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Salary and Productivity of High Performing Community Colleges

A Review and Summary

Introduction

President Roquemore and President Burnett have been aware for several years that the salary levels offered for the position of foundation director were too low to attract the quality of candidates the colleges needed to lead their foundations to produce enough donations and attract community partners to make a substantial contribution to the colleges’ budgets. This problem of non-competitive salaries was in evidence again at both colleges this past year when they encountered significant difficulty in attracting the highest level candidates to apply. IVC was able to hire a director, but only after they offered to place him on the top step on the salary schedule. The salary problem was further evidenced in the district’s salary study and reclassification process that would have left the positions at an uncompetitive level.

During the final phase of the district’s reclassification process, with urging from the two presidents, the chancellor agreed to remove the two foundation director positions from the reclassification process in order to review them further. The salary study would have compared the salaries of the executive directors at IVC and Saddleback to those of other multi-college districts in California. The chancellor and presidents wanted to base the salaries on the pay level for CEO’s at highest performing California Community Colleges. To facilitate a further review of the salaries of CCC foundation director positions, I conducted a salary and performance review and summary of the highest performing California Community College (CCC) Foundations.

The Presidents and the Chancellor selected me, Principal of The Magellan Group, to conduct further research and make a recommendation. Their selection of The Magellan Group was based on my work as a consultant with some three
dozen community college foundations in California, my leadership of several of
the NCCCF baseline surveys that were done over the past eight years, my direct
experience with both IVC and Saddleback as a foundation executive director,
and my status as the current Acting Director of the Saddleback College
Foundation.

The following review and recommendation is based on all my previous
experience with CCC foundations plus two additional pieces of data. The new
data is derived from a new survey of selected high performing CCC foundations
and data from a highly respected national survey of compensation of
philanthropic CEO's.

Previous Studies

The Network of Community College Foundations (NCCCF) conducted surveys
that included salary data in 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2009. I helped conduct the
NCCCF surveys and have made extensive use of their findings. I was the
primary researcher and author of the 2007 NCCCF white paper, "Realizing the
Potential of California Community College Foundations: White Paper submitted
to the California Community Colleges Master Planning Committee, July 2007 by
NCCCF." (Appendix "B")

The surveys, conducted by the NCCF insofar as they contained personnel
information, were primarily used to make the case that only those Foundations
with at least four staff members were able to make a three or four to one return
on the investment in their salaries. A later study conducted by the Kresge
Foundation drew a similar conclusion. The survey results that follow are
intended to shed light on the salaries needed to compensate the leaders of the
highest performing CCC foundations so that SOCCCD can determine what
salaries are sufficient to attract the best candidates to IVC and Saddleback.

Foundation Senior Executive Compensation Benchmark Survey

The survey conducted for this summary was named, "Foundation Senior
Executive Compensation Benchmark Survey" and was conducted between June
and September, 2012. CCC Foundations chosen to be the subjects of the survey
were those who met three criteria.

1. Annual budget was near or greater than one million dollars or above
2. Previous year’s annual income, 2011-2012, was two million dollars or
above
3. Net assets were ten million dollars or above

Based on these criteria, we identified eight CCC foundations as high
performance colleges. Key columns of information from these foundations are
shown here. The entire results are shown in Appendix “A.”
The results of this survey were that starting salaries ranged all the way from one at $91,000 to one at $175,000. Current salaries ranged from one at $101,000 to two at $170,000+.

- The median starting salary was $105,084.
- The median current salary was $147,084.
- Median total compensation was $191,720.

