study (JGA, 2013) showed that institutions with bigger endowments, more valuable assets, and higher levels of government funding, at the beginning of 2001, correlated to the number and value of million-dollar gifts received from 2000 to 2012. An institution's endowment is vital to operations and survival with diminishing state funding. The increase in the UofA's endowment during the CTFC was noteworthy and essential to the vision of the institution. In 1997, the UofA's endowment was $119 million, but by the end of the CFTC in 2005, the UofA's endowment grew to $691.5 million, and to $818 million by Fiscal Year (FY) 2013.

According to JGA (2013), public universities, specifically, liberal arts schools and doctoral and research universities, receive more million-dollar gifts, although private institutions tend to receive gifts with a higher dollar value. Therefore, institution type has an impact, as does classification. JGA's case study of Arizona State University (ASU), the nation's largest public university, showed that ASU moved to a top research university status in a relatively short amount of time. In 2011, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classified the UofA as a research university with very high research activity, ranking it with only 107 other universities nationwide (108 out of 4,633) and placing the UofA among the top 2% of research universities in the country. If a university does not possess the traits of million-dollar-ready institutions, they can obtain them with the help of a successful capital campaign. That is what occurred for the UofA. The results of the CTFC have elevated the status of the UofA.

Research Question 1

In a final report on the CTFC (UofA, 2005), the researcher identified numerous past or current trustees who served on the steering committee for the CTFC along with many other distinguished volunteers. Several of the campaign steering committee volunteers became future trustees. This finding led the researcher to question what criteria were used when choosing trustees to be a part of the campaign steering committee. However, the findings related to research question 1 were counter to what was expected. The researcher assumed the past and current trustees were targeted to be part of the steering committee because they were members of the board of trustees.

Major Theme 1

The core premise to emerge from research question 1 was that the main criteria in choosing trustees to serve on the campaign steering committee was that the trustees had an affinity for the UofA campus and because of their ability to influence others. The institution of study was a public research university within a state system, so the trustees are governor appointed. With varying backgrounds, not all of the trustees were alumni of the UofA campus. The researcher assumed that all of the system trustees were asked to serve on the campaign, but this was not the case. Trustees with a known connection to another institution within the UofA system were not targeted or asked to be on the steering committee. "Some of the trustees . . . have an affinity to other campuses . . . we didn't want to insult their loyalty to some other institution [by asking them to be on the campaign steering committee]" (UofA administrator, personal communication, September 10, 2012).

With this single case study, it was important to understand the criteria used in choosing the trustees who were recruited to serve as volunteers of the campaign steering committee. According to Worth (2005), the place to start in fundraising is to build strong boards, which are "composed of dedicated and able people who understand their responsibilities and take them seriously, who respect one another and the institution, and who approach their work as trustees with the thoughtfulness it deserves" (p. 108). All of the administrators interviewed for this study were asked research question 1. Even though the trustees were not asked research question 1, several trustees spoke of how or why they volunteered to be members of the campaign steering committee. Every university is unique and the UofA was fortunate to have dedicated trustees who possessed the skills to raise funds during the campaign. Along with fundraising skills, the trustees were willing to share their time to volunteer. Trustees volunteered many hours to the efforts of the campaign over the approximate eight years of planning and execution.

An important aspect of raising major funds includes having trust and relationships with donors. It would be uncommon for a person to rise to the level of governor-appointed trustee member without being a person of respect and influence. In Satterwhite's 2004 study of the function of public university presidents in fundraising with capital campaigns less than $100 million, he found that there is a distinct advantage of having a board of volunteers "who could discover and identify with potential donors from a very broad pool" (p. 45). "Trustees often have more clout than CEOs, and should be able to cultivate and solicit their peers of great means" (Fisher & Quehl, 1994, p. 104). The capital campaign steering committee volunteers need the assistance of carefully chosen, well-connected community leaders who are willing to invest their resources, time, and talents into the university's fundraising efforts (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Public university trustees "must take responsibility to see that an effective foundation is operating and that, whenever possible, governing board members themselves identify, cultivate, and (when appropriate) call on prospects" (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 103). Trustees, according to Overley (2006), have "vast connections in their communities and throughout their respective states" (p. 127), and can help the president and vice president to identify and solicit potential donors.

Sub-Theme 1

Typically, steering committee volunteers give lead gifts toward the campaign, although that was not the main reason they were chosen to serve on the CTFC. The classic standard that members "recruited for work, wealth, and wisdom" still requires that at least some of the trustees be recruited primarily for their philanthropic capacity (Worth, 2012, p. 64). UofA trustees with histories of giving to the campus were obvious recruits to become steering committee members, and most importantly, those trustees were willing volunteers to the steering committee. In addition, administrators hoped that trustees who were members of the campaign steering committee would report back to the rest of the trustees on the events of the ongoing campaign throughout its duration.

The university leaders need to be prepared to undergo scrutiny by their constituency and volunteers, "especially trustees who will contribute both prestige and funds to the institution″ (Ingram & Associates, 1980, p. 284). According to Ferrell (2005), campaigns require a clear vision and "are a mechanism to take stock in the status of the institution, to reflect upon its goals and aspirations" (p. 102), requiring more than the usual academic planning. A campaign planning process includes the "entire institutional stakeholder community" (Ferrell, 2005, p. 102), with a steering committee made up of alumni, community leaders, and trustees, who work closely with the university leaders and advancement professionals. Besides a favorable economy, the institution’s reputation among its potential donors and alumni will play a role in a successful outcome for the campaign. Large capital campaigns are assisted greatly by a lead volunteer committee for strategic planning, establishing goals, and reviewing lists of names for additional volunteer committee members as well identifying potential donors (Gearhart, 2006).

Sub-Theme 2

The administrators did not feel that there were many challenges with recruiting trustees to be members of the steering committee, even though, they did not target all of the current trustees at the beginning of the campaign. One newly appointed trustee asked to become a member of the steering committee after the campaign began, because he heard other trustees talking about upcoming meetings. Trustees' willingness to become volunteers on the campaign steering committee could either speak of the level of confidence the trustees held in the administrators of the UofA campus or it could speak to the level of dedication of the trustees in moving the UofA forward. Either way, many of the UofA past, present, and in some cases, future trustees assisted the administrators in accomplishing and exceeding the goals of the campaign.

Sub-Theme 3

Several of the trustees were willing and able to pledge multi-million-dollar gifts. However, it should be noted that the UofA also had wealthy trustees who did not participate in any capacity during the efforts or events of the campaign. It was said of one wealthy trustee, "I don't know if he ever gave. If he did, it was a very small gift. But, he never stepped up in a way that he was capable of stepping up" (UofA administrator, personal communication, August 30, 2012). Of those trustees with the capability but without the inclination to give or participate in the events of the campaign, there were issues that could have been deciding factors for those trustee members. It was said of one of those trustees that "[he] was not happy with some things that happened" (UofA administrator, personal communication, August 30, 2012). According to one UofA administrator, ". . . being on the steering committee didn't necessarily mean that [trustees] were going to step up and give significantly. Whereas, at private institutions it is pretty well understood that you are going to be helping financially for the institution" (personal communication, August 30, 2012). At private institutions, trustees have long played a major role in helping raise the endowment as board members participate in fundraising in addition to financial decision-making (Ingram & Associates, 1980). For institutions within multicampus state university systems, the campus president is believed to be primarily responsible for the campus fundraising efforts (Cook & Lasher, 1994). Although presidents must be knowledgeable about major and planned gifts, trustees must also be involved in the advancement process for the fundraising efforts to be comprehensive and successful (Overley, 2006). One UofA administrator felt that there should be a distinction between the role of trustee oversight versus the role of those trustees who volunteer in the campaign to avoid micromanagement of the campaign and institution. Worth (2005) agrees that in planning a capital campaign, "trustees cannot micromanage the development office or undermine the authority of the president to set budgets and select staff" (p. 33).

