A Study of Leadership Characteristics
Requisite among Chief Development Officers
in Michigan's Public Universities

Cindy E. Hales

A Plan B submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Administration

Department of Political Science
Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
December, 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend the following acknowledgements to those who joined me on this long and exciting journey.

First, to the chief development officers who took time from their hectic schedules to share their insights about leadership with me.

To the faculty in the department who indulged my interests in the non-profit sector and allowed me to explore public administration theory outside of the traditional setting. Thank you, Drs. Kurtz, Pak, Ringquist, Soni, and Sych.

Next to my supervisors, Dr. Karen Adams and Mike Leto for allowing me the space to be both a CMU employee and a CMU student.

I'd also like to thank my many classmates who provided unique perspective, intriguing dialogue, and the opportunity for me to explore exciting new ideas.

To my dear friends (you know who you are) who tolerated my endless whining, massive insecurities, and constant questions. You showed amazing patience and in doing so became an important part of my learning experience. You're the best.

Finally, I would like to share my appreciation for the gift of laughter, perhaps my dearest companion on this journey…

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND 1

LITERATURE REVIEW 3
- **Leadership theories** 5
- **Industry-specific studies** 7

METHODOLOGY 9

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 13

CONCLUSIONS 21

BIBLIOGRAPHY 24

APPENDIX A 27

APPENDIX B 29

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Overview of Popular Leadership Theories………………… 4

2. Demographic Profile of Subjects……………………………10

3. Leadership Characteristics and Resulting Values
from Pre-Interview Survey………………………………… 12

4. Comparison of Survey Results…………………………….. 14

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

Although the concept of charity has existed since the writings of the New Testament, modern philanthropy was created in the 1920's through the philosophy of American industrialists such as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller. According to Scott Cutlip (1965), author of the only major history of fundraising ever published, *Fund Raising in the United States: Its Role in America's Philanthropy*, the first professional fundraisers were hired to serve two up-and-coming colleges, Harvard and Yale.

Private colleges and universities have long been the leader in higher education fundraising. With private support making up a significant percentage of the budget, these institutions built the model for the comprehensive development program. Public institutions, created to provide accessible, affordable education to the masses relied heavily on government subsidies and less on the generosity of alumni and benefactors. In recent times, government support has declined while the need for quality education, significant research, and accessibility in public colleges and universities has only grown. To meet those demands, these institutions have learned from their private counterparts and have begun to invest in larger more comprehensive development initiatives.

Within the context of this report, the term "development" is used interchangeably with the term "fundraising", a common practice. Specifically however development is defined as a process that includes the identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of gifts (Worth, 1993).

The purpose of this qualitative research study is to identify those leadership characteristics considered necessary to the role of the chief development officer (CDO).

The focus of the study will be those chief development officers working in a public university within the state of Michigan, where in many cases development programs are still relatively young when compared to their private counterparts. As public universities continue to expand their development efforts, the demand for capable leadership will also grow. It will be critical for those who aspire to leadership roles in university development to understand the skills necessary to achieve these senior level positions.

According to a study by Indiana University's Center on Philanthropy, the average tenure for a fundraising professional is three years for women, and four and half years for men (Schwin, 2005). This degree of turnover and the demands it puts on a development program is yet another challenge for those in leadership roles. The cost of recruiting, training, and retaining a qualified team of development professionals is high – both to the organization's bottom line and in the loss of continuous relationships with prospective donors. The fluidity of the profession also inhibits an organization's ability to successfully develop its own future leadership.

Although many professional organizations conduct regular research on the demographics of the profession, I found little written about the characteristics needed to advance to a leadership level. Entities such as Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), National Society of Fundraising Executives (NSFRE), and American Fundraising Professionals (AFP) all actively survey their membership. These studies help produce demographic data, identify issues in the profession, and predict future trends. While adding to the body of knowledge about the field of development, none of the studies I found report any relationship between particular characteristics and their importance to assuming a leadership role.

Given the lack of existing data, there are two main objectives to my study. First, is to develop a clear understanding of the skills considered essential by those currently serving in these leadership roles. These skills were identified through the use of a pre-interview questionnaire. The second objective is to explore in greater depth how these characteristics manifest themselves in the daily function of leaders, through personal interviews with current CDO's.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The body of knowledge on the topic of leadership is enormous and extends over decades of significant and meaningful research. Furthermore, I discovered that the discussion of leadership reaches into many other disciplines such as management, supervision, and human resources (training and development). The topic can also be approached from a variety of contexts, such as gender, race, or across cultures. The challenge was to remain focused on the basic principles of leadership theory.

