FUND DEVELOPMENT AND DONOR RACE: HOW COLORBLINDNESS AND A 'SALES MENTALITY' DELIMITS EXPANDING THE DONOR BASE

By

Johanne Jensen-Ives

Copyright © Johanne Jensen-Ives 2019

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICIES STUDIES AND PRACTICE

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

WITH A MAJOR IN HIGER EDUCATION

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2019

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by ***Johanne Jensen-Ives***, titled ***Fund Development and Donor Race: How Colorblindness and a 'Sales Mentality' Delimits Expanding the Donor Base*** and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_________________________________ Date: 2/28/19
Dr. Gary Rhoades**, **Dissertation Chair

_________________________________ Date: 2/28/19
Dr. Regina Deil- Amen, Dissertation member/special member

_________________________________ Date: 2/28/19
Dr. Nolan Cabrera**, **Dissertation member/special member

_________________________________ Date: 2/28/19
Dr. Amanda Kraus, Dissertation member/special member

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_________________________________ Date: 2/28/19
Dr. Gary Rhoddes
Dissertation Chair
Department Head
Education Policy Studies and Practice
Professor and Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education
College of Education

ACWKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, thank you Jason and Matthew for your love and encouragement to just finish. Thank you to all of my supportive family. Thank you, Karen and Ron, for the times you watched Matthew, when Jason was working, and I needed to write. Thank you Rissy for all the times you asked how my research was going and for helping me prepare for graduate school with math review prior to the GRE. Aunt Eva, thank you for paving a path for me and for always offering your love and reassurance. I love all of you.

To my parents: Mom and Dad, thank you for inspiring my love of learning, for teaching me the value of an education, the power that comes from knowledge, a respect for those who teach others, and the importance of philanthropy and kindness. Mom thank you for all the time you spent listening to me talk about my classes, my research, and my writing. I loved our time together during your class reunion and could not have reached this goal without you.

Thank you to all my friends: Joanna, Sarah, Ashley, and Mary Francis, who offered to proof read, transcribe, and who always acted interested and engaged when I talked about my research. Amanda and Jenny thank you for answering so many questions about EVERYTHING. I am lucky to have such amazingly brilliant friends in my life to share ideas, laughs, and life with.

To my advisor, Dr. Gary Rhoades, your faith in my writing, critical thinking, and unwavering support mean more to me than I can express.

To my committee, Dr. Nolan Cabrera, your scholarship and instruction is what inspired me to want to move forward with a focus on Whiteness and race for this research. Thank you for challenging me and supporting my journey with this scholarship and important work. Dr. Regina Deil-Amen and Dr. Amanda Kraus, thank you for your guidance, new ideas, and important perspective. Thank you to my committee: Gary, Nolan, Regina and Amanda, it has been a privilege to learn from each of you and I am so grateful to each of you for being a part of my committee and making this research better, and more relevant, by sharing your perspectives and feedback.

To my classmates, comps study buddies, writing group, and more: Rebecca, Janette, Carmin, Laurel, and Devon. Thank you for the offers to read drafts of findings, for the comps study support, lunches to talk about our proposal defenses, and for helping me reach this point.

To my colleagues and past supervisors, Dr. Carol Thompson, Dr. Keith Humphrey, and Kathy Adams-Riester. Thank you for the tips, forwarded articles, constant encouragement and checking-in on my research. You each played a key part in me reaching this point.

To the participants who took the time to take part in interviews and share your stories, thank you. This research would not have been possible without you.

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my grandpa, Maurice Sanchez. Thank you for all you taught me in our short time together and for the legacy you left for our family. Your service to others, and commitment to hard work is what broke barriers for me, your family, and so many others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study examined the practices used by higher education development professionals and institutions to better understand how a donor's race is considered as part of the fundraising process. It employed a Critical Race Theory (CRT) framework (Delgado, 2001) designed to combine the scholarship on fund development and race. The central frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) were key organizing concepts for the analysis of findings in this study. Additionally, this research used concepts of White savior ideology (Cammarota, 2011) and poverty porn (Collin, 2009) to interpret the messages and language used in the higher education development field. To provide context for this study, the concept of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) is engaged relative to the pressure higher education development professionals may experience connected to their fundraising efforts. This study employed several qualitative methods for gathering data which consisted of interviews, document analysis, and observation. Findings revealed that development officers utilized a colorblind approach or a one size fits all method for their fundraising, which maps on to several of the four central frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla- Silva, 2006). The findings from this study also suggest that the growing 'sales mentality' and pressure to generate more revenue for big campaigns is fueling a development environment where fundraisers are being conditioned to desire a donor who is White and familiar with the philanthropic process; therefore not taking up too much of their time. Institutional, practical, and research-oriented recommendations and implications are presented to inform the work of higher education advancement professionals. This research contributes to the scholarship in CRT, but also provides new empirical based scholarship on a topic that was previously unexplored between higher education fundraising and race.

CHAPTER 1:
NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

At the early stage of forming my research questions for this study, and narrowing the purpose of this study to one that was realistic for a dissertation, I simultaneously had the opportunity to attend a professional conference geared towards higher education fund development efforts. As a new professional in higher education advancement, this was also my first professional conference focused on development and higher education. As I sat in an audience of professionals who were mostly White individuals, I listened to the opening keynote presenter, a well-known researcher in the field of fundraising, who studies race and philanthropy. This scholar, who was a former front-line fundraiser in higher education, shared some important points that resonated both with me, and other members of the audience, regarding how as a development professional he felt that donors were narrowly viewed and often overlooked as generous if they are not White. He very simply explained that this bias may be informed from racism, tradition, or fueled by faulty statistics, such as when giving data are pulled and statistics are run to demonstrate what subsets of the population are making the most donations. These data and statistics are often generated from tax history (i.e. philanthropic tax deductions), which is very misleading, because many Black donors, who give to their churches may not be recording this when filing taxes because they have been taught they should not receive any "benefit" from tithing. This example of how the narrowing of the donor base plays out and must be recognized and corrected appeared to be eye opening for many of the fund development professionals in the room. In fact, one audience member, during the Q&A portion of the keynote, specifically recognized and thanked the presenter for being the first person she had ever heard speak so publicly and directly about this problem.

Reflecting on my experience thus far as a practitioner in development, and what I have started to learn as a researcher, I realized that many of the tactics we use in development are informed from stereotypes and colorblind practices. Recognition of these practices is likely the first step in working to address them. My aim, through this study, was to explore if and how color-blind racism may be embedded in development practices, as well as to understand the influence of academic capitalism on fundraising efforts. Specifically, I was focused on understanding how current practices may limit the higher education advancement field's ability to develop and expand their donor base and to suggest how it could become more inclusive, precisely in terms of who is being viewed as a donor by higher education institutions. Retention and expansion of donors is a key problem for higher education, as only a small percentage of first time donors are retained by non-profit institutions (Burke, 2003). This retention challenge, coupled with the decreasing support in public funding for higher education (Heller, 2001), emphasizes the importance for foundations to consider who is being overlooked as donors, especially when private giving is becoming a significant portion of higher education's funding model.

Private giving has been on the rise since the economic downturn of 2009. In fact, 2017 was a record-setting year for college and university fundraising. According to the Council for Aid to Education's (CAE) annual report, charitable contributions to higher education institutions in the United States increased 6.3 percent, resulting in a record 43.6 billion dollars raised, which is the highest recorded giving level since the implementation of the CAE survey in 1957 (Council for the Aid to Education, 2015; Osili & Zarins, 2018). According to the 2017 Giving

USA annual report, the longest running and most comprehensive report on philanthropy in the U.S., a total of $410.02 billion dollars were donated in 2017, which is a 5.2 % increase in charitable giving over the previous year (IUPUI Lilly School of Philanthropy, 2018). 14% of donations in 2017 were directed towards education, placing giving to education as the second highest giving area. Religiously affiliated organizations were first with 31% of gifts (Osili & Zarins, 2018). Personal giving by alumni appeared to be the driving force for this increase in giving to higher education in 2017. Alumni donations increased by 14.5% to $11.37 billion and non-alumni gifts increased as well (Seltzer, 2018.)

Private giving to higher education is one way that individuals are helping to alleviate the decrease in resources, especially for public education. This has rapidly become more important as the last five years have seen significant decreases in state support for public education. Major shifts have occurred in public funding for higher education due to shrinking state budgets and declining allocations for education. This has caused many institutions to raise their tuition (Heller, 2001) and to look to the private sector to increase revenue, with one form of that focused on increasing revenues from philanthropic contributions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

As public institutions struggle to maintain their status, as purveyors of knowledge and research, while also providing access to students, an increased understanding of development practices employed to generate private giving to higher education is important. One barrier that may exist for development professionals realizing the institution's full potential in generating such revenues is the current practice of drawing from the same homogenous prospect pool and donor population. In his book, Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors, Noah Drezner (2013) explains that as universities move from one campaign into the next capital campaign, institutional advancement efforts must be considering who they will engage for major gifts and their next big leadership gift to the campaign. Drezner's (2013) book is compiled to help development professionals think about donors more broadly than the traditionally sought after White man, but to consider racial minorities, LGBTQ philanthropy, women, young alumni, and faculty. Drezner's book is a compilation of the majority of scholarly research regarding diverse donor groups and implications for the profession based on the existing studies. The scholars' findings all indicate that a one size fits all approach to development is not successful or evidence based. Also impacting a need to think more strategically about who donors to higher education are, is a change in the student population, and then therefore the alumni and parent population.

The increasing diversity in the student, alumni, and parent base contributes to the increasingly diverse prospective donor base. Thus, just as the changing prospective student population calls for changes in recruitment and instruction, so, too, do the changes in the prospective donor population calls for changes in fund development philosophies and practices. The racial makeup of the higher education student population and the population of graduates are changing, (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2012) thus influencing the change in who makes up the parent and alumni population. For example, between 1996 and 2008, the percentage of U.S. university alumni with a bachelor's degree increased by ten percent for Asians/Pacific Islanders, by six percent for Blacks, and by four percent for Hispanics and American Indians/Alaska Natives (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2010).

Although White individuals still have greater wealth when compared to people of color, there has been a slight increase in the income level of people of color and more people of color now make up the middle-class. Furthermore, Blacks give 25% more of their disposable income to charity when compared to Whites and the Latino population alone made up $978 billion in spending capacity in 2009 (Drezner, 2013; Humphreys, 2009). Keeping this in mind, Drezner writes that “when we, as practitioners or scholars of philanthropy, operate based on stereotypes, the consequences for our institutions are extraordinary” (p. 9). I believe, like Drezner, that further empirical evidence is essential for shifting development officer practices. More scholarly research in the development profession is needed in order to change the practice of ignoring race or employing the stereotyping of donors.

Statement of the problem

Despite these changes in the student demographics and potential new opportunities, the tactics used by fund development professionals to identify and secure funding continue to be limited by the types of donors who have traditionally been engaged for giving and stereotyped as generous. More specifically, in my limited experience as a development professional, I have found that traditional fund development efforts focus on older, White men as the donors. As a woman, who is a newer professional to the field of fund development, and a long-time annual gift donor, based on what I have experienced, I believe that I am being socialized into this field to view women and people of color as less likely to be generous and/or less capable of making a major gift. For example, during my first year working as a front-line fundraiser, I was encouraged to participate in a new professionals’ track that consisted of monthly meetings on development related topics or competencies. At one of these monthly sessions, the topic was focused on stewardship of donors. The lead development officer for his college, who was presenting the workshop, shared examples of donor stewardship from his college. One of the examples he shared stuck with me, not because of the stewardship event, but because of his description. He said, “We had a fabulous dinner event in our new college lobby for all of the donors and their wives who supported our campaign." Not only was I struck by how the description of this event so obviously characterized all of the donors as men, but I also appeared to be the only individual in the presentation who was surprised by this statement or noticed. This dated/antiquated viewpoint is reflective of the first alumni of U.S. colleges and universities who were primarily White men; however the trends in who makes up today's student body have shifted and therefore the practices of prioritizing the retired, White, male alumnus, needs to shift as well.

Recent research and data shows us that women are attending college at a higher rate than men and becoming more involved with philanthropy (Kaiser & Dolan, 2013). "The Pew Research Center analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data shows that females outpace males in college enrollment, especially among Hispanics and blacks" (Lopez & Gonzales-Barrera, 2014, p.1). A failure to acknowledge this shift and update development practices is not only reflective of racial stereotypes but also may be perpetuating them by ignoring donors of color; thus possibly hindering the goal of expanding the donor base to higher education and thereby leaving people of color with wealth overlooked and uninterested in engaging with their alma mater. Additionally, as development practices from the past may have disregarded donors of color the result is that we have fewer scholarships, spaces, and buildings named for people of color.

This study explored the philosophies and strategies used by professionals in higher education fund development and focused on how professionals consider donor race, as well as how higher education institutions frame their giving campaigns. As a current fund development officer, at an institution with a goal of doubling fundraising over the next five years, I believe that expanding the donor base beyond the traditional White, retired, male is essential to increase giving and ultimately meet the goal of doubling fundraising. Current development practices selectively attract a relatively homogenous pool of donors and signal to donors of color that institutions do not want or need their money. Through my research, I have learned that most development professionals do not research donor race, have no idea it is exists in their database, nor are they encouraged to update their donor database to record this information. I believe that by not making it a priority to learn this about our donors and track it, we are either signaling that your race it not important to us or that we assume all ideal donors are White, so why even bother considering race? Each of these philosophies are problematic and should be characterized as colorblind. In order to adjust the colorblind practices of fund development in higher education, we must understand more about how institutions and development professionals think about their approach to fundraising and what they feel their institution prioritizes and uses to measure their success.

Purpose of the study

Through examining the intersection of race and fund development, this study attempted to discover in what ways advancement practices of higher education institutions may be perpetuating a colorblind approach and to explore in what ways it may push against colorblindness. This research focused to identify and distinguish if the strategies and philosophies employed in the fundraising process are held by the individual fund development professionals, or if these practices and assumptions are more institutionalized and indicative of the embedded racism and inequities that are found in many organizations (Acker, 2006). Relying on such a narrow pool of donors is not only problematic and potentially racist and sexist but there are practical and fiscal ramifications as higher education institutions are obviously neglecting a large and important sector of potential donors. This research also explored the connection, if any, between White savior ideologies and the tactics of the development profession. For example, understanding the way programs are framed or marketed by the development professionals and institutions and learning more about the proposal and marketing strategies used to solicit gifts for initiatives that traditionally benefit more students of color than White students can provide valuable information. Understanding these practices can help to illuminate how, and if, the use of racial stereotyping and development efforts intersect and if they do, at whose benefit and whose detriment. Finally, this study also focused on learning what influence the movement to the market for higher education (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) has had on development practices, and what, if any connection this has for how race is considered in the fundraising process. In chapter two, I discuss the theoretical framework for this study. In my framework, and through the application of the central frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), informed by the concept of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), I used a lens that adds race to what we currently know from the literature on fundraising and marketing. Empirically this relationship has not been studied and is explored in this research study.

Research questions and methodology

The study has three key research questions.

1) Does a color-blind ideology exist and inform the strategies used by higher education development professionals and higher education advancement organizations?

   1a. Do fund development professionals explain practices that can be understood as racial stereotyping or profiling through naturalization when asked to describe their approach in qualifying a prospect, and viewing them as a major-gift prospect, or a non-donor?

   1b. What role, if any, do fund development professionals think the donor's race has on their approach or the assumptions they use to explore a donor's interest in giving to a particular program?

2) Do the approaches, targeted campaign priorities, and strategies that characterize the advancement profession of higher education institutions reflect a White savior ideology, or express racial stereotypes?

3) Do development officers experience an increased pressure to generate revenue, and if so, what impact does that have on the practices used by development officers?

These research questions were designed with the goal to provide more empirical based support for understanding how the fundraising profession approaches donor race and to provide recommendations and implications for the higher education development profession that will aid the practitioners in expanding their donor base and ultimately raising more money.

This study used as multi-site case study research design and several qualitative methodological approaches for gathering data. One of the key characteristics of qualitative research, as explained by Maxwell (2013), is that it allows the researcher to better understand the lived experiences and perspectives of those participating in the study. Since discussions of race/racism can be sensitive and emotional, this provides an important rationale for using a qualitative approach for this analysis. A combination of in-depth interviewing, along with document analysis, and observation were used as data for this study. Interviews with development professionals, field notes taken during observations of foundation leadership team meetings and workshops, and institutional sites' campaign/foundation websites, videos, and printed development collateral were studied.

Three research sites were selected for this case study and a total of 16 fund development professionals were interviewed. Each research site is a large public university located in the southwestern United States. Each of the selected sites were chosen to reflect a slight variation in the racial demographics of the student population and therefore alumni population. The universities are located in three different states, three different metropolitan areas, and are racially distinctive in their student populations.

Interviews were conducted with 16 individuals. Two of the 16 individuals were participants in the pilot study and were not current development officers at any of the three sites selected for the study. 11 of the 16 participants identified as White on their pre-interview questionnaire, four of the participants identified as non-White, and one participant wrote in the open-ended question field that her race was “human.” All but one of the professionals had been working in development for more than five years and almost all of the participants had been working in higher education development for more than five years. The majority of participants had been working in the profession between 5- 10 years and had experience closing multiple major-gifts of $25,000 or more during their career. All participants, with the exception of one participant from the pilot study, were interviewed in person. Each interview was transcribed and analyzed. The interview transcripts, along with the documents gathered for document analysis, foundation websites, and field notes were all coded allowing for several major themes to emerge. The most prominent themes were selected to be discussed as findings.

Significance of the study

This study contributes to both the development profession and to the literature in several ways. First, this study adds to the pragmatic knowledge in an under-researched area for which I was able to develop new understandings of fund development practices by looking at how they may overlap with racial stereotyping, and explain why these findings are important to help aid the effort to increase the donor base for higher education. This study contributes by adding to the limited amount of existing empirical evidence for the fund development field and it also enhances the scholarly literature that exists around color-blind racism. My study is distinctive, in that at the time of my research, it was the only study of higher education development practices to use the central frames of color-blind racism and concepts from Critical Race Theory and Whiteness studies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006, Leonardo, 2009) as a tool to help understand the perpetuation of White privilege. My study provides new perspectives to analyze and understand the relevance of race in higher education philanthropy. The findings and their implications for the profession are also significant because they offer evidence of colorblind practices in development that reflect a cookie cutter approach to working with all donors. The recommendations, based on the findings from this study and key insights from higher education advancement professionals, provide a framework for implementing a focused and strategic approach to development that can be undertaken by institutions that want to push against using savior ideologies and grow their non-White donor base. Thus, the study findings may be used to inform the creation of innovative and effective strategies designed to aid universities in their engagement and solicitation of non-White donors, as well as strategies for cultivating a fund development professional culture that embraces and understands the importance of recognizing racial and cultural difference among individuals.

Organization of the dissertation

In chapter two I share several recent studies and data related to race and development and donor giving models and theories. I provide an overview of the theoretical framework used to guide this study. I outline the four central frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), discuss Critical Race Theory studies and frameworks in conjunction with White Savior syndrome (Cammarota, 2011) and critical media literacy. Last, I provide more context for higher education development practices and the rise of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In chapter three, I discuss the research design and methodology used for this study, as well as the research sites and participants. Chapter three provides more detail on the participants, the three types of data gathered, such as the documents used for document analysis. I share the methods for data analysis used, such as first and second cycle coding, and discusses the limitations and validity of the study. Consequently, the findings are organized into two separate chapters organized by research questions. Chapter four is focused on the major themes and findings which connect to research question one and two. Chapter five discusses the major themes in relationship to research question three. Last, chapter six summarizes all findings and I make recommendations for practice, policy, and further research, while also discussing the implications of this study for practice and policy. I provide recommendations with the goal that the fund development profession will shift their strategies for working with donors of color.

CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This review of the literature provides information about the giving patterns of donors by race in order to help situate my problem, it sets the context for the development practices in higher education philanthropy, and it includes my conceptual framework. Recently, some scholars, have undertaken small steps toward identifying differences in donors by learning more about the nuances of giving by race, but the existing knowledge base does not fully address how race or racism may be operating in fundraising currently, including very few studies of donor motivation which involved an analysis of race (Drezner & Huehls, 2015).

Philanthropic giving

According to the 2017 Giving USA annual report a total of $410.02 billion was donated in 2017, which is a 5.2 % increase in charitable giving over the previous year (IUPUI Lilly School of Philanthropy, 2018). 2017 was also a record-setting year for college and university fundraising. The Council for Aid to Education’s (CAE) reported, charitable contributions to higher education institutions in the United States increased 6.3 percent in 2017, resulting in a record 43.6 billion dollars raised, which is the highest recorded giving level since the implementation of the CAE survey in 1957 (Council for the Aid to Education, 2015; Osili & Zarins, 2018).

The outlook ahead for 2018 is unclear as there were some big changes in federal tax reform, which will likely impact colleges and universities on several levels. One major change is an increase in the standard charitable deduction, which may cause fewer households to itemize their tax return, the change also eliminated a tax provision allowing donors to deduct 80% of the value of contributions toward preferred seating at athletic events (Seltzer, 2018). These changes, among others for donors, make it even more important for higher education advancement professionals to understand the variances between donors when race is considered, and different motivations for donor giving.

Donor identity

Understanding the differences in donors based on racial identity and encouraging advancement offices to examine their own practices relative to culturally sensitive engagement and solicitation strategies has recently started to garner the support of researchers (Drezner, 2013). Studies of the philanthropy of African Americans (Gasman & Sedgwick 2005, 2011; Drezner, 2008), Latino(a) (Diaz, 1999; Ramos, 1999; Cabrales, 2011) and Chinese Americans (Tsunoda, 2013) are helping to inform these strategies, but this research is still limited and often not specific to higher education. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2012) in its report of Cultures of Giving found that

> identity-based philanthropy is a growing movement to democratize philanthropy from the grassroots up by activating and organizing its practice in marginalized communities, particularly communities of color. Simply described, it is the practice of raising and leveraging resources by and from a community on its own behalf, where "community" is defined not by geography but by race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation (p. 2).

Identity-based philanthropy has the potential to transform practices in higher education advancement, but more research is needed to understand how the practices of development professionals intersect with race, as almost all of the theories related to donor motivation have looked at the giving of wealthy White men.

A recent study, known as the National Alumni Giving Experiment (NAGE), led by Dr. Noah Drezner (2018), found that when a prospective donor received a solicitation with a student depicted, who mirrored as least one marginalized identity for the donor, that it increased the perceived importance of the cause and the likelihood of the donor increasing the size of their gift from their prior donation. Based on the findings from the NAGE, Drezner (2018) argues “that by using relationship marketing techniques coupled with identity-based philanthropy strategies, universities can build more responsive and larger alumni donor bases” (p. 183). These findings clearly speak to the need for fundraisers to develop more culturally aware and sensitive solicitation approaches, in order to develop meaningful relationships with alumni of color (Drezner, 2018).

In a review of literature on Latino philanthropy (Center on Philanthropy & Civil Society, 2003) the general characteristics of Latino philanthropy are summarized along with the findings of several scholars regarding how Latinos/as exhibit giving in the community. Overall, the findings suggest that a personal connection, and familial feeling or network are important in decision making for Latinas/os when identifying causes to support. Therefore, Rivas-Vázquez (1999) argues that many nonprofits and higher education institutions are dismissive of this cultural distinction and have failed to consider how Latina/o alumni giving has a different expression than White alumni. This same lack of attention to cultural difference appears to hold true when Native American philanthropic practices are studied.

According to Barry (1999), Native American giving is not about power where the giver is presenting a gift to the recipient with an expectation of gratitude, but rather, in Native communities, gifts are spiritual and based on “an extension of honor to the generations to come and to other kin or clan members. Giving symbolizes an expression of interest in the larger world" (p.44). This is a distinction from more Euro-American or Anglo philanthropic systems which are more hierarchical and typically described as "a relatively small number of White families and individuals who enjoyed access to education, owned major businesses, held leadership positions in government, dominated professions and inherited wealth" (Council on Foundations, 1999, p.7).

As the research on identity-based philanthropy is slowly growing, so is the research on other traditionally underrepresented donor groups such as women and LGBT donors (Garvey & Drezner, 2012). As the patterns of female donors are emerging, this may shift the focus from assuming men are the more wealthy and generous donors. A recent study done at the Lily school of philanthropy (The Nonprofit Times, 2015) found that "divorced/separated, never-married, and widowed women are more likely to give, and give higher amounts than their male counterparts, and among most men overall, that as women's income rises, they become more likely to give to charity than their male counterparts; and that Millennial, Boomer and older (Silent/Great generation) women are more likely to give in general" (p.1). These findings indicate that past gender barriers and stereotypes of women not serving as the decision makers in their household, and unequal wage earners need to be broken.

"According to Webber-Thrush (2008), fundraising professionals in education need to focus on women as givers. Many women who were first generation law and business school students are now in a position where they are able to give to education and they tend to give in large numbers. In fact, for many women education is their preferred cause to give" (Kaiser & Dolan, p. 63). Paying attention to this potential is increasingly becoming more obvious based on women's wealth and it is predicted that as the intergenerational wealth transfer occurs women will control a greater percentage of the wealth as it is transferred between generations in the next 50 years (Webber-Thrush, 2008).

Racial demographics

Similarly, the distribution of wealth and giving in the United States has also been transforming slightly away from past racial patterns and federal income-tax records indicate that Black and Hispanic homeowners often give a higher proportion of their incomes to charity than do White homeowners. As people of color are becoming wealthier they can sustain increased philanthropic support to university programs (Anft, 2002; Cabrales, 2011). Although the bulk of wealth is still held by the White majority, it has been stated in recent years that this is starting to shift (Drezner, 2013). A recent CNN Money article accurately explains that because wealth or net worth is intergenerational and accumulated, the likelihood of America's racial wealth divide ever being completely eliminated is unlikely. This is predominately a result of historical forms of racism that have put communities of color at a disadvantage in terms of access to housing and has resulted in an overall smaller transfer of wealth (Vega, 2016). The institutional racism and long standing systems of oppression that were established to maintain White dominance and wealth has continued to impact communities of color and likely influence the stereotype that people of color are less generous than the majority (Drezner, 2013). This inequity of wealth distribution should not be discounted, but as one is thinking strategically about prospective donors and the expansion of the donor base, the distribution of wealth must be discussed in relationship to the rapidly growing rate of the non-White U.S. population and the number of students of color accessing higher education.

Recent population projections from the U.S. Census Bureau predict that by 2044 more than half of all Americans will identify with a minority group, specifically, any group other than non-Hispanic White alone; and by 2060, almost one in five of the United States' total population is estimated to be foreign born (Colby and Ortman, 2015). In the 2016 College Board *Trends in Education* report racial demographics for college enrollment has been shifting greatly since 2000. College enrollment among Hispanic students increased from 48% to 58% in 2005 and to 65% in 2015 (The College Board, 2016). Also, of significance to note is that college enrollment rates for Asians is higher than for other racial/ethnic groups. "In fall 2015, 85% of Asians enrolled in college within a year of graduating from high school" (The College Board, 2016, p. 11). With the exception of students who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native, enrollment in degree granting post-secondary education institutions is projected to increase for all non-White students between 2014 and 2025 (Hussar & Bailey, 2017). The National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2017 predicts that there will only be a three percent increase in enrollment for students who are White, while post-secondary degree granting institutions between 2014 and 2025 will likely see an increase of 22% enrollment for students who are Black, a 32% increase for students who are Hispanic, a 16% increase for students who are Asian/Pacific Islander and a 37% increase for students who identify as two or more races (Hussar & Bailey, 2017). These statistics clearly demonstrate that the majority of students accessing higher education in the next 5 to 8 years will be non-White and this translates directly to the alumni base for colleges and universities.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical perspective I am using to guide both the conceptual framework, and research questions for this study is from Critical Race Theory (CRT). Critical Race Theory gives grounds for the analysis of how racism manifests and is embedded within systems and institutions. For example, race was, and continues to be, fundamentally woven into the education process so that as educational institutions and curricula were constructed historically, and politically, they maintain White domination and privilege. Using CRT, racism is examined by looking at the intersection of race and class and race and economics (Delgado, 2001). “Unlike some academic disciplines, critical race theory contains an activist dimension. It not only tries to understand our social situation, but to change it; it sets out not only to ascertain how society organizes itself along racial lines and hierarchies, but to transform it for the better” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2006, p. 1). Additionally, “CRT argues that race and racism continue to be central organizing concepts in society, providing a lens to see how subtle messages centering on race, inclusions, and exclusion may be at play” (Park, 2012, p. 4), which can easily be applied in the fundraising profession.

In order to explore and analyze the professional practices development officers employ, I will be using Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s (2006) central frames of color-blind racism. Born out of/an extension of Critical Race Theory and Sociology, the concept of color-blind racism has emerged as the new race talk of Whites and is often used to defend and justify racial practices (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011). However, this race talk is not only used by White individuals; it can even be adopted by persons of color. “Theoretically, color-blind racism is not regarded as “prejudice” grounded in individual-level or affective dispositions but rather as the collective expression of whites’ racial dominance” (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011, p. 192). Bonilla-Silva (2011) casts this ideology as a mechanism for maintaining social dominance (White privilege); therefore because Whiteness is so embedded within higher education, color-blind racism holds as an ideology even if the makeup of the institution is more diverse than White men.

Zeus Leonardo (2009) in his book *Race, Whiteness and Education* describes Whiteness as both racial in some elements, but not in others, and as a complete ideology devoted to perpetuating a benefit to White individuals. Whiteness can morph based on the context and history but its focus is to maintain White power. Leonardo (2009) explains that a central component of Whiteness is color-blindness and the denying of racism through the argument that we live in a post racial society. Although I am uncertain if the majority of fund development professionals are White, I still believe this application of color-blind racism can apply as a core framework for this study, due to the fact that the majority of senior leadership within higher education are White individuals and most higher education institutions still exist within frames of Whiteness ideologies (i.e. the maintenance of White privilege and domination).

Other scholars, who have studied ally development, race talk, and Whiteness (Cabrera, 2012; Linder, 2015) have applied concepts of CRT and color-blind racism when studying White ally development or Whiteness on college campuses. They explain that higher education is an ideal environment for disrupting racism (Cabrera, 2012; Linder, 2015). In Cabrera's study of White male undergraduate experiences with race and race conscious policies, four interrelated themes emerged as he sought to better understand how White male students challenged Whiteness. The themes were "racial cognizance, critiquing White privilege, 'work still to be done' and social justice action" (Cabrera, 2012, p. 384). These themes all connected and built upon each other as the student's recognition of their own privilege as White men was the foundation for developing racial awareness, and thus working through Whiteness and ending colorblind practices. One of Cabrera's key findings, which is important for all critical race scholars to take away from this study is how "the narratives of these participants challenge some of the foundational research of Critical Whiteness Studies. In contrast to the visions of Whiteness espoused by Ignatiev (1995, 1997) and Roediger (1994, 2003), the participants demonstrated that Whiteness and racism are not necessarily synonymous" (Cabrera, 2012, p. 397).

Chris Linder (2015), in her research related to White feminist ally identity development, interviewed former women's studies students. She found that the women would avoid talking about race due to the fear of appearing racist and that they also expressed resistance or anger connected to identifying White privilege. This finding is significant because these feelings were emerging for women who are allies and much more conscience about the power and privilege they experience as White women. Linder explains how this cycle must be interrupted because "Inaction rooted in White participants' desire to be liked by People of Color resulted in continued perpetuation of racism and oppression" (Linder, 2015 p. 547). Scholars like Linder and Cabrera, whose research focuses on the lived experiences of White individuals, when discussing race, may be useful to inform this study and my findings.

Academic capitalism

One of the key concepts that may explain the increase in entrepreneurial practices of fund development efforts in higher education is academic capitalism. Academic capitalism, and its impact on higher education, as described by Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) consists of the cumulative actions of groups of actors (faculty, administrators, and even students) intended to attract external revenue for higher education. This movement to the market is motivated by globalization, decreases in state resource allocation, and changes towards a knowledge based economy. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) identify four key examples of how higher education institutions are integrating into the new economy. One of those examples is the creation of interstitial organizations, where universities bring the corporate world into education and universities. This is evidenced in the way each college and university division has their own development officer and development office. These administrators are no longer just located at university foundation offices. This has led to a significant increase in the number of managerial professionals working in fund development/advancement for both public and private two year and four year institutions (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). According to the educational professional association, Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE),

> the primary core disciplines of educational advancement are alumni relations, communications, marketing and fundraising. Advancement professionals work on behalf of educational institutions to: secure private financial support from potential donors committed to the mission of the institution, engage alumni in the life of the institution as volunteers, advocates and supporters, promote or market the institution to prospective students, their parents and others, and communicate about the institution with those who have a stake in its success, including community members, business leaders, government officials, the press and others (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education [CASE], 2016, p.1).

The professional body of development officers, whose primary role is to secure gifts, continues to grow due to the demand for private giving to sustain education. In fact, CASE is one of the world's largest nonprofit educational associations with respect to the size of its membership (CASE, 2016). Also as the demand for advancement professionals grows, so do the pressures and long work hours. There has been a recent rapid turnover in the personnel working in fund development, the average fundraiser is only in their job 16 months (Flandez, 2012), and as this cycling through of professionals is occurring it is not easy to develop deep relationships with donors and to fully understand every program/research project/initiative that you are asked to raise money for, sometimes annually.

Notably connected to academic capitalism is the surge in the number of institutions announcing billion dollar plus fundraising campaigns. In 2017, multiple public flagship research institutions stretching across the United States, from Florida to California, to the mid-west announced they were kicking off multibillion-dollar fundraising campaigns running into 2022 (Seltzer, 2017). Included in this group was the University of Florida which announced the public phase of their campaign to raise 3 billion dollars and the University of North Carolina sharing a goal to raise 4.25 billion dollars (Seltzer, 2017). Interesting to note is that both universities are located in extremely racially diverse states. There are likely multiple factors influencing these campaign announcements some of it may be due to the surging stock market, others argue that universities have become more sophisticated with planning for these campaigns years in advance and some believe that the lofty goals may be spurred by a competitive nature of between institutions (Seltzer, 2017). Perhaps it is a combination of all of these factors and the undeniable reality that higher education institutions have a massive priority list and a shrinking public revenue stream.

Also pushing the success of these campaigns are the advancement professionals working in front-line fundraising. Many higher education development officers describe that they have fundraising goals or metrics associated with their work. In a recent survey of 270 major and planned gift officers the data indicates that the gift officers are concerned about their own effectiveness and if the metrics being used are really measuring success (Lederman, 2017). “The survey suggests that the fund-raisers don’t spend time on the activities they believe are most important, aren’t armed with the most helpful information and are judged more on activity then on success” (Lederman, 2017, p.1). The top metrics that development officers reported being used to judge their productivity are: dollars raised, donor visits and total solicitations; however, many felt that a solicitation success percentage would be more closely tied to their productivity, but only 27% of those survived had this core metric (Lederman, 2017). These results suggest both a strong influence of academic capitalism and a strong need for development operations to re-evaluate their strategies.

Haste within the profession to find more money, and the fundraising metrics most institutions are using to drive productivity may be deterring researchers from devoting time to conduct more research. The current metrics due not encourage professional development and with the constraints on their time, development officers are likely limited in the time available to attend conferences, to read, and to learn about the research that would ground the development field in more empirical practices. Although this is not part of the theory of academic capitalism, it may be connected to the formation of interstitial organizations because when compared to higher education institutions, the corporate world is likely less accustomed to developing practices which are grounded in research.

Color-blind racism

The urgency to generate revenue, and the growing push for higher campaign goals could be influencing the development field to stay focused on only White donors. If this pressure is in fact resulting in a rushed approach to secure gifts, rather than using best practices for development, it may be unintentionally guiding the fund development officers, who are typically operating in predominately White environments, to employ the use of racial stereotyping, rather than slowing down to dig into the data, think strategically about their donors, and get to know more about each prospect and to assess their affinity and likelihood to give.

To explore how academic capitalism may be connected to the development field's vision of what a "good" donor's identity looks like and to make meaning of the experiences involving race, as described by development officers in this study, color-blind racism will be used as another framework (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Color-blind racism is characterized by avoiding racial language and is more abstract and de-contextualized than racism. Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes color-blind racism as “a new powerful ideology that has emerged to defend the contemporary racial order” (p.25). Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) developed four central frames that he uses to distinguish color-blind racism. The four central frames that White individuals use when discussing race, and as a way to justify racial inequality are: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). For the purpose of this study I am going to be primarily focusing on the first three frames.