Sub-Theme 4

An important aspect of raising funds is feeling comfortable in the role, and since capital campaigns can run from five to eight years, there is time for volunteers to become more comfortable in the role of fundraiser. The trustees who gave generously of their own funds and who had more fundraising experiences coming into the campaign seemed to be more comfortable in the role of asking others for major gifts. According to one trustee:

> . . . to a degree I was an active fundraiser . . . I was sending letters with my signature, and I was going out and making calls and to "close" with [the chancellor and vice chancellor] with significant contributions of up to 7 figures. As trustees, our obligation is to talk about the realities of the system and not get caught up with being on the board of trustees. We are supposed to be good will ambassadors, but our responsibility is to say ". . . [the] reality is that we do need to raise some more private money" because the state coffers to feed into the university system are diminishing. (UofA trustee, personal communication, September 17, 2012)

Research Question 2

Achieving the mission and vision of the institution can be critically linked to fundraising. Higher education institutions need visionary administrators and supportive trustees who value shared governance, student success, dedicated staff, and faculty excellence in teaching, research, and service. University leaders shoulder the responsibilities of financial straits or mismanagement, so they should understand well all aspects of the institutions they serve. "All trustees, regardless of their personal wealth, can contribute to fundraising success" (Worth, 2005, p. 112). The role of the trustees varied greatly during the CTFC depending on the individual trustee's financial means, skills, and level of comfort with raising funds. Worth (2005) warned against setting a minimum gift level for all members of the board or steering committee members and reiterated "philanthropic giving is by nature voluntary" (p. 72). Governor-appointed trustees for public universities are not required to give or raise funds for the institution, as they might be for private universities.

Major Theme 1

The primary premise to emerge from research question 2 was that the role varied greatly depending on the individual trustee members and their level of comfort in fundraising. One size most definitely does not fit all in terms of the role of trustees during fundraising efforts of a capital campaign. The campaign steering committee included trustees who participated fully by giving a lead gift toward the campaign and by identifying potential donors and soliciting gifts. As members of the steering committee, trustees assisted with decision making, by setting goals and strategic planning of the details of the campaign. Besides identifying potential donors, trustees assisted with cultivation. Trustees who were not comfortable asking others to give, assisted in the effort by hosting and being present at events. The study results suggest that familiarity with the institution and prior experience with fundraising as well as giving financially to the effort assisted greatly with trustees' level of comfort in participation in the solicitation of gifts from potential donors, particularly when asking for substantial gifts. Trustees were comfortable with "opening the door" to potential donors; although, trustees understood that the potential donor targeted would be coming to those trustees to ask for gifts for their own pet projects at a later date. Several of the trustees also provided generously to specific programs and units with their own funds, and took the goals of specific targeted programs on as personal goals.

The UofA advancement professionals who worked with trustees understood that matching the steering committee members with targeted projects and programs of interest to the individuals was also an extremely important part of the process. The UofA was fortunate to have friends of the institution who were willing to give time and resources during its campaign, and members of the campaign steering committee were part of a prestigious group of individuals. More than one of the trustees took on the success of a particular project as a personal goal. Trustees brought prestige and influence to the campaign events. Trustees should participate in the capital campaign for themselves, because it can help them to learn about and understand the institution, which they serve. It can help to connect the trustees to the institution.

According to Worth (2005), the volunteer leaders are "critical to the success of a campaign, not only for what they do but by who they are," and that trustees must be highly visible, since they are at the "pinnacle of the institution's structure" (p. 96). More than one of the trustees on the steering committee not only identified potential donors, but they also actively solicited funds from those potential donors. Trustees sent letters and made personal visits to potential donors, as well as being present at campaign events. Trustees who had personal wealth gave generously to areas of the campus in which they had personal ties or interest. More than one trustee took on the goal of a particular program as his or her own personal goal and was instrumental in reaching or exceeding the program goal. One trustee was a co-chair for a combined goal for the campus's Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences and the Division of Agriculture for the UofA system, and helped bridge gaps in communication during the duration of the campaign.

Most higher education institutions using the capital campaign to raise funds, whether private or public, have their strategic plan approved by the board of trustees (Worth, 2005). The conventional wisdom is that trustees should lead by example if they are to inspire others (Worth, 2005). However, even trustees without great personal financial wealth can champion the institution or its programs and may have the clout to inspire others to support the institution. One well-respected UofA trustee, who had a background in politics, was a successful fundraiser for one program on campus, in which this trustee had a special interest. Only the advancement professionals know whether this trustee gave to the program of his own personal funds. For private universities, the "obligation of every trustee to make some gift to the college or university has been emphasized in virtually all literature on the subject" (Worth, 2005, p. 67), although, this same obligation cannot be expected of governor-appointed trustees at public universities. Data from this study show that not being a large gift donor does not prevent well-respected and well-connected trustees from identifying prospects, cultivating relationships with donors, recognizing donors, and stewarding gifts. It was said of one trustee who was a volunteer steering committee member:

> We went to him to head up the [project] relations and had no idea that he was going to be as strong a member as he was. He read everything; he had ideas; he initiated certain projects; he had no problem picking up the phone and calling donor prospects. We thought his position and his name certainly would lend us the credibility we needed, but we had no idea he would be as involved as he was. (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 8, 2012)

Sub-Theme 1

Some trustees would have been raising money for the UofA whether or not the campaign was ongoing. Besides a favorable economy, the institution's reputation among its alumni and potential donors will play a role in a successful outcome for the campaign. Trustees who are alumni of the institution and who are involved with the events of the institution outside of the scheduled board of trustee meetings are valued members of the campaign. The UofA was fortunate to have several trustees who were active in raising funds for the university. One of the trustees on the campaign steering committee was nearing the end of his 10-year term at the beginning of the CTFC. He began to make plans for raising funds for a particular UofA program even before becoming a member of the campaign steering committee because of his involvement in that program when he was a student. Another trustee on the steering committee participated in fundraising for a particular program because of his belief in that program's director. Alumni who believe in the institution and have an appreciation for its programs can be strong advocates during the campaign. According to Scholtes et al. (2003), "to succeed, organizations must rely on the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives of a wide range of people to solve multifaceted problems, make good decisions, and deliver effective solutions" (p. 1-1).

In Kimball's study at one state multicampus university system, it was noted that trustees should have an understanding of the institutional mission and higher education in general, and be "community spirited" (1989, p. 115). Regardless of the need to be community spirited, Kimball found that trustees were not particularly adept at articulating the goals and needs of the university system to the public community. During a campaign, the volunteers need not understand or be able to speak of every facet of the institution. For this reason, it is important to connect the volunteers to the area of the institution in which they feel passionately. Fortunately, for the UofA, there were trustees on the campaign steering committee who could speak enthusiastically about particular goals of the campaign and could convey the need to potential donors.

Sub-Theme 2

Trustees were included in the decision-making that determined the dollar amounts for the goals for the campaign, but not necessarily the priorities of the programs/projects. The overall goal for the campaign was raised several times during the campaign, as it did not start out with a goal as ambitious as $1 billion dollars. The campaign steering committee members were involved with decision-making with approval of raising the goals, but it was left to the administrators to determine the most pressing needs of the institution.

