

## CHAPTER 6

### DEVELOPMENT (“FUND RAISING”)

#### Development (Fund-Raising) Background

When I came to EMU in 1991, it was perhaps fortunate that “raising money” was not seen by central administration as any appreciable part of my job responsibility. There were a lot of other things that needed my (and our) attention instead. I was well aware of the huge expectations that were placed on colleague education (and other discipline) deans in some institutions in terms of being personally involved in raising millions of dollars for their respective units. In fact, I had been through several “fund-raising for deans” training sessions, sponsored by various professional organizations, to prepare myself to some degree as a “fund-raiser.” At my previous institution, a “development officer” reported to me and, with his help, we had some experience in raising money from private sources for Education purposes.

However, at EMU, up until the early 1990’s, “fund-raising” apparently had not been a high priority, other than for the institution to take responsible care of donations, largely for scholarships, that, for the most part, had “come in on their own” without particular “cultivation.” As a result, infrastructure at EMU was quite lacking for organized fund-raising.

Not only was there a near-absence of personnel devoted to institutional fund-raising, but record-keeping (especially as it applied to Education) related to prospects was quite lacking in many instances. On the one hand, the COE should have been at a huge advantage, compared to the other academic units. Given EMU’s history as an educator-preparation institution, we had a large number of alums that could be approached for financial assistance.

On the other hand, the great bulk of the Education alums had gone into teaching, a relatively low-paid occupation, and presumably many of these alums were not prepared to make gifts of any appreciable size. Further, the large majority of Education alums, of at least recent decades, were female. Many, if not most, of the women married and took on a different surname. How to contact them afterwards was often not available in university records. Further, the EMU record-keeping system identified almost all of the secondary and K-12 teaching field alums as alums of another academic college, rather than as Education alums.

#### The EMU Foundation

The EMU Foundation was created in 1990, with one of its purposes being to serve as the “fund-raising” arm of the institution. However, it was not until several years later that it was “staffed up” sufficiently such as to become very effective in this respect. In the meantime, the previous very limited structure was in place. In fact, in 1991-1992, the COE’s development fund was in deficit—a mass mailing solicitation of the previous year had cost more to implement than it brought in in revenue.

Until 2000-2001, institutional authorities contracted with a private firm to solicit funds for annual giving to all units of the University. The expenses for this activity were relatively

high and the giving relatively modest, so that the net income to the COE was, at most, a few tens of thousands of dollars per year. Additional relatively small amounts of money came to the COE through the annual faculty/staff campaign and other sources. In 2000-2001 and afterwards, student callers (and Development staff, in some instances) were used for telephone solicitations—with a much greater financial yield to the COE accounts.

Development Officers. I repeatedly requested a “development officer” for the College of Education and, for October 1993-August 1995, Ms. Gwendolyn R. Forrest was appointed to serve in that capacity, on a full-time basis, although not as a COE employee. She was, I believe, EMU’s first collegiate-level development officer.

Ms. Sandy Marshall served as the COE development officer during 1995-1996. In November 1996, Steve Quinlan was appointed as the COE development officer. Mr. Quinlan’s relevant experience and enthusiasm, along with advancements in record-keeping related to alumni and development, brought quick results. For example, in 1997-1998, \$726,088 was raised for the College of Education, compared with \$411,134 for Arts and Science, \$359,764 for Health and Human Services, \$347,462 for Business, and \$183,625 for Technology.

Mr. Quinlan left for opportunities elsewhere. However, by March 1998, Ms. Alice Preketes was serving as the COE development officer, except that she also had this same role with the College of Health and Human Services and she had other duties as well. Needless to say, Ms. Preketes could devote only a portion of her time to fund-raising for the COE.

In the fall of 2002, Ms. Susan Rink was appointed as a full-time development officer for the COE. We provided her with an office on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the Porter Building for ease of access to COE administrators, faculty, and programming. I much enjoyed working with her for the remainder of the time I served as Dean. Due to Ms. Rink’s skills and dedication, along with considerable improvements in various aspects of the infrastructure for alumni and development matters, EMU fund-raising was finally on reasonably sound footing. For example, in FY03, the number of endowed scholarships was up to 60 and \$529,855 had been raised for the COE. And fund-raising for the COE continued to grow.

It was the responsibility of those of us in the COE to spend, in a responsible manner, the money that was raised through development structures. There were several, to be sure, instances where these private-sector sources were cultivated by a COE faculty or staff member, or a Resource Development Board member and those were and are much appreciated. However, I would estimate that 95% of the work involved with securing money for the COE during 1991-2004 was done by the COE development officers, assisted by their support structures and personnel in the campus-wide Development Office.

In my own case, I wrote, or at least individually signed, a very large number of “thank you” letters to COE donors. There were instances where, when it appeared that an individual was ready to make an appreciable gift to the COE, the development officer and I went together to

“make the ask.” I was actively involved in meetings of the COE Resource Development Board, where there was a lot of “brainstorming” and strategy setting.

### COE Resource Development Board

The COE Resource Development Board came into being in the fall of 1994, largely through the efforts of the then COE development officer, Ms. Gwen Forrest. The initial membership consisted of Johnny Carson, '69; Robert Docking, '57, '61; Mary Green, '58 and former COE associate dean; Edward Engle, '39; Michael Flanagan '74; Hayes Jones, '61; Marilouise Smith-Mays, '63; W. Scott Westerman, Jr., former COE dean; Kathleen Quinn, '68 and Special Education Department Head; and me, as COE Dean. Ms. Forrest provided staff services.