Lowest total compensation was $107,500
Highest total compensation was $210,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Performance in California</th>
<th>Annual Operating Budget (Expenses)</th>
<th>Funds Raised Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Total Net Assets</th>
<th># of Board Members</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Top Salary</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Benefits Package Value</th>
<th>Total of Salary &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo College Foundation</td>
<td>$800,837</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$103,168</td>
<td>$145,167</td>
<td>$145,167</td>
<td>$39,274</td>
<td>$184,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Desert Foundation</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuesta College Foundation</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach City College Foundation</td>
<td>$2,179,000</td>
<td>$4,754,000</td>
<td>$13,800,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$145,032</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$172,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo CCD Foundation</td>
<td>$1,430,088</td>
<td>$2,881,915</td>
<td>$11,890,433</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$45,739</td>
<td>$208,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara City College Foundation</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$41,700,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica College Foundation</td>
<td>$1,811,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Junior College Foundation</td>
<td>$924,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$120,276</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$153,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this small number of foundations it is helpful to talk about them individually.

1. Cabrillo College Foundation. The salary is low and the benefits are $39,274. The current salary is only $145,000 but the total compensation is $184,441. The director, Melinda Silverstein, has told me in the past that she very much enjoys her situation except for the salary. When I requested that she apply for the IVC or Saddleback positions she said it would take a "substantial" increase in salary to interest her in moving to a new position.
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2. College of the Desert Foundation. Current salary is $149,000. Again, the total compensation is much higher, $199,000. Assuming SOCCCD benefits, that total about $35,000, the equivalent salary is about $164,000.

3. Cuesta College Foundation. Current salary is $101,000 and benefits there are very low, $6,500. Thus the total compensation is only $107,500. This position, until about seven years ago, was salaried at the level of a dean. However, after Dr. Barbara George's retirement, with the college facing severe budget reductions, the position was reduced to a classified manager. The current manager told me that most of the funds for last year came from a large planned gift that had been secured years ago by Dr. George.

4. Long Beach City College Foundation. Dr. Virginia Baxter served there for many years until she recently retired. Her salary as an administrative dean was about $145,000 at retirement with benefits totaling about $27,000, for a total compensation of about $172,000. She has come back from retirement on a partial salary.

5. San Mateo CCD Foundation. Starting salary is $128,000, current salary $163,000, and total compensation is $208,739, due to a very substantial benefits package of $45,739. As in all cases in this survey, with the exception of Cuesta College Foundation whose salary range starts at $91,000, and Santa Monica whose salary range starts and $175,000, the salaries are at or near the top of the salary range, not near the starting range of the salary.

6. The Foundation at Santa Barbara City College. In recent years the salaries had been about $175,000 plus about $35,000 in benefits for a total of approximately $210,000, though it may have been reduced recently, at least temporarily. The director and the foundation are negotiating a higher but yet to be determined salary from the current salary of $125,000.

7. Santa Monica College Foundation. The College decided to hire a CEO that would make them competitive with other successful charities in their area. They recently completed an 18-month contract for the Senior Executive Director at a salary of $175,000 per year, plus a benefits package of about $35,000 for a total compensation of about $210,000. They offered this position three times at that beginning salary before completing this contract.

8. Santa Rosa Junior College Foundation. Though their budget is under a million dollars, they raise such a significant amount each year it is important to include them.

What can we conclude from this discussion of each of the high performing colleges? Three of them pay their CEO salaries of about $163,000 to $175,000. Three pay $145,000 to $149,000. Two others pay smaller salaries and total compensation. It may be significant that the two lowest compensating foundations, Santa Rosa and Cuesta are in relatively rural settings and the highest paying foundation, Santa Monica College, is in an affluent urban/suburban setting, as are IVC and Saddleback.
National Perspective

A review of national data included several national studies. Only one made it possible to gage salaries using the same sort of criteria used for identifying the CCC foundations. The GuideStar Compensation Report, 2012 is the most comprehensive report of charities available. This 3,300 page report makes it possible to look at educational charities with budgets of differing sizes and provides a compensation factor that recommends a +12% factor for Orange County, California.

