Original Article

Increasing philanthropic support through entrepreneurial activities at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Received (in revised form): 18th September 2010

Monica G. Williams

serves as the Chief Administrative and Development Officer at HoustonWorks USA. She holds a B.A. in Journalism and an M.A. in Communications from Texas Southern University in Houston, Texas, and a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership from Prairie View A & M University in Prairie View, Texas. Williams has more than 12 years of progressive administrative experience in non-profit management and higher education fundraising.

ABSTRACT Historically Black College and University (HBCU) leaders face great impediments when raising private funds to support their institutional initiatives (Brown and Hendrickson, 1997; Allen and Jewell, 2002). While alumni who attended HBCUs tend to value the nurturing education they received, those same alumni rarely give back to the institutions that gave them the affirmation and care necessary to be successful college graduates (*Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 1996; 2000). Raising money at public HBCUs is particularly important given the decline in public funding in recent years. Developing a strategic, innovative and comprehensive fund raising plan is critical to the survival of HBCUs. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to examine the extent to which presidents of public HBCUs exhibited, used and exercised entrepreneurial framework leadership traits in order to secure funding given the context within which minority serving institutions operate. In analyzing the results of this study, the research revealed that HBCU leaders who have raised significantly more money than their peers use specific entrepreneurial leadership traits in their fundraising endeavors. *International Journal of Educational Advancement* (2010) 10, 216–229. doi:10.1057/ijea.2010.18

Keywords: HBCUs; entrepreneurial activities; entrepreneurial characteristics; advancement; chief development officers

Correspondence: Monica Williams
Houston Works USA, 2118 Smith Street,
Houston, TX 77002, USA

INTRODUCTION

In comparison to Predominately White Institutions (PWIs), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) lag significantly in their fundraising efforts

in terms of dollar amounts raised, types of funding sources and corporate donations. Even when comparing HBCUs to community colleges, they still are underfunded and undersupported. In addition to the lack of giving among HBCU alumni, leaders of these institutions face additional challenges when raising money. Typically, conditions include: (a) limited or no advancement staff to cultivate the relationships that lead to continued philanthropy, (b) minimal understanding of what is required to operate comprehensive fund development operations, (c) unfunded and unidentified priorities, and (d) little or no private reserve resources or endowments are available to sustain the institutions during economic crises (Rowland, 1997). To continue to be viable and competitive in a modern global economy, HBCUs will need to examine funding streams and sustain resources through enrollment growth, financial crises and changes in state or board funding structures (Rowland, 1997).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The framework used to design the study and the lens for analyzing the data was Clark's (1998) theory of entrepreneurial leadership traits. According to Clark, entrepreneurial activities comprise third-stream income sources that include: (a) innovative and profit-based, self-supporting operations that go beyond traditional sources such as business development activities and innovative retail sales operations; (b) activities that develop and enhance traditional income streams such as endowment and tuition; and (c) activities that involve both traditional and non-traditional aspects

such as distance learning, which uses non-traditional methods of teaching to gain tuition. Leaders with an entrepreneurial orientation are (a) innovative, (b) creative, (c) team builders, (d) opportunistic, (e) proactive, (f) risk takers, (g) change-oriented, (h) competitive, (i) visionary and (j) persuasive. Other researchers have described entrepreneurs as individuals who recognize and seize opportunities when they occur (Smith-Hunter, 2003).

ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS HELP FUNDRAISERS RAISE MONEY

Fundraising in higher education is the most widely recognized supplement to government funding. Some HBCUs have enjoyed the rewards of successful fund development while the vast majority lags significantly in obtaining philanthropic support. Howard University is one example of an HBCU that has been successful at fundraising. According to Howard University's Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request to the Department of Education, the university's endowment is US\$560 million (US Department of Education, 2010). In 2008, Howard University trustees and officers concluded a capital campaign yielding \$275 million, the largest amount raised to-date by any HBCU (Masterson, 2008). The success of Howard University's fundraising efforts is largely attributed to its past president, H. Patrick Swygert, an alumnus of the institution, who invested \$2 million of personal funds in the campaign. Alumni giving at Howard increased from 4 percent to as high as 20 percent during the capital campaign (Masterson, 2008).

