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Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF NEED AND RESEARCH

The legislature of the State of Montana will convene once again in January, 1991. Its immediate task will be to try to fund government services in the face of a projected multimillion dollar deficit. This ominous future worries the post-secondary educational community because the majority of its funding comes from state revenues.

Even before the present deficit crisis, critics of the legislature asserted that a long-standing problem was the legislature's failure to establish and maintain a funding formula for the university system. Over time, repeated demands for action eventually resulted in zero-based budgeting for the university system in the 1970s.¹ This funding formula, which required justification for each expense above zero dollars, was replaced by a peer funding formula in 1982.² Generally speaking, peer formulas set funding levels for universities in Montana at a specified

¹Ed B. Smith, College and University Funding Study, (Helena: Montana 46th Legislature, [1982]), p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 35.
percentage of the average funding levels of their peer institutions. A list of the University of Montana's peer campuses is provided in Appendix A.

According to former UM President, James Koch,\(^3\) officials lobbied legislators in the mid-1980s for additional support using the strategy that the University of Montana was being funded at only 90 percent of its peers. As shown in Table 1, by 1988 state funding of the University of Montana had fallen to 66 percent of its peers.\(^4\)

\[\text{Table 1}\]

\[\text{University Peer Comparison Study}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U OF MT</th>
<th>PEERS</th>
<th>UM PERCENT OF PEERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures per Student</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)James V. Koch, interview held after lecture to Mortar Board, Missoula, Montana, February 1990.

\(^4\)Dennis G. Nathe, \textit{University Funding Study} (Helena: Montana 51st Legislature, [1989]).
It is difficult to determine whether funding levels below that of the University's peers significantly affect the quality of education. University officials, after all, publicly boast of 25 Rhodes Scholars which ranks UM in the top five of all public schools. The number of Sears Congressional Interns from the School of Journalism is the highest in the nation, and the journalism program itself is reputedly ranked in the upper five in the country. In recent years, accounting graduates have passed the Certified Public Accounting exam at one of the highest rates in the nation according to the School of Business Administration Dean, Dr. Larry Gianchetta; often three to four times higher than the national average. With these well publicized indicators of quality, it may be argued that the University of Montana does not need additional funding.

Nonetheless, other evidence exists indicating that funding levels are inadequate and are adversely affecting the quality of education at the University of Montana. Accrediting bodies, for example, have documented many problems involving the professional schools. The School of Business is on probationary accreditation because of inadequate physical facilities, faculty salaries, and library resources. The School of Pharmacy is on published probation, the only one in the nation, for similar reasons.

Signs of trouble do not rest solely in accreditation concerns. In response to demands by students with disabilities, the Office of Civil Rights is investigating the University regarding the lack of equal access guaranteed by federal law. Tutors, for example, are not available as required by law and many buildings are not physically
accessible to the handicapped. The University pleads that money is not available for these needs.

In addition, the estimated deferred maintenance bill for the University of Montana for long-range building has now reached 20 million dollars. However, the state has indicated that only 5 million dollars will be available in the next biennium for all state deferred maintenance needs including those of the University of Montana. The Mansfield Library roof, for example, was in need of extensive repairs even before a windstorm blew away part of it in February, 1989. The windstorm was a fortuitous occurrence in that insurance coverage paid for the repairs. At the time, neither the state nor the University had money available for the required repairs.

It is evident from the above examples that state support for education at the University of Montana is not meeting numerous needs and that UM is experiencing serious financial shortfalls. Inadequate state funding has precipitated the search for additional sources of revenue.

The University of Montana does not have many options for obtaining additional funding. For example, it cannot look to the federal government for assistance since the United States is one of the few industrial nations which does not fund a federal post-secondary educational system. In fact, the two largest revenue sources for the University are state appropriations and student tuition payments.