The first frame, abstract liberalism, is the most important frame to understand because it is what White individuals use to undergird this new racial ideology. It comes from liberal thinking and is focused on individualism and freedom of choice. Abstract liberalism is the idea that we all equally have the same opportunity, which assumes that we exist in a period that everything is equal among all human beings, but this is a false assumption, and therefore one of the components that leads to the color-blind frame. Keeping this frame in mind throughout this study was important because I was seeking to understand if, and then how, race is being discussed by development officers when they think about who their donor prospects are and how they think about what types of programs or scholarships donors will want to donate towards. The second frame, Naturalization, allows Whites to explain away racial phenomena by inferring that they are natural occurrences. Cultural racism, the third frame, uses arguments based on group norms or stereotypes to explain the status of cultural groups (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). The final frame is the minimization of racism. White individuals use these frames in conjunction with each other and most are not overtly racist and obvious, which is why I believe this framework is an ideal way to examine if color-blind ideologies are used by the development profession and how. Color-blind racism may be more difficult to identify through just one research method, which is one reason why the multi-faceted and multi-site case study, qualitative approach, was used for this study.

One way to examine if racial stereotypes are used in development will be through a review and analysis of the marketing materials/media used to inform donors about programs, campaigns, and causes. In my review of these types of materials, I will be drawing on a critical media literacy (Kellner & Share, 2007) perspective, which will inform my analysis of the use of "White savior" ideology.

> Critical media literacy expands the notion of literacy to include different forms of mass communication and popular culture as well as deepens the potential of education to critically analyze relationships between media and audiences, information and power. It involves cultivating skills in analyzing media codes and conventions, abilities to criticize stereotypes, dominant values, and ideologies, and competencies to interpret the multiple meanings and messages generated by media texts. Media literacy helps people to discriminate and evaluate media content, to critically dissect media forms, to investigate media effects and uses, to use media intelligently, and to construct alternative media (Kellner & Share, 2007, p. 4).

While White savior ideology has been widely theorized in critical media literacy and critical media literacy is commonly used in school settings, I plan to explore White savior ideology in the context of higher education.

White savior ideology

The presence of "white savior syndrome" (Cammarota, 2011) is frequently witnessed in Hollywood. Using the lens of critical media literacy (Keller & Share, 2007), allows for a more critical perspective to inform the process and identify when media is using a White character to guide the character of color from their troubled predicament. This storyline may not be as common in higher education, but savior narratives as a framework for fundraising were extremely common historically, especially in fundraising or “charity” for the “disabled” and recently in television hits, such as, through primetime shows like Extreme Makeover Home Edition (Askew, 2011). The White savior ideology is likely impacting donors and development officers, and evidenced in the marketing used during fundraising campaigns or in the language used during fundraising events and scholarship banquets. The White savior syndrome has the tendency to render people of color incapable of helping themselves. They are instead portrayed as:

> infantile or hapless/helpless victims who survive by instinct. People of color supposedly lack the capacity to seek change and thus become perceived as dispossessed of historical agency. Any progress or success tends to result from succor of the white individual, which suggest that escaping poverty or ignorance happens only through the savior’s intelligence (Cammarota, 2012, p. 244).

The perpetuation of this Hollywood narrative is what is often picked up in the mainstream media and unfortunately may be seeping into the narratives used by the development profession in an attempt to create donor motivation for giving and make the use of racial stereotypes productive. This narrative has been repeated in films such as the Blind Side and Freedom Writers demonstrating that only due to the agency of a White savior can poor Black youth become accomplished and educated (Cammarota, 2011). In some cases, this narrative also denies the existence of structural or systemic barriers, and relegates the conversation to that of individual determination.

CRT scholarship argues that in order to combat stereotypes White allies need to assist in advocating an end to the continuation of naturalization and stereotyping. Particularly powerful in framing some giving campaigns and strategies is the impact of the media in presenting a problematic, though familiar, narrative that normalizes the inequities experienced by people of color and encourages the use of White saviors. A familiar television campaign, focused on giving, that uses this tactic is for the charity Save the Children. Save the Children is known for showing images of starving, poor, Black, African children and letting the donor, who in most campaign materials appears to be White and American, "sponsor" a child and receive mailed updates on how "their child" is improving due to their support. Collin, (2009) describes this type of storytelling and imagery as "poverty porn," which is any type of media that is exploitative of people in poverty for the purpose of selling a product, spurring giving or increasing fundraising for a cause. Most often the campaigns invoking this narrative use images depicting extreme hardship, and overwhelmingly represent African people (Collin, 2009).

Higher education philanthropy collateral that is designed to situate students of color as a victim in need of saving or a "charity case," for critical consumers of information, may not have the intended impact of increasing giving, but rather may push some donors away. Conversely, this practice may be incredibly motivating for other donors, which then presents an ethical dilemma related to the use of racial stereotyping, which, ultimately on a broader scale, undermines the agency for students of color who are working to complete their degree on their own merit and should not be exploited for the purpose of raising more money, even if in the end, the additional money will help that student and other students. In fact, as I was beginning this research, I attended a donor appreciation event where I was able to observe this ideology in practice. At a recent donor thank you event, I observed a key leader within the university foundation thank donors who had given to a low-income student scholarship program say that without the support of the donors in the room, the students, sitting at the tables with them, would not be where they are today (i.e. successfully attending college).

An example which illustrates the powerful impact that this dominate narrative can have on how the students, presented as "charity cases," view themselves is found in the summary of findings from an article which examined alumni giving to Gallaudet (Drezner, 2005). Gallaudet University, founded in 1864 as the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, and later renamed after its first president, is the first school for the advanced education of the deaf and hard of hearing and remains the only higher education institution to have curricula and services specifically designed to accommodate deaf and hard of hearing students. In Drezner's (2005) summary of alumni giving he explains that one of the barriers that was identified to be causing the low alumni giving rate was that many Gallaudet University alumni perceived themselves as being the recipients of philanthropy and not the donors. As members of the Deaf community they are 'used to receiving instead of giving' (Drezner, 2005, p. 308), Gallaudet alumni explained. Bearing in mind the personal experiences of alumni who may have been socialized to view themselves as incapable of giving and only capable of receiving philanthropic support will be an important implication to keep in mind when examining the findings for my study as well.

Due to systemic and institutionalized racism, societal norms, and the perpetuation of stereotypes in media, and social media, I propose that development officers likely, even if unconsciously, operationalize the following assumptions in their practice: 1) People of color will give less and are more difficult to work with than their White counterparts, 2) all donors are motivated to give to programs/causes if that cause is promoted using stereotypes that present a savior ideology.

Donor motivation theories

A variety of perspectives can explain why people give. These perspectives differ between public and private good models and how they incorporate psychological and sociological paradigms. Economists who believe philanthropy lies within the public good model believe that donors give from a purely altruistic ideology (Drezner & Huehls, 2015). "Altruism exists when the donor or volunteer disregards his or her own self-interest in order to help others" (Drezner & Huehls, 2015, p. 2). In contrast, a private-good model of donor motivation assumes that the donor has some personal interest or goal in making a gift. Most of the research that has been conducted on donor motivation has aligned with this model. It is rare that donors give with absolutely no agenda. Past scholars who have studied donor motivation theory have found that a combination of pure altruism and private good models influence donors. (Drezner & Huehls, 2015). The various media that donors are given to read or listen to, as cases for support, may influence their enthusiasm for giving, analysis of the media and then its relationship to donor motivation theory (Drezner & Huehls, 2015) can be used as a counter narrative for White savior ideologies. "Justice motivation theory posits that the urge to fix an injustice motivates people to engage in action" (Drezner & Huehls, 2015, p. 9).

In their study about philanthropic giving Warren & Walker (1991) applied justice motivation theory to their analysis of donor giving. They found that when a donor truly believed that their philanthropic support could right a wrong that they would be motivated to help. Although justice motivation theory is not a central portion of my conceptual framework, I believe this theory aligns nicely with critical race theory and White savior ideology because it presents the opposite ideology to "White savior syndrome" and could be considered the counter version of this philosophy. Donors who want to make an impact for students of color, by investing in philanthropy, that they believe will directly benefit underserved students, may very likely be characterized through justice motivation theory. However, if development officers are marketing programs or scholarships that benefit students of color informed by White savior ideology, it is possible that they are undercutting the exact goal that donors who give based on justice motivation theory are working to accomplish, such as ending practices of racial stereotyping.

The various frameworks that I have described above all connect together in a way that lends their use to developing an explanation of the practices at play in higher education fundraising. Academic capitalism sets the stage for a more frantic attempt by universities to get donors, in doing this, donor motivation theories, such as justice motivation theory, would suggest that this practice may be hindering the careful guiding of donors to causes that they are most passionate about and where they will likely give more generously. Additionally, academic capitalism helps to explain why universities are feeling the pressure to bring in more money. It provides a financial context for higher education advancement efforts where they are currently operating at such a frantic pace that donor motivation theory (Drezner & Huehls, 2015), which has been empirically tested and could aid the profession if used in practice, is not always being considered. As development officers are hastily trying to meet their metrics, and help their institution meet their new billion dollar campaign goal, they are not attracting new donors, are ignoring donors of color, but likely believe they are doing the right thing by following this one size fits all approach for everyone. This shortsighted and colorblind behavior may seem more efficient in quickly identifying “ideal” donors (i.e. White men), but it is not going to advance the work or ultimately increase giving. In order to expand the donor base within higher education, scholars researching development practices are acknowledging that there has been a shift in the demographics of students and alumni and are writing more literature expressing the value and opportunity that exists in engaging non-traditional donors (Drezner, 2013). However color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) would suggest that based on the slow movement to attract donors of color, the development profession may be enacting abstract liberalism or cultural racism, holding the conscious or unconscious beliefs that people of color do not make good donors and are incapable of making a transformational gift.

Conclusion

Philanthropic giving patterns, donor motivations, and the practices used to garner charitable contributions is an area with a great amount of information and statistics. Once one begins to narrow the focus to higher education giving, there is less data, but ironically as much or more desire to raise money. Due to facing an increased need for private support of education, the rise in mega campaigns, and influence of academic capitalism on higher education the literature on higher education philanthropy is growing. Consolidating and presenting the literature on these topics, in conjunction with the scholarship on critical race theory and color-blind racism, was one of the challenges of this chapter. This chapter was purposely focused on the emerging research on identity-based philanthropy, critical race theory, White savior ideology and colorblindness. Absent from the literature is any research connecting these concepts. While this chapter could not provide a full review of all existing literature on each of these concepts, it functioned as introduction to the frameworks that were used to guide the research questions and the analysis of findings for this study.

CHAPTER 3:

RESEARCH METHODS

In this chapter, I provide the research questions, discuss the multiple site case study design used, and describe the selection of each of the site locations, as well as of the interview participants. I begin by explaining why a case study research design and qualitative methodology were used. I further explain how my research initiated with some document analysis and two pilot interviews. I used these pilot interviews to further inform my research methods and discuss the adjustments to the interview questions that were made following these pilot interviews. Subsequently, I explain the data collection methods for both my observations and interviews, the analysis techniques and coding methodology used, how I validated my research, and the potential limitations and biases which may have impacted the research.

Research design

This study used a multi-site case study approach for the research design. A case study design is used when researcher selects the case and then frames the questions for the study in relationship to the particular carefully chosen case(s) (Maxwell, 2013). This is different than a sample study which explains the rationale for the sample strategy as a way for gaining representative data; whereas in my research design I selected three specific sites for the case study based on the goals of the study and the racial demographics of those university sites, which is also known as purposeful site selection (Maxwell, 2013).

This study used multiple qualitative data gathering methods for research. One of the key characteristics of qualitative research, as explained by Maxwell (2013), is that it allows the researcher to better understand the lived experiences and perspectives of those participating in the study. The dissertation’s focus on race/racism in university development, which is a sensitive and emotional topic for some/many of the subjects, provides an important rationale for using a qualitative approach in gathering data for the cases. A combination of in-depth interviewing, along with document analysis, and observation was used as data for this study. Interviews with development professionals, field notes taken during observations of foundation leadership team meetings and workshops, and institutional sites' campaign/foundation websites, videos, and printed development collateral were studied.

Research questions

The study has three key research questions.

4) Does a color-blind ideology exist and inform the strategies used by higher education development professionals and higher education advancement organizations?
   1a. Do fund development professionals explain practices that can be understood as racial stereotyping or profiling through naturalization when asked to describe their approach in qualifying a prospect, and viewing them as a major-gift prospect, or a non-donor?

   1b. What role, if any, do fund development professionals think the donor's race has on their approach or the assumptions they use to explore a donor's interest in giving to a particular program?
5) Do the approaches, targeted campaign priorities, and strategies that characterize the advancement profession of higher education institutions reflect a White savior ideology, or express racial stereotypes?

6) Do development officers experience an increased pressure to generate revenue, and if so, what impact does that have on the practices used by development officers?

In order to answer each of these questions, I considered what research design technique and data gathering methods would provide the most relevant data to help answer my research questions. This is the structure that is recommended when initiating a study (Maxwell, 2013). Through this study there were three main types of data gathered to inform these questions: participant interviews, which were highly focused on research questions one and three, field notes taken during observations, which informed all three questions, and document analysis which was very focused on question two. The documents, videos, and websites used for analysis were the most useful in providing the data to answer research question two. Each of the data types, how they were gathered, and how they were analyzed to inform the findings is discussed in further detail in this chapter.

Developing the interview tool

To assist in answering research question one and two, I developed interview questions guided by the work of critical race theorist and qualitative researcher, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006), who explains that relying on interview data is one of the most accurate ways to study color-blind racism. Because racial ideology is produced and reproduced through language and interpersonal communication, the use of surveys or more quantitative instruments are not ideal for examining and understanding color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). For example, when subjects are participating in a survey regarding racial opinions, they will often try to guess the correct answer to avoid appearing racist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Keeping this in mind, several of my interview questions, which were designed to gain an understanding of the participants' racial attitudes and processes for working with donors of color, were adapted from the 1998 Detroit Area Study (DAS), as presented in *Racism without racists: Color-Blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). As part of the DAS, a random sample of survey participants were selected for in-depth interviews. The portion of these interview questions, which focused on gaining insight into the participants' overall views on minorities, were adapted for my study. My other interview questions were created using a format designed to balance building appropriate rapport with the participants, and to also explore participants lived experiences with race, fund development practices, and donor relationships.

This balance of building rapport and probing is important for both research validity and to help participants feel more at ease (Seidman, 2006).

In addition to structuring the interview questions in a format designed to gain rapport and trust with the interview participants, I also created the interview questions by considering each of my research questions and mapping between each research question and the draft interview questions as a way to note how they were connected and to consider how asking the participant to respond to that question would help me to answer my research question. This process allowed me to identify and eliminate any interview questions that were not truly connected to either building rapport with the participants or answering one of my research questions.

One interview question was written as a scenario designed to help me learn more about development officers' instincts and preferences for how they would design messaging for a campaign specifically designed to generate scholarship support for students of color from the local community. This question was adapted for the three sites in order to be specific to the institutional site's location. For example, at one site I asked participants to share how they would try to market a campaign designed to bring more students from the south valley to the university. This location of the city was incorporated into the question because I knew the neighborhood population was a minority-majority population of non-White students. The scenario question was designed to help compliment my analysis of documents related to campaign language and images, which were reviewed as part of this study to help answer research question two.

Another interview question, which I wrote to help gain an understanding of what language preferences and campaign messages development officers' cited as liking best was question seven, which asked the interview participant to reflect during the interview on the development piece that I requested they send me in advance of our interview. Via email, I instructed each participant to please share with me in advance or be prepared to share during the interview a development piece that they found most effective or best at telling a story of impact for a donor. During the interview I wanted to hear directly from the development professional why they choose the media piece they did to share with me. This data was used in conjunction with the analysis of the piece itself to answer my research questions.

The final list of twenty-one questions used for interviews is included as Appendix A.

Piloting the study

Once my study and research methodologies were approved through the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I piloted an initial iteration of my study by interviewing two front-line fundraisers, who I knew from my previous professional role in higher education. I asked these two professionals to participate specifically because they were previously employed as development officers at a large public university. Each of these participants were still working in the non-profit sector and one of the participants was still working as a development officer in higher education. At the time of the pilot study, neither of these professionals were employees at any of the three research sites selected for this study. Because of their perspectives on higher education fundraising, each of these participants were able to provide constructive feedback on the interview questions. One participant shared a valuable piece of information with me regarding diversity initiatives taking place at a very successful, large public university. The diversity initiatives that this participant shared with me gave me an idea for a new interview question that I was able to incorporate into the interview protocol. This adjustment, among others, to my interview questions is discussed below.

The first pilot interview was conducted via phone due to the participants' location. This was helpful in illuminating the limitations of conducting any future interviews by phone vs. skype, or another technology, that would allow me to view the participant while we were speaking. Since the institution sites for this study were locations where I was going to travel in order to conduct my research, I anticipated that I would need to provide a phone or skype interview option to participants, once I began participant recruitment. Therefore, having a pilot interview conducted by phone aided my planning for conducting some interviews remotely.

In order to recruit the two participants for my pilot study, I contacted them via email using a participant recruitment email I had developed that shared the following explanation for the purpose of my study: "*I am conducting a study examining the experiences of fund development professionals in order to learn more about the best practices and strategies that development officers and higher education institutions use to qualify and solicit donors. I am also interested in learning more about how different institutions market and share their capital campaigns with prospective donors.*" I intentionally did not specify that I was researching the practices of development professionals when working with donors of color or prospective donors of color. I chose not to share this in the initial outreach, but it was later indicated in the consent waiver for the study when the prospective participant wrote back to my email outreach that they were willing to speak with me. I also indicated in the initial outreach email that I was a part-time doctoral student and a full-time development officer working in higher education advancement. I chose to share this in the email outreach with the hope that it would provide me with more credibility and gain more responses from prospective participants. The full participant recruitment email can be found in Appendix B.

The two pilot participants both responded that they were available and willing to participate in my study. I sent them both the consent waiver (Appendix C) and also a pre-interview questionnaire, (this can be found as Appendix D). The questionnaire was designed to gather some demographic data about participants, which I did not want to spend time in the interview asking. I also requested that each participant share an updated copy of their resume. This was also to assist me in learning information about their current job responsibilities and time in the profession without having to allocate time during the interview to ask this information. Each of these processes worked well as the protocol I used for the pilot interview and were therefore carried forth into the study after the pilot.

Before each interview, I reviewed the consent waiver with the participants and provided them with a printed copy. I reviewed with them that the interview was being recorded and asked if they had any questions before we began. Once their questions were addressed we began the interview. I took notes on my laptop during the interview on the participants' tone, and for the interview that was conducted in person, I noted times where I observed that the participant was not making eye contact, was smiling, or appeared contemplative or uncomfortable. I did this by making notes next to the interview question regarding the participants' facial expressions or body language. This was not possible to do during the phone interview and was something I noted for the full study that I would try to conduct all remote interviews with skype or another technology that would allow for recording those types of observations.

Upon completion of the pilot interviews, I listened to the interview transcript, and wrote short memos to reflect on the responses and information I received from the participants. I reviewed my typed notes that were taken during the interviews. This review process allowed for reflection on the interview question flow, and helped to illuminate questions that were redundant or not worded clearly. The pilot interviews also helped me to gauge if the interview would really take 90 minutes as I had estimated. Since the first interview was via phone and the participant only had 60 minutes, I shortened the questions, the second interview took just over 90 minutes. My review of the questions and timeframe resulted in reformatting, re-ordering and removing some interview questions. For example, Question 5 in the pilot interview was worded in the following way: *What is the best advice you have been given as a professional working in development specifically in regards to qualifying or soliciting a donor?*

a. *If they supervise other development staff: What advice do you offer new development professionals?*

I decided to reword this question to remove the portion that asked for the advice to be focused ONLY on qualifying or soliciting. I felt that this was limiting the response and full scope of answers I could receive to this question. Most importantly, in not focusing the interview participant on a specific aspect of development work, it allowed them to self-filter what type of advice would be most important (aka "best") and then what that specific best advice was. In addition to rewording some questions, I also updated some of my probes to follow up questions. For example, in some cases, I also realized that I had probes written to follow-up on a yes answer, but did not have anything to follow-up if they answered with a no. I adjusted the following probes to reflect both possible responses.

18) When you think about different characteristics of donors, do you think there is any difference by ethnic background or race that influences these characteristics?

IF respondent says YES

PROBE examples/ways of race differs

PROBE: WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE ROOTS OR ORIGINS OF THESE DIFFERENCES?

(IF Respondent ASKS for clarification on "roots", SAY: ''BORN with. God given, cultural, etc.'')

If respondent says NO

PROBE examples of how they have seen similarities across donors who are White and non-White

The last major adjustment I made to the interview tool was the addition of a new final interview question. I decided to add the question to try to learn how aware, if at all, development professionals were of a current trend or movement in the profession to focus on engaging donors of color/expanding the donor base. This question emerged because at the end of one of the pilot interviews we started to have more of a discussion about the potential differences in considering race and some of the differences in development efforts between higher education vs. community non-profit work. This topic really seemed more relevant than my original final question and it led me to learning about a more progressive new position that was created at the University of Michigan, specifically in their development area, that is focused on inclusion, equity and diversity. This conversation, and the 2017 Chronicle of Philanthropy conference, the Philanthropy Next Conference, led to the development of my final interview question:

21) As I have come into the development profession recently, I have started to notice an emerging trend related to discussions about philanthropy and diversity. For example, the Chronicle of Philanthropy's, Philanthropy Next conference this fall is focused on America's Emerging Donors. I also recently heard of large, public well known university that just added a development professional to their foundation team who has a job description focused on diversity, equity and inclusion. What is your perspective on this trend?

I liked the idea of ending with this question as I hoped it might help me to learn about other trends occurring in the profession to include more donors of color and it would also help me to gauge if I was only hyper-sensitive to hearing about these trends because of my research interest.

Another adjustment that was made following the pilot interviews was to the request I made in advance of the interview for the development professional to share their favorite campaign piece with me. In the two pilot interviews, I requested the following in the pre-interview outreach: their resume, the responses to the pre-interview questionnaire, and an example of the participants' favorite piece of donor collateral, campaign info, donor publication, proposal etc. Then during the course of the interview, I asked each pilot participant to share why they selected the piece they did and what made it significant. After the pilot interviews, I realized that the participants' first instinct response to this question was to remember campaign slogans or marketing that was catchy. I realized that the question was not specific enough since what I really wanted to understand was more about the favorite pieces they used for storytelling or donor impact statements, which is what I was focused on understanding for my second research question. Later, as I probed more about memorable collateral based on the story it told, this came to light. Therefore, I decided to reword my initial request, which I would send to the participants in the email confirming the interview. I changed the request that they bring to the interview, or share in advance the following: "*donor proposals/publications, thank yous, from your work or your college/department that you would be willing to share with me that you thought told the best story of impact.*"

The ability to step back and reflect on the approach I used for recruitment of participants, technology, and my interview tool, were all very helpful in developing and adjusting my in-depth interviewing methodology. As Seidman (2006) explains, a pilot study can alert the researcher to elements of their own interview techniques or limitations in the interview tool or protocol, and allow for the opportunity to make adjustments, before beginning the study. I found this to be very important for revealing the adjustments I needed to make before launching the full study.

Once the pilot interviews were completed, and the interview tool and participant recruitment process were updated, I began the participant recruitment at each of my research sites using purposeful selection.

Sites

The research sites that were selected for this study are all large public universities located in the western United States. Each of the selected sites were chosen to reflect a slight variation in the racial demographics of the student population and therefore alumni population. The universities are located in three different states all located in the southwest, three different metro areas, and are racially distinctive in their student populations. The student body demographics, at the time of the study, categorized two of the institutions as predominately White institutions (PWIs) and one as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). The first PWI, Desert University has an approximately 40% non-White undergraduate student body (Desert University, 2017), with the largest non-White student population being Latino(a), and University of the West Coast, although similar to Desert University because of its’ status as a PWI, has a large percentage of non-White students who are Asian/Pacific Islander, approximately 30% (University of the West Coast, 2017), slightly differentiating the two universities’ student bodies/alumni populations. Last, the University of the South West was selected because of its status as a Hispanic Serving Institution with almost 50% of the undergraduate student body identifying as Hispanic and approximately 70% identifying as non-White (University of the South West, 2017).

Since a key portion of what I was seeking to understand through this research, related to the practices of development professionals, hinges on the necessity of off-setting decreases in state allocations for public higher education with private giving, only public universities were studied. Additionally, as indicated above, I was using purposeful sampling in my selection of case sites to identify large, public research universities that were racially diverse in their student body makeup. I did not try to select universities to study that were representative, but rather that were racially unique from one another in some aspects but were also not all PWIs. The three universities are all located in the southwestern United States and each in states that are racially diverse. According to the U.S. Census Quick Facts, in two of the three states within which the case study sites are located, the census report indicated that approximately 35% of the state identified as White alone and not Hispanic or Latino (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2018) and in the third state with one of the sites the percentage was higher with approximately 55% of the state residents identifying as White alone (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2018).

The universities that were selected for observation, campaign website reviews, and interviews with development professionals are listed in table 3.1. All three institutions are either currently involved in a major university fundraising campaign or concluded a campaign in the last 18 months. Each of the universities have their own foundation, or 501c (3) non-profit entity, and for each site it varied by site and department if the front-line development professional was an employee of the institution or of the foundation.

Table 3.1

University	Undergraduate Student Enrollment	Non-White Undergraduate Student Body	University Endowment
		%	$
Desert University	**~34,000**	**~40%**	**~1 Billion**
University of the West Coast	**~31,000**	**~70%**	**~3.5 Billion**
University of the South West	**~19,000**	**~70%**	**~460 Million**

Sources anonymous (2017)

Selection of sample

This study used purposeful selection for both the site and participants. Purposeful selection is used as a strategy to deliberately select participants or sites of study in order to identify the persons or settings that will provide information that is particularly relevant for answering your research questions and that cannot be reached from other choices (Maxwell, 2013). To obtain a sufficient number of participants, recruitment emails were sent weeks in advance of my on-site campus visits to each interview site. Following the emails, a follow-up phone call was placed to each potential participant who had not responded to the email. As I began my initial participant recruitment, I intentionally tried to selected development professionals working across multiple disciplines at the university (i.e. planned giving, arts, athletics, hard sciences), but after my initial recruitment outreach at my first site, I learned that it would be more important to have a larger sample of participants than to be selective about what area of the university they worked for as a development professional.

At the University of the South West, 17 potential participants were initially contacted, after the first email attempt, each potential participant received a phone call to follow up on the email. This outreach resulted in a total of 6 participants from the University of the South West. At the University of the West Coast, 14 potential participants were contacted by email and for those who did not respond to the initial email outreach, a follow-up phone call was placed. This outreach resulted in two interviews of development professionals from University of the West Coast. Last, eight potential participants were contacted by email at Desert University and six responded to the outreach and were willing to participate in the study. Each of these participants, from the three sites, with the additional two pilot interview participants resulted in a total of 16 individuals partaking in interviews. In order to recruit more participants at each site, I had intended to use a “snowballing” approach (Seidman, 2006), but using the two criteria of sufficiency and saturation of information (Seidman, 2006), I determined that I had interviewed enough participants. Applying this criterion, I reviewed the participants to determine whether a sufficient number of people had been interviewed to obtain a wide range of information within the group and then secondly, I felt that I had reached a point in the study where I was hearing the same type of information shared by the participants.

Participants

Interviews were conducted with 16 individuals. Two of the 16 individuals were participants in the pilot study and were not current development officers at any of the three sites selected for the study. 11 of the 16 participants identified as White on their pre-interview questionnaire, four of the participants identified as non-White, and one participant wrote in the open-ended question field that her race was “human.” All but one of the professionals had been working in development for more than five years and almost all of the participants had been working in higher education development for more than five years. The majority of participants had been working in the profession between 5- 10 years and had experience closing multiple major-gifts of $25,000 or more during their career. The participants who partook in the study are listed in table 3.2 with a pseudonym ascribed for their name. The unit/department for which they worked is also categorized more generally as to not identify the participant. Overall, participants for the study represented the following departments or units: engineering, health sciences, social sciences, arts, student affairs, planned giving, law and education. At all three sites, I attempted to recruit participants from intercollegiate athletics but received no response. I will discuss this limitation further during the limitations section of this chapter.

Table 3.2

Research Participants

Name	Race/Ethnicity	College/Unit Type	Yrs. in H.E. Development
Nathan	African American	Central Advancement	>10 yrs.
Sarah	White	Student Affairs/Education	>5 yrs.
Andrea	White	Central Advancement	<5 yrs.
Gabrielle	Hispanic	Student Affairs/Education	<5 yrs.
Maureen	White	Student Affairs/Education	>20 yrs.
Tiffany	White	Student Affairs/Education	<5 yrs.
Jessica	White	Social Sciences	>5 yrs.
George	White	Central Advancement	>5 yrs.
Carrie	Human*	Fine Arts & Humanities	<5 yrs.
Emma	White	Central Advancement	>5 yrs.
John	White	Central Advancement	>15 yrs.
Candice	African American	STEM	>5 yrs.
Shannon	White	Social Sciences	>15 yrs.
Dennis	White	STEM	> 5 yrs.
Paul	White	Fine Arts & Humanities	>10 yrs.
Kelly	Hispanic	Social Sciences	>5 yrs.

*Participants wrote in a response and this response did not fit one of the similar selected races

Data collection

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were the primary method of data collection used for this research. The study also included document analysis in the form of website reviews, review of videos, and donor collateral analysis. The final method for research was observation. By inserting myself into university development meetings and trainings, I was able to observe instances of color-blind racism that I would not have been able to understand or put in context through interviews. Since discussions of race, and especially racism, can put people on the defensive and, as a topic, it is rarely something most people are forthright about, I found conducting purposeful observations and reviewing development collateral and websites an important part of the data collection.

This cumulative approach as a method for gathering data also allowed for triangulation and provided a more diverse perspective and richer themes to emerge during analysis. The complimentary approach for using both interviews and observation as data collection methods is helpful because interviews may provide additional information that was missed during observation, and observation can provide “a direct and powerful way of learning about people’s behavior and the context in which it occurs” (Seidman, 2006, p.103).

Interviews

The primary method of research was in-depth, semi-structured interviews. These were all conducted in person, as no participants, outside of the one pilot interviewee, was available or willing to participate in an interview via phone or skype. The interviews took place at the three different university sites and were conducted in private offices, conference rooms, or library study rooms. The interviews were conducted between August of 2017 and January of 2018. The interview participants were asked where they would feel comfortable for the interview and if they had a private space at their office to use, if they chose a location outside of their office, a safe, private location, such as a study room was used. There was no overlapping of participants to help protect their identity.

The interviews averaged 85 minutes in length and were recorded for transcription and further review by the researcher. Each interview began with a review of the consent waiver and an opportunity for the participant to ask any questions. If in advance of the interview, the participant had not provided the pre-interview questionnaire or their resume, this was requested at the time of the interview. During each interview I explained to the participant that I would be using my laptop to make notes and to also read the questions. I used my laptop during each interview to record observations I made about the participants facial expressions or body language, which would not be picked up by the audio recording.

In the interviews the individuals were asked to share their thoughts and prospective on development metrics, the best and worst professional advice they have received, their ideal donor, and to provide the researcher with an example of campaign collateral or a donor impact piece that was most memorable to them based on the story of impact. The intent of these interviews was to understand the actions of development professionals or their perspective on their institutions' actions around engaging donors of color and White donors.

There were twenty-one interview questions used for the majority of the study. As discussed previously, the interview questions were adjusted following the pilot interviews and then small adjustments were made to the questions after the first site and again after site two. This decision to keep adjusting and perfecting the interview tool is important because as Maxwell (2013) describes, qualitative researchers need to be ready to adapt to what they are finding in their research and able to shift the design as the research proceeds.

During one of the interviews at the site one, I organically asked how, if at all, the development officer utilized students in her work with development. I felt this question was important because several of the first interviews I conducted started to shed light on this theme, specifically related to donor stewardship. Adding this question provided me with even greater insight into the narrative that fund development officers were wanting to tell, and who they are hoping will tell it, etc. and therefore I wanted to include this question in my future interviews. After beginning some transcription from site one and site two, and writing memos about the interview tool, I chose to make another adjustment to the interview questions before beginning at site three. Before beginning the interviews at site three, question 13 was removed. Question 13 was*: Tell me, generally, about who the donors are who give to your department at $1,000 or more a year?*

PROBE for EXPLICIT racial and ethnic makeup
PROBE for gender makeup

b. *Are these the same types of donors in your portfolio? How are the similar or different?*

The decision to remove this question was made because it was only producing redundant responses to the previous question about the bio-demographics of the donors' who were in the development officer's portfolio, and it also appeared to be heightening their cautiousness and influencing how they responded to the questions that followed it, about race and donors. Also, due to the length of interviews, drawing close to exceeding the 90 minute mark, and this question not providing any new information, I removed it. All other questions remained the same from the first interview conducted at site one.

As was explained previously in the discussion about the development of the interview tool, during each interview, there was one question which I asked that was adjusted based on the interview site. This question was adapted by site to reflect a region of the city which the respondent would be familiar with, and would know was predominately non-White residents, but the racial make-up of the residents would not explicitly be stated in the interview. Each time, before I read the question, I would share with the participant that I had a scenario type question to ask them to reply to and then I would read the prompt. Another portion of the interview which had a more variance between interviewees' was the question where I asked the development professional to share more about the collateral piece they had selected and provided me. If they had not done so yet, I would ask them for the document/video/website link, etc. during the interview and then ask for them to explain why they selected the piece they chose. I received materials from 12 of the 16 participants. With the exception of the first pilot interview, whom this information was not requested from, all participants shared a reflection with me on the development piece they selected. However, several of the participants did not feel comfortable sharing the document, or after the interview, committed to emailing me the document but never provided the material. The documents and donor collateral that was shared are discussed further in the next section of this chapter.

Document analysis

A review of each research site's alumni association and foundation websites were the first method of data collection for this study. In March of 2017 I began a preliminary review of the anticipated research sites websites as a way to begin to consider what documents or webpages would be important for review and what method I could use for recording my observations and analysis. I realized quickly that a full review of every page and layer to each of these sites' websites would be overwhelming and impossible and I had to narrow the review and analysis to a few key pages. This process allowed me to focus my review to the home page for each of the university foundation and alumni websites, and to a secondary page if they had a specific mission statement page on each site. This initial review of the websites helped me to narrow down the pages to focus on for review and what appeared that it would be most helpful in answering my second research question.

As I reviewed each site, I took notes in the form of memos recording what donor stories were featured on the home page and for which types of colleges or units. I followed each donor story that was highlighted to read the full article and coded it for themes. I did this in relationship to the images and language that was used on each site. As I wrote memos regarding the websites, I used an approach considering a combination of what was present and what was missing. I tried to compare and contrast the sites, their campaigns, images, and messages. I made notes related to each of these analyses, which were later consulted during categorizing my findings, in conjunction with the interview transcripts, documents provided by the development professionals, and my field notes.

The primary source of documents that were analyzed for this study were the documents provided to me by the development professionals who participated in the study. These documents ranged from PDF files used for donor solicitation pieces and donor stewardship, to hard copies of development collateral, donor newsletters, proposals or collateral regarding donor giving circles or societies, which benefit the college annual fund or scholarships, to several electronic links for videos used as donor solicitation or stewardship tools. In total, 36 documents or videos were analyzed from those provided by the development officers. Six, of the thirty-six documents, were links to videos, which I watched and made notes using a similar approach to what I used during the website and document analysis process. Tracking if the videos used savior language, gave agency to the students/community being impacted by the gift, featured people of color and how, and I considering who or what was missing, while also focusing on what was included.

The remaining 30 documents I tried to first categorize before analyzing and grouped them by purpose using the donor solicitation cycle. For example, if the piece was designed for solicitation such as an annual appeal for a planned gift or a donor proposal, those were grouped together. If the piece was created for donor stewardship, such as a thank you note or donor newsletter/publication those were grouped together, if the piece was more cultivation or information, something that a development officer would leave or send to a donor prospect to share more about a giving opportunity like scholarships, etc., but it was not specifically a solicitation piece, I grouped these together. This categorizing of the various documents helped me as I read through each piece and took notes on the language and images used. Some I made notes on as part of the analysis, and some, upon full review did not appear to be of development focus and were more general information about the college. Any marketing collateral that could have been a recruitment piece, and was not provided to me as the development officer's "most memorable" I did not include in the analysis and is not part of the 36 documents referenced for this study.

Once I had completed an initial review of the documents, I went to each of the interview transcripts to review the transcript for the participant who selected the development piece and to listen to their response to question seven, which asked them to share with me why they selected the document they did. I chose to analyze together the participants' response to question seven and the document together for this next phase because I thought it was important for informing how much of a savior ideology or color-blind philosophy is institutionalized vs individualized. In some cases, I took notes on the interview transcript itself, as I did this second series coding process, related to the document analysis and the interview response. Once I completed this review, and my notes related to the documents, I did not do any further website review or document analysis, as I felt I was reaching a saturation point in the data.