The Council for Aid to Education (2007) survey on giving illustrates that HBCUs rely more on receiving gifts from foundations and corporations than from alumni. In order for HBCUs to increase their endowments through private philanthropy, alumni participation is necessary. There is a critical need for HBCUs to modify their current fundraising practices to include aggressive solicitation strategies for various constituencies. Corporations, foundations, alumni and other vehicles for securing private philanthropic gifts are essential to the survival of public institutions of higher education. However, as noted by Gasman and Drezner (2008, 2009a, b), there is a disparity in the level of gifting to HBCUs compared to other institutions. Michael Lomax, president of the United Negro College Fund and former Dillard University president, affirms that HBCUs should actively pursue funding opportunities irrespective of apprehensions or reservations about such efforts (Stuart, 2009).

Across the nation, higher education has experienced a significant decline in funding, yet enrollment in higher education is at an all-time high (Schoenecke, 2005). Riggs (2005) posits that 'for most American institutions of higher education, traditional academic ideology held that the institution had no business in the marketplace' (p. 27). By design, universities and colleges were to exclusively provide teaching, learning and research to their students. Accordingly, institutions of higher education did not exercise conventional business models in order to generate current-use funds. Today, these institutions are expected to enter the competitive marketplace, survive and

adapt the practices of their for-profit counterparts (Williams, 2009).

Until recently, public colleges and universities did not face the need to compete with private entities because most public funds were automatically disbursed to public education. In the last two decades, the public funding landscape has changed drastically, causing public institutions of higher education to embrace the entrance of private corporations into the business of higher education (Cook, 1997). Parents and students have petitioned institutions to address concerns about rising tuition costs while universities are also being increasingly held accountable by public funding entities. Due to the decline in state resources, public institutions are placing stronger emphasis on fundraising (Riggs, 2005).

Riggs (2005) offers that 'the rapid changes in economic, demographic and political conditions that face American institutions of higher education indicate that both the institutions and their leaders must be adaptable and diverse' (p. 3). Gasman *et al* (2010) suggest that the HBCU president use African-American church pastors as an example of how to inspire giving. These leaders must use a skill set that differs from their predecessors. 'A business-like orientation focused on efficiency, accountability, and productivity is reshaping the management of higher education' (Dingfelder, 2007, p. 2). Changes in the historical roles and responsibilities of college presidents have presupposed that these leaders possess entrepreneurial characteristics. Cooper and Dunkelberg (1988) describe entrepreneurs as having orientations that influence growth and independence. Accordingly, HBCU leaders that possess entrepreneurial

characteristics could be more successful in their fundraising efforts if they exercise an entrepreneurial ideology (Williams, 2009).

Clark (1998) defines an entrepreneurial leader as one who applies non-traditional strategies to acquire resources and capital for an organization irrespective of the discipline. For each type of institution, he recommends strategies to advance the financial growth of the organization. For educational institutions, he recommends leaders identify innovative strategies that increase the ability of the university to have more elasticity in fulfilling its mission. Clark (1998) proposes that leaders embody a set of character traits that are similar to those employed by entrepreneurs, which subsequently translate into institutional transformation. Entrepreneurs are individuals who recognize and seize opportunities when they occur (Smith-Hunter, 2003). Leaders who exercise an entrepreneurial framework embody the following traits: (a) innovation, (b) creativity, (c) team building, (d) an opportunistic mindset, (e) pro-activity, (f) risk taking, (g) change agency, (h) competitiveness, (i) vision and (j) persuasiveness (Clark, 1998).