Research Question 3

The researcher found the ability to attract, charm, and influence others was present with each of the individuals interviewed for this study. The responses to research question 3 provided an array of fundraising experiences and abilities, which translated into being effective leadership as volunteers of the campaign steering committee.

Major Theme 1

The main theme to emerge from the research was that none of the trustees involved had what could be considered formal training, although all of the trustees were experienced fundraisers on some level. Several of the trustees who were members of the steering committee were effective fundraisers for the campus, but they worked hand-in-hand with the UofA advancement/development professionals who staffed the trustees during the campaign. UofA advancement professions provided guidance and ensured that volunteer leaders understood the style and methods, which were appropriate and provided effective fundraising for "higher education's unique environment" (Worth, 2012, p. 21).

Sub-Theme 1

The secondary theme was that trustees found volunteering on the campaign gave them a deeper understanding of the university and its needs. Volunteering on the campaign allowed for an understanding of what would be required to obtain the vision of the institution. The trustees interviewed for this study had previous fundraising experience, as they were involved in raising funds for community projects, political campaigns, or for their own businesses, before agreeing to serve on the CTFC. The trustees' previous experiences in raising funds translated into the confidence to take on the task that constitutes a capital campaign at a public research university. However, a comprehensive capital campaign was far and above fundraising efforts the trustees had ever undertaken, which is why the partnership with the advancement professionals is an important aspect of the planning and in carrying out the functions of raising funds.

The steering committee "must ensure that fundraising goals and priorities reflect the institution's mission and strategic plan" (Worth, 2005, p. 55), and trustees are well positioned to understand the institution's mission and vision. Worth (2005) stated that at private institutions, "fundraising should be part of the agenda in orienting new trustees," and one of the interviewees for this study made the same statement for public university trustees. All of the trustees interviewed acknowledged gaining a deeper understanding of the UofA and its needs and challenges while serving on the steering committee. One of the trustees considered himself to be self-taught, and he acknowledged spending time with the UofA's director of planned giving to learn all of the options open for that type of gift giving. Mentoring by a senior-level advancement professional was helpful to the trustee, but one of the reasons this trustee became so competent at raising funds for the UofA was because he took it upon himself to learn about fundraising for a university, and because of his love for the institution. This trustee also held the chancellor and vice chancellor for university advancement in high regard. In addition, this trustee took it upon himself to read Gearhart's 1995 book, *The capital campaign in higher education: A practical guide for college and university advancement*, and he also read Gearhart's 2006 book, *Philanthropy, fundraising, and the capital campaign: A practical guide*. The trustee credits the two books with giving him a deeper understanding of the task of taking on a capital campaign.

The UofA advancement professionals did provide training and prepared the trustees with an understanding of what would be expected of them in their roles as members of the campaign steering committee. One of the trustee's comfort level in soliciting gifts was in the $1,000 range at the beginning of the campaign, but accelerated to the $1-million level by the end of the campaign. Additionally, past trustees who have already rotated off of the board should not be overlooked as potential steering committee members. Several of the UofA's past trustees were effective members of the steering committee. "The reality of the board's ownership gives the campaign real power to succeed and transform the college or university" (Worth, 2005, p. 87). An added benefit for the trustees is a deeper understanding of the campus needs and what is required to reach its vision. More enlightened, and possibly, more supportive, board members who gain knowledge and understanding during volunteering as members of a campaign steering committee can only benefit the campus. Any campus chancellor hopes for supportive trustees who help reach the campus goals, but for public universities, trustees might not always understand the difference between running an institution of higher education versus a corporation or business.

Research Question 4

Major Theme 1

The participants for this study were asked what advice they would offer to trustees who volunteer during a capital campaign. In addressing research question 4, the main theme emphasized the need of volunteers to be present and engaged in the campaign effort and that matching areas of interest to volunteers was the best way to ensure success with volunteers. In order to make the case for higher education to its citizens, the steering committee members need to possess interest, knowledge, and involvement in the campus, and these qualities are often characteristic of the institution's trustee members. When cultivating or soliciting potential donors, trustees would need to possess the able to articulate the goals and needs of the university campus. For this reason, it was important that UofA advancement professionals worked hand-in-hand with the steering committee members throughout the campaign.

Sub-Theme 1

A sub-theme, which emerged from research question 4, was that campaign leadership strived to communicate information to its steering committee members and team leaders to help them accomplish the goals of the campaign, which was important to the success of the campaign. The fundraising role takes the trustees beyond their policymaking role as they become involved in "carrying out activities" (Worth, 2012, p. 44), and should become a "part of the agenda in orienting new trustees" (p. 68). The better prepared the trustees are with knowledge of the institution and their ability to represent the campus during a campaign, the more comfortable trustees will feel in carrying out those fundraising roles.

It is important for trustees and administrators (including advancement professionals) to understand that campaigns have become "communication and marketing vehicles as well as fundraising efforts" (Worth, 2005, p. 85). A sound piece of advice from one of the trustees interviewed was to read a book on fundraising—in other words, do your homework. Being well informed on the policies and procedures, as well as having a working knowledge of the priorities and goals of the campaign, are helpful for steering committee members. However, one administrator interviewed for this study made it clear that the steering committee members did not need to possess a thorough working knowledge of a comprehensive capital campaign for a higher education institution, because the administrators and advancement professionals partnered with the steering committee members every step of the way during the campaign. Worth (2005) agreed "trustees need not be experts on the technical points of fundraising in order to meet their responsibilities" (p. 17). Trustees on the steering committee should work as effective partners with the president/chancellor and the institution’s advancement professionals (Worth, 2005). To be effective partners, trustees need to possess knowledge and understanding of the goals of the campaign as well as the mission and vision for the institution. To be engaged during fundraising events, trustees should have the ability to articulate some of those goals and the reasons behind those goals. Past board members have proven to be great assets to the fundraising efforts of the UofA. "Trustees have the relationships, credibility, and stature to communicate the importance of an institution’s cause" (Worth, 2005, p. 77), and that was true for past UofA trustees who were members of the CTFC steering committee. According to Worth (2005), "Effective fundraising partnerships are built on mutual confidence, respect, and understanding among all members of the team" (p. 47). The UofA administrators understood the importance of communication and in keeping the steering committee members well informed for the duration of the campaign. It was also the hope of UofA administrators that trustees on the campaign steering committee would keep the nonparticipating board members informed regarding the ongoing campaign.

Sub-Theme 2

The second sub-theme was that trustees have the ability to bridge gaps in communication during a capital campaign. It cannot be overstated that communication can be key to the success of any undertaking as complicated as a comprehensive capital campaign. "Research was a very important part [of the campaign's success] and I think it helped with communication" (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 8, 2012). According to one administrator, "trustees were keenly aware of and beautifully informed about the campaign and its progress because [the UofA] had so many programs and joint recognition [events] that went on all across campus and all across the country" (UofA administrator, October 8, 2012).

Limitations

Limitations inherent to this study include potential researcher bias and transferability to other higher education institutions. Producing and contributing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner was the goal for this study's researcher. Internal validity (or credibility) deals with how well research findings match reality and how well the data are interpreted (Merriam, 2009). To ensure credibility for this study, the researcher used strategies, such as triangulation of data, audit trail, and member checking of interview transcripts (Creswell, 2008; Merriam, 2009). Validity and reliability relates to whether the study’s findings are "sufficiently authentic" (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 178) and ring true. Limitations characteristic of qualitative research include the researcher’s ability to provide the reader with descriptions of experiences and perspectives of the participants.