In Bass & Stodgill's *Handbook of Leadership* (1990) an historical overview is provided which highlights the evolution of leadership theory. Table 1 provides a general description of each of the most popular theories over the past 100 years.

Table 1 Overview of Popular Leadership Theories

Era	Major characteristics
Great Man Theory	Emphasis on emergence of a great figure who has a substantial affect on society
Trait Theory	Emphasis on individual traits and skills that leaders bring to all tasks. Influenced by scientific management such as definition of roles and assignments.
Contingency Theory	Emphasis on behaviors rather than traits and skills needed for different situational variables. (can be transactional)
Transformational Theory	Emphasis on leaders who create organizational change through compelling vision, technical insight, or charismatic qualities.
Servant Leadership Theory	Emphasis on the ethical responsibilities of leaders to their followers, stakeholders, and society.
Multifaceted Leadership Theory	Emphasis on integrating the major leadership theories, in particular those representing trait and behavior issues with those addressing visionary and charismatic characteristics.

Adapted from Van Wart, 2003

In an attempt to efficiently examine the vast body of work on leadership, I created a conceptual definition of leadership characteristics to guide formation of the pre-survey questionnaire. For this study, *leadership characteristics are defined as personal behaviors or traits, rather than skills or techniques*. This definition was particularly useful to differentiate between success as a leader from success as a fundraiser, in particular with industry-specific articles.

With this in mind, I examined three contemporary leadership theories: transactional or managerial, transformational, and servant. A simplified detail of each theory follows.

Leadership Theories

Transactional theory essentially says that leadership is contingent on a set of traits and situations involving a transaction between the leader and those being led (Bass, 1990). Transactional leaders typically use rewards to encourage performance and work

to maintain the status quo (Kouzes, 1987) rather than institute change, a characteristic commonly associated with transformational leadership. Both the trait theory and the contingency theory originally explored leadership from a transactional point of view (Bass, 1990).

The relationship between leader and follower in this theory is one of exchanging rewards or benefits for agreed upon performance. It is most closely associated with the traditional role of manager in an organization and is represented by terms such as supervise, negotiate, evaluate, and coordinate (Bass, 1990). Transactional leaders are generally concerned with management issues, definition of roles, and assigned duties (Van Wart, 2003).

The transactional perspective was considered for this study, in part because it represents a more conventional form of leadership. The environment being explored in this project, specifically institutions of higher education are by reputation more traditional organizations and could therefore potentially tolerate a more conventional leadership style. Today, scholars are integrating transactional theory with the more contemporary transformational theory for a new, holistic approach to leadership (Van Wart, 2003).

The concept of **transformational leadership** emerged in the late 1970's from a need to re-energize American business (Van Wart, 2003). Numerous studies (Bass, 1985; Hater and Bass, 1988; Seltzer, Numerof, and Bass, 1989) have determined that transformational leadership can be organized into four dimensions: charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass, 1990).

These dimensions became the foundation for *The Leadership Challenge* by Kouzes and Posner (1987). In their popular text, they define transformational leadership as inspiring others to excel, giving individual consideration to others, and stimulating people to think in new ways. The authors outline five practices common among transformational leaders: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. They further detail the ways in which leaders enact these practices within an organization.

In challenging the process, leaders search for opportunities to change the way things are done. Once discovered, leaders must be willing to experiment and take the risks necessary to affect change (Kouzes, 1987).

Inspiring a shared vision involves both envisioning the future and then enlisting others to work toward that future. The practice of enabling others to act requires the ability to foster collaboration among people, and then provide them with the power to respond. Modeling the way is simply leading by example. The final practice outlined in *The Leadership Challenge* is encouraging the heart, or recognizing and celebrating the accomplishments of your followers (Kouzes, 1987).

From the socially conscience 60's and 70's rose the concept of **servant leadership**, which gained recognition through the seminal work *Servant as Leader* by Robert Greenleaf. Servant-leadership is described by the Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership as a practical philosophy which supports people who chose to serve first, and then lead as a way of expanding service to individuals and institutions. Servant-leadership encourages collaboration, trust, foresight, listening, and the ethical use of power and empowerment (*What is servant-leadership?*, n.d.).