Observations

As a way to provide a more robust picture of the development practices used within higher education philanthropy, observation was another data collection method used for this study. Using the university foundation president's or foundation vice president's email address, which could be found using an internet search, all three sites' foundation presidents were contacted with the request to observe development related meetings, training etc. Only one site responded to the request to allow me to observe. The email to foundation staff that was used to request the ability to observe a meeting or donor event is included as Appendix E. The initial requests to conduct observations were sent between July 2017 and November 2017 to each site. Desert University responded to the request in July and allowed for the opportunity to observe foundation senior leadership team meetings between October 2017 and December 2017. This allowed for me to attend four observations, which ranged from 45 to 90 minutes each time.

Prior to each of the observations, an email (Appendix F) was sent to all participants in the meeting sharing that I would be in attendance at the upcoming meeting. In this email notification, they were provided an observation consent waiver (Appendix G). At the opening of each leadership team meeting, I introduced myself to explain that I would be taking notes and observing the meeting and that anything that was shared in the meeting would be confidential and that a pseudonym would be used for all participants' names, and for the institution, as part of my research protocol. Before the meeting began, participants were given the opportunity to ask questions about the waiver of consent, and if they wanted to leave, they were given the opportunity to do so and to not participate.

Each observation I attended took place at Desert University's foundation offices. The executive team meetings were held in a conference room and began at 11am and typically lasted 60 minutes. Each of the meetings I observed began on time or within just a few minutes of the start time. The meetings were attended by the foundation president, and his executive leadership team which was made up of approximately five other professionals. The leadership team members all appeared to be between the age of 40-55 years of age and White. The team is predominantly female.

During each of the four observations, field notes were taken which allowed me to record the meeting topics, the participants' responses to the topics, their body language and notes about the meeting environment and natural setting. The field notes included everything from processes and questions to values and emotions I observed. For example, I made notes about how during each observation, the foundation president, Travis (pseudonym), would open the meeting with general updates and ask others for any additions to the pre-set agenda. He would also typically give an update on his senior leadership team meetings with the university president and once left the meeting early to meet with the president. I took notes on the topics which were deemed important enough to rise to the executive leadership teams' meeting agenda, and which topics were not. I also, in the second observation, made notes regarding the artwork and images from the campus that I observed in the conference room, taking note of which buildings were featured. These field notes aided me later as I wrote memos reflecting on the observations and provided helpful insights into the priorities for the senior leadership team at one of the sites for this study.

In addition to the field notes and memos from the observations at Desert University, I also made notes while conducting my interviews at the University of the South West and the University of the West Coast. Although I was not able to do any formal observation at these sites, I tried to take in everything while at the sites such as how the spaces looked and felt, where the development professionals worked, and who I observed working in the development offices. After each of the observations, I would write memos reflecting on the formal observation or my informal observations. These reflections were about my observations, the research sites, and the connection between what I was observing and what I had heard from participant interviews, or read and listened to during my document analysis. Field notes and memos were a continuous tool used throughout my research and for guidance I followed Corbin and Strauss' (2008) recommendations for memoing throughout my research.

As a professional working in higher education philanthropy, there were several occasions during professional meetings or visits with donors that I would hear something or observe something that connected to my study and I would quickly record notes that I revisited later during memoing or data coding. Some of these memos were written by hand in the margin of an agenda or transcript, and some were typed and more precise. Each of these short memos were then used later, along with the full meeting notes from observations, for my data analysis process and for coding purposes.

Data analysis

Throughout the several months of data collection for this study, there was on-going data analysis starting with document and website review, but once all interviews and observations were complete I began a full analysis of the interview transcripts, memos, and field notes from observation, and documents using a deductive and inductive coding process, letting the central themes emerge naturally from the data.

A transcription author was hired for this study to assist in the transcription of seven of the sixteen interviews. For those interviews, were I transcribed the audio, I made notes and comments in the margins of the transcript related to themes or preliminary codes I planned to use. These themes were not pre-set or determined by the conceptual framework or theories, as this can often disrupt the validity of the data; however, specifically, to address research question one, I reviewed interview transcripts and memos from my field notes looking for any themes or evidence of cultural stereotyping or colorblindness and used a first cycle coding method known as structural coding to record examples of colorblindness. Structural coding is a deductive coding process, described by Saldaña (2012) as a question based code that is used to categorize or label data in relationship to the research questions. For example, since my first research question was regarding colorblind processes in development, I began to categorize data that demonstrated colorblindness using Bonilla-Silva's (2006) four central frames of color-blind racism (i.e. cultural racism).

For the interviews that were transcribed using a transcription service, I reviewed the transcripts for accuracy, while listening to the audio recording and making any corrections to the transcript, I made some notes and added preliminary codes during this process. These codes were also created using structural coding as a first cycle method. Once all of the transcripts were completed and edited, they were uploaded to the computer software program, Nvivo, to assist with the coding of the data.

Once the transcripts were uploaded as sources in Nvivo, a process of first cycle and second cycle coding (Saldaña, 2012) was used. First cycle coding was very direct and a variety of coding methods such as listening for emotion, values, and using basic structural coding, descriptive coding, and attribute coding (Saldaña, 2012) was used to theme the data. As I analyzed the data, several "In Vivo" codes, which are codes that emerge from the data using the language of the participant (Corbin and Strauss, 2008), developed as both codes and theme titles from this coding system. These In Vivo codes are *"dirty fundraising"* and *"sales mentality."* At the point that the data was uploaded into Nvivo, and when I had completed the first cycle coding, the process for analysis became more inductive rather than deductive. Overall, a mixed scheme of inductive and deductive coding was used to analyze the data and determine the key themes from the research.

The primary goal of second cycle coding is to develop a sense of categorical, thematic, and/or theoretical organization from your first cycle codes (Saldaña, 2012). The first cycle of coding was occurring both as I transcribed and listed to the interviews, and as I reviewed data in

Nvivo. The second cycle of coding occurred once all the transcripts were loaded into Nvivo and I was able to apply the Nvivo codes, or nodes, to the documents and field notes through a second cycle coding process or theming of the data. Throughout both of these data analysis processes, embedded coding or subcoding was used after a primary code that needed more detail. For example, one of the attitude codes that I created was busy at work, subcodes that developed related to this code were 1) understaffed and 2) staff turnover. A structural code that was used was colorblindness and subcodes that emerged were three of the central frames of color-blind racism: cultural racism, naturalization, and abstract liberalism. Through a process of coding all of the data and reviewing it, some codes later shifted to subcodes, as with any iterative process, other codes emerged as better topic labels and some codes became more detailed and better subcodes or categories. Through this process a total of 52 codes were created.

Before starting a second wave of analysis, the study's research questions were reviewed, as well as my original methodology for how I planned to characterize the data that was gathered. For example, when I began preparations for this study I thought about how I would examine the data for both the presence of and the absence of savior ideologies. I planned to do this by creating markers or indicators that represent the presence of White-Savior ideology in the medium used for the campaign and this was to be tracked and coded based on the themes and number of times this type of strategy is used. I did not end up tracking this by number once I began the study, as the frequency did not seem high enough to warrant that, but rather the themes, such as merit aid vs. need aid, and "special cases" and students' loss of agency by being named in a way the connoted ownership by a donor was used to theme the data. As I reviewed the data, I also searched for the discrepant evidence of White savior ideology. I found this to occur in several examples, when the college or development officer placed more agency on the students' and less on how the donor "saved" the student and coded this as *pushing against savior ideology*. This process, in between the first cycle and second cycle coding, allowed for review of what themes were potentially missing and helped to organize the codes into themes and allows the researcher to look for how various themes are similar, different and what kind of relationship may exist among them (Saldaña, 2012).

To begin second cycle coding, with the goal to conceptualize the codes developed during first cycle coding and to pare down the codes into major themes, I used both the query function and analyze functions in Nvivo. I used the query function to help me search for keywords or phrases that I might have missed during first cycle coding, but that were perhaps emerging as a key theme, such as the word 'assumptions' and I also used the word frequency query to help search for any key words or phrases that occurred many times that I might have missed. The analyze function was used to link memos and field notes to the nodes that were not previously connected from my observations. The last method I used for second cycle coding, and to complete my data analysis, was axial coding. According to Saldaña (2012), axial coding is appropriate for studies with multiple sites or data forms such as videos, transcripts and field notes. It is also used to help transition between initial and theoretical coding processes. Although my study was not intended to be a grounded theory study, this approach made sense to me as I was starting to observe the convergence of multiple theoretical frameworks in forming a theory about how development officers and higher education philanthropy environments construct who is an ideal donor. I was finding through my analysis, and theming of data, that this ideal donor was influenced by colorblindness and academic capitalism, which together were influencing racist practices. Once the axial coding process was complete, I made an outline of the major themes that developed from my analysis. I then mapped back to my three research questions each of these major themes and categorized how they helped to explain what I was seeking to understand through this research. This process led to the several major findings which are discussed in the two subsequent data chapters that follow this chapter. The first findings chapter is written focused on the themes and major findings regarding research questions one and two, and the second findings chapter discusses the findings connected to research question three.

Validity

While it is challenging to ensure the validity of a study, and it is commonly recognized to be a key issue in research design, Maxwell (2013) argues that is why it is necessary to address as part of the study. As discussed previously, a rich collection of data is one way to help address validity threats; therefore, the triangulation of data collected for this study between interviews, documents, and observations help to reduce the risk of chance associations and allows for better generality of the assessments (Maxwell, 2013). Another factor contributing to the validity of the data is that multiple sites were included as part of this study.

Two common validity threats are researcher bias and reactivity. Researcher bias is found when the preselected conclusions or goals influence how the researcher views the data and what 'stands out' to the researcher (Maxwell, 2013). In order to address researcher bias, I attempted to look for discrepant evidence and negative cases in the data during analysis. Several times these were identified and I discuss these in my findings chapter.

As discussed further in my positionality statement, reactivity is the effect of the researcher on the individuals' being studied (Maxwell, 2013). I tried to minimize this through structuring the interview as a collegial conversation and through assuring the participant how their information will be kept confidential and with a review of the waiver of consent at the start of each interview. However, it is likely that due to my own identity, both as a woman and as a Latina, that some researcher bias and reactivity occurred as part of this study. Originally, each interview participant was going to be given the opportunity to review the transcript of their interview, and I was going to solicit feedback through member checks, but this was changed due to time constraints for the study, and the delay between interviews and transcription. Allowing participants to review their transcript would also have provided more of a direct link from the interview participant back to the transcript, which would otherwise not have occurred and could influence the participants' privacy. Member checks could have improved the validity of this study, but due to the factors just discussed, it was not included.

Confidentiality

The study was sent to the University of Arizona Office for the Responsible Conduct of Research for approval in April of 2017 and the study was approved in May of 2017. Since multiple research sites were intended to be used as part of this study, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter from the University of Arizona, for the study, was shared with the IRB granting departments at each of the other institutional sites. In June of 2017 each of those sites had approved the study. To protect the identity of the interviewees and the institutional sites, pseudonyms were used to refer to participants, universities, and organizations or programs within each university. All recorded interviews were kept in a secure location during the transcription process and all hired transcription providers signed a confidentiality agreement prior to transcription.

Positionality statement

In my interviews with fellow development officers, I tried to minimize my role as the researcher and to emphasize my role as a colleague. I attempted to accomplish this by writing in my first email outreach for participant recruitment that I currently work in the fund development profession and that I am a part-time doctoral student. I also introduced myself this way in both follow-up calls and before I started each interview. This was done intentionally, with the goal to make my role as the researcher less intimidating and slightly minimized, and to hopefully also make the participant more comfortable if they perceived our conversation as more collegial than research based. I also believed that I may build more rapport with the fund development professional, who I interviewed, if they viewed me as being part of their “in group.” As the interview progressed, to discussing more sensitive topics such as racial stereotyping and their opinions about working with donors of color, I hoped that they might perceive the topic as less threatening if the tone of the interview was collegial. However, sharing my professional role in the respective interviews, as outlined above, could result in some reactivity concerns, causing a potential validity threat as well. I tried to minimize this through structuring the interview as a collegial conversation and through affirming the participants’ experiences during the interview when I had experienced similar feelings as a development professional.

Another reactivity consideration I have for my interviews was in regard to my racial phenotype. As a Latina woman, who passes as White, it is highly likely that fund development officers who are White and did not know my racial background assumed that I am White and perhaps this lead them to open up more during our discussions of race, rather than if I disclosed to them that I am Latina. This potential for increased honesty may have also aided me in minimizing reactivity. In contrast, there was no way to minimize my identity as a woman and for any men who I interviewed there may have been some slight reactivity changes to their interview based on my gender. Although my primary focus for this study was not gender stereotyping or sexism, there were several intersections between a donors' racial and gender identity that emerged during my research and analysis.

Limitations

This study had a few different limitations**.** One limitation of the study was the inability to participate in observations at all three of the research sites. While observation was just one method of data collection for this study, it did help to present a more complete picture of the environment that interviewees were describing in the study and help bring to light what I found through website analysis. Only participating in observations at Desert University is a limitation, but one that I tried to address through the observations I could make while being on campus at the other sites, and taking notes on the informal observations I made while interviewing participants.

A second limitation of the study is my lens as a both a researcher and a higher education development professional. Based on my position as a front-line fundraiser, there may have been more probing in an interview that would have occurred by a researcher less familiar with the development profession. In some cases, in an attempt to be neutral or because of my professional relationship with a colleague, who I was interviewing, I may have failed to ask more probing questions. In reviewing the transcripts I found examples of when I should have probed further at a response, but due to my own assumptions about the profession and what they were referencing, or for fear of making the participant uncomfortable I did not. I tried to minimize my own biases as much as possible in my review of the data and during the coding process by sharing my preliminary findings with members of my committee and seeking their feedback and by using self-checking strategies and validity checklist (Maxwell, 2013).

A final limitation of the study encourages future research with a more diverse sample. For example, this study only looked at three institution sites and they were all large public institutions. Another study could explore how the practices being used by development professionals in public higher education universities might be different at a private schools. This study also had a majority of development professionals as participants who identified as White and there were no development professionals who participated who represented intercollegiate athletics. A larger group of participants who represent more races and more areas of higher education both in the unit for which they fundraise and the type of institution (i.e. private) would allow for a wider sample.

CHAPTER 4:

FINDINGS PART ONE: RACE AND PHILANTHROPY

In presenting the findings emerging from my study, I have organized the results into two chapters organized by my research questions and sub-questions. This first data chapter is focused on multiple major findings, which developed as I attempted to answer my first and second research questions: (1) Does a color-blind ideology exist and inform the strategies used by higher education development professionals and higher education advancement organizations? (1a) Do fund development professionals explain practices that can be understood as racial stereotyping or profiling through naturalization when asked to describe their approach in qualifying a prospect, and viewing them as a major-gift prospect, or a non-donor? (1b.) What role, if any, do fund development professionals think the donor's race has on their approach or the assumptions they use to explore a donor's interest in giving to a particular program? (2) Do the approaches, targeted campaign priorities, and strategies that characterize the advancement profession of higher education institutions reflect a White savior ideology, or express racial stereotypes?

Introduction

This chapter will explain each finding and sub-finding in detail and in relationship to how the development profession, and development officers, consider or ignore the race of donors or prospective donors as part of their work. Interview quotes, examples of institutional practices, and the discussions of university leadership I witnessed during my observations, and documents gathered from web sources and the development professionals, who I interviewed, will be shared. I provide these examples not only to help illuminate and justify these findings, but to help create a stronger sense of how embedded colorblindness is within these various institutions and for the development professionals who must function within them. The goal of this chapter is to present an accurate picture of how race is discussed, or in many cases, not discussed within the development profession, and how discussions of diversity really center on gender and age demographics.

The very first themes that emerged as I began to review my interview transcripts center around colorblind practices, language, and ideologies. Often the donor’s racial identity was an afterthought or a non-consideration for development officers as part of their work practice. For example, the dialogue exchange that I had with several professionals regarding donor databases, resulted in sheer surprise or disbelief when they learned that the database did contain information on race. Many had never checked if their institution tracked race in the donor database and the interviewees’ ignorance that the database did contain information on a donor or alumnus’s race is a strong example of this facet of colorblindness.

Other themes connected to donor race that surfaced are connected to several of the central frames of the color-blind race talk defined by Bonilla-Silva (2006), which are abstract liberalism and cultural racism. This showed up more in the data than did naturalization. Development officers’ shared rationales for not considering race focused on how it would be disingenuous if they brought up racial identity, a topic they might be uncomfortable discussing. A colorblind rhetoric was used frequently by the development professionals to justify why ignoring the donor’s race was more “fair” to the donor, than if the donor’s race was considered. Several of the development professionals I interviewed expressed concern that focusing on the race of the donor might be pigeonholing them into a certain stereotype or assumption of their interests. The work processes that the fund development professionals described, and that I observed, also connects to another tenet of colorblindness, which is grounded in the desire to assume that the organization or practices in the profession are anything but racial. Overall, the inability for most of the respondents to consider the prospective donor's race and their desire to treat everyone the same, without making assumptions about their giving interests, resulted in a pattern of increased focus on the donation, not the donor.

Cultural racism and a theme connected to keeping giving White are discussed as a one of final findings in relationship to research question one. I share several examples of how colorblindness was used as the new race talk, not only by White individuals, but when it was adopted by persons of color, which Bonilla-Silva (2011) contends is how Whiteness can become so embedded.

Not all development professionals shared these viewpoints, and disconfirming cases of fundraising examples with professionals who shared how identity matters in their work are shared as well. Although this was shared less frequently, and often with caveat that working with donors of color takes more time, some professionals shared how identity was important and not ignored. Often the discussions of racial identity, in the interviews, shifted to a focus on the need to diversify the staff in the development profession, rather than recognition of the benefit or desire to expand to a more racially diverse donor base. These findings are discussed further in this chapter as well.

Last, I share examples of racialized practices and policies and how some best practices in the profession are fueling a savior rhetoric and loss of agency for the students and communities who are the recipients of philanthropy. Finally, I discuss how the categorization of students as "needy" or with deficit language is impacting how donors and development professionals' view who is deserving of financial aid and the relationship I found between "needy students" and White savior language.

Colorblind data: "We track race?"

I found this "you are kidding me moment" to happen more frequently than I anticipated. I also assumed that everyone would know their institution's database well enough to answer if the database tracked donor racial identity. Below is the conversation exchange I had with Paul, who through the course of our conversation learns for the first time that his institution tracks donors' races in their donor database. I asked him about what identity factors he looks at in donors and prospective donors, such as their marital status, age, race, graduation year, etc. Then I asked him to reflect on how much he would say he utilizes those demographics to help him prepare for visits and if he has any kind of standard practice to look at all those facts. After he described his process, and did not mention race, the following exchange occurred.

> PI: *So, you mentioned a lot of things you looked at but you didn't mention race. Is there a reason why? Do you think? Did you just forget it or do you not look at it?*
>
> Paul: *I'm looking at you because I don't even know where that's at.*
>
> PI: *And I think most people don't. I think most people don't look at it.*
>
> Paul: *Is it in there?* (Referring to the database that houses donor records.)
>
> PI: *Well, it's in there if it has been entered by them when they were a student or if the development officer has gone in and updated it. Just like if they've updated marital status…*
>
> Paul: *I've never, ever looked.*

It seemed surprising, like an afterthought, to many of the development professionals interviewed that this key part of someone's identity would be important to capture in the database or how they would utilize it. I also found examples of development professionals at each of my interview sites who had absolutely no idea if their donor database had a way to track an individual's race and therefore never looked for it or believed they would have a reason to utilize it, likely because they were implementing a colorblind approach in treating all donor suspects the same.

> *PI: Does your department track facts in the donor database like marital status, age, race, things like that?*
>
> *Dennis: Wow. The race part. Holy cow, I don't think we track that. The marriage part definitely. When it comes to domestic partnerships, we have a way of noting that. I forget. Like for some of the gay couples I know, some are married, some are not, but there are ways to track that.*
>
> *PI: Gender?*
>
> *Dennis: Gender, yes. Race. Wow.*
>
> *PI: If you do track it, it sounds like it is nothing you have paid attention to?*
>
> *Dennis: Right. It is nothing I pay attention to.*

In some interviews development professionals would acknowledge that they knew they could look at the donor's race, but they questioned why that would be helpful. However, not all had this reaction and many were excited to know about this additional feature if they had not previously known.

In some cases, donors' photos may even appear in some institutions' donor databases, but even when a development officer, who uses a donor database with photos, was talking through his or her process for reviewing information about prospects or donors, the idea that a photo would be a way to learn more about an individuals' race never came up; and if it did, they acknowledged that it was not something they really thought about as part of their development process. For example, in this conversation with Tiffany, I asked her about the photos for donor constituents in the database.

> PI: *It sounded like from something you mentioned earlier that you use CRM as your donor database. Do you know, in that, do you track things like the donor's marital status, or their race, or who is head of household?*

Tiffany: *I don't even know if they track race. That is so funny that you ask that. That is how clueless I am. They might? I know we track marital status. Head of household, ugg? It kind of comes up that way. I am not sure.*

PI: I have heard that CRM can upload a photo so you can have a photo of your donor. Is that true?

Tiffany: Yes. So, they all have photos if we have requested a research profile they will have a photo for the most part. If someone has requested research be done on the person they will update it with a photo.

PI: Okay. So, you could make an assumption about someone's race based on the photo then, even if it does not track it?

Tiffany: Uh huh. Oh yeah. I guess that is true. There are a lot of people who do not have photos though. That is the thing, especially with my department, if we have big people. Like the call I got today at 9:30am, because there was this big name on campus, and I was like I have to drop everything for this, they would be in there, but most of the people connected to our department, not necessarily. I try to request research so it gets updated, but yeah, you could tell from the pictures.

Although Tiffany explained to me that she felt a majority of the donors to her unit at the university did not have photos, I was still surprised that when asked, she was aware of the identities tracked in the database like gender, age, and marital status, but the idea that photos are part of the database for some constituents did not resonate with her.

The best advice is to be myself

Another finding that emerged as a theme from my research into the development practices used by major-gift officers, is the advice many of them have received, or given to others: to be genuine in order to develop strong authentic relationships with the donors. This belief, in the authentic self, was something many of the professionals I interviewed relayed during our discussion about the best or worst advice they had been given. Also, the concept of being themselves was frequently used as their rationale for why they chose not to alter their approach when working with a non-White donor. For example, when I spoke with Sarah, a woman who identifies as Caucasian, and asked her that question, this is how she responded:

> PI: *In general, when you think about approaching a non-White prospective donor, do you feel like you alter your approach than working with a White donor?*
>
> Sarah: *I don't think so, I think donors can sense whether you're genuine or not, so, don't, and I can't make assumptions of how they want to be approached. So, I think I just have to approach them how I would approach anyone and just be genuine myself. I think they know that I'm White, so, however that comes across I just have to be myself, yeah.*

After reviewing the data from my interviews, the common response to the question(s) I asked about the best advice and worst advice they have heard working in the advancement profession, were most often connected back to honest relationships, genuine approaches, and the danger in trying to pretend to be someone else. Once I recognized this theme, it was easier to understand why Sarah, and others, responded the way they did to the question about adjusting their approach when the donor was non-White. Sarah's response to this question was likely not only influenced by her own experiences, but also through what is being shared in the profession as a best practice in the field (i.e. to be yourself, or donors will feel the relationship is not honest). For example, when I spoke with Kelly, who has worked both in higher education fund development, and fundraising for a K-12 private school, about the best advice she has received she shared the guidance below.

> Kelly: *To be myself, yeah, if try to be the used car salesmen type, people see through that. If you are not genuine, I mean, you got to let who you are show, because the people can't trust you with their money. They can't trust you if you are putting on airs, or trying to be somebody you are not.*

> *That is another thing that I think is, I really like that part of it, because you have to be ethical. You have to be honest, and you have to be a person of your word, and to be able to keep information confidential and all of those things. That is a high bar, and it is a challenge and so I like that. So, the best advice is be yourself.*

Although the responses I received like this were not given in the context of discussion about race, like when I asked Sarah, this mentality to be genuine or true to one's personality ultimately unintentionally encourages the opportunity to assume colorblind practices and maintain that they are the most honest or fair because you are treating everyone equally, being ethical, and not "trying to be somebody else."

Big assumptions

In the course of my interviews, I presented a hypothetical campaign to the development officers that was similar to the following scenario, but adjusted for each institutional setting. I asked them to consider what messages they thought would resonate with donors or what their strategy would be to engage donors:

"We believe that University of the West Coast (pseudonym for the university where the subject worked) is losing out on academic talent from X location [I would name a geographic region of the city that was predominately low-income and minority] and so we want to open up more access to scholarships for students from X location so they can attend the university. If you were tasked at coming up with the campaign messaging or focus to try to get students scholarships from that population, what do you think would resonate with donors? What would you put out there for donors?"

Multiple times in my interview process, if the development officer did not mention engaging donors of color, I would probe the interviewee further to ask why they did not mention engaging donors of Latino(a) decent since this population would be largely Latino(a). My conversation with Jessica highlights the theme that emerged of how concern over donor assumptions, based on their race was used as a rationale for not specifically soliciting donors of color or for ignoring donor race and focusing on other parts of their identity.

> PI: *Yeah. With the student population in that region of the city, those students, I mean the population there is primarily Latino, do you feel like there are donors specifically that are Latino that you would engage, or maybe not, or why?*
>
> Jessica: *So we deal with this a lot for the Chicano Studies Department, African American Studies, Asian American Studies and Gender Studies, it is, you know, we have talked a lot already about the fact that our donor base is really White males, so it is really hard, I think it is really hard to make a case for why we need diversity to White males. It is also hard to get them to support, you know, things that they, I am sure they might in theory support them, but it is not necessarily where they want to invest. So this is a nut that we have not cracked, but scholarships may have, scholarships may have a more diverse donor pool. I am not sure. If I was actively fundraising for that I would probably go to the, we have alumni associations for those groups, so we have the Latino Alumni Association, the Black Alumni Association, I don't think there is an Asian one, but technically Asian's are not really considered minorities at our institution.*
>
> PI: *Yes there is such a large portion of the student body that is Asian.*
>
> Jessica: *Yes, but for Latinos I would probably go to the Latino alumni association to ask them, you know how to help, or who they might connect us to fundraise for support for that population. It is tough.*
>
> PI: *Yeah. Especially when you do not have an established donor pool and then trying to..*
>
> Jessica: *Right and you are also making a big assumption. As a Jewish women, if someone were to come up to me and say, "Do you want to support Jewish women going to college?" I would say maybe, but I don't know, and it has nothing to do with, sometimes I feel like you know just because someone is Latino or African American does not mean that is the thing they want to support. Yes they identify with that group, I would imagine, but they might want to save the whales, or give money to cancer, so it is a big assumption I think.*

I found this conversation exchange with Jessica interesting because of the irony in her justification around not making assumptions, because she started out with the assumption about who donates to ethnic studies. Additionally, her viewpoint, that I would characterize as an assumption, that most White men do not want to support diversity initiatives or scholarships to provide more access for students of color, seems to contradict her rationale for not making assumptions. She was quick to push back on the idea of engaging Latino(a) alumni for this campaign, based on their race, stating that was an assumption on my part and just because they are Latino I should not assume they would want to support this cause. I think this conversation illuminates how colorblindness, and the use of an abstract liberalism ideology, (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), which is how White individuals undergird their argument for the benefit of not treating people of color differently, is being adopted in fundraising.

In one of the few interviews I had with a front-line fundraiser who identified as a person of color, Candice, who is African American, explained how she feels she may be more comfortable or in a position to bring up a conversation of race with a non-White donor than her White peers.

> PI: *So I am curious, if you had access to race or tracked that better, how if at all do you think you would use that? What would be the benefit to you? Would you pay attention to it?*
>
> Candice: *That is a good question. I think I would. I mean a lot of times you do look people up first and find their picture, so I don't think it would be taboo to have it in there. I would not necessarily treat them differently because of it, I mean I would not treat them differently, but I don't know how this would go over, but there may be things that I could sort of say to someone who is African American that maybe you would not be able to say.*

This response from Candice was more unique because she does discuss treating a person of color differently, even though she does not think she would. Even though she claims to "fair" and "not treating people differently" but by being upfront about race and acknowledging this key part of their identity Candice is doing something different.

> *Just like something you would say to a woman. Not necessarily getting too personal, but asking them how was your experience for undergraduate school here being an underrepresented minority? So the same, so I don't think it, well you might be asking that question too when you see them. Just like I might ask how it was graduating from the*

> *College of Engineering when you were one of only 10 women during your time. You might be prepared to ask that question.*
>
> *Knowing their race might help with your donor visit prep a bit more. I don't know that it would hold more weight than any of your other questions. There is what they are doing in their career? I mean it is so touchy sometimes. It can be. No different than if the person was an athlete, how was your experience being an underrepresented minority? I think sometimes people stay away from it because they don't want to offend of course. Also, it depends on who is delivering that question, right? If a White man asks how was your undergraduate experience being one of the few women of color in engineering? I don't know. We still have to be authentic and kind of know that I could read the same handbook as our Foundation President, but know that his delivery vs. mine is going to be different and know that is okay. I am not going to be able to be different people. I have to be my authentic self because that is what donors want.*

Here again is that ideology of the "authentic self."

> *I think that if people are uncomfortable asking that question and would trip over that question, they should not ask that question, as for me, I would not trip over that at all. We don't really talk about that and we don't really talk about this in our development meetings.*

Next, Candice starts to describe another very important point, but was one of only two or three development professionals who recognized that in higher education advancement and at her institution, there is an absence of conversations about race. She goes on to share the following.

> Candice: *We don't talk about this at all. I would love it. I would love knowing what people look like ahead of the visit. Where when you walk into the visit and you are surprised what they look like. You know so you are not walking around the Starbucks looking silly and going are you Jill? Not just that you would just walk up to Jill because you know what she looks like. I think it would help. Hopefully people would treat donors differently knowing what they look like.*

Again, Candice was one of the few professionals to recognize that there might be value in approaching a donor visit differently with a donor who is of a different race than the fund development professional. Candice understood that there is value in knowing the racial identity of her donors, acknowledging that, learning about their different experiences, and then being thoughtful about those. The limited research done related to this very topic (Gasman and

Bowman, 2013), supports that more money can be raised when institutions adopt practices that more inclusive and focused on their alumni of color rather than "one size fits all" approach, but as Candice points out, if your university development program is not ever talking about race as part of the training for professionals then it is not surprising that a colorblind approach remains the status quo for fundraising.

Keeping giving white

Not only did my data demonstrate that an abstract liberalism frame for color-blind racism philosophies are engrained in the development profession, I also found examples of how White dominance and cultural racism, another frame of color-blind racism defined by Bonilla-Silva (2006), are being employed to keep donors White. As I interviewed development officers, who work as front-line fundraisers, a small number identified as non-White, and when I spoke with them, I was hopeful that some of the same themes I was finding around colorblindness would be challenged, and at times they were, but at other times I observed several examples of how colorblindness was used as the new race talk, not only by White individuals, but when it had been adopted by persons of color, which Bonilla-Silva (2011) contends is how Whiteness can become so embedded. I found that colorblind racism still held as an ideology, even if the makeup of the institution what not predominately White and was more diverse than simply White fundraising professionals. In an interview with Andrea, she recalled a story that was memorable for her during a time when both her supervisor was Hispanic, and the institution she was working for was trying to diversify their student body to include more Hispanic students. The situation was notable for her since she was asked to change a picture in a donor publication, by a non-White supervisor, who told Andrea the image it did not fit the mold of who represented donors at her institution.

> Andrea: *It is one of the top 50 Universities for Hispanic students and I will tell you, going off a little bit, but it was very prominent there, because traditionally you know the students would come from California, all over, maybe other places, but they had been White because, well that was just the way it was. But the institution was located near these smaller agricultural towns, near where I grew up, these farming communities. They call it the lettuce bowl, so we have a lot of migrant workers, its' just that kind of economy, so now what the university was trying to do was to get more of those first generation Hispanic students, they did not have to be Hispanic, but first generation college students from these communities so we could be serving the people that are nearby.*
>
> *There is a lot of tension around that, I noticed. So what I thought, I was making a post card, it was to advertise planned gifts so I was going through all the photos the university had and I found this picture of, it was like a Hispanic mother and daughter and they were obviously moving the daughter into the dorm for the first time. It was really cute and I said to my boss, who was Hispanic as well, I said what do you think of this? She said, I don't like this picture, these are not our donors. And so I was like, I thought that by putting that picture on there that it might resonate with people, like oh wow these are the people we are serving, or if they were Hispanic or another race they would say oh there I am. So I was really surprised. We had to change the photo.*

This example is important, not because multiple development professionals shared similar stories, but it is unique for several reasons. For one, the minoritized person in a leadership role has developed the same viewpoint as the dominate population and second, this example, as Andrea explains, was designed by her to demonstrate that the Hispanic students and families are who the donors are "serving." This explanation, for why the Hispanic family's photo was selected by Andrea, relates directly to some of my findings discussed later regarding White savior ideologies and the prolongation of students as "needy."

After hearing this story, I asked Andrea about a publication she had just provided me. Andrea had shared an example of a donor appeal with me because it was one of her favorite campaign or donor impact pieces. She shared a planned giving piece that she had created, which featured photos of only White men and women.

PI: *Wow. And all of your donors' in this piece look White. (referencing the planned giving brochure).*

Andrea: *They are.*

PI: *And so I imagine that experience with the post card probably influenced too how you thought about who should be in this?*

Andrea: *Yeah and that picture I found, those people were not donors, they were just parents and students moving in and these people were actually real planned giving donors and I cannot actually remember but if I had to go down that list there, those people were 90% white, so we did not really have anybody else you know, if we wanted to make it more diverse, anybody to choose from.*

This philosophy was not uncommon for me to hear. Most development professionals wanted to only feature "real" donors in their publications, which is likely part of what is normalizing in the profession that major-gift donors are White, it is just the reality or "way it is." This practice serves to maintain a larger racialized narrative around who is considered to be a donor and who is considered to the recipient of philanthropy or charity. Additionally, for higher education fundraising there is already a lack of racial diversity in the donor base and when institutions continue to only share photos of White donors with their donor prospects, this is likely leading to more donors giving who look like the donors who are featured.

Donor stereotypes: Cultural racism

Contributing to the narrative about who represents donors, and who does not, are donor stereotypes or color-blind ideologies. In coding themes, several of the professionals I interviewed shared responses that I characterized as cultural racism, which is one of the four central frames of color-blind racism defined by Bonilla-Silva (2006). I also heard from development professionals who did not have any racial diversity in the donors in their portfolio, and perhaps due to their own cultural stereotypes, could not speak to any experiences of working with non-White donors. For example, even when Jessica, a Director of Development with seven years of experience, at multiple non-profit organizations, was encouraged by her Interim Dean, who she shared is Latina, to seek out donors of color for the ethnic studies departments in her college she did not appear to take the Dean's request seriously. Jessica pushed back that there would not be success in fundraising from this population based on her experiences. The discussion of the challenge to fundraise for these units surfaced multiple times during our interview based on questions I asked about her time at work and her work priorities.

> Jessica: *You know we are only four front-line fundraisers supporting 16 different departments, so we really cannot provide the same level of service to every single department. We have to work with the departments where we think there is the biggest likelihood of raising major gifts. It is hard for the departments to understand that. They feel like you guys are not paying any attention to us, why are you not bringing in big money for us, Chicano Studies, or Asian Studies or Women's Studies but the reality is that the major gift capacity is not there. We don't think, I mean, it is not to say that there are not people who want to make major gifts to those areas, we just feel like we have a higher likelihood of success reaching out to Econ alumni, history alumni, because there is also better indicators of wealth in those alumni bases.*

And then when she was challenged, that the donors featured in their giving pieces were not diverse, by her other supervisor, Lindsay, who works in the advancement program, Jessica shared that she was not finding alumni or faculty of color to be philanthropic and therefore could not simultaneously feature "true" donors and also find diverse representation. Jessica explains this challenge below when I asked her about the racial makeup of donors in her portfolio and to her division.

> PI: *What about the Division as a whole? What would you say the donors look like to Social Sciences?*
>
> Jessica: *I would say the same. White, middle-aged to older. It is tough. We do, so one of the stewardship projects that we are working on, we have been working on for a couple of years, throughout the college, is featuring faculty donors and we are basically having to stop it for our Division because it is all White males and we have gotten complaints, like "where is the diversity here?" We do not have any. If we are featuring donors, we do*

> *not have any diversity. We have a couple female faculty donors. They are mostly White men, and I think that is true throughout our whole donor base.*
>
> PI: *Yeah. So when you said that you got that feedback, where is the diversity? Was that like internal?*
>
> Jessica*: I think it was internal. Lindsay got the feedback. So we went back to the drawing board, I brought some more people that I thought we might be able to feature and she was like, we have got to have some diversity and I was like, well here is the whole list of donors and there is none. (Laughs) So it is just, we cannot pull that out of thin air.*

After Jessica shared that there was no way to find more diverse donors to feature from her list of "real" donors, I probed more to try to learn why she thought they would not be able to find anyone to feature.