The following chart summarizes their findings for all philanthropies with budgets of $1 million to $2.5 million and, on the bottom two rows, for educational philanthropies with budgets of $1 million to $5 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GuideStar Compensation Report</th>
<th>CEO Salaries</th>
<th>For All Philanthropies &amp; Education Only</th>
<th>With Orange County Compensation Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charities Between $1 Million and $2.5 Million</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/Executive Director</td>
<td>18,620</td>
<td>$90,909</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Between $1 Million and $5 Million</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/Executive Director</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>$96,621</td>
<td>$132,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe this data shows that in six of the eight selected high performing CCC Foundations, the total compensation range was $172,000 to $210,000. Those numbers are consistent with the numbers found in the most comprehensive national salary survey conducted annually by GuideStar.

Recommendation

Based on all of the above, SOCCCD should consider a salary of $160,000 to $190,000, or range 27 on the SOCCCD Integrated Academic/Classified Administrator’s/Manager’s Salary Schedule. A salary at this level would allow the colleges to compete with other high performing charities in our area or to attract high performing CEO’s who have proven success in a CCC foundation.

Donald L Rickner, Ph. D. Principal
The Magellan Group
## Community College Foundations
### Senior Executive Compensation Benchmark Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Annual Operating Budget (Expenses)</th>
<th>Funds Raised Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Total Net Assets</th>
<th># of BOD Members</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Top Salary</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Benefits Package Value</th>
<th>Total of Salary &amp; Benefits</th>
<th>Degree Required</th>
<th>% Cost Paid by District</th>
<th>% Cost Paid by Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Performance Colleges in California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo College Foundation</td>
<td>$800,837</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$103,168</td>
<td>$145,167</td>
<td>$145,167</td>
<td>$39,274</td>
<td>$184,441</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Desert</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuesta College</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$127,500</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach City College</td>
<td>$2,179,000</td>
<td>$4,754,000</td>
<td>$13,800,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$145,032</td>
<td>$145,032</td>
<td>$217,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$172,032</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo CCD Foundation</td>
<td>$1,430,088</td>
<td>$2,881,915</td>
<td>$11,890,433</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$45,739</td>
<td>$208,739</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara City College Foundation</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$41,700,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica College Foundation</td>
<td>$1,811,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Junior College</td>
<td>$924,000</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$120,279</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$153,600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>$588,000</td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td>$17,847,880</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$75,623</td>
<td>$108,019</td>
<td>$102,875</td>
<td>$33,550</td>
<td>$166,425</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College of San Francisco</td>
<td>$308,340</td>
<td>$2,389,091</td>
<td>$14,068,506</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino College Foundation</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$251,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Costa Community College</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$123,619</td>
<td>$167,859</td>
<td>$145,003</td>
<td>$18,190</td>
<td>$163,193</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Coast Community Foundation</td>
<td>$212,888</td>
<td>$3,330,437</td>
<td>$15,290,197</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$91,153</td>
<td>$129,058</td>
<td>$129,058</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$169,058</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena City College</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$17,900</td>
<td>$147,900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College Foundation</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: Donald L. Rickmer, Ph.D.
Director, Saddleback College Foundation
drickmer@saddleback.edu (949) 582-4568 10/09/2012
Executive Summary

A survey was taken of California community college foundations with 37 responses (about 40%). A projected $60M is currently being raised annually by all of the 100 California Community college foundations. This is about 10% higher than a decade ago but only equal to the total funds raised by CSU San Diego alone. Two distinct groups emerged. About 20% of colleges have an average of 5 full time staff and raise an average of $2M annually with contributions to their college of over $1.5M. They have assets averaging over $15M. About the same percentage have an average of less than 2 staff and raise less than $500,000 annually and contribute $100,000 to their college with assets under $1M.

Comparisons with other institutions – public and private, show that small (CSU Stanislaus), medium (UOP) and large (CSU San Diego) are much more successful than the community colleges in fund raising - $3.5M to $60M per year, with staffing and budget representing about 1 professional per $1M raised and 10% budget of funds raised. The economies of scale show that a staff of 5 or more provides greater efficiency and results, with an even greater efficiency at higher staffing and budget levels.