Recently a paradigm shift has taken place within organizations looking to integrate the concept of servant leadership. Servant leadership involves getting to know employees as unique human beings (build relationships) to better understand how to "serve" them. It requires always telling the truth (honesty) and modeling productive behavior. Servant leaders strive to be a teacher, mentor, coach, and cheerleader, and buffer employees from undue pressures (Ramsey, 2003). Additional sources outline a framework for servant-leadership that also includes active listening, nurturing trusting relationships, and being an effective steward of the organization (Douglas, 2003).

Industry-specific studies

Beyond the general literature, sources were consulted specific to the field of development. Although there is surprisingly limited literature specifically linking leadership characteristics to advancing in the field of educational fundraising, there is considerable discussion about the profession. Much of this exists under the direction of the industry's professional organization, CASE. Numerous articles, surveys, and books also offered insight into which broad conclusions about leadership characteristics could be drawn.

In the late 80's, Robert Carbone conducted a survey of 1,750 professional fundraisers, representing a range of fields. His objective was to assess how fundraisers viewed themselves, each other, and the profession as a whole. To do so, he gathered information on just six characteristics he considered particular to the field of fundraising: autonomy, systematic knowledge, self-regulation, commitment, dedication to service, and ethics. His findings were reported in a 1989 monograph titled, *Fund Raising as a Profession* (as cited in Tempel & Duronio, 2003).

In his report, Carbone expresses concern that fundraiser training focuses primarily on the skills needed to accomplish the work of fundraising. "This somewhat single-minded attention to expertise on the job suggests many fundraisers only have a rudimentary understanding of what is involved in professionalism and in the attainment of stature as a true profession." (Tempel, sec VIII, pg. 26). He further contends that while competence is important, it is not enough.

Also from the late 1980's is a study by Jerald Panas which involved surveying 2,700 professional fundraisers, and personally interviewing 48, who he identified as "outstanding". From his work, he suggests ten attributes, skills, and characteristics necessary for a fundraiser. These include: impeccable integrity, ability to listen well, ability to motivate, high energy, concern for people, high expectations, love of the work, perseverance, presence, and a quality of leadership (Osborne, 1993).

More recently, a survey of 50 college and university presidents was conducted by Educational Management Network, a division of the search firm, Witt/Kieffer. The objective of the survey was to determine the attributes the CEO's think make for an effective chief advancement officer and the responsibilities they consider most important for that job. In institutions of higher education, advancement typically includes alumni relations, public relations/marketing, and development functions. Recently some institutions have expanded this division to encompass government relations, volunteer centers, institution-related foundations, and student recruitment (Bongiorno 2003).

Five attributes emerged as the most vital and included integrity, communication skills, relationship building skills, attention to detail, and strong strategic thinking. The study also segmented institutions with an alumni base greater than 100,000 to determine

characteristics unique to this size organization. Scoring high with this group were additional traits including vision, ability to work with diverse constituencies, ability to adjust to change, and a sense of humor. The three bottom traits in the study were familiarity with technology (likely because this falls to staff), risk-taking, and ability to delegate authority (Carbelli 2000).

Despite each being unique in the data they collected, the three studies referenced above all suggest that integrity and ethics are critical to the development (fundraising) profession. These surveys also indicate that characteristics consistent with both transformational and servant leadership theory are most prominent, while those characteristics generally attributed to transactional theory rated less significant.

METHODOLODY

This study is a discussion of leadership characteristics requisite among CDO's in Michigan's public universities and was designed to test the following hypothesis.

A common set of characteristics (independent variable) can be identified among those achieving chief leadership roles (dependent variable) in public university development programs.

To collect this data, a pre-interview questionnaire was mailed to the CDO at thirteen public universities in the state. (For purposes of this study, the two University of Michigan extension campuses in Flint and Dearborn have been removed from the list.) The questionnaire asked respondents to rate the importance of twenty leadership characteristics to the role of a chief development officer. Rating was on a Likert scale from 1 – 5. (Appendix A)

While they hold a wide variety of titles, each participant in the study appears on the institution's organizational chart as the person to whom all development functions report. They represent a range of demographics including gender, educational background, and experience. The number of years in higher education development ranged from 5 to 26, with an average of 16 years. All participants were adults and joined the study on a voluntary basis.