This study's researcher understood her biases. Working as a staff member in the Chancellor's Office for the past 20 years allowed the researcher to understand the necessity of a supportive board of trustees toward the success of the university and its fundraising efforts. Without trustees who support the campus chancellor and administrative cabinet, the institutional goals would be harder to reach. Since this research inquiry was a qualitative single case study, it was important to ensure the interview technique and interview questions provided for richness in the participants' answers (Ogden & Cornwell, 2010). In addition, according to Ogden and Cornwell (2010), interview questions ". . . should be carefully constructed as a means to generate rich data, and numerous guidelines are provided as to how this can be achieved" (p. 1061). For these reasons, the researcher pilot tested the interview questions with two of the directors of development (major gift officers) for two of the UofA's colleges. The data from those two test pilot interviews were included in this study, because the data collected was rich with information and provided a triangulation of data. The two major gift officers interviewed worked closely with trustees during the CTFC. Therefore, credibility for this study was established through (a) interviews of participants who provided varying viewpoints; (b) literature review of higher education fundraising and leadership, and capital campaigns in higher education; (c) document collection from the CTFC which included archival printed materials, electronic documents, news articles, UofA-produced videos and photographs of the CTFC; and (d) observation of the events of the CTFC.

Since this research was for a single case, there can be an issue with transferability (Merriam, 2009). External validity concerns the extent to which the findings can be "generalized or transferred to other situations" (Merriam, 2009, p. 234). Qualitative research scholars (e.g., Patton, 1990; Yin, 1993) have written that it can be hard to generalize qualitative findings;

however, there are methods the researcher can carry out to strengthen his/her case (Firestone, 1993). For the transferability of this study, the researcher attempted to provide sufficient contextual information and detail of the institution of study (Shelton, 2004), which allows for the reader to determine whether the "prevailing environment is similar to another situation with which he or she is familiar and whether the findings can justifiably be applied to the other setting" (Shelton, 2004, p. 63). The prospect of transferability should not be immediately rejected, although, each university is unique (Stake, 1995). Qualitative scholars (e.g., Bassey, 1999; Firestone, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 2000) have agreed that when situations are similar to those described in the study, practitioners may relate the findings to their own situations. Therefore, the issue of transferability is left to the reader to determine how well the findings of this study transfer to his or her own institution or situation.

Recommendations for Future Research

Higher education fundraising success depends on many factors external to the institution as well as the abilities of the internal fundraising professionals. Because of the changing and challenging economic climate in higher education today, public research universities must find ways to continue to improve in quality of teaching, research, and community outreach to be competitive, while being accountable and transparent to the varies constituencies of the institution. Based on the findings of this study and the literature review, additional research into fundraising during capital campaigns and the role of trustees for public universities is needed. Therefore, the following suggestions for further research are based upon this study and questions left unanswered.

1. Additional research of public institutions that replicate this study could offer further insight to the roles, which can be undertaken by trustee members. Furthermore, an

exploration of the role of trustees who volunteer to assist with fundraising efforts during a capital campaign might yield consistent results of this study and could be of use to higher education leadership and fundraising professionals.

2. The motivation behind the generosity of the trustees who participated fully in the fundraiser role during a capital campaign should be of interest to public university administrators. Asking research questions related to why a trustee, or any steering committee member, gives their own funds or devotes years of their time to volunteer in support of an institution during a capital campaign could assist fundraising professionals with trustee and donor cultivation.
3. Survey of past trustees to understand whether they have volunteered in more than one campaign over their years of serving on the board of trustees with the institution and their perceptions of those experiences could supply fundraisers with guidance in working with trustees. One of the trustees interviewed for this study was a volunteer with the UofA's first capital campaign as well as the CTFC and he has already committed to serving on the upcoming campaign. A survey of past trustees who do not participate in an ongoing a capital campaign could lead to important insight for administrators as well. Was the nonparticipation due to lack of expertise or another issue? Could sufficient training have easily eliminated the trustee’s apprehension?
4. Because trustee leadership can be important to fundraising success, research into how trustees are recruited for public institutions is needed. If trustees are governor appointed, does the governor contemplate whether the person being considered to fill a trustee role can also fill the fundraiser role for the institution?

This research was undertaken with the belief that for public research universities, fundraising and the capital campaign can lift the institution to a higher level of greatness. However, it takes great leadership and strategic planning to accomplish the goals of a comprehensive capital campaign. Additionally, it takes enlightened leadership all working together to envision greater than the status quo in today's higher education environment.

Implications for Improved Practice

Implications from this study could assist leadership of public institutions that have not utilized trustees in the volunteer capacity during capital campaign fundraising efforts. This study offered insight into the strong leadership trustees can provide in fundraising at a public institution outside of the policymaking roles. Worth (2005) found the best practice and principles of successful fundraising "related to involvement of volunteer leaders and the necessary teamwork among boards, presidents, and chief advancement officers" (p. vi). Worth discovered the principles of fundraising are common to all types of institutions seeking private support, whether the institutions are public or private.

One recommendation for improved practice is that fundraising roles be discussed during new trustee orientation. For private institutions, according to Worth, "Trustees have never faced a more challenging time than today in meeting their responsibility for fundraising leadership" (2005, p. 2), and the same can be said of public universities when considering the smaller percent of state funds compared to past state support. A second improved practice recommendation is to match trustees to campaign goals, as you would match donors. A third recommendation is to include non-participatory trustees in campaign celebratory events, if possible, while understanding not all of the trustees for a public university can be expected to participate in the events or activities of a campaign. The fourth improved practice recommendation offered is related to identifying proper use of board members. The researcher of this study would suggest that there is not one proper use of a trustee during a capital campaign. However, there are varying roles that trustees can undertake, depending on their own personnel commitment toward the fundraising effort as well as their own fundraising abilities and comfort level in carrying out the roles they chose to undertake. Therefore, the following suggestions for implications for improved practice are offered.

1. Raising private funds has become increasingly important to public institutions and it appears that it will remain so. Training and workshops to prepare trustees for their role in fundraising will become increasing important for the trustees and the institutions. Many institutions do not provide trustee orientation properly to introduce trustees to their duties, requiring trustees to learn on the job. Even though public trustees are not chosen for their ability to give major gifts and raise funds, as they are for private universities, they can still participate in fundraising and contribute significantly to a capital campaign.
2. It is up to the campus chancellor and the advancement professionals to ensure the campaign goals and priorities match the university's mission, vision, and strategic plan. Ideally, trustees can be matched, based upon interest and knowledge of the institution, with areas of university need. "Alumni are the largest source of private support to higher education" (Worth, 2005, p. 4), and trustees who are alumni of the university can become strong campaign leaders, especially if they care deeply about a specific program or department that is a priority during the campaign.
3. There can be a role for non-participatory board members (trustees who do not volunteer to be members of the campaign steering committee). Although trustee gifts can "set the standard for other donors and lend credibility to trustee solicitors" (Worth, 2005, p. 13),

the "old saying that trustees should 'give, get, or get off' hardly seems an adequate response to the complexities of today's trusteeship" (Worth, 2005, p. 10), especially for public institutions. "The capacity to give and raise funds must be an important consideration in selecting individuals to serve on the board" (Worth, 2005, p. 49); however, trustees who do not give major gifts can still lend prestige to campaign events. Trustees can help build positive relationships with potential donors, especially those potential donors whom the trustee has identified. In most cases, it is only the fundraising professionals of the institution who know whether or not a trustee gave to the campaign effort, or if so, at what level.