A charge to the Board was to cultivate “friends” of the COE and to actively solicit money for the COE’s scholarships, endowment funds, and development funds. Indeed, the initial and subsequent members of the Board made personal donations and assisted with a good deal of “cultivation.” However, over the years, perhaps the most important contribution of the members of the Resource Development Board was to serve as an advisory body to the COE development officer. This came about through individual communications with the development officer and through discussions at the Board meetings.

The Resource Development Board had an irregular history during the remainder of the 1991-2004 period. At times, the Board met frequently, even monthly, and at other times many months went by in between meetings. Membership changed over time, as well. Some members “dropped out,” either formally or informally, and new members were added. Appreciation is expressed to all who served in this capacity.

Major areas of attention changed from time to time. For example, as the former Library building was being readied for use by the College of Education, and in the early months of COE occupancy of this building, much attention was given to the need for private-sector funding of the furnishings and equipment—especially technology—needed to make the facility “state of the art” for Education and related programs. At another time, much attention was given to the need for scholarships and other financial aid to attract students into “high need” teaching fields. Many meetings included a discussion of “how to find” and “reach out to” alums and “friends” who had resources and who would be inclined, if approached, to make appreciable gifts to the COE.

### Categories of Fund Raising

During the 1991-2004 period, the fund-raising for the COE fell into five major categories.

Endowed and Expendable Scholarships. Over many decades prior to 1991, endowed scholarships for COE students, primarily for prospective teachers, had been put into place. Many of these were initiated by family members in memory of a long-time teacher. The

objectives during 1991-2004 were to increase the number of endowed scholarships and to increase the principal of the endowment fund of existing ones. Although expendable scholarships were not particularly solicited, when they were received, they were welcomed and used, typically on a one-time basis, in honor of a faculty member or in memory of a relative of the donor. At one point, a number of relatively small funds, inactive for an extended period of time, were consolidated into a larger, viable endowed scholarship fund.

COE, Department, and Other Unit Expendable Funds. In general, if a donor did not specify some purpose for a donation (other than something related to COE), as was often the case with telephone solicitations and other annual giving, the proceeds went into a general development fund for the COE and I had the responsibility for spending these funds appropriately. Similarly, if the donor wanted the money to go to Department X or some other unit/function in the COE, that went into a department/unit development account and the department head/unit head had the responsibility for spending the funds appropriately.

COE Endowment Fund. For many years, there had been a COE Endowment Fund, one that was small and that grew very slowly. EMU Foundation policy was that interest on such a fund would not be allocated to the college (or comparable unit) until the principal of the fund had reached at least \$250,000. During the final years of the 1991-2004 period, the COE Endowment Fund reached and exceeded this threshold, such that we began to receive a few thousand dollars per year, all of which went for technology expansion and upgrades in the Porter Building.

Small amounts of “gifts-in-kind,” typically unsolicited, were received over the years and they included such items as a large grandfather clock, hearing aids, adaptive devices, films, books, memorabilia, etc. All were appropriately put to use or placed in some appropriate venue.

John W. Porter Endowed Chair in Urban Education. Dr. John Porter, former state superintendent, former EMU President, former Detroit superintendent, and for whom the Porter Building was named, was a very strong supporter of better educational opportunities for children who attended school in urban areas. Dr. Porter made a large personal contribution to the establishment of the Porter Chair and he was highly instrumental in obtaining appreciable additional contributions toward this endowment. By early in 1998, more than \$1,000,000 had been received for this endowment. Implementation of the Chair, including selection of the first Chair-holder and establishment of the infrastructure for the Chair, began soon afterwards.

Naming Opportunities, Furnishings, Technology—Porter Building. As architectural planning approached its end and as demolition/construction started on what became the Porter Building, it became increasingly apparent that the available state funding would be considerably

insufficient to furnish and equip the Porter Building as intended and as needed. Donors “stepped up” with support of naming opportunities in the building and with gifts to apply toward furnishings and equipment. As a result, along with other last-minute funding, on opening day, we had a functional building, even as expansion and upgrades continued for many months afterwards. These donations were and are much appreciated by the students, staff, and faculty who continue to make great use of what was provided.

Highlights of Development Activities, 1991-2004. Please see Appendix F for a representative sample of development-related items that appeared in *Monday Report* during 1991-2004. These add detail to the information provided in this chapter.

—Endowed scholarships increased from about 40 to more than 60 during 1991-2004. Along the way, a number of small, inactive scholarship funds were combined to create a larger, viable COE Scholarship Fund.

—COE, department, and unit expendable funds increased during the 1991-2004 period. This was around \$30,000/year at the beginning of this period. For several years later in the period, the total exceeded \$200,000/year in much needed funds.

—The COE Endowment Fund, starting from a very low level in 1991, grew to more than the \$250,000 threshold for drawing interest from the principal. In the final years of the 1991-2004 period, \$8,000-\$10,000 per year in interest income came to the COE.

—The endowment for the John W. Porter Chair in Urban Education reached and exceeded \$1,000,000 by early 1998. The Porter Chair was implemented soon afterwards.

—Considerably more than \$100,000 was provided by donors, through gifts and naming opportunities, to provide furnishings and equipment (much of it technology) for the Porter Building as it neared occupancy.