Since fundraising can be territorial, institutions often suffer because their advancement efforts promote competition within their own development teams instead of encouraging collaboration and teammanship. Teambuilding creates the synergy necessary to draw the best skills from all the players (Fisher and Koch, 2004). Worth (2002) suggests that opportunistic intuition gives an entrepreneurial leader the ability to create opportunities for donors to connect with their most passionate philanthropic aspirations. Creating a rewarding experience for the donor

and the institution is mutually beneficial.

Fisher (1991) defines an effective leader as a risk taker. Taking risks means analyzing information, consulting others and making a decision to keep momentum going (Fisher, 1991). Risk-takers demonstrate leadership through action or proactivity. Fisher (1991) further states that these leaders are calculated thinkers who promote controversy. Promoting controversy often initiates change. Transformational leaders use change agency to eliminate inflexibility and build powerful relationships (Fisher and Koch, 2004). Entrepreneurial, transformational leaders have powerful, contagious energy that helps them to connect to wealthy philanthropists. They inspire donors to buy in to their vision and make generous donations to their institutions (Fisher and Koch, 2004).

'People with substantial wealth, or at least a personal sense of financial well-being, give to missions they want to see realized' (Newman, 2002, p. 131). When donors decide to invest in an institution, they often need to feel connected to the organization's cause and vision (Newman, 2002). Institutional goals and visions are driven by the leaders of those institutions. Thus, leaders have to be visionaries and find innovative ways to attract donors and keep them engaged.

As the marketplace for universities is very competitive and many institutions vie for the same pools of money, entrepreneurial leaders need to employ creative strategies that will make them more attractive to donors than their competitors (Bok, 2003). Having a competitive edge over other institutions requires the leader to acknowledge that a transformation is necessary.

Entrepreneurial leaders must also possess the skill of persuasion. According to Fisher and Koch (2004), the definition of presidential effectiveness is synonymous with the president's ability to raise money and convince major donors to make a meaningful gift to their institution.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to examine the extent to which presidents of public HBCUs exhibited, used and exercised entrepreneurial framework leadership traits in order to secure funding given the context within which minority serving institutions operate. Creswell describes a phenomenological study as one that portrays the meaning of a concept or phenomenon based on the lived experiences of several individuals (Creswell, 2007). In this study, I examine the lived experiences of university HBCU leaders who navigate the development process during fiscally challenging times.

To clarify this phenomenon, it is important to understand that fundraising is a craft. Unsuccessful fundraisers do not recognize the exhaustive work that is involved in fundraising. Strategy and prescription drive successful fundraising. Fundraising prowess cannot be taught. It must be second nature to the fundraiser. A common practice among HBCUs is selecting existing staff to lead advancement efforts. Often times, these staff have been reassigned from a department that has been eliminated or downsized due to budget cuts. Because there is little knowledge, understanding or value placed on fundraising as a craft, HBCU presidents have a tendency to assign staff members

with little knowledge about the art and science of fundraising.

PWIs, on the other hand, recognize the importance of identifying, selecting and training development officers who will produce fundraising results. For example, Rice University, where I was employed as a Development Director in 2008, expects its development professionals to balance a portfolio by spending 30 percent of the time on donor qualification, 25 percent on donor cultivation, 25 percent on solicitation and 20 percent on stewarding. At Rice, we were required to collaborate with other team members to ensure that members of the division worked in a strategic, collaborative, efficient and effective manner.

In the literature review, I have examined the difficulty that HBCUs have raising funds. Despite the historical and economic challenges, some HBCU leaders have been successful in these endeavors. To examine the phenomenon of HBCU presidents' fundraising, I employed a qualitative study design that would explore the connection between these leaders' self-identified entrepreneurial characteristics and the amount of money raised at their institutions. I used Clark's (1998) entrepreneurial leadership theory to study the characteristics used by presidents of HBCU to secure funding for their institutions. Specifically, I investigated the following guiding questions to identify innovative and profit-based, self-supporting operations at public HBCUs that go beyond traditional sources to raise money:

1. What are HBCU leaders' perceptions of the entrepreneurial traits they

- possess to lead the developments efforts of their institutions?
2. How do the institutions' development practices, as exhibited by the university presidents, influence entrepreneurial activities for advancing the institutional fundraising effectiveness in fiscally challenged environments?
 3. What entrepreneurial characteristics or behaviors exist among HBCU leaders who have been successful in fundraising?