> *PI: And you think that is just because the alumni base, traditionally, has not been diverse?*
>
> Jessica: *Well this is for faculty and the faculty is relatively diverse. I do not know why all of our faculty donors happen to be White males. It is hard to say, but… (trails off).*
>
> PI: *Okay. I think maybe I misunderstood. So a faculty donor, means that they are faculty and they are also a donor to the Division. So not necessarily that they are donors that endowed a faculty position?*
>
> Jessica: *Right, but that is indicative of what the whole donor base, the alumni donor base, looks like as well. It is very White male.*

At this point in our conversation, I realized that Jessica was convinced that there would be no success fundraising from the faculty of color, although she acknowledged that their college faculty is diverse. I was disappointed in her lack of personal reflection on her department's own practices or processes, which might be perpetuating a homogenous donor base. This leads me to conclude that she is employing cultural racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), rather than speculating why the faculty of color are not giving. Are they being asked to give or cultivated to give? I wish I would have asked this probing question. Perhaps they are giving other places but turned off from giving to institutions or their own department where they perceive that the same White donors are the ones being recognized? This example is another illustration of the profession's desire to only highlight "real donors" and the narrative over who becomes featured, and why is furthered when the fund development professionals feel forced to find a "token" donor of color. Again, perpetuating a White narrative about who donors are and who donors are not. I do find it hopeful that Jessica received the feedback from Lindsay around the missing diversity. This validates that there are development professionals who are looking with a more critical eye at the stories and images that are being produced and reproduced.

Another example of a conversation I had with a development officer, who expressed views I would characterize as cultural racism, was with Kelly, the lead major gift fundraiser working in her college. I asked Kelly to consider any examples she had of working with racially diverse donors, and in her reflection on who made up the donors her unit she shares her beliefs about Native American alumni and giving.

> PI*: In terms of diversity for race would you say it is mostly Hispanic and White? Do you have Native-American donors?*
>
> Kelly: *That's interesting*. (She said as she is thinking)
>
> PI: *There is a lot fewer African-American alumni from University of the South West (USW)?*
>
> Kelly: *Yeah we don't have very many, so I wouldn't frankly I have only met one. He lives here but there is quite a few Hispanics that could be too. Native Americans don't give which is really appalling to me in some ways because they get so much. But it is interesting that you don't see those because there are so many of them that have graduated here that, like for instance, like all of our Native American faculty, most of them graduated here.*
>
> *They teach here and so, like they give back in that sense but you don't see others that are willing to give even though they got some scholarships or their tribes, or they get, there is funding that they get as Native Americans to come here and you don't see that very often.*
>
> *I can't even name one as a prospective donor, I mean we have like our faculty are well known and they are highlighted and all of that, as matter of fact there might be somebody*

> *in these brochures and stuff. But they are not donors. They don't give back to it. So, yeah I would say that it is still the White men that are the best donors.*
>
> PI: *In your experience asking any of your Native alumni, do they have a reason why they say this isn't a priority?*
>
> Kelly: *I don't even ask them, they don't even show up on the list, seriously I mean they don't show up the prospects list.*

In another interview, I asked Carrie, who worked within the Arts, at her institution to describe her ideal donor. As she shared who came to mind, I asked her to share more about the individual, such as their age, gender, if they were White or non-White. This question led to a conversation about how Carrie felt when working with Hispanic donors.

> Carrie: *I would say people in their early 70s are the best donors because they've done their careers, they are at a place where they want to give back. They are comfortable, they know they're going to die eventually, but they aren't there yet.*
>
> *I think a healthy 70-year-old is like a perfect donor. Women, probably women are a little more philanthropic from my point of view. Did you ask a question about race, was that your question?*
>
> PI*: Yes.*
>
> Carrie: *I don't know, I can't answer that part. I don't know, maybe. I want to say, in my experience, Hispanic donors are the most difficult. I don't know if I should say that. This may just be my current state right, at this moment with this upcoming Rufino Tamayo Show.*
>
> PI: *Yeah I bet.*
>
> Carrie: *I don't know if you want to put that on your record.*

Twice during this conversation I senses that Carrie was being honest, but was uncomfortable with her level of honesty. First, when she said, "I don't know if I should say that." And then later when she said "I don't know if you want to put that in your record." I decided it would be important to probe further this idea of Hispanic donors being difficult to give Carrie and opportunity to clarify.

> PI: *A big high and a big low. So, when you think difficult what does that kind of look like?*

> Carrie: *They are just, huffier more. I met with a man yesterday and I think maybe it's just something their culture that, you know, philanthropy, it's funny because you think the Mexican people would be so giving are so giving and wonderful you know and they are. But they want something for their gift, they want that recognition, they want you to either treat them just perfect which is fine, it's a fine expectation. It's just something I found, I don't know.*

Even after asking for clarification, in the interview, I still was not exactly sure what Carrie meant, until I further analyzed this interview and realized that she was describing them as huffy, or easily annoyed or irritated if she was not treating them "perfectly." This description matched for me, how I could describe several donors who I have me in my career, who happen to be White, but I would never then categorize all White donors as huffy.

These examples of cultural racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) are the most problematic of the themes I have identified in this study. This use of culturally based arguments to perpetuate a higher education development culture that is raced, is the greatest barrier to the profession moving forward and engaging a more diverse donor base. These philosophical ideologies did not appear to be held by the majority of fund development professionals. However, when expressions of racism did emerge from my findings I would characterize them as part of the colorblind ideology of cultural racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). This race talk only appeared to be used openly by a small portion of development officers working in higher education, some of whom identified as Non-White. Each of those individuals likely have adopted the dominate ideologies about race, wealth, and where to find donors. Although this finding is disheartening, it is also important not to ignore. If it is not addressed by the profession, the development officers who I spoke with who are recognizing the importance of identity and race as part of their donor's unique makeup, will likely leave the profession, and perhaps are already considering if they are the right fit for this work.

Racialized policies and practices

As I reviewed my field notes from several observations, I found that as higher education institutions and foundations, we are trying to find diverse donors in the same places we have NOT found them in the past. Most development professionals are continuing to use the same donor networks, events and friends of the university to find their next donors. Although I found little evidence of the profession or professionals intentionally implementing racist practices, which supports the structural nature of colorblind racism, I found several examples of professionals operating in raced structures and following practices that are lacking innovation, strategy, and acknowledgement of changing racial demographics. The failure to recognize these obvious shifts in the market and colorblind practices represented institutionalized racism and that is likely perpetuating the lack of racial diversity in both the profession and in the donor base.

The above point leads to another one of my sub-findings related to colorblindness, which is that the development profession continues to look for new donors in old ways, which is maintaining the one size fits all approach to development and a lack of racial diversity in donors to higher education institutions. Consider this excerpt of one of the memos I wrote after reviewing my field notes from an observation at a senior leadership meeting for development professionals at Desert University Foundation.

> The first meeting, like many of the others, opened with general announcements or updates from the foundation president and he would ask others if they had agenda items to add. At this first meeting, the topic that was most interesting to me was not an agenda item, but rather an announcement. The foundation president, Travis, shared that he felt that the foundation’s board of advisors (a donor board made up of current and past major gift donors, who provide governance for the foundation, and who are responsible for the foundation’s policies, procedures and direction), had available openings. After this announcement he initiated a discussion regarding the board make up and what types of

> individuals the team should consider for the board as these new vacancies are anticipated to open.
>
> I was struck by the positive nature that the announcement took at the beginning. The focus of the conversation was around changing how recruitment had been done in the past, and not just asking current board members to recommend others, because they would likely be recycling the same type of individuals and they wanted to ideally broaden representation on the board. Although the word diversify was never used in the conversation, this is what I understood to be the goal of the discussion around adding new board members. They discussed the age demographic on the board (generally older) and that finding some younger members would make sense.

This discussion about expansion of board members to be younger was consistent with what I heard in my interviews with development professionals. The diversity that was addressed was either age diversity or gender.

> They discussed that finding people who are bright, and still working in various industries would be important, and likely bring younger perspective to the board if they were still working. They discussed that the individuals did not have to be alumni of the institution or even really know the University intimately. I thought this was a fresh perspective, the concept that someone who might be an "outsider" would offer a good perspective and not be so insular. However, I was struck that through their discussion about "changing up" the board make up there was never anyone who mentioned the breakdown of the individuals by gender or race and an effort to try to make this more representative of either the campus student population, or the alumni population.

This discussion illuminated that the "value" placed on diversity or the best kind of diversity to gain fresh ideas or new insights would not come from an individual's racial identity, but rather their age or gender. Then I began to think likely that perspective was held because all of the leadership team appeared to be White.

> This lack of acknowledgement about the Board's identity left me wondering that if even in a conversation, essentially about diversifying the perspectives on a board, why a discussion about the board member's racial or gender background would not come to light? Was it because the leaders at the table appeared to be only representing one race? Was it because the individuals in the room are so use to only seeing donors who are White? The leadership team is a female majority group so why a discussion of gender did not surface was also confusing. The discussion ended with a decision to ask current

> development officers to nominate or suggest someone who might want to be on the board.
>
> After reviewing the data I gathered from this study, this idea does not surprise me. It continues to support my theory that as a profession we are looking at the same type of people to try to do different type of work and with limited direction about the criteria to be on the board, who they are looking for, etc. I am not sure that this outreach to the develop officers for nominations will actually help in finding “fresh perspectives” because I think people default to thinking about what they currently know and most development officers, when they are asked to think about someone will likely picture the current board and automatically start to consider people they know who look like those folks. I believe that without explicit direction that there is a goal to change the board make up and bring in fresh ideas and that the university is looking for younger, non-university alumni, maybe even non-donors, who are women and not White, it is unlikely, based on the conversation I observed, that there will be any true success in updating the board. As this discussion came to a close, one of the senior staff members in the meeting specifically asked what should we think about? The answer was younger.

During another meeting I had the opportunity to attend as an observer, a discussion took place about the process that development officers should use when requesting a presidential visit for a donor in their portfolio. A worksheet was presented to the staff with questions to answer about the donor prospects, their interests, capacity, etc. In the course of the process for explaining how these requests can be made and what to expect after submitting a request, I observed a development officer ask the following question. He said, “Is this still the same process we should use if we have a donor who wants to play golf with the president?” This question surprised me for several reasons, clearly there was a more “in-group” way to circumvent the process for requesting a presidential visit. Also, in my experience, there are likely a certain demographic of alumni who were more likely to fit the demographic for golfers. Traditionally, golf is sport that I find is more commonly played and watched by men, by White men and, by White men who work in or retired from a certain type of professional field. I realize that I am making several assumptions about the type of individual who plays the sport of golf, but my point is more that through this observation I learned that there was a “loop-hole” to the presidential visit process, and the loop-hole was an activity that automatically segments this institution's donor population in some form or fashion. Additionally, this extra-curricular preference for golf, over another option, yields what professionals at this institution think is important and what they do NOT think is important (i.e. knowledge about cultural interests, or community group participation), which could be other places where Non-White donors would be engaged.

These two specific examples from observations speak to the problem and one of the themes I found through my research which is that these patterns of behavior are racist, regardless of intent, and the structure and practices employed by the development officers is a product of embedded institutionalized racism. Institutions of higher education are learning that to diversify their student body they must start recruiting students in different locations, but development operations are not catching on that to find diverse donors they also must branch out from the same spaces and environments where they have been cultivating prospective donors.

Racial diversity in donors

There were several development professionals who I spoke with who acknowledged that they felt the profession was behind in engaging donors of color and diverse alumni. Some shared specific examples of how when they were intentional, or their college or department was intentional, about seeking out a diverse donor base they were met with success. However, they also shared that this often took more time or work. The perceived additional time involved to engage this more diverse donor segment, amidst pressure to meet goals, is discussed more in data chapter two. The development professionals who were working with donors of color expressed that once they made the time to get to know more individuals in the communities of color they had fundraising success.

One refreshing interview conversation I had involved a development officer who began to work with the African American community in his city. John, a senior development professional with the medical program at his institution, explains what he was taught by an African American woman, Gale, who is a donor to the college of medicine at his school, and who wanted to more fully engage some of her peers.

> John: *If you look at our board membership, if you look really across the board it is largely not representative of our community. I think with the Latino community there is slightly more representation, but I would say it is nowhere around where it should be. What I learned around philanthropy, what Gale helped teach me, she wanted to help teach chest compression only CPR. I said okay, I will help you do it. She said I have a goal of training this many people and I said okay I will help you do it. She wanted to get the word out and she wanted to talk to African American women about their own cardiovascular risk factors, how they really are the touch tone for family life and how they can help influence health. It is not really philanthropy, but it was teaching me that for us to be able to raise money from anybody, we had to have a relationship, and we had no relationship with anyone from that community.*

John also recalls how through branching out to spaces where African American alumni are in the community he developed awareness for how White some donor spaces are.

> *So I spent a lot of time in churches. We created flyers for Gale and her group to put in beauty parlors. Through Gale I learned that, there are very specific places that African American women feel a sense of community- churches, beauty shops, and not everyone, in Gale's words, can do Black hair. Got it. So we started to think about those things and created a newsletter that we would share. She was very thoughtful about this though. She did not want it to be just about African American or Black women. She wanted it to remain open to minority women. We know that we have a large population of Native American women who are incredibly at risk for diabetes and Latino women have hypertension and Black women stroke and hypertension. So in the time I was working with her we never really were able to open up the Latina population or the Native American population to do anything, but she has volunteers that get together. They do these things. The community didn't, her group, did not really come forward with a gift, but they came together with a lot of time and a lot of enthusiasm and a lot of passion and they are supporting their endowment over time.*

John realized through this relationship building with Gale that there was opportunity to engage women of color in his board and in fundraising. He acknowledges that they did not make a major gift, but perhaps it is because the relationship still needed more time to develop. I heard similar stories from another development officer, Shannon, who when focused on a campaign to engage donors of color, states that they had great success, but she said they were intentional about their outreach and communication.

> Shannon: *"We also have American Indian studies and we did get an arch in the plaza and we were able to get the Native American community to give to that and we did an African American arch where we were able to get a large part of the African American community to give to that. And that's, granted $25-30,000 dollars it was very, it was wonderful to see and then we did the Hispanic woman's plaza which is the south end of the plaza so those communities all came together. It's the first time I've worked on a campaign where there was a lot of diversity in giving because we went for that. Right? We focused on that. So the women's plaza of honor really demonstrates that. It's great, from that standpoint."*

Identity matters

Another finding from my research is that identity matters. Although this was not a major theme, it is important to highlight that some development professionals did respond to this study sharing that they think about donor race or their own identity as part of their work practice. Some members of the development programs at these various institutions shared that they saw value in knowing more about their donor's identity and in better understanding their donors and this included race. As I spoke with Shannon, who identifies as a Caucasian woman, about the process she uses for working with different donors, and asked her to consider how she does or does not think about the donor's race in her preparation for a proposal presentation or visit. She shares how she recognized the importance for bringing others to the meeting from her college who might match the donor's race since no development professionals in her unit do.

PI: *And in your process for working with non-white donors, versus a white donor, whether it's a discovery visit or someone you've known longer, do you feel like you adjust anything or would you say that it's similar as how you'd work with a donor that's White?*

Shannon: *"I definitely make sure whoever's the head of that unit is with me. I think it's really important they hear from whoever is the head of that unit what is going on in that unit, I could not talk about Mexican American studies as well as Regina Gomez. I mean I couldn't. She runs that unit, she knows everything that's going on with it. She can explain to them what the students are doing, the impact of their money. Much better than I can. And that's with all of those units. I do make sure that the unit they're funding, if it's specifically in those kinds of units that they care about that, that person is with me. I think that's really important. Because really what my job is is to facilitate that relationship. It's like what we were talking about earlier. The most important thing I can do is build trust with that donor and the best way to do that is bring the person in who is running the unit which they wish to fund and to steward the relationship because that donor needs to trust that person. So I think that's critical when you're dealing with donors that care about a specific region or area. I think that's really important. Or particularly with Middle Eastern and North African studies that this particular donor really cares about a specific faculty member who focused on Persian and Iranian studies, it's making sure that relationship is maintained."*

In order to help the development professional to be more comfortable sharing some of their own examples related to donor visits, I would provide an example where my gender did not match the donors and how I felt that this dynamic influenced some of my conversations or the comments that were made about women. This approach led to several stories about identity and how important they are to consider for both the donor and the fund development professionals. Below is an example from my interview with John. John shares a memorable story with me about how his identity become a central part of the donor visit.

PI: *Do the opportunities you have presented ever vary based on the donor's race?*

John: *No. Size wise?*

PI: *Just in general. Whether it was where the gift would be directed or the giving size.*

John: *I think how I presented it was a little bit different. So I will use Gale as the example, because it was going to be a group gift that was going to come, it was talking with her, it was keeping it, it was taking her lead, and in other cases I would likely have* *been a little bit more direct. What I have found is, and I am not sure if it is based in race, or if it is based in the community, and I found that there were different things that resonated. I have also found differences between men and women. It would, the way I would present did change a little bit because we were talking more about a community and how it would impact a community. Does that make sense?*

PI: *Yes. I think and one of the pieces that you just said that I have thought about as a woman working in development is that the topic of conversation, or my level of comfort with a conversation differs if I am talking with a woman that is a donor prospect vs. with a man. I have walked out of some meetings and thought I don't think that I would have had that conversation if that donor's gender matched mine. So it makes me wonder in terms of race, and it sounds like it has happened to you too, in terms of both race and sex, in your experience.*

John: *It is interesting because race and gender is something I think about as a human being. I likely, there are likely some unconscious pieces that I do, that I don't know that I do. I want to pay more attention to that, what I was going to say, to your point. I will often, if I am not meeting with a couple, and I am meeting just with a woman, specifically, who we are working to build a relationship with and I sense that there is some, I can typically sense if there is not unease, but just something and I will often come out at that point, because it changes things and I don't know why it changes things but it does. It could be because of my size, or my age, but I will make mention of my husband or something and I see a disarming and I see some guards being dropped down. It is fascinating to watch that. I don't do that with men. It is not, it is just never a thing because I think there is some parity..*

PI: *It makes a lot of sense. I think about some of the donors I work with, who have made comments that I would not want to share, if I was not straight. Based on some really insensitive things I have heard them say, and I would think this is not the person I will reference my husband to. I imagine that would happen for you too.*

John: *Oh yes. I have lied once and I have regretted it ever since. I won't lie anymore but I won't disclose. It was with a donor, who I was sitting in her living room, and she was going to have her nephew visit, who was by all accounts her favorite nephew, but who had been disowned because he was gay. I was married already at the time and wearing my wedding ring. We were talking about an 8 million dollar gift and I knew she was going to ask me personal questions and I just thought, this is not about me, this is about her relationship with the university and so I am just not going to disclose the gender of my spouse and it came to a point where I was going to have to use a pronoun and I used "she" and I regret it to this day. Also that relationship was not that authentic then in my mind. That was not your question though, your question was more about race.*

As John stated in his response, although my question was about race, people are not always open or comfortable with the person who reaches out to them and my research findings suggest that development officers need more training in cultural competencies and awareness of the dynamics of race and privilege to be more successful in navigating these complex and often unobservable raced and gendered structures. Ideally the development officers should not have to consider how they can hide parts of their identity or when to share parts of their identity. In John's case, he finds disclosing his sexual orientation to be a way to foster a connection, or it can be a barrier to developing relationships with donors. I found this example from John extremely interesting because I thought he was going to realize through our interview how a donor might be feeling a similar way when meeting with them, but likely because of his racial privilege, he did not make this full connection.

Whether it was the donor who we were discussing, or the development officer, elements of identity, when acknowledged, celebrated, or better understood continued to support the theme that identity is important, and to challenge the approach of colorblind development work. Based on some of the examples that were shared by professionals in my interviews, it is possible that people may have a way in to understand identity through their own minoritized identities, but have a difficult time spotting, or simply avoid it all together for fear of making assumptions regarding how identity may matter to the donor.

Again, after listening to my reflection related to gender, Shannon opens up about her opinions related to donor race.

> PI: *"I feel like I've had different conversations with a donor that's a woman than sometimes when I'm with a man, and I think, I wonder if he would have said that to me if I'd been a man" and then thinking about that, then I wonder if donors of color, who if I don't match their race, would they be more comfortable if they were talking to somebody*

> *that looked like them? And so your earlier point, I think about who we teach about the profession and encourage to enter it will influence hopefully who we start to think about as donors.*
>
> Shannon: *I'd like to think that people are open to whoever sits down with them, but there's a reality there. You don't know that. I think everybody deserves the chance to give and to be philanthropic and I think it's a good thing if we could increase the diversity in the field of development. Absolutely. Because then I think you'd see an increase across the board. I don't know. I don't have the answer."*

This reflection on how the development officer's racial identity mirrored the donors or did not provided for more discussion about the times when this reality became more salient for the development officers. This question also prompted another theme to emerge which is about the need for more racially diverse fund development professionals.

Over the course of my interview conversations, with multiple development officers, at all three universities, a discussion about a perceived lack of racial diversity in the front-line fundraising role, became part of our dialogue about race and giving. Based on these conversations, and the feedback from the group of professionals I interviewed, I think their acknowledgment of this deficit, in staff's racial diversity could be a source of leverage that may lead to changes in the profession that could start to push against some of the raced structures that exist in development.

"The number of front-line fundraisers that were not White, very small, the number of support staff that were not White, very high." (Quote from John)

Another theme that emerged during my research was the lack of diverse racial makeup in the professionals who work in front-line fundraising roles for their university development programs and how this might be holding back development efforts. A front-line fundraiser is considered a major-gift or principle gift level development officer, who is directly involved in the meeting and solicitation of donor suspects and donors. A non-front-line development professional would be someone who helps with donor acknowledgement letters, gift processing, or stewardship plans. They are often working behind the scenes and rarely, or never, meet face to face with donors. There is also a pay gap in the profession, as the professionals who are often the highest paid are the front-line fundraisers and not those employees who work in research, proposal writing, or gift processing. An awareness of the lack of racial diversity in the development officer role tended to emerge during my interviews when I would ask the development officer to reflect on how often they considered the donors' race in relationship to their own identity, or as a part of the typical work process for writing proposals or preparing for visits. This question provoked several development professionals to discuss occasions where they have observed the Whiteness in the profession.

John, who identifies as Caucasian, discusses how even moving from different parts of the country he noticed this commonality.

> John: *"I walked into one of the university development meetings, and we are not very racially diverse, and I mean we have, I guess diverse as we can be, but there are not very many African American members on our team and I was like and after leaving the east coast and coming here, I was more aware of the makeup of the team. Even where I was out east, the number of front-line fundraisers that were not White, very small, the number of support staff that were not White, very high. I find that to be very interesting."*

This dichotomy, that John describes from his past institution and current work environment, really highlights the disparity in where people of color are working in development and how they are almost working "in service" to the White front-line fundraisers. This powerfully illustrates how hegemonic Whiteness is embedded in every facet of the environment and university donor relationship.

Later, when Shannon and I were discussing trends in the profession, she brought up her recent attendance at a Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) conference, a professional membership association with the mission to serve educational institutions and the professionals working at those institutions in the areas of advancement, development, alumni relations and sometimes marketing (CASE, 2018).

> Shannon: *"I think that working at Desert University, very close to the Mexican border, I think we have some diversity in our development officers but sometimes I'm surprised how little we have as well. And that CASE conference I went to, it is definitely on the minds of people working in development across the country. It's definitely how do we encourage a variety of races and ethnicities to get involved in development so it mirrors our population, you know, and our donor base.*

I followed up this question with a probe to ask Shannon as her university is hiring for new professionals does she think this is on their minds? Are they thinking about finding a diverse applicant pool that might mirror their institutions donor base?

> Shannon: *Right. And I think the big issue we have here, in terms of recruiting is it's hard to recruit people. It's like "please apply!" and my understanding is it's tough. It's tough to get people to move here so it's a bit of an uphill battle. On one hand you're just trying to get people to apply for these positions and another you know, that's why I feel really strongly, when you called up and said you're getting your PhD and I know it's your dissertation is focused on development I think if we could create a degree in development that you would open up that pool of possible candidates to a much larger degree and that you could then focus on diversity in getting people into that degree program and then their likelihood of going into development increases. Right? I mean that's my thought on that.*

Shannon and John's reflections on the opportunity before their institutions to become more racially diverse were representative of many of the viewpoints I heard during my interviews. The development officers I spoke with seemed much more aware of this deficit and bought-in to the value of trying to address the lack of racial diversity among their peers than recognizing the need or value of increasing the donors of color. Yet, I did not get any sense from either my interviews or observations that there is any institutionally or individually organized action being implemented to shift this staffing model. I feel that the reason many of the development professionals were more cognizant of the need to become more diverse as staff is because staff and faculty racial diversity and student racial diversity in higher education is openly and regularly discussed, whereas the racial diversity of donors or alumni seems to just be emerging as a point of discussion at many institutions.

The lag time in discussions around donor race may be attributed to the on-going use of higher education institutions' use of a savior ideology in their donor messages and campaigns and the larger narrative around who the "real donors" are and who are the recipients of philanthropy. This racial narrative and the effort to make everything about the donor, are another key finding from my research. Although donor-centric fundraising and helping donors to emotionally connect and feel the impact of their gift, are known best practices in the field, I found that the majority of development professionals I spoke with are unintentionally perpetuating a White savior mentality and removing agency away from what they characterize as the "needy" student or communities donors are funding.

Savior ideology and stereotypes

In the next section of the findings chapter, I revisit my second research question which asks: Do the approaches, targeted campaign priorities, and strategies that characterize the advancement profession of higher education institutions reflect a White savior ideology, or express racial stereotypes? Through my review of campaign collateral, foundation websites, donor proposals, and interview discussions regarding fund development officer's use of students in development work, I have found several examples of White savior ideology. I have also found examples of racial stereotypes; however, they were not necessarily being employed by the institution through campaign messages, but often I heard examples of stereotypes from the development professionals I interviewed. Some of the examples were the expressed opinions of the development professionals themselves, and other examples were stories shared by development professionals from their interactions with donors.

The themes that emerged as part of these racial stereotypes were two-fold 1) donors or alumni of color who are now “successful” or making it in a White man’s world were special stories and 2) students receiving need-based scholarships were considered less academically skilled, and initiatives focused on increasing institutional diversity were equated with lower standards. The students who are scholarship recipients were often framed as needy, poor, or lacking agency. This characterization seemed to tie closely to language that was adopted by both donors and professionals who referred often to scholarship students as if they were a possession, held by the donor or the institution. Because of the themes found in the language, images, and practices used by fund development professionals working with scholarship students and donor stewardship, an undercurrent arose that is unintentionally perpetuating the impression that donors are better than the populations their philanthropy is supporting. Yet, I did find a small number of development officers at each site who were mindful of this pitfall and who I would characterize as pushing against savior language, and stereotypes in their work.

Making the donor the hero of the story

Below is one of the memos I wrote after reviewing my field notes from an informal observation that occurred during the time of my data gathering. I participated in a stewardship workshop, which was not specifically designed for development staff, but for unit directors and department heads who wanted to know more about development and stewarding their donors.

> Today, as I sat in the stewardship workshop, I heard something described that helped to cement a practice that I have been observing in both my research and as a professional working in higher education philanthropy. Telling a story to donors that is compelling and emotional will likely result in them wanting to give again, and the best way to demonstrate impact to donors is to "Make Your Donors the Hero of the Story."
>
> This statement was the cover title on the slide in the stewardship presentation. At face value, one cannot find fault in this concept. Donors are giving their money to something they care about, and something we (higher education) needs help funding, we should want them to feel amazing, like they are appreciated and making a difference. However, as the presentation continued, I found my mind drifting and as I processed this mantra, or best practice, I realized that this concept of good stewardship, which is well adopted in the profession is ultimately wrong. It may be leading to more opportunities for continued support and donors feeling really good about the impact of their gifts, but it is also likely fueling a savior ideology that serves White institutions and provides a disservice to the population being benefited by the donor's giving.

As I wrote in my memo, this practice of celebrating donors, almost to a fault, is not unique to higher education. In my literature review, I discuss a practice that has been described as "poverty porn" (Collin, 2009) used by organizations such as Save the Children to illicit an emotional response from donors, which often does just that and also results in giving. This practice of making the donor feel like the hero of the story is not as overt a "poverty porn" media, which is being used mostly by fundraising institutions working to support children. However, through my interviews, and observations, the theme to focus on the donor, showing them the impact of their giving, and concentrating on their wants and desires emerged. This donor-centered best practice, in combination with making donors feel like a hero, is leading to savior ideology.

Through the document analysis portion of this study, and in review of the institutional sites' websites, I found images and stories of giving on the foundation websites, which also support a White savior theme. For example, one donor story of giving is about a White woman who made an estate gift to the College of Education to support an endowment focused on Native American education initiatives. The article discusses her role teaching as an Anglo woman on the reservation and how "resourceful" she had to be because the students had so little. The endowment gift, as instructed by the donor, is to support initiatives related to cultural preservation and training for Native teachers; which pushes against a White savior ideology; however, the rhetoric used in the storytelling for this donor piece is full of savior language and imagery. The photo that accompanies the electronic piece is from the late 1960s and shows the donor, a White woman, centered in the photo with seven Native American children surrounding her. The story barely explains how the gift will be used by the Native faculty members in the College of Education to further the work they are already doing with the Tribe. Yet the story focuses on the impact this donor had over 40 years ago when she was the first person to bring roller skates into the classroom because the kids had never seen them before. This story from the University of the South West's website showcases an example of both making the donor the hero of the story and White savior language.

Another example, that was perhaps the most obvious example of a donor or institution using White Savior ideology in giving, was shared by one of the development professionals I interviewed as part of my pilot study. Nathan, who did not work at one of the three institution sites used in my study, but who was working in higher education fund development at a large public university in the mid-west, shared the example below of a gift he worked on with a White donor. Nathan explained that this gift conversation took place in the wake of a very key movement in higher education, when in 2015 the University of Missouri football team led efforts to protest institutional racism and bring awareness to marginalized students on college campuses. Nathan explains how one of the White male donors who he worked with expressed his interest in wanting to specifically help the African American students at his alma mater because he believed they needed mentoring.

PI: *Have you ever had a White donor be interested in minority initiatives?*

> Nathan: *Oh yes. Oh yeah. Absolutely. I have one right now who is a multi-millionaire and who is part of the leadership at his local church. This gentleman was so touched, two years ago we had racial upheaval on campus, so this guy felt that our African American students were lacking the mentorship and you know, and things like that, that are provided by, through a church. So, he approached my boss and said he wanted to give money to support a new mentoring program for minority students and so we worked with him and so right now we are developing a proposal for about half a million to a million dollars for it.*

Looking back at this interview, I wish that I would have asked Nathan more questions about this gift and the mentoring program that this White donor wanted to help establish, but since this interview was part of my pilot study, and I had barely begun to gather my data, I was not aware enough to probe for more information. Nonetheless, this donor's intention and the institutions' development of a six or seven figure gift proposal designed to support this type of mentorship program seems to strongly align with a White Savior ideology.

Special stories

As I reviewed the data I had gathered, in addition to finding examples of savior language and storytelling, I also started to notice several examples of racial stereotypes that were emerging. These stereotypes showed up as part of the campaign photos, language, or how development officers would characterize the "story of success" when I would ask them about any alumni or donors of color in their portfolio. The storytelling surrounding the accomplishments of a non-White donor, when compared to the story of White donors often seemed to be categorized as special or something to celebrate. Below are two examples of my conversation with development officers about donors of color in their portfolio, who they described as beating the odds or special.

> PI: *I am hoping that the trend will keep moving. A lot of our institutions were a place that first just educated men and educated White men. There were some women who came, and after the GI Bill, there were more people of color, but I still don't think we have caught up yet in identifying our donors and having them reflect our alumni base or student base.*

> Candice*: I would say the majority are still going to be White males, right? Just based on when you look at where people are in their careers, age, capacity, opportunities, salary gaps. When you look at the top 1%, how many of those are underrepresented minorities? How about in the top 5%? It is good that it is on people's minds I would say.*
>
> *It also is usually such a special story when you are working with someone who has capacity, who wants to be able to make an impact and to be able to share their story. Not that a non-minority donor can't have that.*
>
> *I am just thinking about the gentleman who I am currently working with, his story, his career, he was told "Don't make waves, if it does not work out. You are Hispanic and the bar is set higher for you." And at first he did not really think about it and a close friend said "It is because you are Hispanic. You cannot just think Oh I will do a good job and my work will speak for itself." He could not do that, because it was not working.*

Dennis, at the University of the South West, responded similarly to my inquiry about his relationship with any donors of color. I shared with him how I felt entering the profession that I was being assimilated to follow the wealth and that this often felt like I was being instructed to overlook donors who were non-White.

> Dennis: *Yes. I have a personal experience with this guy, a guy I just love, who to this day calls me Mr. Gordon, and I call him Doctor. He is from Charleston and is a dermatologist there and he was the first dermatologist resident we had and he is Black.*
>
> *He really struggled in this state because besides his wife, there was no one else who was Black. He struggled and grappled and has become very successful and I have this group of Derm residents that is giving $5,000 a year basically for whatever the hell we want to do with it, right now they are working on endowing a lectureship for a guy that was very important to a lot of them and he got on board because of that. He comes, and he is also an amateur photographer, so he comes and shows up at all of the events that we do and he takes photos and he is like loving this role that he has in this team of people who are all White.*
>
> *So I told him when I visit the east coast next, that I want to come and see him. I flew in there and I was treated like royalty by him and his wife. It is always a great sign when you get taken to dinner. In the beginning you are usually buying people lunches and stuff. He told me what hotel to stay in, and he picked me up because he did not want me to have to drive in a city that was unfamiliar to me. He went out of his way to pick me up at my hotel and take me to his favorite restaurant, which had been his favorite for like two decades, and they all know him there. This relationship, that was probably the fourth or fifth time that I had met him somewhere in the last couple of years, and because I went to*

> *see him, on the drive to the restaurant he began talking about you know, that he had three kids and his last son got a free ride and I had six figures set aside to send him to school and he does not need it. I am not just going to fritter that away. I am going to do something important with it.*
>
> *He had started his next gift conversation and that was about pride and having made it in a White mans' world. I say White man, because he is of an age that was pretty much how it was, we have a lot of women now in dermatology and they are some of my best donors, but I know from a southern Black man, who has three kids in school, or some finished, toughed it out to be something really important, something that he really wanted to do, and he now provides leadership in his community.*
>
> *There is tremendous energy out there and tremendous untapped energy. I don't know how to best get at that because we have not done a great job in our society of doing it in other ways, but it is a fascinating a question. It is one in your professional career that we are probably still not going to answer, but I have hope that we will get better at it.*

Dennis's choice to share this story and how he had formed his opinion about why this gentleman was feeling proud or motivated to give back was striking to me. It seemed that Dennis was projecting a lot of his beliefs about how this donor felt. This story was how Dennis and I ended the interview. His response above was how he answered my final question, which was if he felt like I had accurately picked up on a trend in the profession regarding discussions about diversity in donors.

The "needy student"

To determine if there was a theme emerging around racial stereotypes or savior ideology, in addition to my consideration of the type of language and storytelling that was used by universities and development professionals, I also tried to examine the campaigns and donor stories shared online by the institutions. For all three sites, the institution websites and the fund development professionals often described the need for scholarship support both as one of the top giving priorities for their institution and their Dean, or as one of their favorite opportunities to share with donors who want to make a gift. This necessity for scholarship support often translated into what I have named the "needy" students role in development.

Development professionals' preference for telling a story of impact related to scholarship support, coupled with making the donor the hero of the story, is unfortunately diminishing the role of the student in the story and their own agency. This caricature of the students as less than, and without agency fueled a narrative that supports more racial stereotypes. The opinions shared with me about who donors are, and which types of students are the beneficiaries of "aid," often appeared to serve as a way of advancing a White dominance agenda, which led to questioning the merit of some students' role at the university. This philosophy held by alumni or donors came up on several occasions at each of my interview sites.

For example, at the University of the South West, Dennis described to me a "coded" language that he had learned from some of the medical school donors regarding their displeasure with university/medical school leadership. Dennis believed this was related to an initiative from the university to try to intentionally build a more racially diverse medical school class that represented the state. Below is my conversation with Dennis about this program and his thoughts about fundraising during the implementation of this initiative.