Finally, there are clearly best practices that have emerged. First is the importance of the leadership of the college president and having fundraising experience as a criterion for the selection of the college president. Second is making specific goals for the college presidents (such as CSU, where fundraising increased by 236%). Finally the report notes several best practices from those submitted in the survey.

Recommendations:

1. Increasing the size of Foundation staffs. It takes money to make money. Small foundations (size 2 or less) barely have the enough critical mass to support themselves. Foundations of 5 or more make three to five times their budget. Larger foundations make up to ten times their annual budgets. For CCC’s the top ten foundations raise $750,000 per foundation staff member ($1M per professional staff member), while for the lowest foundations raise less than $200,000 per staff member. For a well staffed mature CC foundation, the college receives about 7 times the annual foundation budget. For a small foundation, the college receives 1-2 times the annual foundation budget. It takes about 4-5 years for a foundation to become mature.
• How can this be achieved?
  o Develop a plan to grow your foundation staff from current levels (typically 2 or fewer) to 4-5 or more over the next two to four years. If possible, increasing the size above 4-5 will produce exponentially more income, since the additional staff can focus entirely on fund raising.
  o A typical staff of four would include an Executive Director/Fundraiser, an annual gifts/alumni person, an accounting/donor tracking person, an administrative assistant. Budget total would be about $400,000 per year. It will take about two years for the foundation to break even. At the end of four-five years the college can expect to raise an average $2,000,000 annually. For each additional staff person, the college should raise an additional $750,000.
  o Hire professional staff (not redirection of current employees.) Hiring a fund raising professional with a proven track record from the local community should accelerate the fund raising curve by at least one year.

2. Hiring College Presidents that are expected to fundraise. The CCCs could learn a valuable lesson from the CSUs when they added fundraising to the expectations of College Presidents.

• How can this be achieved?
  At the College or District Level
  o Include fundraising and/or development in Community College Presidents’ vacancy listings.
  o Include specific performance goals for CC Presidents – e.g., within five years – an amount equal to X% (typically that is 5-10%) of the general fund budget will come from development activities. (CSU uses 10%).

Statewide:
  o Advocating with the California Community College Trustees Association;
  o Surveying the CCLC to determine the degree to which fundraising is currently included in Presidents’ vacancy listings, then working to increase that number;
  o Meeting and working with the handful of consultants that CCDs hire when filling Presidential vacancies;
  o Raising the image of the NCCCF (and this issue) by establishing a presence at Community College events and activities attended by Chancellors, Presidents and Trustees
3. Adherence to “best practices”. Otherwise, success and advances on other fronts is undermined.

- **How can this be achieved?** By hiring more and better qualified staff and giving them the tools (training, resources and time) to do the job. The NCCCF can play a leading role here, by carrying out its strategic plan, which calls for the development of “best practices” that can be imparted in writing, at training events, on the web, and via other means. The Network could also establish “resource intervention teams” comprised of the best practitioners in the system. These teams could be available for deployment to CCCFs in need of help. The FCCC can assist here as well, by supporting training and by continuing or expanding its support of the Network.

**Introduction**

This report summarizes the status and fundraising potential of California Community College Foundations (CCCF). It poses the question: how might they become more successful?

This question begs an even more basic one: why does it matter? Why is their work important, and why should it be expanded?

Such questions are not hard to quantify. In 2006, a representative group of 37 CCCFs contributed nearly $31 million to their college campuses. A conservative extrapolating of these figures across all of the state’s community colleges suggests a figure of over $50 million that community colleges received from their foundations (probably closer to $60 million). That support took the form of student scholarships; faculty grants; capital improvements; the purchase of equipment, instructional materials and books; endowment development; and the funding of countless college programs.

While citing such impressive figures certainly has its place, they can fail to capture the very personal, life-transformations experienced by so many individual students. One of them—a recipient of a foundation scholarship—put it this way:

“I am proud to say that I am giving this chapter in my life all that I have. I now have the drive inside me to make it all the way to the end. No matter the outcome, I will keep my head held high because I know that I will succeed in school. This is what life has taught me so far, never to give up on my goals and never to give up on myself.”