A total of 13 university leaders participated in this study. Initially, I contacted all 47 Thurgood Marshall College Fund (TMCf) member schools' presidents and chief developments officers to participate in the survey. In the electronic transmission of the request to participate, each president and development officer received a letter explaining the purpose and significance of the study, an informed consent statement, and the questionnaire. The respondents accessed the survey by selecting a link to an online survey collection website.

Originally, 17 individuals from 16 institutions agreed to participate in the study. Although they originally agreed to participate in the study, six administrators withdrew from participation for unreported reasons. Once the respondent chose the *agree to participate* option, they were immediately redirected to begin the survey. As a follow-up to non-respondents, I sent a reminder letter by US Mail with an additional copy of the survey. Finally, I telephoned each prospective participant as a means to follow up on questionnaire responses.

Administrators from HBCUs in Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi,

North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia participated in the study. The administrative titles of the 13 respondents of the schools included three university presidents and 10 chief advancement officers. It is important to once again re-emphasize that the population of public HBCUs in the country is limited to 47 schools, which allowed me to capture a small sample of 26 percent.

In order to maintain confidentiality and protect anonymity, I classified each institution by region, enrollment size and type. Universities in the southeast included those from Tennessee, North Carolina and West Virginia. Southern institutions are located in Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. The university in the northeast is located in Pennsylvania, and the institution in the mid-Atlantic region is in Maryland. I classified each institution using the Carnegie Classification matrix (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). Table 1 denotes the numbers assigned to respondents who agreed to participate in the study, the region, enrollment size, type and degree granting status.

I developed the survey instrument based on the existing literature surrounding HBCU leaders and fundraising efforts. In addition, I once served as Associate Vice President for Development at an HBCU located outside of a large metropolitan city in the southwest. As a result of this expert knowledge of the fundraising conditions in HBCU environments, I had an intimate knowledge of the challenges HBCU leaders faced. This information guided the design and instrumentation of the study. I used

Table 1: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Enrollment size</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Degree granting status</i>	<i>Enrollment profile</i>
1	Southeast – West Virginia	3506	Public	Undergraduate	Exclusively undergraduate 4 year
3	Southeast – North Carolina	3100	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, some graduate coexistence, single post baccalaureate (education)
5	South – Texas	11635	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions, post baccalaureate plus arts and sciences, doctoral STEM dominant, some graduate coexistence
7	Northeast – Pennsylvania	2012	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, some graduate coexistence, post baccalaureate professional (business dominant)
8	South – Louisiana	5039	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, some graduate coexistence, single doctoral (education)
9	South – Texas	8350	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions, post baccalaureate plus arts and sciences, some graduate coexistence
10	South – Mississippi	3621	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions, post baccalaureate professional plus arts and sciences, some graduate coexistence
11	Central – Texas	8350	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions, post baccalaureate plus arts and sciences, some graduate coexistence
12	Southeast – Tennessee	9100	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, doctoral, professions dominant, some graduate coexistence
13	South – Mississippi	8351	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions dominant, doctoral plus arts and sciences, some graduate coexistence
15	Southeast – North Carolina	10383	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Professions plus arts and sciences, single doctoral program (other field), some graduate coexistence
16	Mid-Atlantic – Maryland	6891	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, doctoral, professions dominant, some graduate coexistence
17	Southeast – North Carolina	6442	Public	Graduate and undergraduate	Balanced arts and sciences/professions, post baccalaureate with arts and sciences (other dominant fields)

the survey instrument to identify whether HBCU presidents engaged in entrepreneurial behaviors that could lead to an increase in institutional fundraising. I used the qualitative variables, which are derived from Clark's (1998) entrepreneurial leadership framework, to consider how these behaviors and characteristics influenced fundraising efforts. The variables are as follows: (a) innovative approaches used on the job, (b) creativity in fundraising strategies, (c) risk-taking approach to realize fundraising goals, (d) competitive nature, (e) vision-driven initiatives, (f) ability to be proactive, (g) persuasiveness, (h) professional experience, and (i) impact of private philanthropy on the institution (Clark, 1998).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Three themes emerged from analysis of the open-ended data responses. The qualitative themes were (a) university leaders as business executives, (b) entrepreneurial activities of university leaders, and (c) successful fundraising activities of institutions.