4. Proper use of board members who do participate on a capital campaign steering committee should be tailored to the individual trustees. Board members can be effective spokespersons if they understand well the mission, goals, and vision of the institution. "It is critical to maintain the flow of communication and to tend carefully to the relationship with previous donors" (Worth, 2005, p. 31). Donors appreciate being able to meet and mingle with trustees during university campaign events. When trustees are present at campaign events and activities, they lend prestige to the event and show support to the campus chancellor and the overall fundraising effort. Donor and steering committee member support to the campus chancellor during a capital campaign is essential to campaign success.

Summary

This study’s purpose was to examine the role of trustees during the University of Arkansas's capital campaign, the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century, which concluded in 2005. Although tax funds support basic needs of public universities, administrators rely on private gift support to achieve academic excellence (Worth, 2012). There are many financial challenges for public higher education institutions today. According to the Kelderman (2013), net tuition revenue made up 47% of public colleges' educational costs in 2012, and for the first time in the history of public higher education, students could be paying a higher percentage than do states for the institution's operating costs. In 1987, net tuition revenue accounted for 23% of those costs (Kelderman, 2013). According to Arkansas Department of Higher Education Director Shane Broadway, higher education funding will never be the "top budget priority for state legislators—or even second or third" (Adame, 2014, p. 1). Fundraising and capital campaigns have become a necessity for most postsecondary institutions.

To stay competitive, the need for private funds has increased. The time trustee volunteers are willing to spend on the various events of a capital campaign, and their clout and talent for raising funds, are indicators of their effectiveness. Worth (2005) proposed the following for private universities, and the statement was certainly true for the UofA's trustees who participated in the CTFC:

> At most institutions, fundraising is a team effort that includes the trustees, the president, and the advancement staff. While trustees have overall responsibility for setting fundraising goals, establishing policy, and monitoring the performance of fundraising programs, they also participate actively in fundraising activities. (p. 14)

It was said of the CTFC, "other than the founding of the University of Arkansas, the billion-dollar campaign and the billion-dollar goal was . . . right up there as one of the most important events that ever happened in the history of the University of Arkansas" (UofA administrator, personal communication, October 18, 2012). For leaders of higher education institutions who are contemplating undergoing a capital campaign, it is important to recognize that they cannot accomplish the goals without teamwork and strong leadership. Whether or not the campaign represents the institution's first organized effort to raise funds, it must also be understood that resources will have to be allocated to the advancement arm of the institution to be able to staff the effort. Being able to build on the momentum created during a capital campaign can lift an institution to a new level, and as a result, touch many lives of students, faculty, and staff. Philanthropic achievements at the UofA have been tremendous, considering Arkansas has always been viewed as one of the nation's poorest states. Results of the CTFC helped move the UofA from a *U.S. News and World Report* third-tier ranking into the first tier. However, the UofA administrators are not satisfied and believe the UofA can move from being ranked 63th to being ranked with the top 50 public research universities. The UofA leaders understand that it will take considerably more funds than the state provides to reach its goal of the top 50 ranking. As the UofA readies itself for its new capital campaign, Campaign Arkansas, important lessons were learned during the CTFC. Public university system trustees can and should play a pivotal role in the ultimate success for any institution in their system that launches a well-planned capital campaign.

References

Adame, J. (2014, April 17). Higher-ed chief pushes for increase in funding. *Arkansas Democrat Gazette online.* Retrieved from http://www.nwaonline.com/news/2014/apr/17/higher-ed-chief-pushes-increase-funding-20140417/

Almanac of Higher Education (AHE). (2013). Fastest-growing campuses, 2001-11. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* online. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Fastest-Growing-Campuses/140741/

Altizer, A. W. (1992). *Seeking major gifts: How 57 institutions do it.* Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (2014). *Top 10 higher education state policy issues for 2014.* Washington DC: AASCU.

Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB). (2004, August 6). *Recommendations for educational and general operations: State-supported institutions of higher education - 2005-2007 biennium*. Retrieved from http://vcfa.uark.edu/Operating_Recommendations.pdf

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). (2011). *Board responsibility for the oversight of educational quality*. Washington DC: AGB.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). (2012). *Effective foundation boards: A guide for members of institutionally related foundation boards*. Washington DC: AGB.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). (2013). *Top public policy issues for higher education in 2013 and 2014*. Washington DC: AGB.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings: Doing qualitative research in educational settings.* Florence, KY: Taylor & Francis.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559.

Bennett, R. L., & Hays, J. C. (1986). Setting targets for a successful capital campaign. In J. A. Dunn (Ed.)*, Enhancing the management of fundraising. New directions for institutional research, 51*, 7-16. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Balderston, F. E. (1995). *Managing today's university.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolt, D. B. (1991). University strategic management: A businessman's view. *International Journal of Educational Management, 5*(5).

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Bornstein, R. (1989). The capital campaign: Benefits and hazards. In J. L. Fisher & G. H. Quehl (Eds.), *The president and fund raising.* New York, NY: American Council on Education (ACE)/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Bornstein, R. (2000). A president's guide to fund-raising success: Relationships are key. *The Presidency, 3*(2), 24.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (2008). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities.* New Brunswick (U.S.A) and London (U.K): Transaction Publishers.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buckman, K. H. (2010). *Why did the professor cross the road? How and why college professors intentionally use humor in their teaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3416149)

Caboni, T. C. (2010). The normative structure of college and university fundraising behaviors. *The Journal of Higher Education, 81*(3), 339-365.

Cantor, N., Howard, M. A., Miles, D., Woolsey, S. H., & Yudof, M. G. (2011). Responding to today's challenges: Is governance up to the task? *Trusteeship, 19*(4), 8-13.

Chait, R. P. (1993). *The effective board of trustees*. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Chait, R. P., Holland, T. P., & Taylor, B. E. (1996). *Improving the performance of governing boards*. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Cheslock, J. J., & Gianneschi, M. (2008). Replacing state appropriations with alternative revenue sources: The case of voluntary support. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(2), 208-229.

Ciconte, B. K., & Jacob, J. G. (1997). *Fund raising basics: A complete guide*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, W. B. (1994). *Courting philanthropy: The role of university presidents and chancellors in fund raising.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9519272)

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

Cook, W. B., & Lasher, W. H. (1994). Toward a theory of fund raising in higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 20*(1), 33-51.

Cooper, H. L. (2000). The benefits of teamwork in the development office. *Fund Raising Management, 31*(6).

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). (2009). *CASE management reporting standards: Standards for annual giving and campaigns in educational fund raising* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cutlip, S. (1965). *Fundraising in the United States: Its role in America's philanthropy*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Davies, R. O. (2005). *The new university president: How nontraditional presidents construct their presidencies* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3173618)

Delaney, J. A. (2010, August 10). Higher education funding may need decade or longer to recover, scholar says. *News Bureau* (Champaign, IL). Retrieved from http://news.illinois.edu/news/10/0810higheredfunding.html

Dove, K. E. (2000). *Conducting a successful capital campaign* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Duronio, M. A., & Loessin, B. A. (1991). *Effective fund raising in higher education: Ten success stories* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dyson, D. H., & Kirkman, R. (1989). Presidential priorities. *AGB Reports*, *31*(2), 6-11.