Table 2 Demographic Profile of Subjects

Sample	*Gender*		*Education Level*		
	Male	Female	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
***N* = 9**	6	3	4	3	2

The characteristics listed in the questionnaire were culled from an extensive literature review in the area of leadership. The literature included general leadership materials, the majority of which came from the study of private sector organizations, as well as articles from professional development-related associations such as CASE.

Responses were received from nine of the thirteen institutions and represent schools from each of the three designations granted to colleges and universities by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. These designations include "research extensive", "research intensive", and "masters level", and are available from the foundation's website at www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications. By obtaining representation from all Carnegie levels, the study includes universities with a broad range of budgets, student enrollments, employees, and research agendas. The study also represents organizations with development programs at varying degrees of sophistication.

A break-down of the participating universities follows.

Research Extensive:
Michigan State University
Western Michigan University

Research Intensive:
Central Michigan University
Oakland University
Michigan Tech University

Masters Level:
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State University
Lake Superior State University
Saginaw Valley State University

Results from the surveys were entered into a frequency table to determine the characteristics rated "extremely important" to the majority of respondents. The top four values were identified as honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and relationship building. (Table 3) The results formed the foundation for the second phase of the study – the personal interview. Questions for the interview were created to more fully explore those characteristics that rated highest in the survey, including the ways in which they are most apparent in the daily activities of these leaders. I also wanted to introduce the topic of leadership training, again as it related to the "extremely important" characteristics.

Table 3 **Leadership Characteristics and Resulting Values from Pre-Interview Survey**

CHARACTERISTIC	VALUE
Honest	5.0
Competent	4.5
Visionary	4.1
Inspiring	4.2
Collaborative	4.6
Caring	4.0
Ethical	5.0
Risk Taker	3.3
Change Agent	3.3
Effective Communicator	4.4
Team Builder	4.6
Trustworthy	5.0
Creative	3.6
Charismatic	3.3
Sense of humor	3.7
Politically aware	3.5
Strategic thinker	4.5
Practical	3.8
Problem solver	4.3
Relationship builder	4.8

Personal interviews were held with all nine of the respondents; seven were done face-to-face, while the two Upper Peninsula schools were conducted via telephone. I chose a lightly structured interview process, as defined by Peter Knight in his book, *Small-Scale Research (2002).* According to Knight, a lightly structured interview includes some prompted questions, but follows a flexible sequence and allows for improvisation around a list of topics (Knight, 2002). Four standard questions were used in each interview to provide the framework from which further conversation flowed. (Appendix B.)

Knight presents two additional formats; structured (fixed responses in a set order) and semi-structured (fixed and open-response questions). Neither of these presented the

opportunity to explore the ways in which the development leaders I spoke with applied the characteristics identified in the pre-interview survey. Although Knight outlines a number of challenges with the lightly structured format, I believe it provided for richer, more descriptive data. Challenges to this format include the time required to conduct interviews, difficulty in analyzing the data, and validity (Knight, 2002).

Knight suggests that validity can be shown by the quality of the interview questions, the commitment of the informant, and the amount of time allocated (Knight, 2002). Each face-to-face interview lasted approximately one hour, while the telephone interviews were slightly shorted at around 45 minutes. The inability to interpret body language or make a more personal connection with the interviewee was also found during the telephone sessions. These time frames and phenomena were validated in the text, *Learning from Strangers* (Weiss, 1994).

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The pre-interview survey provided the foundation for the personal interview portion of the study, and revealed some interesting results. Characteristics identified with transformational leadership theory such as being charismatic, a risk taker, or change agent each received the lowest scores in the survey – 3.3 on a 5-point scale. Those traits that scored a 5.0 on the 5-point scale, honesty, trustworthiness, and ethical behavior, were based on personal character, rather than job performance and are more consistent with characteristics of servant leadership. (See table 3, page 12)

The results of this survey are also parallel to studies conducted within both the

broad field of fundraising, and specifically in higher education development. Table 4 shows the comparison of results between this and two comparable studies reported in the literature.