Unquestionably, these and similar words are expressed throughout the State by students in the tens of thousands: lives changed by community colleges.

That’s why this work is important.
Methodology

This report addresses seven topics or issues—several of which are overlapping:

1. A survey of current CCCF fundraising;
2. Staffing and budget/cost related to fundraising; Comparisons with other higher education institutions, including CSUs and small private colleges;
3. Cost/Benefit of Investing in New Foundation Staff
4. The “best practices” of CCCFs and other colleges and universities;
5. Role of FCCC in assisting CCC fundraising;
6. The importance and role of the College President.

It became clear in compiling and processing the data for this report that simply covering each of the seven topics above in strict sequence was inadequate in effectively conveying the ideas, recommendations and conclusions. Hence, there is overlap of several of the topics, and several themes emerge in multiple places in this report.

1. Survey of Current Fundraising

Not surprisingly, fundraising efforts and successes of California Community College’s cover an enormous spectrum. A recent survey conducted by the NCCCF of 37 California Community Colleges, over one in three in the State, dramatically reveals this range. Note the span in these select but crucially important areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$26.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to College</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$7.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fund</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range represented by these figures is only further reinforced when the number of examples is expanded beyond the single highest and lowest foundation in each category. For example: An equal number of Foundations—six—boast over $15 million in assets as have less than $1 million; in annual revenue, the same number—eight—achieved in excess of $2 million as reported less than $500,000. Endowment figures are even more contrasting: Three
foundations maintain endowments of over $10 million—the same number that report a value under $100,000; the top six endowments, meanwhile, all exceed $7.5 million, while the bottom six all fall under $300,000. Contribution to the college is similarly disparate: six foundations provide over $1.5 in annual support, and six contribute under $100,000.

2. Staffing and Budget or Cost related to Fundraising: the Experiences of California Community Colleges and other Institutions of Higher Education

Turning from categories atop of the ledger sheet to the bottom—specifically, costs—a correlation (not surprisingly) is found between foundation successes and the money it spends—or better, invests—in staffing.

Eight CCCFs constitute those cited above as the most successful, according to the indices used. Their average staff size is almost 5 people (4.75). Compare this to the average staff size of less than 2 people (1.875) for the sixteen foundations with the lowest results used in the above comparisons.

Logic tells us the same thing that the data does: that the greater the number of staff that works at raising funds, the greater the amount of funds that are raised.

The experience of other higher education institutions underscores this correlation between money spent and money raised even more dramatically. Think of it as a cost/benefit analysis (figures are from 2004):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Fundraising Expenses (Cost)</th>
<th>Funds Raised (Benefits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Stanislaus</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOP (Pacific)</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>$21 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern in universities is found when the staff size is used as the indicators rather than total fundraising expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Fundraising Staff</th>
<th>Funds Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Stanislaus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same dynamic is found if one looks at the same institution over time, i.e., CSU Fullerton went from a staff of 16 who raised about $1 million in the early nineties to a staff of 42 that raised $12 million by 1998.
Of course, more staff and a larger operation/infrastructure create the additional benefit of an economy of scale. For example, in the above comparison San Diego State has 12 times as many people as its sister campus in Stanislaus while raising 17 times as much money.

The main point here is a simple one: more people means more money raised.

There’s an old fundraising adage that says, “The problem in fundraising isn’t getting people to give; it’s getting people to ask.” That said, the problem in raising more money lies in is getting more people to ask.

3. Cost/Benefits of Investment in New Foundation Staff

Perhaps the next logical question is, how much must one invest in Foundation staff, to get what return, over what period of time? The following answer to that question is asked on The Magellan Group’s Modesto study (see “Planning for Growth, Rickner, December, 2004), the NCCCF 2004 Survey, the NCCCF APG 2007 study, and discussions by the Board of the NCCCF Members who represent about 20 Community Colleges.