> *Dennis: Let me on this, because I knew going into this that some of your focus was on diversity. This is not directly related, but it is peripherally related to fundraising. So a few years ago we started our B.A., M.D. program. The B.A.M.D. program takes students from the entering med school class, of about 100 people, 20 of them are from the rural part of the state, and this is not the med school they are actually brought in as undergraduates.*
>
> *PI: So that is the BA? Like a Bachelors in Arts?*
>
> *Dennis: Yes. So what this is, is that we recognize in the small rural communities in the state, students do not have access to high quality high school educations. A lot of them are very talented, but they are not going to test as well as some other people are, so their math and science scores may suffer. We find promising people based on interviews, and*

> *enthusiasm for becoming a doctor, and the idea of returning to the home town to serve as a doctor. So this program is now entering its 10th year. So BAMD. I think it is a good thing.*
>
> *What it is about is underserved areas. Naturally, a lot of the people who come from those underserved areas, are Hispanic or Native American. When they get out of their undergraduate programs, if they pass the MCATS, and their grades otherwise are strong enough, they are guaranteed admittance to our med school. Okay and that is the carrot. If they want to be a doctor, they are academically capable and they are willing to work hard, they will get admitted to medical school in their home state. When I am fundraising around the country, there is a certain code that is developed about people who are not completely happy about the way things are going at the medical school. So maybe they would give more, but they are just not happy with the leadership, that is code for I think that you now have racial or diversity quotas, that are lessening my degree. It has less of an effect on those of us who are fundraisers but a greater effect on our donor community. I think that they are wrong, because I see the quality of the students that are coming out and they say things like when I was there, the standards were higher. Well the standards have not diminished one iota. The MCAT score requirements are still the same, it is just that the class is looking more diverse than it used to be. So that probably, it is not a big issue, but it is an undercurrent with some people who are supporters of the school. It is one of those issues that comes up when I am traveling around, and I know the code now. They are not sure that they are happy with the university.*

Dennis's experience with this segment of his alumni base illustrates the opinion held by alumni that if an institution focuses on access for underrepresented students that this equates to a decrease in standards or the academic talents of the student. Similar to the feedback from alumni that Dennis received, some fund development officers shared parallel examples of their exchanges with donors regarding scholarship aid. For example, some development officers expressed that they have worked with donors who may not like to support need-based scholarships because they perceive that they are not merit awards and more "handouts." In my interview with Tiffany, who works in Student Affairs at University of the West Coast, I asked her about fundraising for scholarship support and through our conversation exchange she shared her challenge in discussing need-based scholarships with some donors.

> PI: *It is easier to award* [referencing a scholarship] *too when it is not so specific about who…*
>
> Tiffany: *Right and what I try to tell people too is that every student here is worthy of a merit based scholarship. We have something like 102,000 applications and we let in 14% now, they are all amazing, so you do not have to worry about the merit, but the need is really great. I think something like 60% of our students are on some type of aid so the more broad-based scholarships give the enrollment management office more opportunity and bandwidth to help create the class and work around it.*
>
> PI: *Do you feel like you have donors who are concerned about the merit part though? I felt like when you were talking about the GPA requirement…*
>
> Tiffany: *Oh yes (laughs). You get a lot of people who are like, I just want to make sure I don't give it to a lazy student (laughs). And I am like well there are not really a lot of lazy students here, but you know, I think they just don't want students who are like wasting it, but the student will lose a scholarship if they drop below a certain GPA so that is the other part. I am thinking they have to be in good academic standing so I don't know why they are worried and want to add this extra caveat. People's life experiences shape how they think about people who are given money and financial aid and I have definitely seen that and I would say more in certain political leanings.*
>
> PI*: So more an association of that a student of color would be the one who is getting the aid, and that is here for access and not here for merit?*
>
> Tiffany: *I would not say that anyone I have worked with has gotten that specific. But, I think sometimes there are assumptions that what you hear and yes false equivalences and things like that.*

Tiffany directly addresses how she has seen some of the donors, based on their political leaning, feel like the scholarships might be going to those who need "aid" rather than those who are the most deserving. This donor viewpoint, that a student could not be both deserving of a scholarship for aid, and also a merit awardee, is problematic. Somehow the donors do not see these traits as being synonymous and this may be fueled by the professions' imagery and language around need and which students are "needy." It also appears that Tiffany has encountered donors who not only question the merit of some scholarship awardees but who believe that "aid" based scholarship awardees might not be hard working students (aka: lazy). It infers that the student is not worthy of the scholarship and further promotes the idea that perhaps the student receiving the scholarship has less agency and without the support of the "generous" donor would not be able to be at University of the West Coast.

This mentality was not only something I heard described by development professionals as they discussed donor giving to scholarships, but also by some of the fundraisers. In my interview with Jessica, and in our discussion about scholarship support, I noticed her inferring that without the donor the student would not be at college. In this excerpt from our interview, Jessica described giving for undergraduate support with financial need.

> *PI: Ok. I think we kind of already talked about this a little bit, but are there giving opportunities for your department that you like to tell donors about the most? I know there is kind of like what are you needs, but are there things that specifically you like to tell donors because you feel like donors will support that?*
>
> *Jessica: Umm. I am trying to think. There are things here in the college that I think are spectacular programs. There is the AAP, the Academic Advancement Program, which is specifically designed for our first-generation college students and it is an undergraduate, you know scholarship program, and I think that it is amazing and when I do have donors who you know are interested in supporting first generation college students, you know students who might not otherwise have the opportunity to be here at University of the West Coast (UWC, I love talking about that. It is not in my area, but you know, there are a lot of amazing things we are doing here at UWC. In my area, not particularly. Honestly, and I think that sometimes that is my, that is the hardest part of being in this position.*
>
> *PI: So that AAP program is something you like to talk about because donors…*
>
> *Jessica: When I have the opportunity, I am not like, it is not in my area, so technically I am not, I don't talk about it a lot, but if somebody indicates, we are donor centric, so if someone indicates that they like student programs and we do have a lot of programs in our division that are aimed at helping the top tier, the top pile of our students, and so if someone comes to me and says I think these programs are great, but I really want to support a student who is more like me, if I was a 'C' student when I was here a UWC, and I did not really know what I wanted to do. I will talk to them about other programs that are designed to help students who might be struggling, or middle of the pile, those kind of programs, but they do not exist within my Division.*

I find it salient how she characterized, likely without realizing it, that the first-generation students in the Academic Advancement Program, were not "top tier" and that they were likely earning average academic grades, and floundering without a major. She shared that she only had top tier student scholarships (i.e. merit aid) available in her area, of Social Sciences, to share with donors.

As I mentioned previously, in reviewing my data for themes, a common response I begin to recognize when coding, was to my question about the favorite giving opportunity development officers liked to share with donors. A majority of the donor collateral documents shared with me from the professionals were about supporting students in need by giving to scholarships or stewardship videos or profiles from scholarship recipients. Of the 36 documents I collected, seventeen of them were related to student scholarship support, as either a case statement, donor stewardship piece or an appeal.

Many major-gift fundraisers who I interviewed shared that supporting students is their favorite opportunity to share. In my interview below with Emma, she described the two favorite areas she would share with donors and specifically states that scholarships were one of these because donors would feel good about giving to "needy" students.

> PI*: So in giving opportunities for the law school what did you most like to tell donors about and why?*
>
> Emma: *Oh gosh. What did I LIKE to tell them about? I mean the easiest thing was something to do with the students. What I really LIKE to talk about are the big dollar projects because that's where the transformation happens. Ya…that's my answer.*
>
> PI: *Would you say those are the same giving opportunities a donor would gravitate to? More transformation? Or Student focused?*
>
> Emma: *It kind of depends on the donor but certainly the concept of helping a needy student a lot of people can understand and they like that. It's a warm, feel good. And for the larger donor, the people who really did want to do something transformative the big dollar projects are where you really get that kind of impact. So yes, I do think there was alignment.*

In my interview with Sarah, she also shared that scholarships for students were one of the things she most enjoyed sharing with donors because it was easy convey a story of impact.

> *PI: Okay, when you think about the giving opportunities in the department that you most like to tell donors about, what were those and why?*
>
> Sarah: *I think scholarships or scholarships were always most important and just. Yeah, the students who were really working towards a college education and really had that goal and it was a unique opportunity to let them actually just go to college. I think that was always a big deal. Then anything that was unique. So, for example here the programs the VETS center worked on. I always really enjoyed talking about that because that was very meaningful. They were doing some pretty new things. Anything that was unique and you could see that there was change on campus, so a new program allowed for something to be built. It didn't have to always be built but it actually impacted the student's life in a pretty significant way. So, those were always the most fun to talk about.*

The only exceptions I found to including student scholarships in the response to this question, was in relationship to the health sciences/medical school development officers I spoke with, who were responsible for bringing philanthropic gifts to their university medical school or health sciences area. These professionals also relayed that they liked to talk about research, faculty, and tell the story of the grateful patients. Because of the desire to make donors the hero of the story, I think that many development professionals like to share the story of patient impact or student support because they believe it is easy to convey the difference a donor is making for those in 'need.' One challenge with this story of impact is that often the development officers are removing agency from the student scholarship recipients and furthering the ideology that they are "needy" or require "charity."

Loss of agency for student scholarship recipients

As I have discussed previously this language is problematic for multiple reasons, but in addition to students being described as needy, I also noticed an almost consistent use of language about students' who are scholarship recipients being referred to as "the donor's student." I have found this mostly in conversations about stewardship, where the development officer will tell me that the donors received thank you letters from “their students” or at a donor scholarship lunch or mixer that the donors get to meet “their student.” I find this idea of the donor having possession of the student interesting. I think that it is likely not intentionally used by the development professionals or the donors themselves; however, it relates to this larger concern that the donors are “saving” the students or taking some agency away from them in their accessing or navigating higher education and that through giving and providing the scholarship they now have a student. Below are multiple examples of quotes from my interviews or from donor publications that demonstrate this possessive language.

> Andrea: ***“****We do an annual dinner where we invite half students, half donors, so they get to mingle and actually learn how* ***their student is doing****, they have other get togethers throughout the year where they can touch base with their student, and some correspond regularly.”*

> *PI: Do you ever bring students with you to talk to donors?*
>
> Kelly*: I have. We have done it once, it was more, it is all stewardship, you know somebody who was a benefactor of, it wasn’t really a scholarship but it was a fund. She was on the Moot court, and the donor had provided the money to the team, or whatever, so, we took her along. I have tried to set meetings, for donors to meet with* ***their scholars,*** *for you know, that they got the scholarship.*

The excerpt below is from my interview with Paul when he was discussing his work schedule and how involved his college is with donor stewardship lunches.

> Paul: *We also have different dates because not everyone who’s gone away for the summer is usually back yet and some people don’t get back until October, November so we have purposely spaced these luncheons out to accommodate everyone. And it doesn’t always work, but for those who can make it, usually the students will show up, the sponsor will show up and of course you sit them together at the tables. And there could be 3 donors with all* ***their students*** *at the table. And that way they interact with the students, the*

> *students interact with each other, the donors interact with each other and it's a very nice luncheon.*

From a donor impact story shared on the foundation page for the University of the South West Scholars Program: "***The Thompsons try to see their students*"** several times a year. "We've had them up to our house, and they rarely turn down an opportunity to meet for dinner…

In the donor appeal collateral, shared with me from one of the major gift fundraisers I interviewed at Desert University, I found the following language for their college's scholarship program. "This unique program offers Artemis Scholar donors an opportunity to interact with **their scholar** by receiving correspondence from them, attending a performance or exhibition of their work, and learning about their summer experience."

This common use of language, which evoked a sense of possession for the scholar, is paternalistic and used frequently in several facets of higher education. During this study, in some cases, I found that the language also conveyed how a college viewed their scholarship recipients as owing them. Just as Kelly put it during her interview, "She is ours...", which was certainly the most precise way to sum up this sentiment of ownership or indebtedness.

> Kelly: *That is one thing we do really try to instill in the students, especially the top of the class. That to those you know who much were given, much is expected.*
>
> *We put them to work, I mean they get a full ride, so they are poster boys and girls and they work at all of our events, the fundraising events for the alumni association, which is the distinguished award dinner and the golf tournament that they put on.*
>
> PI: *So, those are some of the students who you are saying that are speaking at the…*
>
> *Kelly: See and then we will have somebody she received, this is a scholar that had received it. She is ours. I mean we use her for all kinds of things.*
>
> *We have tried to instill that into them. It is like look, you got a free ride. We want to keep you involved and integrated so that when the time comes that you will be a donor too and to continue it.*

Pushing against the "needy student" or deficit language

However, in some colleges and units, I did hear from development professionals that they were hypersensitive to this type of development work and that they tried to ensure that the students or recipients of donor philanthropy had their voices heard and were not being "othered" as part of their development work, which became another finding of my research. This theme I describe as pushing against the "needy student" image or resisting employing savior ideology. As I reviewed the findings from my interviews, and document analysis to answer my research questions, I really tried to note when an institution or department was sensitive to this pitfall, and to look for disconfirming examples of savior literature or language. I found examples of how some departments empowered student scholarship recipients to use their voice and to share their own agency, resiliency, and accomplishments in the stories they told as part of the donor thank you videos or letters. This approach, in my opinion, was equally effective, if not more effective, in inspiring more gifts, when compared to when the institution featured a story about the donor(s) and their impact, rather than the student.

Many of the descriptions on scholarship support completely leave out of the story the larger systemic issues that fuel the inequity that exists between students who have access to higher education resources and the students who need financial support or scholarship aid. Increased training for development professionals around cultural competency, social justice and inclusion would help them to feel more confident in how to guide or educate donors who are misinformed about scholarship support. Although this dialogue exchange highlighted below did not occur with Tiffany during our conversation about her actual practice in fundraising for scholarships, I was struck by the justice motivation theory (Drezner & Huehls, 2015) language she chose to use when I asked her to describe her approach to my hypothetical student scholarship campaign. This is one, of several examples I found when a development officer seemed to be pushing against the professional norm of making the recipient of the gift "needy."

> PI: *This next question is a scenario type question: So WCU is losing out on academic talent due to students from [name of a geographic region of the city that was predominately low-income and minority] being underrepresented on campus and we want to open up more access for these students with scholarships. So you have been charged with a campaign for student affairs to raise money for scholarships and develop a campaign story that would convince donors to give to support this effort. What types of messages, or stories do you think would be compelling to share?*
>
> Tiffany: *So is this me just kind of talking to a potential donor about the initiative?*
>
> *PI: Sure. If you were going to put together the strategy for what would be the core message that you would tell, or your team would tell.*
>
> Tiffany: *I also would like to just know a little bit more about who is the donor, I find this hard because I would want to know so much more about the person who I am talking to, um but were they are a scholarship recipient? Do they feel like their WCU education was valuable? What made it the most valuable? Was it the fact that they had tuition support so that they could come here and you know when they have things like that they don't have to work jobs and we have research that shows that students are more engaged on this campus when they don't have to worry about funding they do better here. They graduate on time, they are more successful in their careers in the long run and that we are closing the opportunity gap. I mean we have to be representative of the city we are in and we have to be sure that everyone from every single neighborhood can have a place here and that begins with outreach in the high schools so students know that we have funding, but only gifts from major donors can allow us to do that so it will start with you.*

I love this message because it does not make the donor the savior for the student, but rather the inequity that exists for students is based on their income and those systemic issues are often driven by racial inequalities. Tiffany makes the donor the hero by discussing how they can have an impact in closing the opportunity gap and still gives agency to the student.

I found a few examples of differences in language around scholarship recipients and have highlighted a couple of the preferred examples for how one or two development officers referred to the students in their college who were receiving a scholarship. In this first example Maureen refers to the scholars without the sponsor having any ownership or possession of them. The word sponsor still has some connotation that the student is in "need" and requiring of sponsoring, but this was one of only a few times I did not hear a development professional refer to students as a possession of the donor.

> Maureen: *There is a huge banquet once a year where students talk about their own experiences and **scholars and sponsors** are able to have a meal together.*

Again, this next example is not perfect, since Shannon talks about "using" the students, but I have highlighted her choice of language as it is slightly different than her peers.

> Shannon: "*We also use our Circle scholars, **who get funded by our donors**, and they help run our events. They check the box whether it's acceptable to meet the donor and if they do we make sure we match the student up with the scholarship donor.*"

I also found it unique when Shannon shared that her college asks the student for their permission to match them or introduce them to the donor. This practice was not shared by any of the other professionals I interviewed and is a good example of giving choice to the student, rather than the feeling that the college "owns" them or they "owe" the college something.

Resisting employing savior ideology

Over the course of my interviews and review of development materials. I did find a small handful of examples, one from each of my three interview sites, where the fund development professionals shared that they tried to be mindful of and careful to consider their own privilege and White identity in their work or discussions with donors about impact on communities of color or underrepresented students. Below are a couple of these examples from my interviews.

When I asked John the same hypothetical scenario question about creating a campaign message for scholarships for underrepresented students, he shared the following as part of his response about the message he would want to convey.

> John*: I think what we have to be very careful of, for lack of a better way of describing it, is White washing things- so staying away from messages like the only way you are going to get better is to go to a White university. The only way you are going to get better is to get out of here. That is not true, but we want to give people the opportunity to dream to get an education.*

I was impressed to hear this philosophy shared by John, not only because it was unique compared to many of the other responses I had received to this question, but also because he identifies as a White man.

In my interview with Maureen, who is the major gift fundraiser for the College of Education, our interview shifted to talking about the under-resourced schools at which student teachers were placed. That discussion spurred me to reference one of the drawbacks I see in programs like Teach for America and to ask Maureen about how, if at all, she sees examples of White savior ideology play out in the college. Below is the conversation exchange that we had related to development efforts, Maureen's goals for the college, and how she consciously avoids employing savior ideology in her work.

> PI: *Okay, just curious as I think a lot of times that, thinking about problems like AmeriCorps or Teach for America, there is often a lot of White individuals in these communities of color and how that kind of manifest into feeling like they are saving the community, and how you see that or don't see that play out in the giving so…*
>
> Maureen*: Right, and in our college, you know there is an understanding that, you know in some small rural communities for example in the Hickey County school district, there's such an incredible teacher shortage that you would not have teachers in classrooms. You would have classrooms with no one to lead them if there was no Teach for America kids out there.*
>
> *But you know what we have seen in our college is that those kids who go out there for two years it is like a whole, it is like a whole different world and they are only there for two years. Then they go back to wherever they came from and they are not ever going to be members of that community and if those same resources could be spent on some of the type of work that our college does, where you identify the education aide, who is Native American, who is working in that school that needs maybe courses taught on site, and child care and those sort of things. Help that individual become a licensed teacher, who will be in that community, because a person is from that community that would be a much*

> *better use of resources and so our work tends to be much more of the second kind than of the first kind.*

I was impressed that as the development professional for her unit, Maureen was able to share some of this pro-active steps that the college was working towards with the support of donors, and that she understood why this would have a longer term positive impact for education in the state.

> *All of the work that I'm thinking about, when I think about donors to scholarships for, you know under-represented students who are interested in social justice or work at high need schools, it is all work that was done in the right way where people went to the school and said, "What do you need?" and they said, "You know well, we don't have culturally appropriate curriculum, we don't have art and music, we don't have enough bilingual teachers, so why don't you do something like that?" Because that's what this community needs. We need people who can work with parents and the kids and learn how to work outside the four walls of the classroom. As opposed to like a cookie cutter, you know sort of, here is your lesson plan, and it might not make any sense to you. So, our college is so focused on working with communities and having the community say what they need.*
>
> *So, for example, we have a group of future teachers who are working at a school where it took an entire year meeting and planning with the various leadership there and meetings of the governors of all the Pueblos in order to get permission to work there. It is definitely not a case that people come sweeping in and say, "Tisk, tisk, tisk." Let us just solve all your problems.*
>
> *You find for example, you might find that at a certain site. This is why for years and years colleges like ours mostly had you know student teachers at schools where they weren't the high need schools. Because you have to have licensed teachers who have a certain, you know they can't be underperforming or anything like that.*
>
> *So, you have to have licensed teachers for your students to teach under, and if you have a lot teachers, teaching on a Pueblo who are teaching on a waiver because they are not licensed, then you can't place your student teachers there, so you find that you know you have to go three steps back and provide training and help people pass their licensure exams. Then they could be the mentors of our students. So, solving problems often times takes a tremendous amount of a lot more time and a lot more resources. Just a thousand little fixes when people think well, the whole problem is this or that and really it is much more complicated than that.*

This larger picture solution that Maureen explains in our interview for teaching on the Pueblos is an example of what could be shared with a donor to make a major gift level solicitation grow into a principle gift solicitation that is totally transformational in impact.

> *I know there is this whole issue, like called poverty porn, or whatever you know about people using like sad photos of little kids. We are aware of all of those issues and you know when we write about things we try to talk about underserved populations, in something other than just a deficit mentality. You know because there are things that are not good, you know if kids don't have enough to eat, or if they don't have stable housing, or their parent is in jail. That is not good. But there are lots of other things that those kids may know, so in one of our programs in like fliers we are talking about kids who are really good at making change because they work at a flea market at the fairgrounds every weekend with their parents. So, they incorporated that into their Math lessons, so the kids may have a lot of strengths that you just have to kind of dig down a bit in order to find out and determine how to incorporate those.*

I was really excited during the interview to hear this approach, but later when I went back to the documents from this college and institution and reviewed them for examples of savior language or examples of pushing against savior ideologies, I unfortunately did not find these messages in the websites or documents.

> PI: *The idea, kind of the resilience with your upbringing is that situation. So, how did you come to I guess be conscious of that or even know the terminology of the poverty porn? Because in my time, I mean granted I have only been in development two years, but I don't feel like there are many development officers who are that conscientious about how they are portraying things, but rather this is the story that sells, this is the story that will tug at the donors' heart strings.*
>
> Maureen: *I think that maybe I first heard the phrase when I was at a training. You know about how to produce materials that will really resonate with donors and are very donor focused and a participant in the training brought up this issue.*
>
> *Then the other thing is that our college is an extremely diverse college. I don't have the statistics for our faculty right off hand, but I can't be here and be in meetings and hear things without really getting it.*
>
> *I really need to be aware of how I talk about places so that it doesn't come across as I'm this White woman talking about these poor underrepresented kids because there will be a faculty member who would really call me on that. So, it is just kind of the environment that I'm in.*
>
> PI*: So, some of it is the college of education you think?*

Maureen: *Absolutely.*

This example, from my interview with Maureen, demonstrates that when a development professional is exposed to the negative consequences of savior language or has their awareness raised for how to avoid using deficit-based language in telling a story of impact or need, that the advancement professional will likely want to and choose to avoid this narrative. Maureen explained that her understanding of this pitfall and the ramifications came more from being embedded inside the College of Education, then it did from a development conference or her role in fundraising, however, this example validates that with more social justice and cultural competency training and awareness, that development professionals working in everything from marketing and stewardship to front-line fundraising could learn to avoid this narrative.

Trainings and education for advancement professionals on topics like cultural sensitivity and difference takes time, and time for professional development or initiatives that are not directly connected to fundraising metrics is limited. The high pressure of the development profession and limited resource of time is discussed in detail in the next data chapter as I share the major findings in relationships to research question three.

CHAPTER 5:

FINDINGS PART TWO: THE 'SALES MENTALITY' AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

In part two of my findings chapter I am focused on the themes that developed in response to my third research question, which is, Do development officers experience an increased pressure to generate revenue, and if so, what impact does that have on the practices used by development officers? Several major findings emerged as I attempted to answer this question. These discoveries center on a couple of big themes which I highlight in this section of the findings chapter. In conjunction with sharing these themes, this chapter will explain how my findings directly relate to the accelerated expectations of fundraising for public institutions and development professionals, which is consistent with previous research surrounding academic capitalism (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004).

Introduction

I start this chapter by responding to the first part of research question three with a summary of the themes that demonstrate how development professionals do in fact experience an increase pressure to raise money and how the majority of the professionals I spoke with feel very busy at work, understaffed, experience stress, and therefore, at times, like they must push against academic capitalism for the sake of relationships. This finding directly relates to the second portion of research question three, which asks what impact this has on development practices.

My finding suggest that this burden to generate revenue quickly is leading to "dirty-fundraising," which is terminology that came directly from a development officer in one of my interviews. As an outcome of this pressure to raise money, I will discuss several findings and sub-findings categorized as "dirty fundraising," which was used to describe the disregarding of relationships in development. My findings suggest this is closely tied to development metrics. Therefore; as one of the sub-findings related to "dirty fundraising," I will highlight the impact of both metrics and portfolio size on relationship development and the stress the development officers experience to reach their development goals. I also explain another theme that arose around metrics, which is, that although they are not always viewed positively, they are viewed as necessary.

Finally, I will discuss the last theme that emerged from my research. Based on the language development officers use to describe their ideal donor, combined with the pressure they feel to quickly raise funds, my findings suggest that development professionals are being assimilated to desire a donor who they can quickly close a gift with and who does not require a lot of "hand-holding." As I discuss further in the next chapter, which is focused on a more in-depth discussion of these findings and conclusion, this combination is leading to raced practices that are perpetuating a culture of philanthropy in higher education that is focused on White donors, and that overlooks significant and growing populations of potential donors. Between the busy schedules the development professionals shared they must try to maintain, and the lack of time for professional development or cultural competency awareness, the professionals working in advancement appear to be experiencing increased pressure to raise more money, resulting in multiple negative outcomes.

Acceleration of expectations

Universities are quickly cycling through their campaigns and moving from one to another. The focus is on more, more, more. Hit one goal and then increase for the next year. Most development officers did not describe a feeling of stress or concern over losing their jobs. Yet, they all acknowledge that their role is critical for public higher education and they are given large and ambitious goals and priorities, that may at times result in feeling under pressure. I think that my conversation with Nathan, a development professional who has been working specifically in higher education fundraising for over 11 years, sums up this theme of the accelerated pace of campaigns and fundraising best.

> PI: *So you have been doing this for over 11 years now, do you think that push to do more with less, to bring in more money, not really focus on relationships, those things you were saying. Has it been like that the whole time? Do you think it has gotten worse, or better?*
>
> Nathan: *I compare it to Intercollegiate Athletics where I started working. It has gotten worse because what is happening in Higher Ed, is you are having a lot of people coming in as Deans or as Department chairs, or as Chancellors or Provost, who are looking at their institutions as not the place I want to go. It is the place where I am making a pit stop at, I doing 4-5 years and I am moving somewhere else to become Provost or President somewhere, and because of that there has been a push for these exorbitant capital campaigns, where we are focusing primarily on buildings and doing those things where one can tangibly say, when I was president, I did X or I did Y.*
>
> *So, given that people are only married to only being at a university for X amount of years, and they just want to have a successful campaign, there has been this hiring frenzy over the years to basically just fill campaign related jobs. Come in and just fill that campaign related job and you know and we will be good. No one is really thinking about the long-term and building a team, assembling a team, that can be at a university for decades, even though research shows that the longer you work at the same institution as a fundraiser the better you are going to be and so because that is the underlying current there is pressure essentially to just deliver results.*
>
> *We are adopting the "sales mentality" in advancement and the development leadership that caters to that. Because if you are the Vice Chancellor and you are asked to increase performance and you give excuses as to why you cannot or that this is not right, then they fire you. So, nobody wants to get that, so instead they just push, push, and push.*
>
> *Frankly, I see more people from the sales background getting into development, who do not have a solid university development background, or an understanding or appreciation for it. So, with that in mind, I do not see things changing at all. There are very few institutions that do not do things that way. I think it will continue for a long time because results are showing.*
>
> *Last year several institutions finished a campaign for several Billion dollars. Well guess what? That emboldens people. We were able to raise 2 Billion dollars. So obviously what we are doing works. Well the story that is not being told there is that likely most of your*

gifts came from a very small percentage of your donors, likely you had a lot of attrition in your donors, and staffing issues.

As Nathan explains, in his response, the role of Deans, Chancellors, and Presidents in development has become very important. This shift that a Dean should have development experience was another commonly shared opinion that also spoke to the change in recent years around the pressure and expectation for higher education institutions to raise major gifts. In my interview with John, who has worked in higher education development for over 15 years and supervises several development professionals, I asked about this shift.

> PI: *One of the things that I am curious about because of your experience in working in various units over different points of time, is that in my experience, and I have heard from others working at the university that there is an expectation for university presidents or deans to make development part of their job. Would you say that you have seen that shift?*
>
> John: *For sure and I think it is coming from different angles. I think there are several new Deans or Directors, who have started in recent months who were even asking, what are my metrics? What am I responsible to be able to do?*
>
> *That is a good thing in my perspective. I don't really care if they have metrics or not, but what became problematic for me, and when I knew it was time to think about leaving one of my previous roles was when we had sort of done everything that was within the Division, and tackled some big priorities. So, as soon as development starts to create the content, to create the reason to raise money, so having Deans and Directors involved with fundraising sort of helps to keep them sharp and invested. What are my fundable ideas? What is it that I need to do next? It keeps them involved with coming up for the reasons to raise money. Quite frankly, there are some units on this campus that don't even need to raise money, because they have enough. The don't spend it, but they keep saying we need more. For what?*

This response from John really emphasized how academic capitalism and the desire to generate money has become deeply entrenched in the university, to the point that some colleges do not even know what to spend the money they have on, yet they still think they need to raise more. After hearing this from John, I shared a common challenge I was hearing as part of my research, which was having a Dean who did not have fundraising priorities or who had inconsistent priorities. Below is our discussion related to this feedback.

> PI: *I think in theory, or hopefully in practice that if the deans are more involved in fundraising it helps for those priorities to remain stable and helps them understand the benefit in having stability and understanding the role of the development officer, rather than just saying oh I decided I need money for this.*
>
> John: *Those Deans and those directors that are successful in fundraising are the ones that have priorities that span more than one year. That is why doing the three year development plan was important. They don't treat their budgets year to year, they don't treat their planning for their academic units year to year. We should really think about for the next three to five years what are we going to be doing.*

Priority stability and the turnover in fundraising staff is something I observed as a challenge for the profession and that I heard being discussed during one of my observations at Desert University. Below is an excerpt from my field notes during the executive team meeting I observed, which I felt directly related to staff turnover. In the case described below, this turnover may be tied to the acceleration of expectations or the desire to work with a dean or university leader who is better positioned to help the development officer fundraise.

> Today I attended my third executive team meeting, as an observer, with Desert University Foundation senior staff. One of the topics of discussion that was shared as part of the foundation president's agenda items was around leadership change in the health science area at Desert University.
>
> Travis, the foundation president, shared that there was a change in leadership for the development efforts in health sciences. He did not share the following context, but it was well known that there had also recently been a shift in the dean for health science due to questions being raised about ethical spending practices by the dean. Travis shared that he had met with the new interim vice president for development efforts, Cindy, to help her with this big transition for leading a team and, also, because of the interim dean in health sciences. Travis mentioned that a key topic of their conversation was about hiring and staffing. Travis shared that with these shifts he thinks that hiring for development staff in health sciences, which was done in a siloed fashion previously, will be better coordinated now.
>
> One of the other senior leaders at the table, asked Travis to clarify what this means.

> Travis said it was related to two promotions and someone leaving with recommendations. He explained that the health sciences and college of medicine have several open development officer roles. Travis explained that he will meet weekly with Cindy and that he wants updates on hiring and a plan. Travis also shared that he will be keeping the HR director at Desert University Foundation in the loop as well.
>
> Travis also reported that Desert University foundation will start sharing with the department heads at health sciences the internal unit reports on development officer metrics. Travis explained that this increase in transparency is fueled by Cindy relaying to him that Desert University, health science, department heads continue to ask questions about fundraising and want to see more reports.

In addition to hearing about staff turnover, I also interviewed several development officers who shared they had only been in their role less than three months, and many others described hiring needs during my interviews. I also found at two of my three institution sites, there were vacant development positions and positions posted for development professionals. These were easily noted when I was reviewing the foundation websites at each site. It is highly likely that the multiple positions being posted to recruit development professionals, and specifically frontline fundraisers, is a result of the desire to raise more money and because of staff burn out/turnover. Many of the development officers who I interviewed, described their days as long and busy, but few actually indicated that they felt overwhelmed. However, several acknowledged how busy they felt, and how they could use more staff on their team based on the expectations that are placed on them and their teams.

Busy at work

To try to gauge how much leisure time or how busy the development officers I spoke with feel, I asked them to describe their work flow, if they traveled, if they could describe a typical cycle to their work, and although some would not come right out and state that the expectations for their work product were stressful or overwhelming, they certainly described a lot of pressure and incredibly busy schedules.

> Carrie: *So, mostly I'm trying to meet with donors and then just all the ancillary work that comes with that. It seems like my low times are like December. I do my year end gift pushes and then I go quiet for about 3 weeks and then usually the month of June is usually pretty, I've met my goal early for the last few years. So, I've really put the brakes on it in June and to kind of… so, I have December and June where I have to just gather my wits and rest. So, that's kind of the only cycle I found here. But then that is just crazy, I mean it is a crazy job, its super fun.*

Shannon is a development officer who I spoke with who had been in her role for 16 years and she shared that this was just something one should expect from working in fund development.

> Shannon: *"I think when you enter the field of development there is an understanding that your hours will be long. It's not all the time, you know, it's not every night that you have an event, but I would say in the range of three times a month and sometimes it's over the weekend so you're not having a long night. I think that's the nature of the type of work that we do. Being available to people, being able to get your work done, but also being available to people. I think all of that is important in our job."*

Others who I spoke with, like Andrea and George, were new to their positions and as you can read below, were hopeful that once they settled in more they would find themselves less busy.

> Andrea: *"No leisure time yet. I am hoping maybe after my second year here. You kinda get into those annually cycles, you know what to expect. Things always change. But you just, you never know. So I feel like my time here is really full. I am not really the type of person to close my door, but I have to do that because I cannot, I can't get all of my stuff done, if I am not really focused. It is a matter of keeping a bunch of balls in the air to make sure I am covering these difference bases."*
>
> George: "*I have been so busy getting started here and responding to requests for help, that I have had very little time to work my own portfolio, so I don't know many of them.*"

Candice and I were discussing the time involved for her in closing major gifts and during that discussion she shared how being overwhelmed at work has impacted how often she can make contact with some of the donors in her portfolio.

> Candice: "*I just feel like it is the same people and we have not really done the work because maybe everyone has just been overwhelmed and you know you just have got to look at Donor X and think wow, has it been a whole year since we met with her, and we don't want that to happen again, so how can we make sure we are touching them, and in*

> *the most genuine way possible, but in 12 months, or in 18 months, you are not going to reach the level of success you want if you are only meeting with people every year or every 6 months, if you are really actively trying to cultivate someone."*

Candice also shared that she felt her team could use more staff, which was another sub-finding related to the accelerated pace of development efforts and the outcomes associated with this pressure.

Understaffed and under pressure

> Candice: *We definitely need another fundraiser, I think. If we can off load some things from the director. There is me, as the associate, a senior director, but we are missing a director. Then the senior director could off load some things and really be focused on the people she needs to be focused on and maybe even off load some of that administrative stuff because that ability to delegate and let people own their space and we cannot really do that.*
> *It can hold you back from meeting your goals, I feel, and I am trying to help her realize areas where she really just needs to off load that and not worry about it. That person will inform you if they need you, but you cannot really be in the weeds with it because you only have a certain amount of time in the day to get things done.*

As I interviewed development officers at each site and asked them about their development metrics and goals, or the cycle of their work, often the conversation turned to a discussion about the level of staff in their unit and how many have seen their goals increase or stay the same, but the staffing level has not increased or in some cases even been maintained.

> Carrie*: I wish I had one, I used to have an assistant, a fulltime assistant and when she retired they didn't replace her. So, I've had to absorb her job. So, I do everything here from you know, the gift reporting out, to all the thank you letters to, you know, I have to do everything which is kind of and this is a really big college here, a lot of students, a lot of departments and a lot of the programs I'm working for. So, it is hard, that's one of my challenges is to have a cycle of work. I try to keep my Mondays free to do administrative work which doesn't always work out.*

In my interview with Nathan, he shared how having such small teams impact how pessimistic he feels about meeting the goals for his college.

> PI: *Do you have fundraising goals that you are either encouraged or required to meet? And then how do you feel about those goals and how you are evaluated in meeting them?*

> Nathan: *And my thoughts regarding those. I mean, in many units across our campus we have very small and lean teams. So for instance, I have a team of two that reports through me. That team does not include the external relations team that used to report through my office, but was moved. So you end up having a situation where I am expected to assist in developing strategy to enhance the brand, which means, you know dealing with our social media exposure, our marketing promotion, and what not, and I cannot drive that strategy because I am not in charge. So, that presents a problem for us as senior development officers because we are asked to be responsible for an area that we are not truly responsible for. I have never really thought why it should be that way, but if it is going to be that way, let's make sure that we are, we have oversight over marketing and communication.*
>
> *As far as the annual goals, my problem with them, and at times has been because we are under pressure to deliver results, we are too focused on just meeting the number and not necessarily on building those long-term relationships. So like I said, when we have a small team, we have to put a premium on something.*

When I spoke with Gabrielle, the chief operations officer for her division, at the University of the South West, she explained that her division was so understaffed, that they do not have a full-time staff member dedicated to development. When I asked Gabrielle about her biggest challenges or what she liked least about development, she shared how her staff does not have time for development and how she needs more staff or help from the foundation.