---

The University could, as an option, generate additional revenue by raising tuition rates. This would be consistent with the view that those who receive the service should pay for the service. However, several reasons dissuade administrators from substantially increasing tuition. Concern about the effects of higher tuition on equality of access to educational opportunities is the first reason to be considered. If a large percent of the cost of education is borne by the students, then only those who can afford tuition will receive a post-secondary education. Public opinion generally supports the view that education should be available to all, regardless of their ability to pay. A second concern is the effects higher tuition will have on enrollment and thus on levels of state funding for the University. The state currently funds two-thirds of the cost of educating a student with tuition comprising the other third. If a student cannot afford to attend, then UM loses both the tuition and the state support. Finally, the current funding formula discourages tuition raises since the experience has been that the more students pay, the less the state allocates. Simply put, the state legislature can and has reduced the amount of state resources allocated if the tuition portion increases.

Private donations is a third revenue source that has potential for increase. The purpose of this paper is to analyze how alumni support, as one type of private giving, can be increased by the selection of the appropriate fund-raising model. A comparative study was conducted to determine how peer campuses have increased support from their alumni. The University of Idaho, Washington State
University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, Boise State University, and Weber State University were chosen as peer campuses because of the similarity of their academic missions and student-body size to those at the University of Montana, and because they have all received national recognition for successful alumni fund-raising efforts. Although the Washington State and Colorado at Boulder campuses are twice the student-body size of the University of Montana, they have been included in the peer review because both are recognized by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (C.A.S.E.) as national leaders in encouraging alumni giving. I felt it was preferable to analyze a few larger organizations' successful techniques and incorporate them into the study than to simply look at UM's "peer" campuses if some of these peer campuses were not successful at alumni fund raising.

**Methodology:**

Telephone surveys were conducted with a contact from each campus. In the initial call to campus, I requested to speak to the individual in charge of alumni fund-raising. In some cases, I spoke with directors of foundations and in others, I spoke with directors or associate directors of alumni relations. I asked each individual a series of open and closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions were designed to help me categorize how the person structured his/her office's fund-raising efforts. Specific attention was given to determining who was responsible for the different fund-raising
activities. The second series of questions was designed to help me get beyond the organizational structure and to look at how the system really worked.

Information gathered was then assembled and reviewed with specific attention given to isolating conditions that suggest which fund-raising model works best under different conditions. Based on this analysis, the study's recommendations in Chapter 4 were developed to suggest how the University of Montana could proceed toward increasing alumni support through the selection of an appropriate fund-raising model. (See Appendix B for a complete Telephone Interview Outline.)
Chapter 2
APPROACHES TO PRIVATE FUND RAISING

Fisher\(^6\) describes alumni as the constituency most often taken for granted and he encourages every university to fully consider their importance as a source of funding. Yale in 1792 was the first campus to develop a systematic method of collecting information on graduates. Since then, alumni have been asked routinely to give money to their alma maters. The current emphasis on private support has increased to the point where Stanford University recently became the first school to announce a billion-dollar capital campaign.

Basic instructions on how to make donations will encourage well-intentioned alumni to support their alma maters, but as fund-raising efforts intensify, techniques on how to encourage alumni to give and to give at higher levels must be developed. This chapter reviews the basic principles of fund raising and describes three organizational methods developed by universities for soliciting contributions.

The basic technique used for alumni fund raising can best be described in terms of reciprocity. Cialdini defines this as an

obligated repayment of favors, gifts, invitations and the like. Tomme Lu Worden, in her remarks after accepting the Montana Alumni Award in 1990, succinctly stated this as, "we must give back to campus that which it gave to us." Universities often use this feeling when soliciting money from their graduates.