Fifty percent of the surveyed university leaders believed there was little to no difference between university leaders and business executives. One leader who was a vice president stated that there were no differences between the two types of leaders. This leader elaborated by saying, 'As a leader, my responsibility is to galvanize and direct the creative and intellectual capacities of the staff to achieve our core purpose. This is the universal goal of leadership'. Another leader at the development director level believed that there were few differences between university leaders and business

executives. This development director said, 'The corporate world (gave me) the ability to tap spiritual (and) philosophical motivation to give'. One leader, who was a dean of development added:

Much of the work I do is similar to that of traditional business executives. However, the most important distinction is that I am an educator. I must remain committed to integrating students into the process of fundraising so that they remain connected as alumni, and engaged as learners. My office is often times full of volunteers and interns. This maintains vibrancy and connectedness to our students, while helping to stay focused on the goal of producing leaders.

Many HBCU leaders are not comfortable with cultivating the relationships that will translate into major gifts for their institutions. While leaders do not have to be entrepreneurial to ask a prospective donor for a gift, there has to be a level of comfort around telling the university's story, articulating the institutional needs, and illustrating the case for support. One institutional advancement officer said:

Fund development is more than seeking financial resources. It requires an understanding of the institutional priorities (as well as) an understanding of donor intent. (It) must include ways to engage and involve donors and potential donors for long-term relationships. There should be a strategic, well-crafted plan

for each constituency group to maximize opportunities to build resources and to sustain long-term relationships.

‘The pursuit of excellence requires much change – transformative change – and we must be guided by high expectations, not influenced by low expectations others may have of us,’ said one president. Employing this basic philosophy leadership at an HBCU could lead to transformational gifts for HBCUs. There has to be a message from the top that fosters an environment of moving beyond the traditional way of thinking about fundraising. A leader who was a vice president of advancement stated,

My belief is that fund development’s purpose (as it pertains to higher education) is to advance the mission of the institution by raising money for current operations and capital projects; marketing the institutions to target audiences and publics; and attracting the types and kinds of students the institution desires.

Promoting activities that create institutional awareness and attract donors is key to successful fundraising. One president noted the importance of building university programs that invite external funders to engage in partnerships. This president further suggested that donors need to have confidence and connection in order to feel that their investment is making a difference.

Other leaders offered suggestions for successful fundraising activities including: (a) hosting special events, (b) utilizing twenty-first century

solicitation strategies, (c) having an intimate knowledge of donor backgrounds, (d) using electronic media contacting alumni institutional friends and patrons (referred e-philanthropy), (e) matching institutional needs with donor preferences, (f) designating the appropriate gift closer that is person who is related to the field of the donor, and (g) engaging students in donor cultivation.

In addition, each respondent was asked to self-report characteristics that best described them from a list of 10 entrepreneurial descriptive words. The list of entrepreneurial descriptive words used were innovative, creative, team builder, opportunist, risk taker, change agent competitive, visionary, proactive and persuasive. In reporting entrepreneurial characteristics, 92.3 percent of respondents reported being innovative, 53.8 percent reported being a risk taker, 100 percent reported being proactive, 84.6 percent reported being creative, 92.3 percent reported being change agents, 92.3 percent reported being persuasive, 100 percent reported being team builders, 69.2 percent reported being competitive, 30.8 percent reported being opportunist and 84.6 percent reported being visionaries.