> Gabrielle: *Again, part of it is just having it in the database and getting that together and then just having the time to actually put that database together. I wish we had more support in this office to help them. Because, like I said, right now the college enrichment is trying to do that with just their support and it's just hard.*
>
> *Because they're doing orientations and you know, they do a lot of student support and they've got all kinds of projects that they're doing. Then, you know, so, that's our, I would say our biggest challenge is just having enough people staffing to try to work on this.*

Maureen shared a comparable situation in her college and how maintaining an annual giving circle is not realistic based on their current staffing model.

> Maureen: *We don't have a dean's circle or anything like that where I give $1,000 and you will be a part of this thing because we just don't have the capacity to manage that*

type of thing. You have probably heard this, from every development officer. There is an administrative person here in the college who has some of her time committed to development, but if anything goes wrong, like a department administrator puts in her two weeks' notice, then that person might have to fill in for two months while the next person is hired. Or it is the wrong time of the year when this person has a huge project then they are not available to help me. So, we just don't have much support. Where this year, there is supposed to be a student employee who is primarily dedicated to helping the development operations. That would be new and hopefully extremely helpful and I'm going to give them my address updates and get rid of the worst part of my job.

There were several other examples from each interview where the development officer discussed the desire to find balance in their work, or how they have learned to manage their time due to incredibly busy schedules, and how they have also started to try to push back against academic capitalism.

Pushing against academic capitalism

The professional shift described above was taking place over the last decade, ironically at the same time when the profession embodied the name development vs. fundraising. This renaming of the profession was intentional to emphasize how key cultivating relationships are to their work in raising money.

> Kelly: *Sometimes a donor will want to do something that the deans don't want to do. Sometimes you get some pressure from some people. We had a project here that no longer became a priority, it was in danger of going away because it didn't have enough funding. It had a grant and the money was going to be going away and the deans didn't think that was a priority, but yet you have this constituency that are pressing and they are mad at me because I didn't raise the money. But it is like I can't go against the deans.*
>
> *So, being in the middle I guess is the answer to the question, being in the middle of some of that negotiation, you're like always at the whim of the donor, and the whim of the institution. So, you are going to kind of balance that and try and bring it together and that is hard. Sometimes it is totally hard to do.*

This challenge to stay donor centric, focused on relationships, but also meet the expectations of your dean or the institution was not just expressed by Kelly. Several of the professionals I interviewed explained how they tried to hold the relationship with the donor as their top priority and not let the pressures to raise money or the institution's timeline dictate the nature of their relationship.

> PI*: As a professional working in development, what's the best advice that you've been given?*
>
> Carrie: *I guess as a fundraiser probably the best advice I got it's not about money it's about the people generally. I think that's something that I've heard that I've stuck with, that's stuck with me a long time.*

This ideology is well known in the field and is likely why several professionals reiterated that this was advice they had been given or something they tried to share with others. It was emphasized to always keep in mind because it could be easy to lose sight of when the burden to bring in major gifts is looming.

> Shannon: *It's called development because you're developing a relationship. I try hard not to use the word fundraising even though that's what we do because it's really developing relationships. And people don't give unless they know you care. Unless they know you care about what they care about. They're not going to trust you, there's no genuineness there. And I think it's important to always remember that.*

The above examples of development officers trying to focus on donor interests' over their college's priorities and metrics, were expressed by some professionals. However, this was not the majority of professionals I interviewed. More commonly development professionals explained how they felt pressure by metrics and were losing site of relationships. These examples are shared in the next section of my findings, as I discuss the impact of the accelerated pace to fundraising, on the practices used by higher education development professionals. I outline how closely metrics appear to be linked to these practices and the influence they have on what one development officer so appropriately described and named as "dirty fundraising."

"Dirty fundraising"

The pressure fundraisers experience to bring in money quickly, coupled with the current structure for quantitative metrics, as part of the accountability process for development, may perpetuate what one development officer described as "dirty fundraising." This hurried pace to close gifts was described by development officers as too transactional and being in direct conflict with relationships being at the heart of development. Shannon describes this occurring both in higher education and in other settings. She said she realized she really had to try to educate her colleagues and try to push back against what she felt was dirty fundraising.

> PI: *What do you feel is the worst advice you've been given working in the profession?*
>
> Shannon: *You know, people misunderstand sometimes what development is. I talked a little bit about that earlier and they look at us…they can sometimes look at the profession in not a respectful way. And I don't want to say it's advice but they said, "we're going to go meet with this person and we're going to walk out of there with $5 million, right? Is that what we're doing today?" And that's what you do and that's what you're going to do for me. And so we went in there and of course we didn't raise the $5 million and they just went "well that's a disaster. That was a waste of my time. Why didn't you do that for me?"*
>
> *I just said "Why did you feel like that was a waste of your time?" Because I wanted to get $5 million today and be done with this. Right? And I realized I really have to...so although it wasn't advice, it was a red flag to me where I went, "Wow, there really is a misperception on development and um, I need to change that culture of what people feel"*
>
> *So there was that misperception. Now I know that's not advice but it's more of misperception when I realized how people viewed our profession and what we were there for and felt almost disenchanted with it for a bit. I don't know that anybody's ever given me advice from the field but the realization that the perception of it, particularly in the college I worked in was rude and wide awakening for me. And I really realized I'm going to have to start from the beginning to educate people in what we do.*
>
> *Was more the advice of "You need to close these many gifts by the end of the month. Or I need you to raise this much money" And I said, "Well have any of these people been spoken to?" and they said no. And I said, "Well then that's going to be an issue and you're going to do what I call dirty fundraising which is just asking people, not getting them passionate about something, just asking them to give. And what I found through that direction that I was given is that people don't think you're genuine, they don't respect you, they don't think you care, it's all about you and it's not about them. It's only about your needs, it's not about their needs. And when you get to that point, you're not developing a relationship. And they just feel that you think of them as an ATM machine so it was, that was another time I had to step back and be brave and take the time to*

> *explain that that's not going to happen this month. If we take the time to develop the relationships this is where I feel we can go. But it took a little bit because that organization wanted that money right now. We hired you that's what you need to do. Make it happen. But in the end I think through the educational process it worked out.*

Shannon also explained how she felt that metrics were connected to this problem.

> Shannon: *I think sometimes we can get really caught up in the numbers. That we have to hit these metrics and we have to hit so many visits and we have to raise so much money that we forget the joy of what we do. And I make a conscientious effort not to take that out on the donor and to say, "Ok, can you give this gift before June 30…or can you give the gift after June 30." You know, you never want to be in that state of mind so I think I have to focus a lot on trying to hit my metric before the end of the year so I never have that pressure on my back. Which, as you know, is never a sure thing. There are years we are completely cultivating and not a lot of money comes in and the next year it comes in and the next year you're back to a cultivation year…so there's a little bit of pressure there, right? And I just always hope that never interferes with what we call development. And that's developing relationships and that's our goal, not driven so much by this number that we need to raise and that we always remember that we're dealing with people who want to make a difference in the world and that that needs to be really the driving force as oppose to the metric.*

Shannon was not the only one to bring up metrics in this discussion regarding relationship cultivation and the time it can take to close a gift.

> PI: *What about kind of the impact of your work product? So, it sounds like you're saying you didn't feel like there was an impact in work life balance. But do you feel like your work product was directed in a way that maybe wasn't as productive or did it impact anything in that regard?*
>
> Sarah: *Yes, definitely, yeah, I think if I could spend more time on certain products or building relationships with certain people. I mean building those relationships for a longer period of time rather than meeting the metrics of new visits or just making sure I had meetings with different people I think that would have made a difference in certain cases on what the outcome was. That's the tricky thing, is you know, with frontline fundraising is you have to build a relationship. They won't necessarily give you money right away, it can take it could take years. Then in the meantime you have these metrics to meet and you hope that it all goes according to plan.*
>
> *But yeah, I mean just building the relationship takes time and effort. So, if you have to kind of set that aside for other tasks that don't bring in money or something like that. Then that I think can be a lot of pressure or if you have to do events and you know the*

events won't be as successful, but its relationship building and yeah, just split your time that way. So, I think that can be a little bit more pressure in terms of making sure there is some sort of outcome and you want that outcome. But you know, it doesn't always come, so.

The pressure Sarah describes is something I heard from several of the development officers I interviewed. Their discussion of this stress, and how they felt it impacted their work, or the behavior of their colleagues in negative ways, indicated that although the money might be coming in the door, relationships with donors might not be thriving or growing or the metrics may be breeding competition over collaboration in some cases.

PI: *What would you say you like the least about working in development?*

John: *This is an easy question because what I don't like is when people get hung up on their metrics for the wrong reasons. When people begin to forget that what we do is incredibly important for the institution and it is when we get into those sticky situations where I have to try to untangle a mess because somebody, you know, just things go crosswise and I have untangle it and I don't enjoy that.*

Like what John was alluding to here, I heard from others, like Andrea and Paul, which I share below, about how they felt metrics impacted donor stewardship, timelines for giving, and caused territorial or competitive behaviors.

Andrea: *I do get a feeling that everybody is trying to reach those numbers and sometimes that creates a little bit like "oh you went and talked to my person and you did not talk to me." I have that happen and that kind of thing and so I understand that everyone is under the pressure but I have had a couple people tell me that they thought it was too much and frustration over the fact that those visits are really supposed to be forwarding new gifts. Well what do you with all of these folks who have made gifts, and they are great people, and you want to keep them involved? I have heard a lot of frustration from people about the time they don't have to do the stewardship.*

As I spoke with Paul about metrics, he leads off by reflecting on how they are helpful but after talking through his response more I noticed that although he is hopeful about colleagues collaborating to meet their metrics and work with donors on joint gifts, he acknowledges that has not always seen this behavior.

> PI: *In terms of your time in development, not just this position, how have you seen the push to focus on metrics change? Has it become more of a focus? Less of a focus?*
> Paul: *Definitely more of a focus. I feel for all the good reasons, I feel we're moving in the direction we need to be moving in. Especially considering we plan to double fundraising in 7 years, or whatever we're down to now. I think it's the only way with CRM and what it's capable of doing, in order to be successful at raising money I think we just sort of, I hate to say, we sort of have to be forced to go in this corner and really think of ways that can make us more productive in our jobs.*
>
> *I wasn't crazy about these monthly reports that we receive, where we were basically compared to each other, but now that I compare myself I think it's a good thing. Just because someone's raising 5 million and someone else is raising 500,000 a lot of that just depends on the area. I think it's good but I think on the flip side it paints sort of a frustrating picture for some they sort of see it as oh my gosh, everyone's watching what we're doing. But if you're doing your job and you're honestly doing your job I think it's a motivational thing that we can use to work as a team to encourage each other. I truly believe that by working collaboratively on gifts we could bring much bigger gifts. Much bigger gifts and I've seen it. I've always tried to encourage it. I haven't seen a lot of it from other people. A couple situations with science, and the state museum, I've seen it where I've been impressed.*

As I spoke with Candice about metrics, she indicated that in her experience it is important to remember that we should be working to close gifts on a timeline that is important to the donor and not based on the institution.

> Candice: *One of my other challenges here too is, well there is that balance, our bookends don't correlate with the donor. They are not going to make their gift based on the calendar, I mean maybe if the calendar is important to them too, but year-end gifts are important to us, and same as fiscal year.*
>
> *We have those metrics and it is really kind of good to remember to focus on what is important to the donor. And if you are meeting with enough people, and having enough good visits, and to me it is not just about visits, it is good visits. They are not all going to be good, some visits are going to be like nothing is going to come from that. So, if you are focused on quality over quantity, though the foundation of course, they need metrics, and they have their expectation, but I think some people are so wrapped up in the quantity,*

> *but not the quality, but you met with that person and then you have not met with them again in 6 months or a year, what are you working on?*

Candice asks this rhetorical question in regard to strategy and she was not the only one to bring up how visit metrics and the quantity of donor visits do not always convert to quality time with a donor.

As these conversations and quotes shared from my interviews demonstrate, development metrics and work pressures may lead to neglecting relationships, competition for donors, or just focusing on the numbers. In addition to listening to the negative impact of metrics, I also heard from several development officers about why metrics were necessary. I found several interviewees to contradict themselves at times because they explained the metrics as being essential or helpful, while at the same time they would often describe them as inhibiting or pressure filled. Perhaps this was occurring due to the common ideology that it is a best practice in the profession to have metrics, however, my research is indicating that this best practice is not always resulting in better donor relationship building. Below are a couple of examples from Sarah, Shannon, and Kelly where they described them as a road map, encouraging or motivating, and allowing for forecasting.

> PI: *When you were in Higher Education you had goals or metrics that you were encouraged to meet. How did you feel about them and then how do you feel like you were evaluated in terms of meeting them?*
>
> Sarah*: I think I understand completely why there needs to be metrics just for any job you have to have something to be evaluated on, so, I think that makes perfect sense. But what I found is at different institutions is, the metrics aren't really focused on, aren't really connected to the goals sometimes. So, if they're connected to the goals it makes far more sense and it's still challenging and still a lot of pressure. But at least there is kind of a purpose there. But if they're not connected then it's just a lot of pressure for kind of no reason.*

Like Sarah, Shannon also describes the metrics and aiding with her evaluation of her work.

> Shannon: W*hat's good and interesting that you ask this question now, just having come out of the meeting I just came out of is you go back after 6 months and you adjust your goal. So is it realistic that the college is going to raise a million? Well, no because now that I look at it I don't think these two gifts are going to close. Or yes, I think we're going to exceed it and raise more than the million because there's two other gifts coming in that we didn't anticipate. So I think it's good that the University literally looks at that and evaluates that every six months to see if we're still on target, because if not we have to adjust so the university can adjust to what we're going to bring in.*
>
> *So that's what I would say about metrics. You know, it's always hard to follow that but I think it's necessary because otherwise you can't forecast, you can't plan, you can't see where you're going. You don't feel like you're being held accountable and when you don't feel like you're being held accountable it's hard to know if you're successful or not. That's how I feel about the metrics. We usually come pretty close to what we hit but we don't hit it on the dot.*

Shannon's assessment that the metrics are important for accountability and guide her evaluation of success is interesting when juxtaposed with her terminology for "dirty fundraising." I wish at the time I would have thought to ask her more about how she sees the two in relationship to each other and that if there was a more qualitative metric designed to measure if you were learning a donor's passions how that might look in regard to measuring success.

> PI: *How do you think it [metrics] impacts your overall work?*

> Kelly: *Well, it makes you accountable, I mean you have to, it makes you somewhat strategic. I mean because you have to document all this stuff, and you have to document it for it to count. I mean that's a good thing, I mean because if you have to put in your contact report and, that helps lay the ground work and also gives you a record of what you are doing. So, knowing that it is a bigger thing, it is not just going to lunch and forget about it. It is a step and everything and I think it helps structure it I guess. So, in that sense it is a good thing.*

In my interview with Carrie, we discussed metrics as a measurement tool that she found motivating, but she also mentioned how they were something she grew to appreciate. When she first started her fundraising career in higher education they were unfamiliar, and when she was the development officer for the Libraries at the University of South West, she found them much harder to meet and unrealistic compared to her current college. I raised this question during the interview because Carrie had previously told me how hard it was to meet her goal fundraising for the library. I found it intriguing how quickly she shifted her viewpoint on their necessity once she found them more achievable.

> *PI: I see it's a higher education thing, I don't hear about it as you mentioned in a community non-profit.*
>
> Carrie: *Yeah, I like it, you know, I run my metrics every month and see how I'm doing. I find them very motivating and then they're not just a pie in the sky thing, I mean they really do look at these numbers when we do our performance evaluation and then so, I don't have, I know other colleagues of mine do have trouble with them, but it's easy for me, I like them.*
>
> PI*: No, that's great.*
>
> Carrie: *Yeah, and you know when you're raising an audacious amount of money it keeps you going, keeps you plotting forward.*
>
> PI: *Right, and you know kind of what the expectations are and what you're working towards. It seems like there was a difference between libraries and working here that you felt.*
>
> Carrie*: Yes, and it was new to me, you know, I was like I worked there 18 months and I didn't, I was just starting to get the hang of it when I left and then here I was just like okay. It's like the light went one, I'm like okay, I can do this and it was good. But when I first came here I was just like there is no way I can raise this much money, because you know Higher Ed fundraising is, the goals are big.*
>
> *My boss said, just concentrate on the metrics and the money will come and it's true, I think that's very true. So, I mean I kind of tried to use metrics in a lot of things in my life now. I don't know, I can't think of an example that, like I try to reach 4 elderly people a month, you know, that's a personal metric for me. So, I don't know, measuring, just measuring.*

In my interview with Maureen I found her to be so matter of fact about how much she loved having metrics and clear expectations.

> PI: *Do you have fundraising goals/metrics that you are required or encouraged to meet and if you do, how do you feel about them?*
> Maureen: *Yes. I definitely have them (laughing). I am sure everyone has told you this same thing. I definitely have goals and metrics I am required to meet. I love having them because it is so clear what I am expected to do and whether I have done it or not. The other thing I really like about our goals and metrics is I feel like they are really good ones because they are measuring the type of work you really should be doing. At least how I understand it, the ones that they are most focused on, or my supervisor is most focused on is proposals. After that really comes the visits and you know the money, at least my feeling about it is that they think that proposals and the visits really represent the effort you are putting in to it and if you are doing it right and you know how to do your work. The money will come out of that. I think they are great and I just wish, I mean some jobs are much more complicated, but I just think the world would be similar if for every job you just had 5 really goals or clear objectives that are almost the same every year and they might tweak up some each year, but you just know what you are supposed to do and you know how you are doing. It is just completely transparent and I think that is really good for a feeling of equality among the development officers.*

I decided to ask Maureen about what she thought her colleagues would say about metrics and if they would provide a similar answer. I choose to do this in a couple of interviews to try to gauge if the development officer was in a unique situation where they were under little pressure to meet their metrics or to learn if the metrics were unusually low or high. These responses became helpful because sometimes the answer was very different when I asked how they thought their colleagues would respond.

> PI: *Do you feel like in talking with your colleagues that people share that same view? Do you feel other people might feel more pressure by them or overwhelmed?*
>
> Maureen: *I suppose if some people feel overwhelmed by them that might have something to do with who their supervisor is and I don't feel overwhelmed and I am probably my own harshest critic so. I just care about the quality of my work and it is just inherently part of who I am. It is not that I am better than anyone else, I just cannot turn it off to care.*

I think that there are some colleagues who face tremendous challenges in their units because of dysfunctionality in their units and so for me it might be much more straight forward to identify a donor, meet with a donor, and present the proposal and in some other units it might be very complicated trying to determine are we going to present A or B or someone saying this MY donor and you cannot contact them. I know that there may be you know some units where it is harder to get visits than others. Such as medical doctors, they just seem to be extremely busy people, who have very little control over their schedules, so for times you have a meeting set and show up and they are not available because they are off in the emergency room with a patient, so I am not sure that I can say across the board how everyone feels. I also try to maintain close relationships with other development officers who are positive people because I don't really like talking to people who are negative Nellies because that really brings me down, so I think that most people who I interact with may feel like most of the things are attainable. Although there are some units who don't really have very big donor bases and that probably is an issue that the foundation really needs to address.

As I have tried to demonstrate from the quotes I have included, although many of the development officers described the metrics as necessary or helpful, they also circled back to how important donor relationships are and how they felt the metrics had a fatal flaw in recognizing this piece. Additionally, when I asked them to shift their perspective and share how they imagined their colleagues view them, based on what they hear from others, they would open up more about competition, anxiety, and negative side of the metrics, just like in this exchange with Dennis who works in the Health Sciences area.

PI: So as you talk to colleagues, it seems you feel very comfortable with your metrics, but with others do you feel like across the foundation other people feel the same or do you think they feel more pressure?

Dennis: I know other people feel pressure and feel stressed by it. So I am not suggesting that I am just this naturally gifted person who can do this. I think part of it is just this role that I have allows me to dip into those areas that seem to have opportunity, whereas if you are with some units, if you are attached to a unit, in some cases your department chair might want you to be much more involved and they want you to be doing other things.

> *Like when I was at the cancer center, I did a ton of writing. I did not want to be doing that and it was competing with what I was, what my job was. Right? But for the past four or five years, I have been somewhere where that was not a problem.*
>
> *Metrics can feel a bit oppressive depending upon two things, one is the environment that people are working in that demands other services from them and the other factor is who their graduates are. If you are in education, you are pretty hard pressed to find donors who are doing to give you $25,000 or more. If you are the business school it is a lot easier to find them.*

Dennis, similarly to Maureen, acknowledged that not all of the other development colleagues at his institution would likely respond similarly about their metrics and that he does know other people who feel pressure or stressed and even recalls feeling this way himself when he was at the Cancer Center.

Unhealthy donor portfolio size

Another theme that emerged as part of my conversations with development officers about their time constraints, and their metrics, was their portfolio size. Each of the 16 development professionals who I interviewed completed a pre-interview questionnaire where I asked them to record their portfolio size. The responses to this questionnaire ranged from as few as 3 donors to as many as 180 donors in a portfolio. The staff member who responded that she only had 3 donor assignments is a staff member who only had development as a small portion of her job description. Also worthy of noting, she was the only development professional in her division, but NOT a development officer. Therefore, this small size does not seem unusual based on her job description. With all the front-line fundraisers, we discussed their portfolio size, and I would ask each interview participant how many of those donors they felt they had a deep or comfortable relationship with and how they felt their portfolio size impacted their ability to do their work. The same outlooks were shared repeatedly regarding their preference for a smaller a portfolio (~75) people, because the more quality and intimate relationships the development professional could cultivate. Perhaps not surprising, those professionals who had been in the field longer shared that over the last several years they have watched their portfolio size grow and this is impacting their work.

> John: *I would say 100% of my portfolio were folks with whom I had a deep relationship.*
>
> PI: *And how large was that portfolio?*
>
> John: *About 100 or 150.*
>
> PI*: Wow. That is large to be able to have strong relationships with all of those folks.*
>
> John: *I had been there for 9 years.*

John references his strong relationship with all 100-150 donors in his portfolio, but this happened with about 9 years in one area, which for a development professional to stay in one unit this long is becoming less and less common. Since John identified that he currently supervises other professionals on campus, I asked how he feels about portfolio size for them.

> PI: *Working as a manager for 12 other DOs. What would you say for other development officers' portfolio size and number of relationships? Is there a good portfolio size that you have come up with that is the right balance?*
>
> John*: Yes. I think 70 is a good number. I think it is hard to build a relationship that will advance. Having a portfolio of 150 you cannot think strategically if you are maintaining all of those relationships, because maintaining them is not growing them. To be thoughtful you need fewer, in fact, I was thinking this morning if I could go back to my portfolio from 2004, I would be a very different gift officer and be more successful, I think, because I would be much more strategic about who I spent time with.*

Nathan is another development officer with more than 10 years of experience in higher education so I asked him to reflect on how, if at all, he had seen portfolio sizes change over time.

> PI: *Do you feel like more development officers are carrying more donors in their portfolio? Has that number kind of changed over your career or have you heard how it changes across units on campus?*
>
> Nathan: *Yes. The 180 is high and that is because I have multiple prospect pools, but I will tell you, for instance, in my unit, my development officer has 115 and you know, I don't know if of the 115, she has visited most of them. So typically, what I am seeing*

nationwide, is what my personal preference is, which is you should not have more than, if you are CDO, Chief Development Officer in a unit, or Senior Director, or Director of Development, whatever the title is of somebody who runs the shop, you should not have more than 50 prospects that you manage. You should limit that list to 50 and each time a donor gets to a level that you have exhausted the solicitations and move them out of your portfolio and add the next one.

In terms of looking at you know other officers, I think a healthy pool for a road warrior, should be about 100 to 120, for someone doing research, or a junior staff because they are doing more pipeline building work.

You are seeing more and more organizations push people to have smaller portfolios, but what is happening is that places that are not employing a high number of people there is very, essentially a very low threshold of officers so you have to deal with a larger pool of people.

PI: *Right*

Nathan: *So, you then you end up having a development officer have 180 prospects, which makes absolutely no sense.*

I also asked Emma about her portfolio size. I asked specifically about how it might have changed after I learned that she had recently experienced a shift in her role with the foundation and because she was also someone who had been in the field for almost 10 years.

PI: *Ok. And when you think about maybe over time and your time in development, would you say that number has changed? Has it been pretty consistent? And what do you feel like is maybe an ideal number because of relationships?*

Emma: *Soooo it's definitely changed because in the beginning no one was talking about who's in your portfolio. There was no prospect management standards. You called on anybody that you wanted and nobody else knew it (chuckle). There was just no coordination from the University standpoint. So anybody that was your alum was potentially your donor. So we didn't even think about things like how many people are you, you know, cultivating right now. It was much more haphazard…who can you get a meeting with? And then there was a real shift toward "we need to be coordinated." We shouldn't be calling the same person in the same day sort of thing. And there was some bad behavior that went along with it and there was, I think, some prospect hoarding. And then there was another shift and people have become much more collaborative and there's a spirit of one team.*

So, I would say in the beginning I had no number cause we didn't take assignment. Then I probably had too many…I probably had 120, which was just unrealistic. There was no

> *way I was going to go see those people and build a relationship and be in any sort of position to ask them for a gift. And then the 100 that I had, I would say that's probably still too big of a portfolio, but because we didn't have a mechanism at the time for people who were in life-long stewardship, I would say probably 9 of those people were just stewardship. So, they were in my portfolio and they'd get attention but it wasn't like I was going out and actively cultivating them and honestly I pushed a lot of the stewardship to somebody else in my office.*

Emma touches on an important point here about portfolio size and how if her institution did not have a good process in place for maintaining a relationship with a donor, who was in the stewardship cycle of giving, that this was just another responsibility added to her plate and another reason she has too many donor constituents in her portfolio.

> PI*: That's a good point that there are donors [*in stewardship*] I think that are in a lot of folk's portfolios that are kind of in this holding pattern that are like there because we think they'd be good prospects and we just need to find the time for the discovery. Which I think we are addressing and then as you mentioned the stewardship so they're there because they've made a planned gift and we don't want to forget them, but really there is not going to be an active solicitation.*
>
> Emma*: Right. There's actually a lot of great literature about healthy portfolios and thinking about what does that mean and how many people can you realistically go and visit.*

After hearing Emma explain that there is literature in the field related to donor portfolio size I wanted to learn if that literature was specifically guiding professionals to an ideal size based on relationship building or what criteria was being used for this "healthy portfolio size."

> PI*: Is it driven by wanting to have a strong relationship or what…. What would you characterize as how they would say describe a healthy portfolio?*
>
> Emma*: Ya. So it's a recognition that a lot of organizations are measuring DO performance based on how much are they going to ask for, how much are they going to close when you actually should also be managing how many people are in the portfolio, knowing that if you put more than honestly probably 80, you can't go see those people so you take an organization that has this prospect pool and you freeze these people by allowing people to put more than that in their portfolio because it cannot be done. And if it can be done you're either not doing it well, you're not doing the cultivation or in most*

> *cases there just not….people are ignored or you just saw them at a cocktail party you're not doing good development. You can't be.*

Good development, focused on relationships and driven by donor interests, not metrics, is something all of the professionals I spoke with were striving to achieve; however, as my data illuminates the pressure they are under is real and often disruptive to their ideal development cycle. My research also brings to light how the fast pace of the development cycle and large portfolio sizes are limiting development officers' and their institutions/units from having the time to think more strategically about potential donor populations. As I spoke with development officers and asked them about their typical work cycle or day, they did not discuss time for professional development, reading, or strategic conversations about forecasting around alumni giving, changing donor populations, or discussions about engaging donor/alumni populations that are not being tapped in to. Perhaps this is because of colorblind racism or perhaps it is a combination of the culture of fast paced higher education development and colorblind practices. Instead they are busy rushing around trying to meet their metrics and "gather their wits," as Carrie said in our interview, when I asked her to describe her work cycle.

Ideal donors don't take too much of my time

The busy workloads, pressure filled metrics, and yearning to quickly and efficiently do their work was also evidenced by how several of the development officers I interviewed described their ideal donors as individuals who were not too needy and would not take up too much time. Of course, they also described their ideal donors as generous, passionate, philanthropically inclined, and having a love for their institution or college, but noteworthy was the description of their ideal philanthropist as someone who did not need too much attention or time. In my interview with Carrie I asked her to describe her ideal donor and our dialogue that followed my question is below. The woman she chose to describe was a volunteer within the college, who Carrie just happened to have met for the first time, the day of our interview, and secured a gift with her in the first visit.

> PI: *Describe your ideal donor?*
>
> Carrie: *I just met with her and she was so great so. I just met with this woman, she's my ideal donor, she understands the work I do. She all of a sudden realized that she's at the age where she has to do an IRA rollover and she's thought carefully about where she wants to put the money.*
>
> *She knows she wants it to go to this unit. She's like, what do you think they need? Do you know what they need? I said they need a director's fund, that's discretionary cash for the director to use to do whatever she, whatever hole she needs to fill. Sounds good. Good.*
>
> PI: *Wow! A discretionary gift.*

As Carrie and I spoke more about this ideal donor, I learned that not only was the donor someone who was savvy enough to understand the work Carrie does and the role of the development officer, but she even brought to the lunch the paperwork that she needs to submit for her IRA gift. This not only saved Carrie time in a back and forth exchange with the donor, but it made Carrie certain that this gift commitment would come in from the donor.

> Carrie: *I know, so, that's perfect, okay, everyone loves discretionary money. She says well, I'm going to give you $10,000 a year and I said, well, would you consider doing a 5 year pledge so you do $50,000 you get to be at this level be in our special donor society. It will be great, blah, blah, blah. Oh! She would love to do that, she's got her paperwork, I filled out the paperwork for her IRA roll over and I'm going to do a pledge form for her.*
>
> *Then she's thinking about leaving this IRA fund in her Will to us. She's like, because I was just telling her about the friend's of music gift that we got. That was a very complicated thing that had a bequest. It ended up being all cash but a long story anyway bequest. I was telling her about that and she's like, well maybe I can do a bequest.*
>
> *Then I said that would be wonderful because that's transformational, you know, I can use my caned language and she bought it. I mean I think we'll end up having her be a very big donor to us. Perfect, easy, no problem, she's great, she volunteers at the unit where she wants to give. She's perfect, she's healthy, she's got a good outlook she's helpful, perfect. She's not going to be a problem, she's great.*

This donor was ideal in Carrie's description because not only was she interested in supporting the music program at a generous level, but it was easy. She was familiar with how to support a non-profit organization through a bequest and as Carrie said, "she is not going to be a problem," which as I interpreted our conversation meant, she is not going to take up too much of my time or attention with her needs or questions.

In a slightly different example, but similar in the gift officer's description that the ideal donor is easy to work with, from my interview with Maureen, I heard examples of how an ideal donor is someone who does not involved a lot of attention or guess work about their needs or interests.

> PI: *Describe your ideal donor.*
>
> Maureen: *There certainly are challenges, but to be able to work with donors who are just very clear about their expectations, or what they want and where you are not trying to guess about what they want or if they are dissatisfied you are trying to guess what they are upset about. They are very direct and not people who are driven by ego and need tons of meetings with leadership. They are simply people who want to give because they can and they are interested in what we are doing and it seems like the right thing to do.*
>
> *You know there are some donors who you will cultivate, and cultivate and it seems like they are interested in this thing and you present a proposal and they just won't make a decision. That is not my ideal sort of donor.*

Similar to Maureen's description, in my interviews with John and Emma, which are quoted below, I again heard how the ideal donor is someone who already has an idea about what they want to accomplish with their philanthropy.

> PI: *How would you describe your ideal donor?*
>
> John: *My ideal donor would be somebody who has a clear vision, or who would be open to discussing what their vision is for achieving a philanthropic investment. Somebody who knows what they want to do or who is open to seeing what they are going to do.*

> PI*: Could you describe your ideal donor?*
>
> Emma*: My ideal donor is someone who is passionate about Desert University. Is*

> *someone who has the capacity to give. I've had donors who really want to give something but as you start talking to them you feel like you're helping them give away their children's inheritance or be stretching so much you worry about them. I don't like that. So someone who has the capacity, has the passion and has an understanding about what they want to accomplish. You know, we can sort of help them flush it out and fill in the blanks but if they don't know….maybe what I'm trying to say is somebody who is philanthropic.*

As I posed this question to Jessica, I heard some similarity in her response regarding her ideal donor, but it was also a bit unique. Her response was more distinctive because she discussed how not only does her ideal donor have passion or faith in the university and want to give back, but she described a donor who also has so much trust for the university that he will essentially look to her for guidance and ask what is the university priority, what is your need and if he is somewhat interested in that, he will give.

> PI: *Can you describe your ideal donor.*
>
> Jessica: *Hm. So I have someone in mind, I mean I have many ideal donors.*
>
> *PI: So a picture popped into your mind?*
>
> Jessica*: Yes. So I think someone who believes so strongly in the University and trusts the university so they really do want to give to the areas that the university thinks will have the most impact. Those types of donors, I have found, are few and far between. You know most donors want to give to what they are interested in and so I have one donor who has given two endowed chairs and other gifts to the Division and you know whenever he is done paying something off, he says, "okay Jessica, where is the next need?" And he will take my word for it. I mean he will not just give to whatever I say, he has to be somewhat interested in it, like we will start to engage him in another area, he will meet faculty and generally he will support it. So that is the best kind of donor, um. So I am trying to think of other kinds of characteristics.*

In the last example of a response I received to this question, Paul explicitly states that he prefers to work with women donors who are widows because they are the easiest to solicit.

> PI: *Can you describe your ideal donor?*
>
> Paul: *My wife would tell you. This is my wife speaking – she would tell you widowed, I mean, how does she describe me?*

Paul paused here to think about what phrase his wife uses to describe his work with donors.

> Paul: *"like all your donors are female, widowed, who just enjoy the company of a male."*
>
> *And I totally get it. I totally agree with what she's saying. I don't really have a certain donor that I enjoy more. I guess the easier ones are widows.*

This statement from Paul really hits home for me, as I did not ask him to describe characteristics of donors who are easiest to work with or who make the largest gifts, but "ideal", yet Paul, like the majority of the development officers I interviewed, reflected on the question and responded with donors who are ideal because of how "easy" or less involved they are to work with on a gift. The responses to this question really cemented for me that development officers preferred to work with a donor who knew what he/she wanted to accomplish with their philanthropy, and who would not involve too much cultivation or time to a build a relationship.

I believe that because of the immense pressure development departments and professionals are under to bring in million-dollar gifts that fundraisers are being assimilated to not only desire a donor who is generous and passionate, but who they can quickly close a gift with and who they consider to not be too demanding. As I consider the potential barriers, or influencing factors, connected to the raced practices limiting the professions' expansion to include a more racially diverse donor base, it will be important to emphasize how development officers' ideal donors are described. I focus on this because, when connected to some of the descriptions I heard from development professionals regarding their experience working with donors of color, they at times were depicted as "difficult," or for non-White donors, who were "newer" to exploring or understanding philanthropy, these donors were described as in need of more "hand-holding." For my study, I think that the hurried pace of development and high-pressure metrics are important to note, specifically in relationship to how donors of color are described. My conversation with Andrea illustrates one of these examples.

> Andrea: *Yeah, some of the first people I worked with here were a Hispanic couple and were native to our state, and that was really exciting. The thing I did notice is that they tended to need more education because they were not as familiar with the philanthropic process. So he was thinking about donating some property, so we went through all that and then that did not feel good to him, so then we thought about stock and that felt good, but the whole process he just had never done this before.*
>
> *So kind of really walking them through. It took a while and we had a couple of hiccups, so I was really holding their hand through that. So, you never know where folks are at, some of these other people, you try to walk through it and they will say oh yeah I have done this a million times.*

Of the development professionals I interviewed, who had some experience working with non-White donors, Andrea was not the only development officer I spoke with who felt that in her experience the donors of color she had worked with to close gifts were less familiar with the philanthropic process. These feelings translated into descriptions of donors of color as time consuming. More concerning however, were the several development officers who had categorized their experience of working with one, or a handful of Non-White donors, as difficult. As Carrie describes below in our conversation about her ideal donor, donors' who become a challenge, for one reason or another, are not ideal and in Carrie's opinion this was the trait given to Hispanic donors.

> PI: *As you were describing kind of the ideal donor, I know just coming from the lunch that you were referencing this woman. But as you kind of think of people as you're talking about, do you feel like they tend to be more women, older, younger, White, Non-White, married, single?*
>
> Carrie: *I would say people in their early 70s are the best donors because they've done their careers, they are at a place where they want to give back. They are comfortable, they know they're going to die eventually, but they aren't there yet.*
>
> *I think a healthy 70-year-old is like a perfect donor. Women, probably women are a little more philanthropic from my point of view. Did you ask a question about race, was that your question?*
>
> PI*: Yes.*

> Carrie: *I don't know, I can't answer that part. I don't know, maybe. I want to say, in my experience, Hispanic donors are the most difficult. I don't know if I should say that. This may just be my current state right, at this moment with this upcoming Rufino Tamayo Show.*

Carrie's feeling that Hispanic donors are difficult, based on one event, for a Mexican artist is striking. Not only is this quote a good example of the cultural racism, which I discussed in part one of my findings, but it directly relates to the theory I pose about ideal donors. Due to the development officer longing for a donor who is quick to make a gift, and easiest to work with, some development professionals are intentionally ignoring some donors of color.