Pickett states that donor motivation can be categorized into six major groups. These six groups are obligation, belief in values of the organization, community position, ego needs, self-interest, and self-actualization. Pickett describes obligation as that which is expected based on membership in a group or position in society. Membership in middle-class or upper-class social groups or professional clubs may require giving to a local university even if that campus is not an alma mater. Belief in the values of the organization is a motivator for those donors who believe in the stated mission of the organization. For example, a person may give to a university because he or she values education. Community position is often enhanced with very public donations of large sums of money; this element of prestige is important to many people. Pickett describe ego needs as power, success, affection and security. Donors, in their own way, often give to achieve ever-changing ego needs. What is received in return describes self-interest. Tax credits, gift

---


premiums or recognition are often the motivational factors for self-interested donors. Finally, self-actualizers see giving as a basic human action. They give for the joy of giving. Pickett concludes, "In reality, the motivation for gift giving is the same as the motivation for any human behavior: mixed and changing.... The fundraiser must remain aware of the complexity of human behavior and the changing formulation of motivations."9

Alumni fund-raisers seek to exploit each of these kinds of motivations, and to do so, they have over time developed three generalized methods for soliciting funds. These are the generic, the decentralized constituency, and the centralized constituency.10 It has been only in the last several years that fund-raising professionals have started creating an empirical body of knowledge. Two universities now offer advance degrees in philanthropic work where previously none existed.

The generic solicitation is made through mass mailings or by random telephoning. In the case of mass mailings, for example, the university president generally signs the solicitation letter and alumni are asked to give but not for a specific program or purpose. If alumni gatherings are organized, they are coordinated as a university-wide activity rather than by college or department. This type of solicitation will usually produce unrestricted donations to be used at the discretion of the campus president and it is viewed as the

9Ibid., p. 239.

traditional method for alumni fund raising.

In contrast, decentralized constituency fund raising specifically tailors the solicitation and solicitor to the alumnus. A business major, for example, will be asked to solicit a business alumnus. All mailings are developed to strengthen the constituency bond. The key characteristic of decentralized constituency fund raising is that the fund-raising coordinator is located in the individual departments. Little or no communication typically occurs between different fundraisers on the same campus or between academic units. Generally, separate data bases are maintained by each academic unit and alumni gatherings are coordinated separately. This arrangement often results in duplicate records and solicitations of the same individuals, reducing the effectiveness of the overall fund-raising effort.

Finally, centralized constituency fund raising solicits gifts in much the same manner as does the decentralized method. The key difference is that the fund-raisers are located in one office. The fund-raisers share a common data base, and they coordinate the solicitations and alumni gatherings to avoid duplication. Both centralized and decentralized constituency structures produce mainly restricted donations.

The University of Montana Foundation, formed by action of the University's Alumni Association, began a slow conversion to a constituency based program in 1987. Now, whenever possible, constituency affiliations are used to solicit private support. The conversion, although not complete, has progressed to the point that
the School of Business Administration has hired its own development officer to coordinate the school's fund-raising efforts. This new position is jointly administered by the dean of the Business School and the executive director of the Foundation.

The University of Montana Foundation and its employees, whose primary purpose according to its mission statement is to support the mission of the University through private support, is a not-for-profit, non-state agency. It is common to find a foundation coordinating fund-raising efforts for a campus with the alumni office coordinating the maintenance of the biographical files and providing social programming for the alumni. Alumni Office staff members are usually state employees while foundation staff are generally employed through a foundation board of directors. This division of responsibilities is currently found at The University of Montana Foundation and Alumni Association offices.

As noted in this chapter, each type of solicitation has its own advantages and disadvantages for the fundraiser. How peer campuses utilize the different motivational factors and what conditions will maximize the overall effectiveness of the solicitation will be analyzed in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3

The Practice of Peer Campuses

Representatives from the five peer campuses were surveyed through a telephone interview for information regarding their alumni fund-raising efforts. The purpose of the interview was to determine how peer campuses organize their databases, conduct their alumni relations efforts, and design their solicitations to maximize fund raising. Responses to the questions were used to categorize each campus into one of the three fund-raising methods described in Chapter 2 and to formulate recommendations in Chapter 4. This chapter presents a summary of these conversations and an analysis of factors to consider in selecting an appropriate fund-raising approach.