Editorial. (2012, August 22). Take the politics out of trustees position. *Greeley Tribune* (Greeley and Weld County, CO). Retrieved from http://0-web.ebscohost.com.library.uark.edu/ehost/detail?vid=17&sid=110bf653-b23d-4561-ac79-38cc23fab3c1%40sessionmgr111&hid=112&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=nfh&AN=2W63089720190

Eller, D. H. (2010). *College vice presidents' role in fundraising activities in the 2000s and beyond: A case in California* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3406629)

Essex, G. L., & Ansbach, C. (1993). Fund raising in a changing economy: Notes for presidents and trustees. *Foundation Development Abstracts, 3*(2), 275-277.

Farrell, T. J. (2005). *Comprehensive fundraising campaigns in the 21st century: Non-financial elements and factors associated with major campaigns at doctoral-extensive universities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3168022)

Firestone, W. A. (1993). Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher, 22*(4), 16-23.

Fisher, J. L. (1985). Role of the public college or university president in fund raising. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *Public college and university development: Fund raising at state universities, state colleges, and community colleges*. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Fisher, J. L., & Quehl, G. H. (1989). *The president and fund raising.* New York, NY: American Council on Education (ACE)/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Flumerfelt, S., & Banachowski, M. (2011). Understanding leadership paradigms for improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 19*(3).

Fraser, G. E. (2006). *Institutionally-related foundation boards: Processes and perceptions of performance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3406629)

Gardner, L. (2013, June 3). Rice University tops $1 billion fund-raising goal. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* online. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/bottomline/rice-u-tops-1-billion-fund-raising-goal/?cid=at&utm

Gearhart, G. D. (1989). *A study of the relationship between the preparation for and initiation of a capital fundraising campaign in a major research university and two types of organizational structure* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8925697)

Gearhart, G. D. (1995). *The capital campaign in higher education: A practical guide for college and university advancement*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).

Gearhart, G. D. (2006). *Philanthropy, fundraising, and the capital campaign: A practical guide*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).

Gluckman, N. (2014, March 11). University of Maine System campuses grapple with $36 million budget shortfall. *Bangor Daily News (ME).* Retrieved from http://0-web.b.ebscohost.com.library.uark.edu/ehost/detail?vid=14&sid=0d3a3c13-12c2-4d0e-9b09-a4b8fc927b17%40sessionmgr111&hid=127&bdata=JnNpd GU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=nfh&AN=2W62242236740

Gorfine, D. S., Ty, D. L., & Manteghi, L. (2013). *The future of higher education and how America will pay for it*. Washington, D.C.: Milken Institute and Georgetown University's Global Social Enterprise Initiative (GSEI).

Grapevine. (2010). *An annual compilation of data on state fiscal support for higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.grapevine.ilstu.edu/statereports/FY09/index.htm

Green, C. (2000). *A profile of female trustees at independent research I universities with a law school and their role in fund-raising* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3025221)

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Grunig, S. D. (1995). The impact of development office structure on fund-raising efficiency for research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(6).

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hale-Shelton, D. (2013, September 3). For universities, trustee list heavy on the bank side: Industry links for 17 of 29 at Arkansas public colleges. *Arkansas Democrat Gazette*.

Hedgepeth, R. C. (2003). *How public college and university foundation boards contribute to campaign success.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Hendrix-Kral, C. (1995). *Capital campaigns: Implications for fund-raising for student affairs divisions in public universities* (Doctoral dissertations). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9622395)

Hicks, P. W. (2006). *An exploration of capital campaign team organization, functioning, and fund raising success* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3224901)

Huckabee, C. (2013, June 17). Texas governor vetoes bill that sought to rein in university governing boards. *The Chronicle of Higher Education online*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/texas-governor-vetoes-bill-that-sought-to-rein-in-university-governing-boards/61881

Hurtubise, M. F. (1988). *An analysis of presidential attitudes toward and participation in fund raising at select, small, independent, liberal arts colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8918233)

Ingram, R. T. (1996). *Effective trusteeship: A guide for board members of public colleges and universities.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Ingram, R. T. (1997). *Trustee responsibilities: A basic guide for governing boards of independent (or public) institutions.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Ingram, R. T., & Associates. (1980). *Handbook of college and university trusteeship: A practical guide for trustees, chief executives, and other leaders responsible for developing effective governing boards*. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ingram, R. T., & Associates. (1993). *Governing public colleges and universities: A handbook for trustees, chief executives, and other campus leaders.* Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Johnson Grossnickle & Associates (JGA), & Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2013). Million dollar ready: Assessing the institutional factors that lead to transformational gifts. Retrieved online from http://www.jgacounsel.com/wp-content/where_uploads_go/2013/12/JGA-Million-Dollar-Ready-Full-Report-Low-Res.pdf

Kelderman, E. (2012). State spending on higher education rebounds in most states after years of decline. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(*20*), A3.

Kelderman, E. (2013, March 6). Students and states near a 50-50 split on the cost of public higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education online.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/StudentsStates-Near-a/137709/?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en

Kerr, C. (1991). The new race to be Harvard or Berkeley or Stanford. *Change*, *23*(3), 8-15.

Kihlstedt, A. (2004). *Capital campaigns: Strategies that work*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

Kihlstedt, A., & Schwartz, C. P. (1997). *Capital campaigns: Strategies that work*. Gaithersburg, MA: Aspen Publishers.

Kimball, L. H. (1989). *Trustee decisions for one state university system: Whose priorities govern?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8919618)

Kirschner, A. (2012, April 8). Innovations in higher education? Hah! College leaders need to move beyond talking about transformation before it's too late. *The Chronicle of Higher Education online*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Innovations-in-Higher/131424/

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Legon, R. D. (2003). *The board's role in fund-raising*. Washington, DC: AGB Press.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Loss, C. P. (2012, July 16). Why the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Act still matters. *The Chronicle of Higher Education online.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Why-the-Morrill-Act-Still/132877/

Lowenstein, R. L. (1997). *Pragmatic fund-raising for college administrators and development officers*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Maguire Associates, Inc. (2014). The innovative university: What college presidents think about change in American higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* online. Retrieved from http://results.chronicle.com/LP=742?elq=0ce61995c76d4f5 ca2eb1676b823119c&elqCampaignId=820

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Maxwell, J. C. (2001). *The 17 indisputable laws of teamwork*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Inc.

McGoldrick, W. P., & Robell, P. A. (2002). *Campaigning in the new century*. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New strategies for educational fund raising*. Westport, CGT: American Council on Education (ACE) and Praeger Publishing.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case studies of qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook of new methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, M. T. (1991). *The college president's role in fund raising*. ERIC Document 337099. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED337099.pdf

Moisan, L. J. (1992). *Because that's where the money is. Bellarmine College survey of 29 peer liberal arts colleges to explore trustees' involvement in fundraising*. Retrieved from http://www.covenantgrouponline.org/articles/moisan_thatswherethemoneyis.pdf

Moody's Investors Service, Inc. (2012). Annual sector outlook for U.S. higher education. Retrieved online from moodys.com.

Nehls, K. (2011). Leadership transitions during fundraising campaigns. *Innovative Higher Education 37*, 89-103.

Nicklin, J. L. (1995). Trustees are being asked to show commitment with donations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education online.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Trustees-Are-Being-Asked-to/84287/

Ogungbamila, B., Ogungbamila, A., & Adetula, G. A. (2010). Effects of team size and work team perception on workplace commitment: Evidence from 23 production teams. Small Group Research. *Thousand Oaks, 41*(6), 725.