More than half the respondents reported being risk takers. Taking risks without clearly understanding the threats associated with the risk is not wise. I have observed leaders in the HBCU community make selfish decisions that are not in the best interest of the institution. Risk takers have a tendency to make hasty, uncalculated decisions that could jeopardize future gifting opportunities for the institution. Among the top

three institutions that raised the most money, one of the four respondents reported being a risk taker.

Nearly all of the HBCU leaders who participated in this study reported being change agents. If that were the case, HBCUs would not be in the dismal shape they are in financially. Diversifying the funding at HBCUs is necessary for institutional survival. Holloman *et al* (2003) argue that HBCUs must increase their giving rates due to the decline in support from public entities. Riggs (2005) believes that 'the rapid changes in economic, demographic, and political conditions that face American institutions of higher education indicate that both the institutions and their leaders must be adaptable and diverse' (p. 3).

Building teams and being proactive were the most popular entrepreneurial characteristics among the 10 options. Successful team-building would suggest that the institutions have knowledgeable fundraisers in place who have a proven track-record in fund development. It would mean that institutional leaders value the fundraising process and the steps necessary to create a continuum of giving among donors. 'If historically Black colleges are to survive, they must learn how to plan effectively within the institutional context to achieve their desired fund-raising results' (Barrett, 2006, p. 7).

Common entrepreneurial characteristics among the participants who raised the most money were innovative (75 percent), creative (75 percent), team builder (100 percent), change agent (100 percent), competitive (75 percent), visionary (75 percent), proactive (100 percent) and persuasive (100 percent). Each of these institutions

has development personnel in place who have the experience and successful track record. They have demonstrated that are the best fundraisers among their peers (see Table 2).

The examination of responses from the first research question also revealed that the highest level of education was interrelated with the HBCU leader's entrepreneurial orientation. Two of three presidents have doctorates and one has a law degree. This is particularly relevant in a climate where more business and legal professionals are being recruited to lead universities than academicians or individuals with terminal degrees. 'A business-like orientation focused on efficiency, accountability, and productivity is reshaping the management of higher education' (Dingfelder, 2007, p. 2).

The president with the law degree (Respondent 13) reported that his institution raised \$25 million in the past 3 years compared to Respondent 11 who raised \$15 million and Respondent 8 who did not report the amount of money raised. Another finding emerging from this study was the number of institutional leaders (30.7 percent), who reported that they had not participated in a strategic fundraising effort or that they had not launched a capital campaign in ten or more years. As public support to HBCUs declines, private philanthropy will need to increase (Williams, 2009).

I examined the factors associated with best practices in by the level of professional development acquired by each leader and future strategies they would like to incorporate in their advancement initiatives. Each respondent had some additional training, certification, continuing education and/or professional development. However, only four

Table 2: Entrepreneurial characteristics among top three schools

	<i>Respondent 15</i>	<i>Respondent 13</i>	<i>Respondents 9 & 11</i>	
Amount raised	\$30,000,000+	\$25,000,000	\$15,000,000	
Innovative	✓	✓	✓	
Creative	✓	✓	✓	
Team builder	✓	✓	✓	✓
Opportunist		✓	✓	
Risk taker		✓		
Change agent	✓	✓	✓	✓
Competitive	✓	✓		✓
Visionary	✓	✓	✓	
Proactive	✓	✓	✓	✓
Persuasive	✓	✓	✓	✓

respondents (Respondents 3, 8, 10 and 16) took advantage of the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy's training provided by the TMCF for several years.

Indiana University offers the most comprehensive philanthropic academic program aimed at professionalizing fundraising as an occupation. Through a partnership with the Lilly Endowment and The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, TMCF provided training to development professionals from the 47 TMCF member institutions. Faculty members and instructors from the Center of Philanthropy facilitated the credit-based training program. The program was further enhanced by providing an opportunity for development staff at the TMCF member schools to work together, share skills and resources while creating a network of fundraising talent (History of Thurgood Marshall College Fund, Capacity Building, 2007, ¶1). The fact that only four respondents participated in this free training suggests that fundraising is not a top priority for HBCU administrators. Education and training is paramount to building the

infrastructure necessary to operate a successful fundraising program.