As we have indicated there are four fundamental functions which must be staffed if you want to develop a vigorous foundation. An initial staff might be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Director/Fundraiser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual/Alum/Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Asst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acct./Donor Tracking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Executive Director/Fundraiser would provide overall leadership for the Foundation and concentrate his/her time on developing major gifts.
- The Annual/Alum/Event person would provide leadership for all operations of the Foundation, conduct the annual campaigns, develop the alumni program, and manage any events. In short, this person would be a managerial level person who would absorb all the day-to-day operations and problems, provide operational support to the Board, and manage the staff, which will free the Executive Director/Fundraiser to spend 80 to 90 percent of her/his time outside the office meeting with donors and prospects.
- The Administrative Assistant would provide general operational support to the two managers.
- The Accounting/Donor Tracking person would provide accounting for all gifts and assets and manage the donor tracking. This position could be ½ time for about two years or until the volume of gifts, reports and donors to track grows to a full time capacity.

The investment in such a staff might be as follows:
Two managers, about $250,000, total.
One Administrative Assistant and one Accounting/Donor Tracking person, about $150,000, total.

Income over the first 5 years might be as follows:
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Figure 1, Courtesy The Magellan Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this graph illustrates, costs will exceed benefits for at least the first three years, possibly as many as five years, in our judgment, depending on your local conditions and the talent and motivation of your Foundation staff and the dedication and investment in time by the college President. Several colleges provide examples to show that growth may be even faster.
Staff costs are in millions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Yr.</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>Staff Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope V.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that none of these three began the 5 years with a full compliment of 4 staff members. The average was 2 ½ staff.

Your results should be exponentially better if you invest in a staff of 4. Here are our conservative projections going out ten years for a small staff of about two, a medium staff of about 4 and a larger staff of about 8.

These projections are based on our findings that income per Foundation staff member increases dramatically as you add staff. Here are our findings based on the NCCCF 2004 Survey of nearly all CC Foundations in the state. The first column shows the average productivity per staff member in the top ten, highest income producing foundations. The second number shows the productivity in thousands of dollars for the 5 median income producing foundations. The last column shows the income per staff for the lowest five income producing foundations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Productivity</th>
<th>Median Productivity</th>
<th>Low Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that we are starting from zero income in the first year and grow to break-even in the third year, as we showed above, here is what the cost benefits
will be for 10 years. For simplicity we figure all staff costs averaging $100,000 per staff member. Thus, for a staff of two the cost is $200,000 per year multiplied by ten years, or two million dollars. We assume that costs and benefits will be equal after three years, so the two staffers will have raised about $600,000 in the first three years. Then, we use the average of the “Low Five,” see above, of $185,000 per staff for the remaining 7 years, to arrive at the total of $3,190,000 of benefit for the ten years. We have calculated similarly for the staffs of 4 and of 6, using the “Median Productivity” number of $415,000 per staff per year and $750,000 per staff per year to calculate their benefit to the foundation.

As the graph shows, an investment in staff will be repaid within 3 to 5 years, and increases exponentially as you add staff. The reason for the exponential increase is that as more staff is added there are more people added who can spend their entire effort on developing donors and little to no time on the operations of the foundation.

4. Best Practices of CCCs and other Institutions of Higher Education

A peculiar thing happened to CSUs from 1994 and 2002. During this eight year period they increased fundraising 236% (from $109 million to $257 million).

A not so peculiar thing happened to CCCs during a comparable period (the seven years, 1996 – 2003). Fundraising increased 10%.

The difference? Two things, both of which lead us directly to the subject of best practices:
What CSU did first was to make a commitment to **raise from private donations an amount equal to 10% of their operations funds**. Of course, **increased financial and staffing** support put teeth into the commitment.

Second, and no less important, **this fundraising expectation was added to College Presidents’ performance standards** (suggesting adherence to the maxim that *the things that get measured get done*).

The results speak for themselves. Interestingly, the figure at which the CSUs started out ($109 million) is not much different that the state-wide total raised by California Community Colleges today.