Another outcome of the busy schedules and high demands placed on development professionals that my research may have started to uncover is a lack of time for professional development, reading literature/research, or to keep up with current trends in the profession. I have found this to be true in my own experience, outside of my doctoral work, it has never been encouraged by leadership in my development department, or the university foundation to keep up with scholarly sources researching development practices.

Discussing donor diversity

In an effort to try to learn more about what trends related to donor giving and diversity the professionals I interviewed were attuned to, or if perhaps, I was just becoming hyper aware of the trends, I posed the following question during my interviews: *As I have come into the development profession recently, I have started to notice an emerging trend, or what I think is a trend, related to discussions about philanthropy and diversity. For example, the Chronicle of Philanthropy's, Philanthropy Next conference, this fall is focused on America's Emerging Donors. I also recently heard of large, public, well-known university that just added a* *development professional to their foundation team who has a job description focused on diversity, equity and inclusion. What is your perspective on this trend?*

In response to this question, I received a variety of responses, across all three institution sites. Most of the responses were consistent with the themes I have discussed during this chapter. The responses ranged from sharing that they have limited time to devote to keeping up with trends, to more responses that support a colorblind ideology, specifically the response that they never hear their colleagues, or the profession discuss race. A small group acknowledged this trend and the importance of this type of education and Tiffany relayed how she felt this type of information would benefit her and the field.

> Kelly: *No, I have not noticed it, but of course, I have been in the southwest all this time and the two institutions that I have raised money for tend to be majority [minority], I mean the graduates, I should not say majority because I already told you it is 50-50 here, but it seems that the most successful, likely prospects are White men.*
>
> *So, I have not seen it, and I have not even seen the two organizations that I worked for look at a strategy that way. That oh! We need to talk to more, maybe here? No. Not even here. I can't even say that that's happened at the foundation. It has not happened here at the law school, so that's this state for you, we are always behind any kind of trends.*

As Kelly stated in the interview, she believes the best use of her time in regard to success or the ROI for fundraising is working with White men. This perspective was not unique, but demonstrates that lack of strategic direction she later references because if one was watching the trends or considering donor demographics or life expectancy they would realize that women live longer than men and White men over the age of 60 are a minority portion of the population. What the opinions of gift-officers, like Kelly, are pointing out is that the profession is concentrating a majority of fundraising time on one of the smallest segments of the population. Just as she said, "we are always behind any kind of trends," the profession as a whole is behind and is not thinking strategically about who they are cultivating. I discuss this finding more in the next chapter.

In my interview with Carrie she directly states that she has not heard anything about this conference or topic.

> *PI: As I've come into the profession recently so, just doing this the last 2 years I've noticed a trend, and what's coming out from the chronicle of philanthropy and their philanthropy next conference, which they have next month in DC is focused on the emerging diverse donor.*
>
> *There is also as I've done this research, I learned about a large public institution within their foundation just hired somebody and her role is specifically focused on diversity and inclusion. So, I'm curious if you started to see any trend and more discussion about it or more research or..?*
>
> Carrie: *No, I really haven't, but now that I've talked to you I probably will start thinking about it more, seriously. I will.*

Dennis's reaction was different than Kelly and Carrie's but similarly, he did not recall hearing his institution, or any of the professional associations related to development discussing this topic and he shares how he only has time to attend the one conference related to medical school fundraising.

> Dennis: *Okay. So, I do have some reactions to that. The first thing that came to my mind, and I am sure that this is a part of all of that, because the most prominent diversity related stuff that I have seen come out across the e-waves and different generations and generational interpretations of what diversity is. I think that age may be the largest thing that we are dealing with.*
>
> *I don't know how old you are, but I know that we are separated by at least a generation and I know that kids that are coming along now are very different from you because they literally grew up using technology. That is a bit of diversity that has to be factored in. In terms of most of the fundraising related stuff that I do now is all in regard to the AAMC, that is the American Association of Medical Colleges and I do not recall if they have focused a great deal on diversity in fundraising, but there is a great deal of conversation about diversity in medical training and differences that need to be accounted for.*
>
> *Ask me your question again and let me kind of… I think there was another thing or two out there.*

When Dennis paused his answer to ask me to clarify my question again, I realized that he had lost track of the question and started to fumble with his answer. He was not the only interviewee to had this reaction to my question. I discuss this observation further a little later in this chapter.

> PI: *I was just curious if you feel like I have accurately picked up that it is a trend or if it is maybe not a trend, and this discussion has been around longer than I have been in the profession, since I only recently entered, or maybe it is a new and emerging conversation in your mind.*
>
> Dennis: *I think it has taken off in the last decade, partly with the election of Obama, we have become, from a political perspective, much more sensitive, sometimes to a degree that hurts us. It has become much more political football. Yes. In the last 10 years, I think there has been a lot more attention paid to it so you are seeing that in the time you have been in the field. You are picking up on a lot of activity that is there. I think a lot of it used to be subverted and not talked about openly and I think in this period where everything is opening up and it is becoming a political football, that diversity is one of those things we need to talk about and I hope that we do it judiciously.*

Dennis's response to this question seemed to kind of go all over the place and perhaps this occurred because of his discomfort of being asked to speak directly to his observations about trends in giving and race, or perhaps he was unable to answer the question because the conference name was too race neutral. Just like Dennis, Paul also fumbled over his response to this question, and asked me to clarify what I was asking. Again, perhaps it was a result of their discomfort as White men, or it may also have been due to the theme of "America's Emerging Donor" being too vague. I discuss this use of language and the impact of its race neutrality more in my conclusion.

> Paul: *So the trend being….again? I'm sorry*
>
> PI: *The trend being more discussion about diversity and philanthropy.*
>
> Paul: *In respect to race or?*
>
> PI: *In general. So women, homosexual couples vs heterosexual, young alumni, young donors*

> Paul: *I would say more times than not, and I guess maybe most of my conversations have been with females. And with the arts too, you deal more with homosexual couples. More male than female.*
>
> PI: *Do you feel like you have heard this trending in any of the conferences? Like if you've gone to CASE or AFP?*
>
> Paul: *The only thing I've attended is a group called the Southwest Planned Giving Round Table. They meet once a month, usually 10 months out of the year, mostly local professionals come, mostly involved in development, to talk about best practices. Um, I've noticed in the topics being presented there has been more discussion about domestic partnerships. It's been a bigger focus than it's ever been before. I would say that's been the biggest change I've seen. Not change, but it's been increased awareness. Ya, other than that I really, I don't, I really haven't noticed much.*

Paul was not alone in sharing how he had observed some shifts in conversations about diversity and then transferred the conversation away from race to focus on LGBT alumni or first-generation students. This occurred in my discussion with both George and John, two more male development officers who identified as White.

> PI: *So last question, as I have come into the development profession recently, within the last two years, I feel like I have started to notice more of an emerging trend of more discussion about diversity and donors.*
>
> F*or example, the Chronicle of Philanthropy, Philanthropy Next Conference, that they had this year was focused on America's emerging donor and they had an entire deep dive one day focused on women and philanthropy, so kind of like what you mentioned your colleagues who are women talking about. I also recently heard about a large public university with a strong development program who has someone embedded in their development area, not institution wide, but development specific, who is focused on looking at diversity and inclusion in the development program. So, I am curious, is this something that maybe I have noticed because this is my research area and it interests me and I am new, or do you think that this is a trend that you have observed too or happening longer than the last two years?*
>
> George: *Um I mean. I think that they are coming around to that and that maybe some institutions are focusing on it more than some others. At a minimum it is something we should be aware of and thinking about. At most Jesuit schools, something that many of them pride themselves on is that they were originally created to educate the children of immigrants and educating the first-generation student, whether they are immigrants or students whose parents did not go to college.*

George states in his response that this is at least something institutions should be thinking about, but then he shifts the conversation slightly to talking about institution mission, and who they "serve" not who the donor is, which a different conversation is. Again, the immigrant or the first-generation alumnus is not the viewed as the donor but who is the recipient of help.

> PI: *So my last question, as I have started to come into the development profession recently, I have started to notice what I think is an emerging trend, but I have obviously not been following it longer than two years, so thinking that there might be more conversation about diversity and philanthropy and not just around race, but everything from women to, same sex couple donors, so noticing this trend, the Chronicle of Philanthropy had their philanthropy next conference this year that was called America's emerging donor and in doing this research, I have learned about a couple large public universities that have hired someone in their development program solely focused on diversity and inclusion. I am curious if you have witnessed any of those things too and if you see it as a trend?*
>
> John: *I have observed that as well and here is why I know it to be a trend. I got a call from a minor donor, who had helped to close a major gift, who was an insurance salesman, who wanted me, and my then partner, to come talk through some things with him.*
>
> *The insurance company had identified that they wanted to reach out to same sex couples and how could they target same sex couples to begin to invest in life insurance because there are these assumptions that can be made about us, we don't have kids, yadda, yadda. Do I think we are moving that direction where we need to think about the emerging donor?*
>
> *Absolutely, because we need to think about how wealth is being passed, how wealth is being generated, how we should begin to talk to people. One of the things that I am really proud of my university for is that when things began to shift a little bit and being able to list relationships in our database with descriptions like partner. I think that as our donor base begins to shift in what it looks like, that our fundraisers will start to mirror that too. While I don't believe that just because someone is African American that they only want to hear from someone that is African American, but I do think that there are some things when we look on a bigger scale, there is a shared experience, there might be some things where we don't remain tone deaf and someone might be able to say, hey did you think about how that is actually going to land?*
>
> *I think here, we don't think about the high holidays, but we should. On the East coast, you don't do something just before Yom Kippur is starting, you just don't do it.*

John identified that he agreed that this topic was something important to pay attention to, and a trend in multiple industries, but again, like his colleagues I interviewed, he was not aware of the conference. Nor, was he able to describe any specific examples of how he saw the profession addressing race, as an important identity, the same way we are starting to think more about domestic partners and how to track this in donor databases in a more donor centric way.

As Candice answered this question, I noticed her response was somewhat different. She reflected on her own experience as woman of color, and when she remembers conversations of race or diversity occurring, how it was more often around the student body make up and not donors.

> PI: *So last question, as I have come into the development profession more recently, in the last two years, I feel like I have observed that there is more conversations about a diverse donor base, and expanding the donor base. This past year in 2017 the Chronicle of Philanthropy's, Philanthropy Next Conference was on America's Emerging Donor. Then I also recently heard about a large public, well known university, with a strong development program that has a dedicated position within their central development are that is focused on diversity and inclusion. So I am curious, having worked in the profession longer, do you feel like I am accurate in observing that this is a more recent trend in that people are talking about it more? What is your sense? Do you feel like it is the same, less, more? Do you hear much about it?*
>
> Candice: *You know I think at one of my past institutions, I think we talked about it more, especially from the student side, and I remember when I was a student there, we were maybe, maybe 9% African American, I don't know what is was for Hispanic students, but you know about 10% of the student body.*
>
> *Now, that same institution is at a point where 10% of their student population comes from the top 1%, and when I started working there, I remember my husband and I walking around there and he was already there working before I started and he was like, maybe they are just hanging out in different places, but in walking around campus, it feels like there are not as many African American students here. I was like umm, I don't know, and then we realized it had decreased to like 4%, so his gut was right.*
>
> *I don't know if I have really heard, or if we have really talked about it, in our work with donors necessarily. I personally have not worked with any African American donors, not at either of my two past institutions, which were in a region where there were more*

African American alumni. I saw my boss work with African American donors or prospective donors.

Candice, after a talking through the question, comes to the conclusion that she does not really recall any of her past institutions discussing donor or alumni race. The quote below is from Jessica, and it summarizes what I heard from several development professionals that for them the pressure to raise money influenced how they thought about donor identity more than a goal to have diverse donors. For example, when I spoke with Jessica about this trend I thought I was seeing in the profession, to try to grow the donor base to be more diverse, she responded with her assessment about what she views as the most pressing priority, and how in her mind all that matters is if the person can make a major gift and not necessarily their identity.

PI: *So the last question I have, I already mentioned before, that I am knew to fundraising, so in the last two years doing this I have noticed whether it is in the weekly Chronicle of Philanthropy newsletters, or there was a conference this year, the Philanthropy Next conference, that was about America's emerging donor, and I recently heard to about a couple of institutions that have hired someone within their development program area to focus on diversity and inclusion, and I am curious, if you, being in the profession longer than me, have made any similar observations, and if you think that this is a trend or has this always been a discussion item and I am just noticing?*

Jessica: *More diversity in our donor base or in the development profession or both?*

PI: *Both, with the idea that we need to expand and grow our donor base conversation, especially as a public institution where funding is decreasing, so the idea that the more donors we have the better.*

Jessica: *Quite honestly, it only comes up in when we are dealing with projects like the stewardship project that I told you about, we always need to make sure that our marketing materials demonstrate diversity, that is really the only time that it comes up for us.*

In hiring it comes up, we do want a diverse development team, um, but as far as making a concerted effort to diversify the donor base, we are just trying to raise money, frankly, I do not really care where it comes from and we are a small team serving a large division, it has not been a focus because we are really trying to fish in the best pool. Every time I have thought about, when we had that interim dean, she wanted us to focus on that population, and it was like, if I have to kiss a lot of frogs in the Econ pool to meet a

> *prince, we are starting from total scratch over here, you know what how, it is just almost, it is a daunting task, so we really have not focused on the diversity of our donor base that much.*

Jessica's reference to the "best pool" of alumni and the "frogs" she has to kiss are strong examples of cultural racism and colorblindness, in addition to example of how she thinks about what is a good use of her time in a very busy and high pressure job. It appears clear that she views fundraising from people of color as a deficit.

> Jessica: *I mean we are not exclusive, but when I am working, I do not look at race as I am scheduling. I slice and dice the data in many different ways and ethnicity is not one of them, but if some diverse people happen to come to the top of the pool, I absolutely will reach out to them, but I am not intentionally seeking them out. That is changing as we start to do more outreach for Afro studies, Asian studies and Latino studies because we have to go beyond that sort of natural alumni pool, so we will see how it goes. I do not know.*

The "natural alumni pool" referred to by Jessica must be White donors, since she infers through this description of special outreach that she must go beyond the "natural pool" to find donors or color. Jessica seemed focused on the Return on Investment (ROI) of her time here and not what any trends are in the profession. She is not alone in viewing this "special" outreach to diverse donors not good ROI. Her view of diversity as a deficit and having to spend more time to find diverse donors for publications or "special" projects as not lucrative is an overlapping theme in my research between colorblind racism and academic capitalism.

In posing this question to Emma, she discussed noticing a difference between discussions surrounding the importance of diversity from her role as development officer when compared to her role as a team member in her previous college. This is important to note, because it illustrates how the development profession is lagging behind in these conversations and initiatives.

> PI: *As I mentioned coming into the development profession recently, and this being a research interest, I've tried to pay attention, but maybe have been more, it seemed more*

salient, but I don't know if it's true for somebody who has been in the profession longer that there's been more conversations about race. Do you notice a trend?

So for example the Chronicle of Philanthropy has a conference called the Philanthropy Next Conference and the focus this year, the conference was called "America's Emerging Donor" and then I've recently heard about a couple large institutions, similar I would say to the size and alumni base as this university, public schools, in their development programs, specifically, have hired somebody to focus on diversity and inclusion in development.

Emma: *You know I feel like people have been talking about diversity for a very long time. And I feel like being in a public university, there is an overall understanding that diversity is a really positive thing so there's always a desire to be more diverse, but I don't think I've seen an increase and I certainly haven't seen an effective strategy to create that.*

PI*: And being in conversations at the foundation now instead of in a unit, and I know you all are hiring, do you feel like there has been conversations with HR or with your team here about who you are hiring in regard to diversity?*

Emma: No. In fact, I would say we were much more explicit about that at my previous college. We would put it in every posting, we would tailor our searches specifically trying to pull in diverse candidates. And that may be happening here and I'm just not a part of it, but I haven't been a part of it any conversations or heard anything.

As I spoke with Tiffany, and asked her this same question, she was the only one who shared that her development office had started some of these conversations and even participated in an implicit bias workshop. Her response was also unique because she shared how beneficial these types of conferences and trainings are and how she would enjoy learning this type of information.

PI: *I have one last question to ask you. So my background was in student affairs, and I came in to development. I have been in development about two years now and I feel like I have started to notice this trend in development, as a profession, thinking more about diversity and more conversations happening around diversity and development.*

For example, the Chronicle of Philanthropy this year did a Philanthropy Next conference this year focused on America's Emerging donor, so they spent more time talking about donor's of color, LGBTQ donors, and they had a whole post conference session on women and philanthropy, so I am curious, since you have been in development longer than me is that something you see? Or when you think about your community non-profit development compared to higher education development do you see differences?

Tiffany: *That is interesting … so, do I feel like more donors who we are going to see in the future are going to be more diverse and donors of color and that is going to be more of the donor base?*

PI: *Do you think that is entering the conversation or a trend where institutions are starting to say okay, we need to be aware that our donor base is growing and pay attention to that or do you feel like people are not talking about this?*

Tiffany: *I feel like from some stand point of…Yes. I think people are talking about diversity as an issue and we are seeing it particularly on campus and we have a diversity, equity and inclusion office and we have gotten presentations from them about implicit bias and really amazing things.*

PI: *We, as in your development team?*

Tiffany: *Yes. Our development office. I will say, I don't think that we have been talking about it. I would love to see that presentation and I would not say that we have really been given any specific training on this from the development team. Trends, I think people are paying more attention, but you can even see in my answers, I don't really have a strong sense. I know that a majority of development programs are not really as diverse as I think a place like University of the West Coast should probably be, that I have seen. But I kind of am curious, when I think about this city too, I don't really think of a lot of philanthropists of color either at this point.*

I think Asian populations have gotten a little bit more, but I don't know. I have been here for about 4, 4 and half years, now and the families that you hear about here it is kind of specific. I think there is an opportunity probably to grow that and to engage them. I would love to hear a presentation about how to engage them because I don't know that I feel well equipped to respond to what exactly they are looking for. It is my sense that the individuals with the most diverse background, who I have worked with, really enjoy um working and meeting students and giving back time before money. They have shown me that they really need to be deeply engaged with what they are doing before the give. This city is so interesting too because it does not have, I lived in Philadelphia and it is a very different place and there was a tradition of philanthropy there and people gave because that is what you do. Here it is different, and there is a lot of perks associated with things and there is a lot of name dropping. It is not as bad as I think the stereotypes are about the city, but it is interesting, it is very different here. People are transient, and they move around and they live in two homes and so they don't feel like this is their home the same way that I think people felt like Philadelphia was their home. I think that the investment from people of color, makes sense, for this area, I think the lack of it, follows that a bit.

You know, that being said, I do think that there are amazing things happening here for people to get excited about and we do have to overcome the barriers of how certain populations were treated in the past, and how they have come to view the institution at this point, so we could be better there. Yes. I would love to learn and listen to that conference probably.

As I spoke with development professionals like Tiffany, who had worked in development outside of the higher education setting, I started to notice that in the course of the interview there might be some distinctions that were referenced between community non-profits and higher education philanthropy. One of these key differences that relates to academic capitalism, and donor race, is the difference in the dollar or fundraising metrics. When I was speaking with someone who had this varied background, which amongst my participants, was not common, I tried to ask this question.

Community non-profit vs. higher education

> PI: *Yeah, and knowing both worlds of Higher Education non-profit and community non-profit, do you feel like they're similar and the assumptions they make about women as donors, or men, or non-White and White donors are different, or do you see differences?*
> Sarah: *That's a good point, I see differences, definitely, yeah, I think the goal of smaller community, non-profits, yeah. It's more of a community feel and those who are involved, and invested and it's not such a focus on the big money. That can happen and sometimes there are big community or well-known community members who give a lot of money so, they're targeted, but it's more of building a very strong annual fund base and those who will stay committed and just keep money flowing in, keep a revenue source coming in. So, the focus definitely seems to be a little bit different in terms of who they're reaching out to. I think the smaller community, non-profits too do a really good job of kind of ironically, I guess now that I think about it of keeping in touch with their alumni or somebody who's gone through the program or family members of those who have gone through the program and keeping them involved and having and building them as donors. So, that is very common where, yeah, it's kind of a challenge with the alumni at the university, keeping them connected, but yeah.*

Another difference I noted during the study between community non-profit work and higher education development was how those professionals who had worked in both would discuss the difference in pressures. Both were described as very busy, but it seemed that there was an absence of metrics in community non-profit work.

> PI: *Have you seen that kind of increase in your career around metrics or has it stayed the same or what would you say?*

> Carrie: *I never had metrics before I started in higher education development. I used to work as an executive director for a non-profit and so my metric was the budget.*
>
> *You know, I had raised the money to cover all of our needs, everything to keep the lights on. Here, I had never heard of metrics when I started here. I like them.*
>
> PI: *I see, it is a higher education thing? I don't hear about it, as you mentioned, in community non-profits.*

In addition to the data gathered during this study through interviews, I have observed this difference from my own affiliation with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and as a higher education development professional. The local AFP chapter in my community is made up a development professionals working in community non-profits and in higher education, but the majority of members work in the community non-profit industry. There is a difference in the racial identity make up between the development professionals at an AFP meeting and the racial make-up of a development staff meeting at my institution. There is also a difference in the professional development topics that rise to the surface at a university development program wide staff meeting and an AFP meeting. For example, I recently attended an AFP meeting/training discussion with the program title: Diversity Speed Dating. It was focused on building and maintaining diversity on your board, diverse staff, keeping up with diversity in technology and managing donor diversity. Although the presentation was held in the summer, and not well attended in comparison to other AFP meetings, it was a topic that I have not heard be addressed once during my three year career in higher education development by my institution. Perhaps my experience is unique, but based on the responses from the interview participants regarding their awareness for a trend in conversations around donor race and giving, I think my experience is likely the norm.

Conclusion

In conclusion, as I consider the major themes that emerged in response to my third research question, I do believe that the rapid pace at which higher education institutions are being expected to enter into billion-dollar campaigns and solicit donors for multi-million dollar gifts, that many development officers feel a great deal of pressure. This pressure is clearly leading to negative practices in fundraising and encouraging the perpetuation of seeking a donor who is White and familiar with the philanthropic process. This can be framed as both colorblind and lacking innovation. As a profession, we are falling behind in educating our professionals about diversity, cultural relevance, and keeping up with national trends. As a profession we must begin to change both practices and policies around race and giving or we will continue to ignore a critical mass of potential donors and continue to lose the opportunity to raise a significant amount of money.

CHAPTER 6:
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The importance of philanthropy in higher education has steadily increased over time. State support for public education has decreased and institutions are constantly expected to do more with less resources. My own institution is in the midst of unveiling a new strategic plan and as each new initiative is discussed, I have overheard my colleagues, who do not work in development, reassure one another that "we will find a donor to help support this plan." This pressure for development officers to generate the gap revenue for these dream plans is one of the factors that is leading to what one development officer described as "dirty fundraising." Higher education administrators assumptions that invoking donors as the solution to financing new colleges, cutting edge research, and services for students is unrealistic and connects directly to the influence of academic capitalism on fund development.

The impact of these growing expectations on development officers is leading to poor development practices that leave little to no time for strategic planning or consideration of who makes up the donor base. The fast pace culture of higher education development efforts appears to be fueling a certain type of ideal donor and the pressure to raise more money is encouraged by metrics designed to produce more major gifts and not necessarily designed to encourage an expansion of the existing donor base. Development officers' reliance on best practices in the profession is how they are trying to manage under this high pressure environment, but several of those best practices may be exaggerating a savior mentality around donor philanthropy and the profession's best practices and research has most certainly not evolved into an identity-based philanthropy model that encourages consideration of the donors race as part of the development process. The confluence of all of these factors is part of what this study was designed to understand.

This research project sought to examine the practices used in fundraising by higher education institutions and development professionals, with a focus on understanding how they considered or overlooked a donor’s race in their work. My research applies critical race theory to help analyze and understand the practices that fund development professionals use for their work, as well as institution practices for development that may connect to color-blind racism. Through applying critical race theory, as a lens to examine the policies and practices that were used, I uncovered several major themes related to color-blind practices and White savior ideologies.

Through document analysis, observations, and qualitative inquiry, this study revealed how frequently higher education institutions are neglecting a large and important sector of potential donors, a pattern that may be heightened by a performance driven efficiency pressure in higher education development that is shaped by academic capitalism. The findings from this study, which are summarized in greater detail below, demonstrate how relying on a narrow pool of donors is not only problematic, and at times racist, but lacks an innovative and creative approach to strategically enhancing development efforts and in raising more money. The development work being conducted reflects a one size fits all approach to donors. In the implications section of this chapter, I discuss the limitations of this approach to development work and provide recommendations for practice and policy shifts. I also introduce recommendations for further research and the implications for the literature based on my findings.

Summary of major findings

Higher education advancement professionals continue to operate with a one size fits all approach to their work with non-White donors, tending to ignore donors of color by stereotyping them as too difficult, poor, or requiring more time or “hand holding.” The major themes that emerged from my research map on to three key concepts: the central frames of color-blind racism, as defined by Bonilla-Silva (2006), savior ideologies and academic capitalism. Each of the major themes is highlighted and discussed in great detail throughout this chapter by referring back to the key concepts of color-blind racism, White savior ideology, and academic capitalism.

There is a color blind approach to donors, with development officers seeming to lack the time or ability to learn how to acknowledge and capitalize on donor’s ethnicity during the development process. Most development officers display little to no knowledge of racial identity-based philanthropic approaches in their work as development professionals. Additionally, development professionals expressed a desire to stay away from making assumptions about donors and often used this as their rationale for not discussing racial identity with a donor. Their sense of fairness seemed to undermine their willingness or ability to develop full and effective relationships with a range of donors outside the normative White male.

Compounding this challenge, I found that this colorblind approach to fundraising was not specific to the individual fundraiser, but that many higher education institutions and advancement programs have scholarship programs which use language that supports a savior ideology and minimizes agency for scholarship recipients. Last, this study also revealed a negative impact on donor relationship building due to the pressure many development officers feel they are under to raise money, and to do so quickly, not always taking into consideration the needs of the donor This was characterized by one development officer as “dirty fundraising” and another development officer described the influence of academic capitalism on development as "sales mentality." Each of these major findings are discussed in greater detail in this chapter.

An important finding from this multi-site case study approach to understanding how race is considered during the development process is that there was not any distinct difference noted in patterns across the three institutions. Although the institutions were all notably different in the racial makeup of their student body demographics, the lack of heterogeneity in the development officers was striking, and this likely contributed to the perpetuation of a colorblind approach, regardless of the distinct difference in the institutions' racial composition. At two of the institutional sites more development officers participated in the study, which makes a full comparison across all three sites more difficult, as there was not equal representation of institutional employees from all three sites.

Of note, and an opportunity for further research and discussion, is that there were some commonalities by the type of field/college or unit that the fund development professional represented. Some of the development officers, who most frequently provided examples of cultural stereotyping or who did not consider donor race, worked in the humanities/fine arts areas. This was surprising due to the opportunity to work with more faculty or donors of color or culturally specific fund development initiatives. Contrasting this finding, the development professionals working in student affairs and education gave more specific examples of how they have learned to be aware of donor differences and recognize the importance of diversifying donor boards and resisting the use of savior language.

Perhaps the similarity in practices and strategies, followed within each of the sites, relates most directly to the influence of the professional practice and norms shared within the higher education development profession. These best practices and the implications of following those are discussed further in this chapter.

Color-blind ideologies

To make meaning of the experiences involving race, as described by development officers in my study, color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) was used as a theoretical framework for this study. Color-blind racism is characterized by avoiding racial language and is more abstract and de-contextualized than racism. Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes color-blind racism as “a new powerful ideology that has emerged to defend the contemporary racial order” (p.25). Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) developed four central frames that he uses to distinguish color-blind racism. The four central frames that White individuals use when discussing race, and as a way to justify racial inequality are: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and the minimization of racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). The major themes that surfaced during this study relate most directly to two of the central frames: abstract liberalism and cultural racism.

Abstract liberalism applied to development practices

The rationale provided by development professionals for not considering race because they do not want to treat a donor of color differently directly relates to what Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes as abstract liberalism. He explains that abstract liberalism is the most important frame to understand because it is what White individuals use to undergird this new racial ideology and is the basis of their argument for not treating people of color differently. It comes from liberal thinking and is focused on individualism and freedom of choice. Abstract liberalism is the idea that we all equally have the same opportunity, or as the development professionals I spoke with would explain, they want to initially treat all of their donor prospects the same. They feel it is most genuine to do this. A strong theme emerging from my research was the best practice to be themselves, and to not make any assumptions about the donor, the donor's racial identity or how this might influence the donor's giving interests.

The concept of the authentic self and the advice to "be yourself" surfaced multiple times throughout my study and is another sub-finding connected to the color blind approach development professionals' use. This concept was frequently cited by the professionals I interviewed as their rational for why they would not choose to alter their approach when working with a non-White donor. Most of the professionals I interviewed believed that the key to success is "being themselves," and not treating people differently, even though almost certainly as White people they are treating others differently—but they have convinced themselves otherwise. Even during my interviews with non-White development officers, I heard several front-line fundraisers explain that they would not necessarily treat a donor of color differently than a White donor because they felt treating everyone the same was the best practice initially, until they get to know the donor well and learn their preferences. To be the most genuine, they should not try to adjust their work approach; because by not staying true to who they are, this would compromise their honest relationship with the donor, and it would be obvious that they were not being themselves.

This neutrality for a donor's racial identity extended so far into my research that I found most development professionals were not aware that their institution's donor database even had the capacity to track donor racial identity. It was almost always an afterthought to the development professional that this key part of someone's identity would be in the database or that they would utilize it. In some interviews development professionals would acknowledge that they knew they could look at the donor's race, but they questioned why that would be helpful. However, not all had this reaction, and many were excited to know about this additional feature if they had not previously known. One professional, who has additional training and education focused in philanthropy, was aware of this data and specifically discussed how she utilized it because of her awareness for cultural and racial difference among individuals. This perspective was unique.

Some of the professionals I spoke with relayed that their database allowed for including a photo. However, I was surprised that when I learned that photos were a resource available to development professionals that more were not thinking about donor race. For example, in one interview, I asked the development professional about the photos when she responded that she was unsure about if her institution's database tracked race. She responded by sharing that she felt a majority of the donors to her unit at the university did not have photos. Again, this interview reminded me how colorblind the practices are being used in the profession because when I asked her about the identities tracked in the database like gender, age, and marital status, she knew all of those, but the idea that photos are part of the database and would likely be a resource as a way to identify a constituents' race, did not resonate with her. Why not I wondered? Perhaps once you have a relationship with a donor the photo is an afterthought, and prior to having a relationship with a donor the assumption is that they are White. Learning how few of the development professionals researched an alumni's racial identity prior to a first visit, or took this identity into consideration was surprising. Such a significant part of someone's identity, which likely influences their life experiences, was often not acknowledged as a worthy piece of information in the same way as age, major, gender, etc.

Another key finding related to color blind practices is the fear many professionals expressed about making an assumption about donors. Beyond treating donors equally, many professionals also shared that they would not want to assume a donor of color would want to support a specific cause based on their race. I think this finding, along with the previous findings illuminate how colorblindness, and the use of an abstract liberalism ideology support the argument for not treating people of color differently, (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Abstract liberalism is how color-blind racism is being adopted in fundraising. I believe that with more intentional training and professional development for advancement professionals this could change. Training on racial identity development, cultural difference, and Whiteness, would likely increase their understanding of how considering donor race could positively influence giving. This knowledge and hearing from successful development professionals using race as a consideration in their work, would increase and potentially shift both White and non-White development professionals from this colorblind approach to more awareness of race and racial-identity based philanthropy. This is discussed more in my recommendations for practice.

In addition to the theme of an abstract liberalism, colorblind philosophy, surfacing, I think my conversations with White fund development professionals support similar findings by other scholars, who study race talk, ally development, and Whiteness (Cabrera, 2012; Linder, 2015; Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Similar to their findings, I noticed that the absence of a discussion of race may be occurring because some White development officers fear talking about race, because they worry it will make them appear racist or they fear offending someone. This fear was never explicitly expressed, but I think it is another factor influencing their behavior or approach with donors of color. Likely more training on talking about race or working with a non-White donor would help to alleviate this fear.

Cultural racism

The other major finding, connected to color-blind racism, the emerged from my interviews was how development officers used cultural stereotypes or generalizations when discussing racial identity of donors and their experiences with non-White donors. Cultural racism is the third frame described by Bonilla-Silva (2006), and uses arguments based on group norms or stereotypes to explain the status of cultural groups. White individuals use these frames in conjunction with each other and most are not overtly racist. This type of color blind approach surfaced as a theme when I looked at how frequently professionals I interviewed made generalizations about donors of color or donors who were not members of a dominate cultural or religious identity. This stereotype that people of color were less philanthropic, or not "real" donors surfaced in the stories shared with me or in the examples of giving publications I reviewed. The donor publications were either categorized as too White and lacking diversity, which was then described as a major challenge because there are no donors of color to feature, or if people of color were included in the publication, it was because they were included as an example of "the people we are serving." This challenge is discussed more in both the recommendations for practice section and in sharing the sub-findings related to why development officers expressed feeling of pressure at work.

It was during my conversations with fund development professionals when I specifically asked about their experiences working with non-White donors that again a colorblind theme emerged. I found it common for those I interviewed, to frame diversity as a deficit, most times without stating this directly. However, it developed as theme as they would describe how if they spent time working on "special" campaigns, or with difficult Hispanic donors it would take away from pursuing more lucrative donors. Their assumption is that people of color have less assets or as one professional outright said "Native Americans don't give." These colorblind claims are racist. All development professionals can likely think of a demanding or difficult White male or female donor they have worked with during their career, but not once during my interviews did any of the professionals share that based on that one really demanding and rude White woman, I just don't work with White women any more. Yet, I heard Hispanic donors, Native American donors and African American donors all stereotyped, as difficult, non-giving, and only giving to their church. This application of cultural racism was how they justified their focus on White donors. It was not that they disliked Native American alumni, it was just not a beneficial use of their time. There was no true return on investment to spend time cultivating an African American alumnus, when in the end, they were only going to give to their church or their own community.

This colorblind approach to development work was something I uncovered at each of the institution sites and in a range of the colleges/units where the development professionals I interviewed worked. There was no higher frequency within one discipline, however I did observe that those individuals who worked with more people of color, who were non-White, or identified with one or more marginalized identities (i.e. women, gay), demonstrated a greater understanding of the value in recognizing donor identity. As I discuss my recommendations later in this chapter, I will revisit this observation.

Savior ideologies and language

Powerful language and moving narratives that can tell a story of impact for donors is a hallmark of good stewardship. The ability to make a donor feel like the hero of the story is a shared best practice in the profession and one that emerged as a theme during my study. Closely connected to this theme and the continuation of a savior ideology, is a loss of agency for scholarship recipients, who happen to be the beneficiaries of the philanthropy. As I reviewed campaign collateral, donor proposals, and interview transcripts regarding fund development officer's incorporation of students in development work, I found examples of White savior ideology. The numerous examples thread together a theme demonstrating to how institutions' use of images, and language for donor stewardship and cultivation, is often unintentionally perpetuating the idea that our donors are superior to the populations their philanthropy is supporting.

The way that this showed up in the data was twofold. One way was that students were characterized as "needy" and this connotation often seemed tied to other characterizations of the students as poor, lazy, and less deserving. The second way this showed up in the data was in the stories that were told about donor support and the language that was used to describe the relationships between students and donors. Students were often referred to as if they were property of the donor and on several occasions the student's own efforts or talents seemed diminished by highlighting the donors' as the key factor in the student accessing a four-year university.

This finding is perhaps one of the most challenging to address from my study because this type of White savior storytelling is not unique to higher education philanthropy, as this practice is used in a variety of domains from non-profit work, to child adoption, to Hollywood movie scripts. Collin, (2009) describes this type of storytelling and imagery as "poverty porn," which is most often used by organizations showing images of starving African children in order to illicit an emotional response from donors and drive them to give. Another important piece to consider as part of this narrative is how often the donor themselves may be choosing to perpetuate this story.