Table 4 Comparison of Survey Results

Top results from this study	Top results from Panas study (see pg.8)	Top results from EMN study (see pg. 8)
Honesty	Integrity	Integrity
Trustworthiness	Ability to listen well	Communication skills
Ethical behavior	Ability to motivate	Relationship building
Relationship building	High energy	Attention to detail
Team builder/Collaborative (same score)	Concern for people	Strategic thinking

The characteristics which were further explored in the interview process represented the four highest scores and were honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and being a relationship builder. Four questions were asked in each interview to initiate the dialogue, (Appendix B) followed by free-flowing discussion. An overview of each question and emerging themes follows.

Participants were asked their reaction to the top four characteristics identified from the survey. These characteristics were honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and relationship building. In each of the dialogues, honesty, trustworthiness, and ethical behavior were viewed as very similar characteristics and were generally discussed together. Relationship building was seen as a unique characteristic from the other three.

None of the interviewees expressed surprise by the results. Each articulated the

importance these characteristics had in successfully leading a development program, both with internal (staff and university leadership) and external (prospects and donors) audiences. More specifically, they detailed how these particular characteristics are the foundation on which philanthropy is based.

> Reports one VP, "In development, we serve the greater good. Our institutions must trust us to represent its mission and purpose, and our donors must trust us to use their gifts to support that mission and purpose. Being honest, trustworthy, and ethical must be taken very seriously."

Says another, "As we build our team up, people ask what it is I'm looking for in an employee. My answer is simple – I'm looking for people who like others and genuinely want the best for them."

Still another says, "I don't really care how smart you are, or how clever you are. I don't care how experienced you are. If I don't think you have these core values, we're in trouble."

Concepts such as "serving the greater good" or "working for the benefit of society" were mentioned multiple times during the interviews. These concepts reflect the religious roots of servant leadership theory, in particular the New Testament where Jesus was perhaps the first example of a servant leader (Ramsey, 2003).

Interviewees were then asked to identify some of the ways in which these characteristics play out in their roles as chief development officers. There was some variation in responses between larger more established programs, and smaller less

complex programs. However, most of the responsibilities held by these leaders showed little distinction between universities.

All respondents spoke of the duty they have to "educate our institution" about development and its place in higher education. Some specifically talked about the culture that has existed in public institutions where funding has historically come from the state, resulting in limited understanding of the development function.

Each articulated how honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and being a strong relationship builder were critical to this function.

"I need the academic folks on our campus to trust me enough to lead them into our next campaign, says one VP preparing for a capital campaign. That's when being trustworthy really comes into play for me."

"Probably the most important relationship and the one I worked the hardest at in my position is with the president. I invest a lot of time making sure we're on the same page."

Three respondents (all from master's level institutions) saw themselves as breaking new territory for there university. Terms such as "trail blazer, "ground breaker", and "entrepreneurial" were used to express the responsibility they had to grow their development programs. Although not highly ranked in the survey, clearly these leaders are compelled to be risk-takers and change agents, both characteristics associated with the transformational leader.

> The leader of a very young program reports, "I had to start by developing policies and creating procedures when I came to (institution). That meant

developing working relationship with departments across campus so we could do things that had never been done before."

Several respondents (representing a range of sizes) shared a sense of overwhelming responsibility in their roles. In addition to leadership duties, each of the nine interviewees also serves as the development officer for the university's top-level donors. With one exception, each is also part of the university's management/leadership team, which frequently requires duties outside of leading their division.

"People would be shocked to know how much time I spend in meetings, says one VP. And often times they are not with my team."

"I have accountability to the president, the governing board, the other vice-presidents, deans and directors, and of course my entire development staff," says the VP of a large institution. "I can't do that well without those characteristics (from the study)."

When asked if these top-rated characteristics were teachable, respondents offered a qualified no. Although the Great Man theory implies that leaders are born, the contemporary debate is around to what degree leaders can be made (Van Wart, 2003) and how can it be done effectively in an organization (leader development). Responses to this question were not a simple "yes or no".

More specifically, they suggested that workshops and training programs are important to reinforce these characteristics, however honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and relationship building were generally thought to be innate, not something you teach. This attitude was particularly common when discussing the top three (honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior).

“We can certainly teach people about the ethical standards in our profession, but you obviously need to bring the ability to be ethical to the table,” expressed one vice-president.

“Sure I can provide training and lead by example, and it’s my responsibility to do that. But at the end of the day, if someone wants to be dishonest or unethical, they’re going to be.”