Summary of Interview Results:

A series of open and closed-ended questions were asked during the telephone interview. Chapter 3 reports a summary of the open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions form the basis for the recommendations found in Chapter 4. A complete telephone outline is detailed in Appendix B. The following exhibit, 3.1, presents a partial outline used to guide the telephone interviews.
Exhibit 1

FUND RAISING TELEPHONE SURVEY

SUMMARY

Boise State University - Boise
University of Colorado at Boulder - UC
University of Idaho - Idaho
Washington State University - WSU
Weber State University - Weber

Name of the school: _____________________
Person interviewed: _____________________
Telephone number: ______________________
Date: __________________________________

Is your biographical database maintained by
___4___ the Alumni Office ___4___ the Foundation Office
____ each constituency group
___1___ Other(specific)  WSU Office of Records and Gift Processing

Is your giving history database maintained by
____ the Alumni Office ___4___ the Foundation Office
____ each constituency group
___1___ Other(specific)  WSU Office of Records and Gift Processing

Is the biographical and giving history database the same file?
___4___ Yes ___1___ No ___Weber___
Alumni events are organized by

5. the Alumni Office  4. the Foundation Office

each constituency group  Combination of

Other (specify)

Which office maintains the definitive prospective donor file?

the Alumni Office  4. the Foundation Office

each constituency group  Combination of

1. Other (specify)  WSU Office of Records and Gift Processing

What percent of your campus' non-academic external publications sent to alumni are written only for a generic audience? 

Weber and Boise - 50 percent
Idaho - 75 percent
WSU and UC - 90 percent or more

What percent of your mass mailings are constituency based rather than generic? 

Weber and Boise - less than 10 percent
Idaho - 50 percent
WSU and UC - 90 percent or more

If a telephone call is used, what percent of the solicitors call on behalf of a specific constituency group?

Weber, Boise,
WSU and UC - less than 10 percent
Idaho - 20 percent

Do you have a organized fund-raising council

3. Yes  2. No

WSU - active council
UC and Weber - semi-active council
Boise and Idaho - no council
**Type of Database Used:**

Information on an alumna/alumnus's degrees, home and business addresses, and campus activities is considered biographical data. The level of alumni philanthropic giving to a university and donor restrictions to the gift are regarded as the giving-history data. As the summary indicates, four of the five campuses report that one database is being used for both biographical and giving-history information.

The exception is Weber State where two files are being used. The person interviewed at Weber stated her preference is for a combined file. However, several years ago the Weber Foundation determined that the database system used by the alumni office did not provide adequate security for confidential information. The Weber Foundation subsequently opted to use a second database of their own. Software packages are now being reviewed by Weber's foundation and alumni personnel with the expectation that a purchase will be made to bring both offices back to one database.

Although four campuses use a single database for giving and biographical data, each campus clearly differentiates which office will maintain the different information. Except for Washington State University (WSU), foundations are charged with updating the giving-history data while alumni offices are asked to manage the biographical data. WSU is the exception in that the central administration has
assigned the database system to an office separate from the foundation and alumni offices.

WSU has established an Office of Records and Gift Processing. This office is responsible for maintaining both the biographical and giving-history data. Its director is at the same administrative level as the directors of the foundation and alumni offices. The latter offices are only consumers of the information provided by the Office of Records and Gift Processing.

Each campus representative interviewed reported that their prospective donor file is maintained by the foundation. This file usually consists of information on individuals who might be in a position to give large amounts of money to the university but to date have not. The purpose of the file to find a link between the prospect and the university which will encourage a monetary contribution. The only variation found to this approach is the WSU's Office of Records and Gift Processing. WSU fund-raisers work directly with the office of records and not with the foundation when requesting information on prospective donors.

How Alumni Relations Efforts are Conducted:

Each person interviewed reported that the majority of alumni events continue to be the responsibility of the alumni office. Traditionally, alumni events are social in nature with the purpose of updating the alumni on campus happenings. These events usually try to avoid a heavy fund-raising component but often they provide recognition for local donors. Several campuses now vary from this
norm by having their campus fundraisers organize small gatherings of select constituencies. For example, large alumni social events at WSU and the University of Colorado at Boulder (UC) remain the responsibility of the alumni office; whereas, small, more elite donor recognition receptions are being organized by foundation fundraisers.