The respondents who did not know when their institution participated in a capital campaign or those who did not report the amount of money raised may face difficulties in handling budget crises or changes in the amount of support from traditional funding sources. Barrett (2006) confirms that HBCUs need to engage in appropriate planning to achieve fundraising results. The need to implement a strategic plan emerged as a priority among respondents in this study. Activities such as matching institutional needs with donor interests, involving students and alumni in donor cultivation, and using technology to execute e-philanthropy were identified as key strategies for institutional advancement.

I asked survey respondents to share current strategies they used to raise more money from private philanthropists in order to determine how the institutions' development practices influence entrepreneurial activities. Results of the study show an interrelationship between professional development and how the institutions'

Table 3: Funds raised in 3-year period

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Most recent capital campaign</i>	<i>Amount of funds raised in past 3 years</i>
1	Not sure	\$500,000
3	1991	\$8,000,000 ^a
5	2003	\$8,500,000
7	Currently	\$6,000,000
8	Currently	Not reported
9	2008	\$15,000,000
10	2000	\$3,000,000 ^a
11	2008	\$15,000,000 ^a
12	Planning phase for first campaign	\$8,000,000
13	Currently	\$25,000,000
15	2007	\$30,000,000 ^a
16	2007	Not reported
17	2003	Not reported

^aRepresents approximate number.

fundraising practices influence entrepreneurial activities. For example, development professionals gave the same or similar responses to one another when reporting additional training they had to prepare them for their positions and how those professional development courses helped to frame strategies that translated into raising more money. Finally, in an effort to consider each leader's entrepreneurial orientation, I queried each participant about the amount of private money the institution raised and the last time the institution engaged in a capital campaign (Table 3).

CONCLUSION

Most participants in this study are engaging in practices that yield minimal fundraising dollars. Respondents who have led their institutions in successful fundraising campaigns have done so because they use entrepreneurial characteristics in all areas from donor cultivation to gift closing to stewardship. These three elements, when executed properly, will

create a continuum of giving among donors. Some participants shared insightful information about activities that could assist their peers in fundraising efforts. Each respondent reported that there was a shortage in advancement staff. Donor cultivation requires consistent contact with donors, and that means having an adequate number of staff to engage the donor community. Each donor is different and they need to be treated independently and differently.

REFERENCES

- Allen, W.R. and Jewell, J.O. (2002) A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically black colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education* 25(3): 241–261.
- Barrett, T.G. (2006) How strategic presidential leadership and institutional culture influenced fundraising effectiveness at Spelman College. *Planning for Higher Education* 35(1): 5–18.
- Bok, D. (2003) *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown II, C.M. and Hendrickson, R.M. (1997) Public historically black colleges at the crossroads. *Journal for a Just & Caring Education* 3(1) 95: 19.