Three respondents clearly articulated the belief that the issue isn’t training, but proper recruitment. If we in fact do a better job of recruiting people inherently suited to development work, teaching the mechanics is easy. “Turnover is expensive and time-consuming”, says one VP. “But mostly it doesn’t engender long-term trust with our donors.”

While respondents did not believe a dishonest or unethical person could be taught to behave differently, several reported that as the leader of a development team, their job was to encourage the characteristics they expected to see. In all cases, the importance of modeling behavior was addressed.

The ability to be a good relationship builder was viewed somewhat differently. Two institutions shared their plans to bring a comprehensive training program to their campus to improve the art of building relationships, both with donors and among their teams. Despite the sense that you can teach people “strategies” for creating strong donor relations, several respondents indicated that genuinely liking people was by and large instinctive.

While not part of this study or the literature review, the issue surrounding the degree to which leadership skills can be learned is an important one, as is the system organizations will need for delivering such training. This is an area for future analysis.

Finally, participants were asked to name some of the leadership characteristics that they believed others, such as their team or university leadership, expected of them. Several were shared and include:

- Ability to solve problems – “They expect that I can fix whatever problems they have, even ones that involve the president or trustees.”
- Effectively manage the team – “I’m the one responsible for making sure everyone does their job, so that the team itself is successful.”
- Competent – “I am expected to be a good fundraiser, with a full understanding of the profession and the rules that govern it.”
- Motivational – “I spend a lot time cheerleading…not just my development team, but deans, chairs, even the president. I’m the one they all look at to say we can do this.”
- Program builder – “My president sees me as the trailblazer who is bringing development to our institutions.”
- Set an example – “This is a highly visible position. I’m expected to be the poster child for how we want our division seen.”
- Be a buffer for conflict – “I take the shots for my team, and they know I’ll do that when times get tough.”
- Visionary - “My team expects me to have a picture of what success looks like and a plan for how we’re going to get there.”

While these characteristics cut across several leadership theories, those mentioned by respondents are most consistent with transformational and servant leadership. Only "managing the team" and "competent" are more congruent with the transactional theory (Bass, 1990; Van Wart, 2003).

Given the structure of this project, a number of themes emerged during the personal interviews outside of the scope of the questions. Three arose in multiple conversations and are reported above, however are worth discussing further. The issue of mentoring and/or modeling was examined both as a tool for "teaching" leadership and as a responsibility of these particular leaders. This concept is an important part of the transformational leadership process outlined in *The Leadership Challenge*. Modeling the way is the fifth step in challenge presented by the researches who specifically address setting the example for the values you want to see in your organization (Kouzes, 1987).

The second theme that surfaced during the interviews was the issue of gender. Although deliberately not included as part of this study, two of the three female respondents reported unique challenges based on their "more feminine leadership style". One respondent, who works in a predominantly male institution, felt particular strain from not only her team, but also her colleagues, and university leadership. "The way I put my inner dialogue out on the table is really different than my male counterparts." The topic of gender-specific leadership traits and the ways in which they influence university development programs provides significant opportunity for future research.

Finally, several respondents shared their frustration with the amount of time available for visioning or strategic planning. As vice-presidents, most are involved with senior level, university-wide strategic planning initiatives. However, six of the nine

respondents reported they did less visioning or planning activities than they felt they should.

While this study is small in its scope (number of subjects and geographically), the strong correlations to contemporary leadership theory and the consistency of results to other large-scale surveys suggests some level of generalization. Based on the findings from both the pre-interview survey and the personal interviews, several conclusions can be drawn.

CONCLUSIONS

This project discovered that there are in fact a common set of characteristics that exist among the chief development officers in public university settings, thus proving the original hypothesis. Despite focusing only on universities in Michigan, the results can be generalized to public institutions in other states, particularly those states where funding has historically been provided by the government. The compatibility of my survey results with those of the EMN study (page 8) helps support this statement.

My findings also indicate that these common characteristics, honesty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and being a relationship builder are analogous with the servant leadership philosophy. I believe this strong correlation is a result of the profession (philanthropy) as opposed to the environment (higher education). As outlined in the introduction, the very nature of philanthropy over time would suggest a close connection with the servant leadership values.

Little differentiation was made by survey participants when they discussed leadership characteristics with either internal or external audiences. It appears that the

servant-style of leadership required to properly engage and steward prospective donors is also applied with staff and university leadership.