Two University development officers gave virtually the same response when asked what community colleges needed to do to raise more money: UOP’s Jonathon Meer, Vice President of University Advancement, says that *to grow means adding staff*. Dr. Bill Ruud, Vice President of Development and University Relations at CSU Stanislaus could not agree more, stating that *the only way to grow is to add staff*.

Successful colleges, though, share much more in common than an active President and the belief that you have to spend money to make money.

Several **best practices** were consistently cited in interviews recently conducted with over 20 CCCF staff, University staff, and with CCC Presidents and Trustees. In fact, these are “the best” of the **best practices**.

Virtually every respondent identified **relationships with prospects and donors** as essential. Nothing was identified as much or as often. The types of practices cited most often in building close donor relationships included:

- Thanking them quickly, thoughtfully, and often;
- Sending personal notes;
- Sending them notes from students;
- Personally speaking to them on a regular basis;
- Spending personal time with them, i.e., including lunch, coffee or other similar visits;
- Involving them in college/foundation activities and decision-making;
- Getting and keeping them connected with the College President.

Mentioned nearly as often as donor relations was the importance of **stewardship**. Specifically mentioned were:

- Good organization, record keeping and attention to detail;
- Management accountability;
- Written administrative and financial policies, i.e., gift acceptance, investments, etc.
- Job descriptions that are accurate and up to date;
- An annual audit.
As a recent CASE article put it: “it’s all in the details.”

**Involving the college faculty and staff** is critical from two perspectives. First, if faculty and staff have knowledge of the benefits (including directly receiving benefits from the foundation) of a successful foundation, they will turn from suspicion and opposition to support. This will move development and the foundation to the mainstream of campus activities and the faculty and staff can become active participants in development.

**Focusing on larger gifts** was another theme, whether it is through a President’s Circle or other special/major gifts. From a cost/benefit standpoint, this is where the greatest return is found (as opposed, say, to special events).

**A well rounded fundraising program** is also important, including annual support, major gifts and planned giving.

Getting acquainted with and learning from your colleagues is also noteworthy—especially those getting the results that you want! They are successful for a reason.

### 5. Role of FCCC in assisting CCC fundraising

Currently the Foundation for California Community Colleges (FCCC) serves in several roles. First, it provides the main financial support for the statewide organization for the college foundations (Network for the California Community College Foundations – NCCCF). Second, the FCCC President/CEO sits as an ex-officio member of the executive board of NCCCF. A major role played by NCCCF is to provide staff development and training through its symposia and workshops for college foundation staff, board members and college CEOs. Third, the FCCC is initiating a program to facilitate major property gifts to colleges and assist in the administration of those gifts. Fourth, the FCCC has developed a Community College Alumni Network which will assist college in identifying and contacting their alumni as well as maintaining a centralized electronic database as a shared cost resource for participating foundations.

### 6. The importance and role of the College President

**The leadership and active participation of the College President** was already cited as a necessary ingredient for success. Given its importance, though, its worth reiterating. CASE certainly thinks it’s important. They call the Community College President the “chief development officer,” not surprising given the President’s prestige, influence, and leadership role at the college and in the community.

Of course, one of the biggest obstacles to this in Community Colleges is that fundraising experience is neither something included in President’s vacancy
listings, or in their performance standards—suggesting that it just isn’t that important. The opposite is true at Universities. Not only is fundraising included in the Presidents’ vacancy listings and performance standards, its emphasis is enormous.

**Conclusion**

California Community College Foundations have one of the most compelling stories to tell in all of higher education. And we are clearly no less capable than our University colleagues of establishing and nurturing close and personal relationships with our stakeholders, be they alumni, faculty (both current and retired), business and civic leaders, or other special friends. Clearly, we are well positioned to raise substantial amounts of money. However, previously we’ve lacked the commitment of funds, personnel and time. Once this commitment to development is made, community colleges will enjoy unparalleled success.
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