**Types of External Publications Mailed to Alumni:**

The type of non-academic external publications sent to alumni by the five campuses is consistent with grouping patterns found in previous questions. Weber State University (Weber) and Boise State University (Boise) evenly split their mailings between generic and constituency audiences. The University of Idaho (Idaho) devotes 75 percent of their mailings to constituency based publications, and UC and WSU have approximately 90 percent of their mailings written for a constituency reader.

Questions on mass mailings and telephone solicitations provided similar results. Boise and Weber indicated that both their mail and telephone solicitations are generic. This is to say that all alumni get the same appeal and that no individual group is specifically targeted. Idaho uses constituency mail for approximately 50 percent of their efforts, but only 20 percent of their telephone calls are based on constituency affiliations. Idaho did change their telephone strategy to a totally constituency-based effort during the centennial capital campaign.

WSU and UC, leaders in constituency fund raising, use constituency techniques in 90 percent of their mail solicitations.
Surprisingly, while UC uses a constituency model for their telephone calls, WSU elects to use a generic approach. WSU hires a number of students at the beginning of the academic year to make random telephone solicitations with no more than a casual effort made to match the caller with the prospective donors.

Response to a separate question about the use of an organized fund-raising council was not related to the type or size of the campus. A council is defined for the purpose of this paper as a collection of campus individuals whose reason for meeting is to review the University's fund-raising efforts and to advise on how to improve future fund-raising endeavors. WSU has the more elaborate and active council of the five schools surveyed. At a lesser degree than WSU, UC and Weber also utilize a council format to assist them in their fund-raising efforts. Idaho and Boise seldom, if ever, use a council to enhance their efforts. The presence of a council does not appear to be a particular function of a centralized, generic or decentralized model.

Analysis:

Based on the answers given in the telephone survey, the five campuses can be categorized into one of the three fund-raising models. Idaho is beginning to use a centralized constituency model while Weber and Boise clearly use the generic approach. WSU and UC are using a variation of the centralized constituency model which can be called the decentralized/centralized constituency model. The distinguishing
components of this variation are that fundraisers share a common database and coordinate solicitations with a central office to avoid duplication of effort which are characteristics of a centralized constituency model. However, rather than having all the fundraisers centralized in one office, these campuses have their personnel decentralized in the corresponding constituency unit. The term decentralized/centralized constituency model is more descriptive than simply stating that WSU and UC are using a centralized model.

Factors to Consider When Selecting an Appropriate Fund-Raising Model:

The peer review and CASE Currents, a professional journal for alumni and foundation officers, suggest several factors which must be examined before a campus can select a fund-raising model. These factors are the type of bonding between the alumni and their alma mater, the amount of resources available for fund raising, and how autonomous the academic units have historically been from the university's central administration's decision making.

It is important to know how the alumni have bonded to the campus and where their affiliations lie. For example, does an individual identify primarily with the campus in general, with a specific living group, with an academic unit, or with a student club. While not always the case, the bonding can often depend on whether the campus is a residential or commuter campus.

11Ibid.
A residential campus is generally defined as a school having on-campus living arrangements and students whose primary focus is to attend classes. If they work, often it is only for a few hours to help support themselves. Commuter campuses in comparison tend to have students who seldom live on campus. These students usually attend just one or two classes. The students are primarily aligned with their family or work responsibilities.

Indisputably, students at residential and commuter campuses form affiliations and allegiances differently. It is therefore helpful to determine how alumni define their connection to the alma mater. How these bonds are defined will suggest which fund-raising model to choose.

It is important to note that decentralized offices require more resources than centralized ones. Resources such as computers, support staff, telephone lines, and copy machines will need to be duplicated at campuses using a decentralized model. Before selecting a model, a thorough analysis of the resources available must be conducted.