Overley, K. S. (2006). *Public university leaders as fundraisers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3242129)

Padilla, A. (2005). *Portraits in leadership: Six extraordinary university presidents.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Payette, D. L. (2001). What we mean by fiduciary responsibility. *Trusteeship, 9*(5), 8-12.

Perez-Pena, R. (2013). University of Virginia's crisis reflects wider conflict. *The New York Times online*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/16/education/university-of-virginia-crisis-reflects-wider-fight.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0&pagewanted=print

Quigg, H. G., & Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). (1986). *The successful capital campaign: From planning to victory celebration*. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Rhodes, F. H. T. (1997). *Successful fund raising for higher education: The advancement of learning*. Phoenix, AR: Oryx Press.

Satterwhite, C. R. (2004). *The function of university presidents and CEO's in fundraising: A study of public universities with capital campaigns less than $100 million* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3215650)

Scholtes, P. R., Joiner, B. L., & Streibel, B. J. (2003). *The Team Handbook* (3rd ed.). Madison, WI: Oriel, Inc.

Schueler, L. A. (2007). *How a university president inspires and maintains a shared vision during a strategic planning process and its implementation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3278337)

Selingo, J. (2013). As colleges evolve, so must their presidents. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(26), A33-34.

Sevier, R. A. (2000). *Strategic planning in higher education theory and practice*. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Shelton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*, 63-75.

Skinner, R. A. (2010). Turnover: Selecting the next generation's presidents. *Change, 42(*5), 9-16.

Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(5).

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). (2013). *State higher education finance FY 2012*. Boulder, CO: SHEEO and College Board.

Stovall, W. M. (2004). *A case study of presidents' approaches to fundraising at four private and public historically black colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3144461)

Sturgis, R. L. (2005). *Team relationships within institutional advancement: Board of trustees, president, and vice president of institutional advancement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3161599)

Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report, 3(*2). Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR3-2/tellis1.html

Tools4Schools (T4S). (2012). The *glossary of fundraising terms*. Retrieved from http://www.t4s.org/picture/upload/File/Glossary%20of%20Fundraising%20 Terms.pdf

Trombley, L. S. (2007). Building a better trustee. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(36), B20.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2001a). *Making the case: The impact of the University of Arkansas on the future of the state of Arkansas*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2001b). *University of Arkansas: Campaign for the twenty-first century*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2004). *Picking up the pace: A report by the University of Arkansas 2010 Commission*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2005). *Imagine. Inquire. Impart. A final report on the campaign for the twenty-first century*. Fayetteville AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2007). *University of Arkansas self study report 2007: The criteria.* An Accreditation Report for the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. Retrieved from http://selfstudy.uark.edu/PDF/UofASelf Study.pdf

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2008). *Funding the flagship: A guide to the finance of the University of Arkansas.* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2009). *Providing transparency & accountability to the people of Arkansas: A progress report (TAP).* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2010, December 2). *Financial outlook.* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas. Retrieved from http://vcfa.uark.edu/Images/Financial _Outlook_Dec_2010.pdf

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2012a). *Providing transparency & accountability to the people of Arkansas: A progress report (TAP).* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas. Retrieved from http://chancellor.uark.edu/TAP-A_Progress_Report-2012.pdf

University of Arkansas (UofA). (2012b). *2010-2011 UofA Financial Report*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA) administrator. (2012, August 30). Personal interview.

University of Arkansas (UofA) administrator. (2012, September 10). Personal interview.

University of Arkansas (UofA) administrator. (2012, October 8). Personal interview.

University of Arkansas (UofA) administrator. (2012, October 18). Telephone interview.

University of Arkansas (UofA) administrator. (2012, October 29). Personal interview.

University of Arkansas Newswire (UofA Newswire). (2010). University receives notice of second state funding cut: Appropriation reductions total $2,668,194. Retrieved from http://newswire.uark.edu/article.aspx?id=13364

University of Arkansas Newswire (UofA Newswire). (2011). University of Arkansas elevated to highest Carnegie classification among U.S. universities and colleges. Retrieved from http://newswire.uark.edu/article.aspx?id=15540

University of Arkansas Newswire (UofA Newswire). (2012a). Faculty, staff confirm university rating in: Great colleges to work for. Retrieved from http://newswire.uark.edu/article.aspx?id=18852

University of Arkansas Newswire (UofA Newswire). (2012b). University of Arkansas enrollment grows by 5.8%, sets new record: Record numbers for undergraduate and graduate students. Retrieved from http://newswire.uark.edu/article.aspx?id=19202

University of Arkansas Office of the Chancellor (UofAOC). (2000). State of the university address. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas Office of the Chancellor (UofAOC). (2005). State of the university address. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas Office of University Relations (UofAUREL). (2001). *Campaign for the twenty-first century.* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

University of Arkansas (UofA) trustee. (2012, August 29). Personal interview.

University of Arkansas (UofA) trustee. (2012, September 17). Personal interview.

Unknown. (2013, September 22). Harvard aims to reach its $6.5 billion goal by 2018. *Arkansas Democrat Gazette*, 4A.

Vestal, S. (2007, January 28). Philanthropy 101: Public universities learn need for fundraising. *Spokesman-Review* (Spokane, WA). Retrieved from http://0-web.ebscohost.com.library.uark.edu/ehost/detail?vid=7&s...JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGI2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#db=nfh&AN=2W62W62058144657

Welch, S. B. (2009). Some post-crash capital campaigns struggling. *Crain's Detroit Business 25*(42), 16-17.

Williams, W. (2010). Bucks for brains fundraising off to slow start. *The State Journal, 26*(6), 7.

Williamson, K. (2006). Research in constructivist frameworks using ethnographic techniques. *Library Trends, 55*(1), 83–101.

Winfree, W. R., II. (1989). *The role of persons other than professional development staff in the solicitation of major gifts from private individuals for senior colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9016219)

Winship, A. L., II. (1984). *The quest for major gifts: A survey of 68 institutions*. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Wiser, E. A. (2009). *The new university president: Communicating a vision, cultural competency, and symbolic cultural forms* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3393214)

Wolverton, B. (2008). Many trustees lack fund-raising expertise. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* online. Retrieve from http://chronicle.com/article/Many-Trustees-Lack/4344

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

Worth, M. J. (2005). *Securing the future: A fund-raising guide for boards of independent colleges and universities.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Worth, M. J. (2012). *Foundations for the future: The fundraising role of foundation boards at public colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) Press.

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

Yin, R. K. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Zenger, J. H., & Edinger, S. (2009). Challenging times demand inspiring leadership. *Financial Executive, 25*(6), 18.

Zenger, J. H., & Folkman, J. (2002). *An extraordinary leader*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

Request for Participation Letter

Dr./Mr./Ms. Participant

Address
City/State/Zip

Dear Dr./Mr./Ms. Participant:

As you know, I am a doctoral student in the University of Arkansas Higher Education Leadership program, and I serve as an associate for administration in the Office of the Chancellor.

I believe that philanthropic support is critically important to any university in today's economy, and the long-term fiscal health of institutions depends on the trustees, presidents, and chancellors who lead them. My dissertation, *The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University*, focuses on the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century, which concluded in 2005, and raised over $1 billion.

My study will include interviews with key leadership who were involved in the campaign. Using these specific criteria, you were identified for inclusion in this study along with several others. I realize you have an extraordinarily busy schedule; however, I hope you will consider participating to further higher education research. The interview will take about an hour, and the following questions will be asked:

1) What role did trustees play during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?
2) What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign?
3) To what extent were trustees involved in decisions about fundraising goals and priorities and the metrics by which fundraising performance was evaluated?
4) What advice can former trustees and senior university officers offer to current and future trustees concerning trustee roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?