- Clark, B.R. (1998) *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2007) <http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/VSE%202007%20Survey%20Press%20Release.pdf>, accessed 19 July 2010.
- Cook, W.B. (1997) Fundraising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty: From 1975 to the present. *Journal of Higher Education* 1(1).
- Cooper, A. and Dunkelberg, W. (1988, Spring) Entrepreneurs perceived chances for success. *Journal of Business Venturing*: 97–108.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dingfelder, D.C. (2007) Exploring the Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Community Colleges, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?Ver=1&Exp=11-09-2015&FMT=7&DID=1412457241&RQT=309&attempt=1&cfc=1>, accessed 9 May 2008 from ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Fisher, J.L. (1991) *The Board and the President*. New York: Macmillan.
- Fisher, J.L. and Koch, J.V. (2004) *The Entrepreneurial College President*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Gasman, M. and Drezner, N. (2008) White corporate philanthropy and its support of private black colleges in the 1960s and 70s. *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 8(2): 79–92.
- Gasman, M. and Drezner, N.D. (2009a) Fundraising during the midst of the civil rights movement: The case of Hampton Institute. Nonprofit Sector and Voluntary Quarterly Online.
- Gasman, M. and Drezner, N.D. (2009b) A maverick in the field: Fundraising for change in the black college community during the 1970s. *History of Education Quarterly* 49(4): 465–500.
- Gasman, M., Lundy-Wagner, V., Ransom, T. and Bowman, N. (2010) *Unearthing Promise and Potential: The Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities*, Vol. 35(5). San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.
- History of Thurgood Marshall College Fund. (2007) <http://thurgoodmarshallfund.org>, accessed 10 June 2007 from Thurgood Marshall College Fund.
- Holloman, D.B., Gasman, M. and Anderson-Thompkins, S. (2003) Motivations for philanthropic giving in the African-American church: Implications for Black college fundraising. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 12(2): 137–169.
- Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (1996) Johnnetta Cole's resounding triumph: A wake-up call for HBCUs 13: 18–19.
- Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (2000) The solid alumni base of Howard University, 28: 40–41.
- Masterson, K. (2008) Howard U. assembles fund-raising juggernaut. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*: 54: 42.
- Newman, D.S. (2002) *Opening Doors: Pathways to Diverse Donors*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Riggs, D.G. (2005) Entrepreneurial Activities in Independent College and University Presidents: A View from the Top, http://etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/available/etd-08232005-095345/unrestricted/D_Riggs_8_2005.pdf, accessed 10 November 2010 from University of Pittsburgh website.
- Rowland, T.Y. (1997) Institutional Advancement Initiatives of Historically Black Colleges and Universities: A Multi-case Study of African-American Higher Education, <http://www2.lib.ncsu.edu/catalog/record/NCSU963319>, accessed 10 November 2010 from North Carolina State University website.
- Schoenecke, M. (2005) A description of successful fundraising programs in student affairs divisions, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?Ver=1&Exp=11-09-2015&FMT=7&DID=921019631&RQT=309&attempt=1>, accessed 12 December 2007 from ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Smith-Hunter, A., Kapp, J. and Yonkers, V. (2003) A psychological model of entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Business and Economics* 2(2): 1–11.
- Stuart, R. (2009) UNCF wrestles with new economy, old issues. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* 26(6): 6.
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2010) The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education, <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>, accessed 22 September 2010.
- US Department of Education. Department of Education Howard University fiscal year 2010 budget request, <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget10/justifications/v-howard.pdf>, accessed 3 September 2010 from United States Department of Education.
- Williams, M.G. (2009) Engagement levels of historically black college and university leaders in entrepreneurialism through fundraising. PhD dissertation, Prairie View A & M University, Prairie View, TX.
- Worth, M.J. (2002) *New Strategies for Educational Fundraising*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.

APPENDIX

Survey instrument

1. In which state is your institution located?
2. What is your institutional enrollment?
3. What is your title?
4. How many years of experience do you have in this position?
5. What is your highest level of education?
6. What additional training have you had to prepare you for this position?
7. How long have you been employed at this institution?
8. Please circle the following words you feel best describe you: innovative

risk taker	proactive	creative
change agent	persuasive	team builder
competitive	opportunist	visionary
9. What is your professional experience within the fields of fund development and university advancement?
10. What is your philosophy of fund development?
11. What members of your organization, including yourself, do you believe responsible for fund development? (Please specify titles and exclude individual names).
12. How does private philanthropy impact institutional initiatives?
13. What strategies do you employ to seek resources from private philanthropists?
14. What strategies would you like to employ to seek resources from private philanthropists but are unable to do so because of forces outside your locus of control (that is financial constraints, policy restraints and so on)?
15. What general differences do you perceive between your role as a university leader/executive and the role of traditional business executives?
16. In the past 3 years, how much money has been raised from private philanthropic sources?
17. When was the last time your institution engaged in a capital campaign?