Additionally, campuses can vary in the degree of autonomy of academic units from the central administration. A tradition of making decentralized academic decisions will greatly influence the selection of a decentralized over centralized constituency fund-raising model. The selection of the fund-raising model will also affect how involved other campus personnel will become in the effort. A campus with a history of decentralized decision making may have the problem of getting campus personnel committed.
to a shared mission under a centralized fund-raising model.

WSU and UC, as noted earlier, use the decentralized/centralized variation of the centralized constituency model. Both campuses have the largest student enrollments of those surveyed and presumably more resources to maintain decentralized offices. Boise and Weber are self described as commuter campuses. They prefer to use generic fund-raising appeals sent from the university as a whole rather than appeals from constituency groups. Idaho is a residential campus with a smaller student population and less resources compared to WSU and Boulder. This suggests why Idaho is adopting the centralized constituency model.

Not one of the campus personnel surveyed reports using a decentralized constituency model. They disdained this model because of its duplicated and uncoordinated efforts. Small, special interest fund-raising activities by such groups as friends of the library, supporters of public radio, or backers of public television are examples of the decentralized model. Athletic booster clubs seem to be the single largest users of the decentralized model. It cannot go unnoticed that private support of athletic programs can be the cause of NCAA rule violations.

Chapter 4 will present a primary recommendation on which fund-raising model is best suited for the University of Montana. Based on the peer campus review, secondary recommendations will also be presented on how to alter The University of Montana's present fund-raising model to its specific needs.
Chapter 4
Recommendations

As noted in Chapter 2, individuals make monetary donations for different reasons. Fundraisers expertly manipulate Pickett's six donor motivations for the purpose of increasing these donations. A change in the type of approach can surely affect the results.

The peer review summary in Chapter 3 additionally demonstrated that campuses can be successful in fund-raising efforts when using different approaches. Chapter 3 also analyzed factors to be considered before a fund-raising model can be selected. The following primary and secondary recommendations are based on this review.

Primary Recommendation:

The University of Montana Foundation should continue its current ongoing conversion to a centralized constituency fund-raising model. Although each model offers different advantages and disadvantages, the centralized constituency model offers the best overall advantages for UM. This recommendation is based on the following observations of each fund-raising model.
**Generic Model:**

Schools in the peer review that are the most similar to UM in size, academic diversity, and type of student body are moving away from a generic fund-raising model toward a constituency model. Numerous examples exist to suggest that this shift will also be successful at UM. The Alumni Office, for example, has already discontinued organizing large homecoming reunions. They have recently found that the most popular gatherings are organized around a campus organization or living group.

**Decentralized Constituency Model:**

Not one example of a campus using the decentralized fund-raising model was found among those surveyed. Those interviewed specifically advised against using this model. The main advantage of the decentralized model, the involvement of a large cross section of campus personnel in the fund-raising effort, is then lost. However, the recommended centralized model can minimize this lose.

The centralized model has the potential of encouraging widespread support from the campus community. The design of this model allows the hiring of professional staff who can serve as a liaison with academic departments. In this manner, the active involvement of a cross section of the campus can be obtained without duplicating expensive support services or allowing unintended multiple solicitations.
Decentralized/Centralized Constituency Model Variation:

The decentralized/centralized constituency model variation used by two campuses in the peer review requires vast resources. A commitment of this magnitude cannot be met by the University of Montana or the UM Foundation. This model also appears to work best when combined with a campus where academic units have a certain degree of autonomy from the central administration. The University of Montana has traditionally had a strong central administrative structure.

Secondary Recommendations:

To encourage the increased campus involvement found in the decentralized model and to a lesser extent in the centralized model, the UM Foundation should establish a fund-raising council. This council will need to meet on a frequent and consistent basis. The goals of these meetings should be to review the major prospective donor file for additional information and solicitation updates, to trade prospective names back and forth between academic units and the foundation, and to monitor the progress of all those involved with the fund-raising effort. Membership on the council should be extended to the University's executive officers, academic deans, and alumni and foundation staff members. It should be clearly understood that the council will not set fund-raising priorities.