Should you have any questions or need further clarification regarding my study, please do not hesitate to contact me. Otherwise, I look forward to hearing from you and appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Marcia Overby, M.Ed.
Higher Education Doctoral Student
University of Arkansas

Attachments

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University
Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Principal Researcher: Marcia Overby
Faculty Advisor: Dr. John W. Murry, Jr.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE:

You are invited to participate in a research study because of your role in the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century, which concluded in 2005.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE RESEARCH STUDY:

Who is the Principal Researcher? Marcia Overby

Who is the Faculty Advisor? Dr. John W. Murry, Jr.

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this qualitative and intrinsic single case study is to explore and enhance the understanding of trustee members' roles, views, and experiences during the UofA's highly successful capital campaign (Campaign for the Twenty-First Century), which concluded in 2005.

Who will participate in this study?

The anticipated number of participants for this study will be 11 individuals who were in leadership roles during the campaign.

What am I being asked to do?

Your participation will require you to discuss your involvement in the campaign. There will be a one-hour interview based on semi-structured questions, and the interview will be audiotaped.

What are the possible risks or discomforts?

No risks or discomforts are anticipated for participants.

What are the possible benefits of this study?

It is anticipated that the study will expand the body of knowledge on the topic of the role of trustees during a capital campaign at a public research institution.

How long will the study last?

The study will take place over a two-to-three month period (August, September, and October of 2012), but your involvement will be limited to a one-hour interview. There will also be an opportunity for you to perform "member checking," which will require your review of the interview transcript to ensure its accuracy.

Will I receive compensation for my time and inconvenience if I choose to participate in this study?

No, there is no monetary compensation for participation in this study.

Will I have to pay for anything?

No, there are no associated costs for your participation in this study.

What are the options if I do not want to be in the study?

You are free to decline to participate in this study or withdraw from it at any time.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

The principal researcher will make every effort to keep all information confidential to the extent allowed by applicable state and federal law. All information will be recorded anonymously and the researcher will have sole physical control and access to the data, which will be stored securely. No data will be made available to anyone unless you specifically give written permission to do so. The researcher will select pseudonyms to identify each participant in written and oral reports with no references linking your identify to the study.

Will I know the results of the study?

At the conclusion of the study, you will have the right to request feedback about the results. You may contact the faculty advisor, Dr. John W. Murry, Jr., or principal researcher, Marcia Overby. You will receive a copy of this form for your files.

What do I do if I have questions about the research study?

You have the right to contact the faculty advisor or principal researcher to discuss any questions or concerns that you might have.

You may also contact the University of Arkansas Research Compliance Office listed below if you have questions about your rights as a participant, or to discuss any concerns about, or problems with the research.

Ro Windwalker, CIP
Institutional Review Board Coordinator
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

I have read the above statement and have been able to ask questions and express concerns, which have been satisfactorily responded to by the researcher. I understand the purpose of the study as well as the potential benefits and risks that are involved. I understand that participation is voluntary. I understand that significant new findings developed during this research will be shared with the participant. I understand that no rights have been waived by signing the consent form.

signature date

Appendix C

Interview Guide

The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University

Participant Name: ________________________________

Date of Interview: ________________________________

Questions for University of Arkansas Board of Trustee Members and Senior University Officers who had a role in the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century:

1. What was the role of trustees during the UofA's Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?
2. What fundraising experiences and training, if any, did the trustees have previous to serving on the campaign?
3. To what extent were trustees involved in decisions about fundraising goals and priorities?
4. To what extent were trustees involved in the metrics by which fundraising performance was evaluated?
5. During the campaign, did you feel that communication from the leadership was timely?
6. Did communication provide enough background information for the job that you were doing?
7. What advice can you offer to current and future trustees concerning trustee roles to ensure a successful capital campaign?
8. Do you think that working on a capital campaign, like the CTFC, could help trustees with understanding the goals and needs of the institution, or help them to have a better understanding of how the institution works?

Additional Questions for senior UofA administrators, including the past system president and current and past campus chancellors:

1. What criteria were used in choosing trustees who were recruited to participate in the Campaign for the Twenty-First Century?
2. What challenges, if any, did you encounter when recruiting trustees to serve on the campaign?
3. What challenges, if any, did you encounter when working with trustees on the campaign?

Appendix D

Member Checking Correspondence

Subject: Interview Transcript

Dear Participant:

Thank you so much for allowing me to conduct an interview with you for the purpose of my dissertation study through the University of Arkansas. Your insights on the future role of trustees during a capital campaign in terms of resource development and fundraising will be invaluable to me, and hopefully, to future leaders for many years to come.

I have attached a transcription of our interview from which I will pull key quotes and ideas for my research. To ensure the accuracy of my understanding of the interview, I would appreciate your reviewing the transcript. Please let me know if you have any changes whatsoever. I want to stress that any of the key identifiers (names, places, etc.) will be kept confidential by either redaction or through use of pseudonyms.

I would appreciate receiving your feedback and necessary changes by November 30, 2012. If I have not heard from you by that time, I will assume you have no changes.

I cannot thank you enough for your support of my research study, and I look forward to sharing with you the final product.

Sincerely,

Marcia Overby, M.Ed.
Higher Education Doctoral Student
University of Arkansas

Appendix E

Letter of Appreciation

[Handwritten Notecard]

Date

Dear Participant:

Thank you so much for taking time out of your busy schedule to visit with me, and for allowing me to conduct an interview for my dissertation study. I realize you have an extremely busy schedule, so I am especially grateful for your willingness to share your time and expertise with me. I enjoyed our visit and feel as though I've gained a great deal of knowledge and value from your interview.

Sincerely,

Marcia Overby

Appendix F

University of Arkansas Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

August 6, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Marcia Overby John W. Murry, Jr.
FROM:	Ro Windwalker IRB Coordinator
RE:	New Protocol Approval
IRB Protocol #:	12-07-024
Protocol Title:	*The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University*
Review Type:	☐ EXEMPT ☒ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB
Approved Project Period:	Start Date: 08/06/2012 Expiration Date: 08/02/2013

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (http://vpred.uark.edu/210.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 11 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

October 29, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Marcia Overby John W. Murry, Jr.
FROM:	Ro Windwalker IRB Coordinator
RE:	PROJECT MODIFICATION
IRB Protocol #:	12-07-024
Protocol Title:	*The Role of Trustees in a Capital Campaign at a Public Research University*
Review Type:	☐ EXEMPT ☒ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB
Approved Project Period:	Start Date: 10/26/2012 Expiration Date: 08/02/2013

Your request to modify the referenced protocol has been approved by the IRB. **This protocol is currently approved for 12 total participants.** If you wish to make any further modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

Please note that this approval does not extend the Approved Project Period. Should you wish to extend your project beyond the current expiration date, you must submit a request for continuation using the UAF IRB form "Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects." The request should be sent to the IRB Coordinator.

For protocols requiring FULL IRB review, please submit your request at least one month prior to the current expiration date. (High-risk protocols may require even more time for approval.) For protocols requiring an EXPEDITED or EXEMPT review, submit your request at least two weeks prior to the current expiration date. Failure to obtain approval for a continuation *on or prior to* the currently approved expiration date will result in termination of the protocol and you will be required to submit a new protocol to the IRB before continuing the project. Data collected past the protocol expiration date may need to be eliminated from the dataset should you wish to publish. Only data collected under a currently approved protocol can be certified by the IRB for any purpose.