Though not self-identified by the participants in the survey as important, the personal interviews indicate that transformational characteristics such as being a risk-taker, or change agent are often expected of them in their role as a leader. As the demand to raise new dollars, develop larger programs, and engage more donors grows, these characteristics will likely become more significant. Further exploration of why these traits rated at the bottom of the survey provides additional research opportunities.

Finally, I began this project considering if and how the leadership skills identified in the study could be taught. As I discovered in the literature, the issue is currently one of degree (Van Wart, 2003) which is consistent with the responses in question #3 of this study (pg. 17-19). Identifying the characteristics and better understanding how and why they are important is valuable information. However, knowing the degree to which those aspiring to be leaders can be taught these characteristics and the mechanisms for doing so within an organization are also critical considerations.

Think tanks such as the Center for Creative Leadership pose several questions for examining this issue. How do people learn important leadership skills? Do some people learn more from experiences than others? What are the best strategies for enhancing leadership development? (McCauley, 2004).

I would suggest that these are important questions to explore within the field of development, with an eye toward improving turn-over and building sustainability within our institutions' development initiatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bongiorno, D. (2003). The artisans of advancement. *CASE Currents*, *29,* 18 - 23.

Carabelli, P. (2000). Manager's portfolio: what great CAO's are made of. *CASE Currents, 26,* 11-12.

Coll, E. (2002). A surprisingly good fit. *CASE Currents*, *28,* 48 – 52.

Collins, M. (2002). Top brass (electronic version). *CASE Currents, 28,* 28-37.

Cutlip, S. (1965). *Fund raising in the United States: Its Role in America's philanthropy.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Douglas, M. (2003). Servant leadership: an emerging supervisory model (electronic version). *Supervision*, 64, 6 – 9

GreenLeaf Center for Servant-Leadership. *What is servant-leadership?* (n.d.). Retrieved November 18, 2005, from www.greeleaf.org/leadership/servant-leadership/What-is-Servant-Leadership/html.

Greenleaf, Robert. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.

Knight, P. (2002). *Small-Scale research.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

McCauley, C., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Nielsen, C. (2003). Leaving their mark. *CASE Currents, 29,* 49-56.

Osborne, K. (1993). Hiring, training, and retaining development staff. In Worth, M. (Ed.). *Educational fund raising principles and practice* (pp. 239-250). Phoenix: American Council on Education and the Onyx Press.

O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G., & Berner, M. (2003). *Research methods for public administrators* (4th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Ramsey, R. (2003). What is a "servant leader"? *Supervision*, *64*, 3 – 5.

Sevier, B. (2005). Closing remarks: plan overboard. *CASE Currents, 31,* 64.

Schwinn, E., & Sommerfeld, M. (2002). Revolving-door dilemma. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy,14*. Retrieved on November 26, 2005 from: http://philanthropy.com/premium/articles/v14/i13/13003901.htm.

Tempel, E., & Duronio, M. (2003, May). *The demographics and experience of fundraisers.* Presented at The Fundraising School at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-Sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review,* 63, 214 - 228.

Weiss, R. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: The Free Press.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire will be used to identify the leadership characteristics most important to the role of chief development officer. Please rate the importance of each of the twenty leadership characteristic by circling the appropriate response.

Key:	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Generally important	Very important	Extremely important

1.	Honest	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Competent	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Visionary	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Inspiring	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Collaborative	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Caring	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Ethical	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Risk Taker	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Change Agent	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Effective Communicator	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Team Builder	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Creative	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Charismatic	1	2	3	4	5

15.	Sense of Humor	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Politically Aware	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Strategic Thinker	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Practical	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Problem Solver	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Relationship Builder	1	2	3	4	5

Demographic Information:

Number of years you have worked in development within higher education: _________

Gender: Male ______ Female ______

Education: Doctorate ______ Master's ______ Bachelor's ______

Special Certification ____________ (please indicate which certification)

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions will be asked for each of the top four characteristics as identified from the survey participants, as a way to engage further discussion on the topic of leadership.

1. Why do you believe these characteristics were so consistently rated as most important in your role as a leader?

2. Can you share examples of how these characteristics come into play in your role?

3. Do you believe these characteristics are teachable?

4. What other leadership characteristics do you think your team expects you to have as their leader?