The UM Foundation and Alumni Offices should restructure
their database management into one office for records and gift processing. Changes in technology and theories of database management are far outstripping the ability of traditional foundation and alumni directors to keep pace. Database management is a new profession that is becoming highly technical. Sufficient time and expertise must be devoted to maintaining currency in this field.

In addition, a concerted effort should be made to collect more data elements on each alumnus. A constituency based model implies that as much as possible is known about the alumna/alumnus. The Foundation should work with the Alumni Office to identify an individual's significant affiliations to campus.

The Foundation should strive to coordinate the efforts of all campus groups who use the school's name in conjunction with fund raising. Examples of these groups include public radio, library supporters, and athletic booster clubs. Uncoordinated efforts will diminish returns for all groups involved.

Finally, since the Foundation has not completed its conversion to a centralized model all at once, it must clearly articulate when to use which model and why. Confusion regarding the nature of the mission and appropriate techniques can occur when two different models are being used simultaneously.
Summary:

In summary, the primary recommendation of this paper is for the UM Foundation to proceed with its ongoing conversion to the centralized constituency fund-raising model. The secondary recommendations detail how this model can be specifically tailored for The University of Montana in order to increase private giving. In following these recommendations, the foundation personnel must anticipate a drop in unrestricted dollars which are normally used to support the foundation's fund-raising efforts. Targeted solicitations encourage donors to restrict their gifts to constituency accounts. The UM Foundation fundraisers will need to concentrate increasingly on securing large, unrestricted gifts from friends of the University (not alumni or members of a constituency group), corporations, and philanthropic foundations that are supportive of the University to ensure sufficient operating capital.
Appendix A

Peer Campuses of the University of Montana

Northern Arizona University

University of Idaho

New Mexico State University

University of North Dakota

North Dakota State University

Utah State University

University of Wyoming

University of Nevada, Reno
Appendix B

Telephone Interview Outline

Name of the School:______________________________________________

Person interviewed:______________________________________________

Telephone number: _____________________________________________

Date: ___________________________________________________________________

Is your biographical database maintained by

_____the Alumni Office      _____the Foundation/Development Office

_____each constituency group       _____Other(specify)____________

Is your giving history database maintained by

_____the Alumni Office      _____the Foundation/Development Office

_____each constituency group       _____Other(specify)____________
Is the biographical and giving history database the same file?

_____ Yes  _____No

Alumni events are organized by

_____the Alumni Office  _____the Foundation/Development Office

_____each constituency group  _____Combination of ___________

_____Other (specify)

Which office maintains the definitive prospect donor file?

_____the Alumni Office  _____the Foundation/Development Office

_____each constituency group  _____Combination of ___________

_____Other (specify)

What percent of your campus' non-academic external publications sent to alumni are written only for a generic audience? _____

What percent of your mass mailings are constituency based rather than generic? _____
If a telephone call is used, what percent of the solicitors call on behalf of a specific constituency group? ________

If a telephone call is used, what percent of the telephone numbers called are selected based on constituency affiliation between the caller and the person being solicited? ________

Do you have an organized fund-raising council?  Yes  No

If yes, list the areas that are represented on the council

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

How often does this council meet? ________________

What is the title of the person who serves as its chairperson? ______________________

On your campus, who determines the final fund-raising priorities?

  ______President of the campus  ______Dean of a College/School

  ______Alumni Director  ______Foundation/Development Director

  ______Combination of ____________________________________________
Name the groups on your campus that fund raise using the university's name?

To whom do these people report? Example, the person reports to the dean of a school, the chief foundation or development officer, or a combination of two or more offices.

How satisfied are you with the current fund-raising system?

If given the opportunity, what would you change and why?

What is your one piece of advice you wish to tell me as I research successful alumni fund-raising efforts?