In a recent presentation where I shared these preliminary findings, it was keenly pointed out to me that the institution is not the only one conveying this message. Many times, it is the generous donor who shares their own reason for giving in a way that perpetuates this savior ideology. For example, one donor shared that her interest in funding a STEM program for Native American youth was to help the ill-fated Native American children who are born into broken families, on poor reservations, that have no resources for good schools. Another colleague shared with me a story about the most significant donor to their department and how at each event hosted to raise awareness and money for the adaptive athletics program, he cries, yet, she said, we are not going to stop taking his money. This challenge may always exist for our profession, but drawing attention to it in a way that makes both development officers and campaign writers more aware of the language they use is something I discuss further in the recommendations section of this chapter.

Perpetuation vs. disruption of colorblind racism

Philanthropy has the potential to be extremely powerful in disrupting the perpetuation of racist practices and pushing against the inequities faced by people of color, within and outside higher education; however, my findings suggest that not much disruption is occurring based on how infrequently race is discussed. My findings indicate that the current donors who are engaged by higher education development efforts respond to White savior syndrome language and images and that development officers are often reproducing one another's views related to how they think about race, who is deserving of aid, and which communities are wealthy and which are "special stories."

I believe that higher education development efforts could look to some key community non-profits that are doing a better job of disrupting colorblindness through their philanthropic missions. I discuss this need for further research on community nonprofit fundraising and race, as well as the opportunity for higher education development programs to learn from community based non-profits further in my recommendations.

Merit scholarship support vs. need based support

Unfortunately, the data in my study also revealed that development professionals' preference for telling a story of impact related to scholarship support is diminishing the role of the student in the story, or completely leaves out of the story the larger systemic issues that fuel the inequity that exists between some students, specifically between those who have access to higher education resources and those students who need financial support or scholarship aid. Some development officers expressed that they have worked with donors who may not like to support scholarships for aid because they perceive that they are not merit awards and more "handouts." This theme emerged as I spoke with development officers and heard multiple stories about how often need based scholarship support seemed to somehow equal "less qualified." The assessment by some donors that there are students who are potentially undeserving of this aid intersects both class and race. The intersectionality of these concepts has been politicized and discussed in the literature as the "deserving and undeserving poor" (White, 2007). A similar distinction between which students were meritorious and morally deserving of scholarships appeared during this study. This was evidenced in discussions with development professionals specifically about scholarships. I believe that increased training for development professionals around cultural competencies, social justice based philanthropy, and inclusion would help them to feel more confident in how to guide or educate donors who are misinformed about scholarship support.

Loss of agency for students

Last, the final theme that emerged related to campaign collateral, language and development approaches was the way in which students were referred to as "the donor's student." I found this mostly in conversations about stewardship, where the development officer would tell me that the donors received thank you letters from "their students" or how at a donor scholarship lunch that the donors get to meet "their student." I find this use of language, which expresses how the donor has taken possession of the student problematic, but not unique. I think that it is likely not intentionally used by the development professionals or the donors themselves but relates to my larger concern that the language perpetuates the mentality that donors are "saving" the students. Therefore, taking some agency away from them in their accessing or navigating higher education and that through giving and providing a scholarship gift they now have a student. I heard this language used during my observations, and I found examples of it in my document analysis. As I reviewed foundation websites or donor collateral related to scholarship giving it frequently discussed donors connection to "their scholar", and this was most certainly the common terminology used during my interviews with development professionals.

Addressing this use of language will also likely present some challenges in that this patriarchal use of possessive language is not unique to development. It is also not unusual to hear faculty or teachers refer to the students enrolled in their courses as "their students" or to hear student affairs professionals discuss the students engaged in their office's programs as "my students." While conducting my research, although it was less common, I did hear and observe some positive language and examples of how to highlight the efforts of the scholarship recipient, letting their voice tell the story of their college journey vs. the donor. In the recommendations for practice I share these examples for others in hope they will shift their language and stewardship practices to those that both honor the student's voice and recognize the donor.

Academic capitalism and the impact

My study also uncovered several major themes consistent with previous research surrounding academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Academic capitalism, and its impact on higher education, as described by Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), can be witnessed through the collective efforts of multiple constituents, within the higher education setting, who share the same goal of attracting external revenue and moving the university more into a market like setting. As I began my research, even in the pilot interviews, it quickly became clear that public higher education development professionals are very busy and under a good deal of pressure, due to both their full schedules, and the fundraising goals set by their institutions or departments. This theme, of busy at work, and the accelerated pace of development, were the clearest themes in this entire study. One of the professionals I interviewed used the term “sales mentality” to describe the shift he had witnessed over his 11-year career in fundraising as a way to define what I would describe as academic capitalism influencing development work. The other themes connected to the accelerated pace of higher education development that surfaced during my study, relate back to the consequences or impact of this “sales mentality” on development practices.

The weight of development work

A full calendar of events, travel to meet with donors, or administrative tasks such as keeping notes from donor visits or writing “thank you” letters were all part of the very busy schedules that the professionals I interviewed described keeping. There were varying degrees of how busy the professionals felt they were, but all of them described a work culture that was demanding, many shared that they needed more staff in their office or had lost staff due to turnover and that the position was not replaced. At University of the West Coast, when I reached out to 14 different development officers, only two were available to meet with me for an interview. Others responded that they did not have time, were unavailable due to their schedules, or never responded to my multiple attempts to reach them. A contributing factor to why so many of the professionals I spoke with relayed that they were busy at work is likely the need for more staff. Several of the professionals I interviewed spoke directly to this need, but it was also something I observed.

As I reviewed each institutions' website, I found several job postings for front-line fundraising roles over the course of the year that I was conducting my research, and several of the staff I interviewed shared that they were new in the role and recently hired. I believe that this level of turnover could be related to the pressure that several development officers described feeling either due to their performance metrics or because of the lack of down time to strategize or cultivate relationships. Many expressed frustration over having little time to think strategically about their work, or frustration related to the frequency with which their development priorities might shift. This short-term focus on everything from a college's priorities, to closing a gift quickly with a donor, to a lack of investment in the development professionals, has numerous implications for impacting future giving. These implications are discussed in greater detail along with several recommendations for shifting this culture in the recommendations section of this chapter.

Little time for professional development

My observations, along with the data gathered during interviews related to work load, and work cycle, clearly demonstrate that staff are extremely busy most of the year and in some departments understaffed. This feeling of always having more work that needs to be done, coupled with the accelerated pace of fundraising and growing campaign goals, connected very closely in my conversations with development officers about their metrics. Closely related to the little leisure time described by development officers, is a lack of time for professional development. At the fast pace many of the professionals I interviewed described having to keep, they did not describe a weekly or annual cycle of work that allowed for time to attend conferences, join webinars, or read current research related to the advancement profession. When I specifically asked about a current trend I felt I had observed related to research and professional development geared towards opening up conversations around diverse donors, few of the development professionals I interviewed were aware of the topic, and only one of the interviewees during my study shared that she had recently attended a CASE conference. The lack of time for keeping up with current literature and trends is another important implication that is evident from my findings and that I address further in the implications section of this chapter.

"Dirty fundraising" and metrics

Development officers across multiple higher education institutions, who work to secure philanthropic support for a variety of disciplines from soft sciences, to the college of engineering and health sciences, to planned giving, all described a certain amount of pressure to generate revenue and meet their annual metrics. Not all development professionals felt the same level of pressure to meet their goals, as this varied based on their college dean, or their level of tenure at the university, but overwhelmingly most described that these metrics influenced their behavior and several described negative impacts related to this stress. One of those negative outcomes was described and named by one of the interviewees as "dirty fundraising," which she described as viewing donors at ATMs, and not taking time to develop a relationship, or let them guide the timeline for their gift. Each of the 15 professionals I interviewed, who currently work or had previously worked as a front-line fundraiser, described that they had all or some of the following performance metrics: a visit goal, a dollars raised goal, and a dollars asked goal. There were a few unique interviewees who described having some additional metrics related specifically to planned gifts, qualification, or brand/campaign management. Overwhelmingly, everyone who I met with felt that these metrics were necessary and motivating. When I asked them more probing questions about how the staff they supervise view metrics, or how their colleagues feel about the metrics, several shared more examples of how they can cause stress, territorial behavior, and even lead to the behaviors of “dirty fundraising.” The most frequent example of this behavior that was shared related to how having a goal for fundraising tied to the calendar might influence trying to speed up or slow down a donor gift. Along with the handful of examples of bad development work, influenced by the accelerated pace for fundraising and pressure experienced by the fundraisers, there were several development officers who I interviewed who gave examples of trying to push against academic capitalism and its’ impact on philanthropy. I believe that the work being done outside of higher education, in the non-profit sector, as well as some of the shifts in campaign approaches by top fundraising schools may began to challenge this culture. I discuss this in more detail during the recommendations for further research section of this chapter.

Also worth examining for further research, and discussed in the implications for practice section, are the types of metrics being used. All of the metrics described by professionals in this study, except for one, are quantitative measures of productivity. However, I find this form of measurement incongruent with what institutions should be trying to gauge in terms of development officer productivity, which I argue is related to the quality of relationship developed with the department or development professional.

In addition to the pressure some development officers discussed feeling due to metrics, several of the participants I interviewed also shared pressure they receive from both the advancement department and marketing department to produce donor collateral pieces and stewardship pieces that show a diverse representation of donors. Not only did several of the professionals I interviewed share that they have no time for creating these pieces, but they also did not have the donor rolodex of non-White donors to feature in the publications.

One of the other themes that became extremely clear during my interviews and is a known key factor for closing major gifts, is that donors want to have a relationship with and trust the institution/college/development officer before they make a gift. The relationship portion of the work is critical, yet not one development professional during the interviews relayed that their institution had a qualitative metric for trying to encourage better relationship building. Many of the interviewees shared that the opposite impact of what institutions want for development efforts is occurring, and that their opportunity to develop relationships with donors is almost becoming harder based on metrics, staffing levels, and their growth in portfolio size. I believe all of this is driven by and related back to academic capitalism and the "sales mentality" culture that is brewing in the profession. I provide some unique and perhaps initially time-consuming suggestions for how to address moving towards some more qualitative metrics and smaller portfolios in the recommendations section of this chapter.

Assimilated to desire a donor who is "easy"

The data from my study paints a picture for higher education development work that is marked by several key factors, it is fast paced, colorblind, and influenced by academic capitalism (i.e. characterized by large fundraising goals). The development work is grounded in relationships that are authentic and built on trust, which celebrate donors' giving, sometimes to a fault. The work is ideally conducted at a rapid speed, which is reinforced by performance metrics, which cause pressure for the development professionals, and do not allow enough time for strategic, or innovative practices, but that reinforce working quickly to close gifts. This mad rush to meet metrics, and fulfill the expectations of university leadership, albeit their college's dean, the provost, or the president, is not allowing time for making strategic decisions about potential donor populations. The constraints on a development officers' time also does not appear to allow for the investment of time dedicated to training or on-boarding new development professionals or professional development. This combination of factors is leading to what I found is the final theme of my study, the ideal donor is "easy." Development officers are madly hurrying from one donor visit to the next, and are being assimilated to desire a certain type of donor who is familiar with the philanthropic process and who they would describe as "easy." This theme emerged as I asked development officers to describe their ideal donor and one development officer responded by sharing that his ideal donor is a widow, because they are "easier." Of course, they also described their ideal donors as generous, passionate, philanthropically inclined, and having a love for their institution or college, but noteworthy was the theme in their description of the ideal philanthropist as someone who did not need too much attention or time, and who would quickly make a gift without a lot of extra perks, hand-holding or guiding. This common description of the ideal donor demonstrates how the impact on a development officers' time and the influence of their metrics is pushing them towards preferring to work with a donor who is experienced with giving and who knows what they want to give to and will quickly make a gift or decision about their gift.

Although no development officer specifically stated that their ideal donor would be White, through the course of my interviews, and after analyzing the data from my study, the desired race for a donor became clear. I argue that, unintentionally, the ideal donors development professionals are being assimilated to prefer are White donors. This is occurring because many of the characteristics they described as ideal, they also indicated were not present when I asked about their experiences working with non-White donors. For example, the development professionals I interviewed expressed challenges working with some donors of color, stating that they were difficult, required a lot of time, unfamiliar with the process, and needed hand-holding, or were just not philanthropic. These opinions and perceptions about donors of color indicate that in this fast paced environment, they are not a good use of time, or to use a sales analogy, the ROI for working with a donor of color is not as good of investment as for working with a White donor.

To begin to alter the mentality for the development professionals who hold these viewpoints, a multifaceted approach to shifting the culture will be necessary, and even then, it is likely that a few development officers will still hold some racist ideologies. In order for the criteria of the ideal donor to be challenged, several factors in higher education development practices must shift. I discuss several of these modifications and recommendations for practice and policy changes in the next section of this chapter. Overall, I believe that the recommendations I suggest, if implemented, will lead to both more money being raised, as well as more inclusive practices that will increase engagement and giving from donors of color.

Implications for practice and recommendations

Currently there is little empirical research on donor race and higher education development practices and strategies for giving. There is almost no research on the use of savior ideologies in studying philanthropic campaigns or donor stewardship, and I have not found examples of research using critical race theory as a mechanism to analyze and understand these higher education development processes. While some of the current research does present guidance for development professionals, much of this research is not specific to higher education development, and the existing literature, within higher education development, is limited because it is atheoretical, thus the implications are incomplete due to an inability to ground the research in a conceptual framework (Drezner, 2013). In this next section of the conclusion chapter, I revisit several examples from my research of best practices used in the advancement/development profession that may be fueling a colorblind approach to development and creating unintended consequences when implemented. I present implications for practice and policy related to these finding and suggest recommendations that if implemented will begin to shift these colorblind ideologies. Additionally, I discuss the implications of the fast pace culture of development work in higher education and provide recommendations for practice and policy that will hopefully help to redirect the profession back to a focus on relationships over a sales mentality.

Best practices with unintended consequences

Eliminating a colorblind approach. Approaching all donors or prospective donors the same, not making assumptions about a donor or their interests, and being my authentic self with donors were all shared as best practices or the best advice development professionals follow. This practice of not acknowledging the differences between a White donor and a donor of color's life experiences, likely their experiences on our college campuses, and a fear of making an assumption are all fueling a colorblind approach to development.

An individual's racial identity, if they are non-White, is likely one of the most salient parts of their identity. Learning to acknowledge and understand what experiences a donor of color might be bringing with them to a conversation about philanthropy is vital to building a genuine relationship. Development professionals who feel that if they chose to bring up conversations of race would be uncomfortable during the donor visit, or not being themselves, need to understand that continuing to treat all donors the same with a cookie-cutter approach to giving is NOT authentic and is disingenuous. To address this, I recommend that training for development officers as part of an institutions' on-boarding process include cultural competency training, an understanding of racial identity development, and the racial history and demographics of the institution. The incorporation of this information into all new staff training will both increase staff knowledge about race and cultural differences but also imply within the institution development culture that identity and the diversity of donors and staff matters. Making these topics a standard part of new staff training will require institutional investment and perhaps some outside facilitators, but the investment will be worth it as more staff will likely engage a broader group of donors. A benefit for development professional who begin to engage this more racially diverse group of donors is that they will then be able to respond to requests from the institution for producing more diverse marketing materials. Focusing on a more diverse donor base could help to alleviate this one additional pressure on development officers to update their donor profiles or to find more diversity for their donor magazines.

This would help many of the White and non-White development officers to gain more confidence in meeting with alumni of color and hopefully decrease their fears of bringing up race during a donor visit. I also believe that this would help to shift their fear that making an assumption about a donor based on their race is racial profiling, vs. the dominant practice now which is to ignore their race thus leading to colorblindness. In person cultural competence training done by a development professional for development officers could help to break down this fear and demonstrate that there could be merit in reaching out to donors based on their identity, that they are proud of, and feel very connected to as part of who they are.

I recommend that as part of such training, both for current staff and new staff, that a portion of the training include a reflection on their own identity. This is important because during my interviews, when the development officer discussed an appreciation for donor racial differences, it was typically during a discussion about their own identity and their own individual experience with one of their marginalized identities (i.e. religion, race, sexual orientation). I also recommend that a key part of the training curriculum on identity based philanthropic approaches feature development professionals who can provide examples from their own experience with implementing this approach and who have had success in cultivating major gifts from donors of color using an identity based philanthropic approach. The training must be practical and provide specific suggestions to implement when working with a donor. This should follow once the basic level of understanding around cultural relevancy and difference is implemented as part one of the training.

Training for development professionals should also include a review of where to locate information about donor race in their alumni/donor database and provide for an opportunity to share how knowing this key part of an individual's identity, prior to a first visit, might help in preparing for the visit. I believe that donors who feel that their whole self is being recognized will likely be more willing to engage with the institution and develop a relationship. This relationship, if nurtured and cultivated, just like any other prospective donor, will hopefully result in a major gift. However, there is a lot at stake if institutions continue to approach all donors the same and do not invest in training and education for development professionals. My study, along with the research conducted by other scholars (Gasman & Bowman, 2013), reveal that "higher education fundraisers are ill-equipped in their ability to cultivate these growing populations" (p. 6). More prioritization by institution and foundation leadership for training and for the hiring of diverse front-line fundraisers will help higher education institutions to be more prepared to work with the shifting demographics of alumni. Continuing business as usual and sticking our heads in the sand will not serve our intuitions well in the future. It is irresponsible to not acknowledge the trends and changes in wealth distribution, population demographics, and alumni diversity. Including data on these shifts in the student population and alumni population should also be part of this training for development professionals.

Another recommendation, which should include staff training as a key component, but that would involve a more significant institutional investment in addressing this one size fits all approach to development is to create a strategic and holistic plan to address the implementation of diversity initiatives and inclusive development practices. Several large public, top fundraising programs, like the University of Michigan and University of Washington are executing plans and innovative changes in culture to make their institutions and staff more cognizant of the importance of working with diverse donors and alumni (K. Walsh, personal communication, September 8, 2017). After conducting one of my interviews, I learned about this specific initiative at the University of Michigan and in my follow up with the development professional leading the effort there, I was made aware of the work being doing at the University of Washington.

The University of Michigan has begun this approach by hiring a full-time advancement professional dedicated to implementing a strategic approach to diversity, inclusion and fundraising for their campus. The University of Washington has implemented required training for all gift officers to participate in microaggression and unconscious bias training (K. Walsh, personal communication, September 8, 2017). Hiring a full-time employee, who would be responsible for creating a strategic plan dedicated to the mission of broadening the donor base to include more diversity, increasing the diversity of the development staff, and creating a culture of inclusion within their institution's advancement program is needed by all higher education institutions. It will be critical for this new staff member's success that the professional be embedded within the development program, like at the University of Michigan. This will help to legitimize the position, and assist with gaining buy-in from development staff, who would be more likely to view them as insider. Structuring a holistic approach to executing this type of culture change would require on-going assessment, training, and a commitment of resources on behalf of the institution.

In addition to addressing the color blind ideologies I identified as limiting higher education fundraising staffs, higher education leadership and the development profession must speak out against cultural racism as a form of colorblind race talk. We must not accept the excuse of not working with a specific non-White population because they are too difficult or not philanthropic. These examples, which came up during my study, can be combated with good data about donors of color and giving. There is data that people of color give and give plentifully (Duran, 2001), but this data must be shared regularly at national conferences, by institutions, and conversations need to take place to challenge these ideologies when they surface. We have all worked with difficult White donors, but never have I heard another development officer state that they were going to stop reaching out to White alumni because they are just "too demanding." In order for an institution to demonstrate to their development officers that this is not acceptable, or accurate, there must be representation from donors of color on foundation leadership boards, there must be on-going training for development professional about engaging diverse alumni, and perhaps an added emphasis on attending national professional development opportunities that focus on this topic.

Through this study I have witnessed institutions began to adopt practices designed to engage more women as philanthropists, or young alumni, so I am hopeful that these trends in recognizing the opportunity for expanding the donor base will spur more conversations and shifts in practice to engage donors of color. Although this study was specifically trying to uncover how a donor's race may impact the work of fund development as a profession, I have found that many of the participants in my study have just as many stories, if not more, about gender and how the gender of a donor leads to assumptions about their wealth and who is the key decision maker. I am hopeful that as we have been progressing as a profession to identify that this process is biased and gendered that we will also begin to see that some of our practices around ignoring donor race or not considering donors of color as philanthropists is biased and racist and must change.

Agency for students. The focus of making everything about the donor, including my finding that stewardship best practices suggests making the donor the hero of the story, although a known best practice in the field, unintentionally leads to a loss of agency for the community receiving the philanthropy. However, there is a costly unintended consequence for institutions if we keep focusing too much on the donor and only portray the scholarship recipients as "needy" or beneficiaries of charity. An example which illustrates the powerful negative impact that this narrative can have on how the students, presented as "needy," view themselves is found in the summary of findings from an article which examined alumni giving to Gallaudet (Drezner, 2005). Gallaudet University, founded in 1864 as the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, and later renamed after its first president, is the first school for the advanced education of the deaf and hard of hearing and remains the only higher education institution to have curricula and services specifically designed to accommodate deaf and hard of hearing students. In Drezner' s (2005) summary of alumni giving he explains that one of the barriers that was identified to be causing the low alumni giving rate was that many Gallaudet University alumni perceived themselves as being the recipients of philanthropy and not the donors. As members of the Deaf community they are 'used to receiving instead of giving' (Drezner, 2005, p. 308), Gallaudet alumni explained. It is important to learn from this study and consider the fiscal impact for our higher education intuitions if we continue to write stories that only feature the voice of the donor or highlight them as heroes and convey little about the student or community they are impacting. One potential monetary impact for the future is that if scholarship recipients do not see themselves reflected in who the donors are to institution, or only hear a certain type of narrative related to philanthropy, they will likely view themselves similarly to the Gallaudet University alumni. I recommend that as a way to both celebrate the donor, and their impact, but not disrespect the communities or students who are impacted by the gift, that there must be a balance in the story that is told and how the students are engaged in the philanthropic process. It is likely that as graduating students or young alumni these individuals are not going to be making large gifts, but little gifts build into bigger gifts, and with positive relationship as the foundation for these young alumni they will be thinking about giving back in the future.

All non-profit institutions, before they publish a story of alumni giving or launch a campaign for scholarship support, should critically examine the images and the language used with integrity and the goal to move from charity to solidarity. It is important the higher education fund development practices view the people and communities who are recipients of the gifts or participants in the programs funded by donor philanthropy, as worthy of sharing their stories, ideas, and resiliency. We must not flex our charity muscles and just pull heart strings, but think critically about at what cost we are trying to make a donor feel like a hero. We cannot use the stories of the people we are supposed to be supporting through our mission and exploit those individuals or communities.

We must ask the question about how do the voices of this community get incorporated, beyond just the beneficiary of philanthropy, but also as the instructor? I found a strong example of this during my document analysis. One of the development professionals who I interviewed sent me a set of videos that her department uses to share with donors. I was expecting the video to be all about the donor, but instead, the videos highlighted the story of a student, a motivated, incredibly smart, dedicated college student, who also happened to be a scholarship winner. The videos featured students, in their own words telling the listener about their goals, how they are working to achieve them, and how receiving a scholarship helped them to think about how they hope to pay that kindness forward by giving back to their community, or their alma mater in the future. This example allows a donor or potential donor to hear from a student about their plans to give back and how receiving a scholarship inspired them to want to give back when they are able. Another example I have been able to observe is the story telling about a donor family who choose to give through a new scholarship established to honor the life a loved family member. As this story was told the donors are not portrayed as heroes, but the message given to those who attend the scholarship reception is to live your life in a way that others would want to emulate and one day recognize by naming a scholarship in your memory: "Be the type of person who when you are no longer here, someone will want to honor your legacy by naming a scholarship in your memory." These examples illustrate that there are multiple ways that messages of impact can be shared without sacrificing the voice of the beneficiary.

Approaching giving using justice motivation theory. A significant challenge of pushing against this savior mentality, which I mentioned briefly in the summary of my findings is how development professionals can address this narrative with key donors who play into this savior mentality. There is always the reality of how we still want to have their gift and, in many cases, depend on their gift, but at the same time want to maintain our integrity and respect for the communities we hope to be impacting. I believe that more education for development professionals, and specifically campaign writers, around social justice, microaggressions, and justice-based giving, would help provide more confidence and language to guide or educate donors who are misguided by stereotypes or use savior language. Justice motivation theory (Drezner & Huehls, 2015) is an emerging theoretical lens for which to understand donor motivation for giving. “Justice motivation theory posits that the urge to fix an injustice motivates people to engage in action” (Drezner & Huehls, 2015, p. 9).

Ultimately, I am hopeful that the donors who engage in savior language are employing justice motivation theory for giving, but perhaps do not have the language to explain that the reason for their giving. For example, the donor who I wrote about previously, may be passionate about giving to adaptive athletics not because he feels badly for disabled individuals, but because he realizes the inequity in funding and access for disabled athletes to training facilities, competitions, etc. And perhaps if the donors do not recognize this as their motivation for giving, the guidance of a well-trained development officer, who can utilize this type of language when talking with a donor, will help to move the narrative to tell more of the story about the larger systemic injustices and inequities that exist, rather than a story about the donor helping the poor, “needy” student.

Development professionals from front-line fundraisers, to campaign writers, who become trained and more aware of justice oriented giving, will be able to write proposals and develop messages for key campaigns that operate from a justice based framework. Donors who are motivated to give based on the ideal that their philanthropy can “right a wrong” or help to level the playing field in a an unequitable system could become more engaged by this type of marketing or development strategy. Additionally, a more diverse group of donors, likely those who are younger and more racially diverse, will find this type of marketing and vision for change more inspiring and motivating. Younger donors, millennials and generation Z individuals, are more interested in causes that disrupt systems of inequity (Seemiller & Grace, 2017). Considering the emerging donor and the need to diversify the donor base, as way to build the major gift pipeline for future giving to higher education institutions, using justice motivation theory as a strategy should be recognized as an important piece for how to write and talk with future donors about the impact their philanthropy can have for students and universities. This approach may resonate more with younger and less conservative donors, as some more conservative donors could take a meritocratic view; however having a diverse toolkit of strategies for discussing giving and potential impact can only benefit our development profession.

An additional likely benefit of training development professionals to start talking to donors about the bigger picture or the more systemic issues at play is that this grandiose level of thinking can result in more transformational gift and a significantly larger gift in the future that will hopefully address the underlying systemic problem. Keeping with a similar theme as the example of the donor who cares about supporting adaptive athletics, a conversation with this donor about the impact he could have in putting the university on the map as a national model of inclusive design and really move the needle on access for disabled athletes could substantially increase the size of the donor's gift and his imagination for what he could achieve with his philanthropy.

Another piece of the equation that is contributing to a savior narrative in development work, and specifically in higher education philanthropy, which focuses so much on scholarship support is the language used to describe the relationship between a donor and a scholarship recipient. This study revealed an almost consistent use of language about students' who are scholarship recipients being referred to as “the donor’s student.” As I mentioned in the discussion portion of this chapter, this language is not unique to development and is heard all throughout campus, which will likely make shifting away from it more challenging. However, I did hear several examples in my interviews of what I would refer to as language that gives agency to the student, and that I would recommend be implemented across all colleges. Some examples of this positive language is: “student who they are funding,” or referring to the donor vs the student and using “a scholarship donor.” It would easy for each college or unit, that has a donor giving program for scholarships, stewardship lunches or receptions, or other similar programs with donors and students to do a quick review of the language on their donor collateral, website, and invitations to make sure it is does indicate that the donor gets to meet “their student” or will receive a thank you letter from “their student.” I recommend using other language such as students get to meet the donors to X scholarship, or students gain a better understanding of the impact of philanthropy and how they could give back in the future, or donors meet the student scholarship recipients. Several of the development officers I interviewed explained that prior to these types of receptions or even awarding a scholarship, students are given a choice about if they want to attend, or meet the donors who give to scholarships for their college. I suggest that all colleges with a scholarship program implement a student scholarship orientation where students are given more information about how much of the funding philanthropy makes up at their institution and they get to learn about who development officers are for their college and a little about development as a professional field of work. This type of “scholarship orientation” seemed unique and would be worthy to investigate further. I would be curious to know how many of the students who are given more information about scholarships, the donor funding model, and more choice about how the student can be an ambassador for their college vs. being “used” by their college as a scholarship recipient, would end up giving when they are alumni, or how many of them become curious about work in the non-profit or higher education development profession. Separate from the potential future benefit, to the institution, giving more agency to the student is important. As Shannon stated in our interview: "*We also use our Circle scholars,* ***who get funded by our donors****, and they help run our events. They check the box whether it's acceptable to meet the donor and if they do we make sure we match the student up with the scholarship donor."* Implementing a process like Shannon has for her college should be an easy shift that will likely go a long way in building a student culture of philanthropy and honoring the students and the donors equally.

Fast paced development culture

*Strategic planning and data***.** The influence of a movement to the market, for the benefit of higher education institutions' revenue streams, has impacted the culture of the development profession over the last decade. As my research indicates, development professionals who have been in the field for ten or more years all shared that they have seen shifts in the number of donors in their portfolios, a ramping up of expectations for billion-dollar campaigns, and an increased focus on performance metrics. Although the profession still tries to push back on this influence and keep donor relationships at the center of the work, this is becoming more and more difficult. Due to a growing short-term focus on goals or a "sales like mentality," the culture has moved to support and encourage a rapid pace for fundraising, which appears to be leaving little time for trend mapping, strategy development, or innovation. As I discussed in the summary of findings, the 'sales mentality' approach to fundraising is placing more emphasis on short term results and quickly closing the deal, leading to little focus on shifts in alumni demographics and the assimilation of development officers to desire a donor who is familiar with the philanthropic process and who they can quickly solicit.

One of the most significant implications of this finding is that the higher education development profession is missing the chance to think strategically about how to grow their donor base. Just as the enrollment management arm of the institution must closely monitor the trends and statistics surrounding the number of high school age students who are in their state, and the U.S., in order to strategize and forecast for incoming enrollment at the institution, university foundation leadership and development professionals must begin these conversations and analyses regarding donor prospects as well. Considering how to double fundraising or meet billion-dollar campaign goals, must include a conversation about which alumni and donors are being engaged and who is not. Development professionals must become more knowledgeable regarding how we can expand our engagement approaches to include alumni of color. According to Emmett D. Carson (as quoted in Kasper, Ramos, & Walker, 2004 and Gasman & Bowman, 2013), "the bottom line when it comes to diversity is the 'two M's: morality and market'. Reaching out to alumni of color is not only the right thing to do, it is a necessity as most colleges and universities are no longer predominately White" (p.7). Anyone who questions the value of this argument, or the opportunity cost of not reaching out to alumni of color, needs only to review the latest census data and demographics of college enrollment. For example, between 1996 and 2008, the percentage of U.S. university alumni with a bachelor's degree increased by ten percent for Asians/Pacific Islanders, by six percent for Blacks, and by four percent for Hispanics and American Indians/Alaska Natives (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2010). Additionally, recent population projections from the U.S. Census Bureau predict that by 2044 more than half of all Americans will identify with a minority group, specifically, any group other than non-Hispanic White alone; and by 2060, almost one in five of the United States' total population is estimated to be foreign born (Colby and Ortman, 2015). Recognition of the reality of this data and that we cannot maintain a business as usual approach to our work is key to taking the first step in shifting this culture. Slowing down and strategically assessing how, if at all, we are currently engaging alumni and donors of color is the first step.

To begin this assessment, a detailed review of the communication and outreach modalities, for alumni of color should be conducted, keeping in mind that best practices and research on different alumni populations by race indicate this communication and solicitations should be different (Drezner, 2018) than what is delivered to White alumni. An analysis of the current giving and volunteer levels by alumni and donors of color should be done and the data should be managed judiciously. What I mean by this is, if the data demonstrates low giving or weak engagement, it will be critical to not use the numbers as a rationale for not reaching alumni of color, as the current giving is not indicative of the potential wealth or generosity for this population, but rather a starting point to inform the conversation and strategic engagement of this donor group. I share this ethical concern as my research indicates some development professionals already believe that non-White alumni are non-givers just based on their experience with a handful of donors of that same race. There is research to support that people of color are philanthropic when engaged in identity-based philanthropy (W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2012), but the lack of data on this subject is one of the most significant changes that the profession needs to tackle. A profession wide focus on generating this data is one of the key implications for policy from my study that I discuss in the policy recommendations section of this chapter.

Portfolio size philosophy. The last recommendation for practice that I believe should be implemented to help encourage more development officers to focus on engaging diverse donor prospects and hopefully reducing their frantic work pace is twofold. First, I believe that development officer portfolio size should be strategically reviewed and managed with the support of prospect management teams to help create more of “Jerry Maguire model” for prospect management. I use this term to describe what I am recommending because in the well-known film, a character named Jerry Maguire, works as a sports agent who illustrates the concept of relationship building by advocating for working with a smaller group of clients, so he can deliver better results, build a stronger genuine relationship, and meet the needs of the athlete he is representing. I feel this same concept applies to the work of a development officer. If gift officers had smaller portfolios of donors, approximately between 45-70 individuals, I think they would be less likely to be concerned about the time involved for working with donors who require more guidance through the philanthropic process. I also believe that the professional associations should set guidelines and recommendations for advancement professionals’ portfolio size as “industry standard” designed to maintain a healthy portfolio. Hopefully with the smaller number of donors to work with at one time, they would ideally be able to build a stronger relationship with the donors they work with, thus likely raising more money. In tandem with trying to decrease portfolio size to a more manageable number of prospects/donors, I believe that the performance metrics used by most institutions need to be adjusted.

Changing metrics. It was clear from my study, that the metrics are important to help provide structure and motivation for development officers, but that they can also be a source of stress or fuel bad fundraising practices. I propose that implementing some qualitative metrics in place of quantitative metrics may help. For example, I propose eliminating the common metric designed to measure the number of meetings a development officer has with a donor and in its place adding a requirement that development officers need to be able to identify two areas of interest/passion for at least 25 of the donors in their portfolio. With this information, the gift office then must develop a strategic plan for engagement or cultivation for at least 15 of those 25 related to their passion. Submitting a report with this type of data would be far more helpful to the fundraising institution for future donor cultivation. Also, if a development officer leaves their position this valuable information would be recorded. I recommend this change because I am unaware of a performance metric that currently exists to assess how strong of relationship a development officer is building with the donor or how well the development officer is getting to know the donor. This would help development officers to be more strategic and focused rather than trying to get to 150 plus visits, with perhaps several donors, who are not key prospects. Implementing a metric that requires more qualitative data about a donor, rather just a number of visits, would likely help development programs gather more valuable information about their donors by incentivizing gift officers to record this type of information.

Encourage professional development. Another change to metrics that I am hopeful would encourage more development professionals to become current with trends and research occurring in the profession, is a metric that requires that development officers get a certain number of on-going training or professional development hours or credits. This would demonstrate to the development officers that the institution values their learning and them brining new ideas and skills back to the institution. I would also indicate to the gift officer that their institution is investing in their success and skill building. I propose that for an institution committed to increasing their staff’s knowledge around diversity and inclusion that it should be mandated that at least one or two of these hours annually be related to that topic. This level of prioritization for cultural competency training, understanding microaggressions, etc. as staff development will likely also move the needle for the institution in attracting more diverse team members and donors.

I am hopeful that with a slight change in the metrics used to encourage development officer productivity, a decrease in portfolio size, and a strategic plan implemented to address the impact of academic capitalism on creating a short term, 'sales' model for development practice, that the culture of the profession will evolve and include a strategic approach for expanding the donor base in higher education.

Implications for policy and recommendations

Part of what spurred my interest in conducting this research is the little data that exists related to race and giving. As my findings demonstrate, the majority of development officers I spoke with not think about donor race as part of their work, and most have no idea that this key part of someone's identity is available for them to research in their alumni database. Most development officers did not understand the value of having this data and, unfortunately, the advancement field does not seem to place a lot of value on this information.

National Association Policies. I recommend that a change in policy for the profession be implemented at the professional association level beginning with the Council for the Support and Advancement of Education (CASE). In 2013, when Gasman and Bowman authored "Engaging Diverse College Alumni" they wrote that most institutions do not collect data related to philanthropic giving from alumni of color, nor does CASE. As a result, they concluded that the field knows almost nothing about the way alumni of color, engage, give, and volunteer. Since 2013 there have been some changes in the data collected by CASE and a few key institutions have begun to tackle this uncomfortable hole in their data, but still more guidance and directive from the top professional associations such as CASE and the Education Advisory Board (EAB), which provides best practice advice and research to the higher education advancement profession (Education Advisory Board, 2018) needs to occur. More resources should be allocated to enhance the research and training for the profession on the topic of engagement of alumni and donors of color. These professional association leaders need to take a firm stand in creating guidelines for the profession that share how to conduct an institution self-assessment to help increase practices that encourage engagement of diverse cultures and races. Some of this research does exist, but I have not found examples of it highlighted as the keynote address during CASE conference agendas (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, 2018), but rather only if you attend a specialized institute offered for professional development on diversity. Although this type of deep dive into the conversation is important, and necessary, it is my assumption that the development professionals who are self-selecting to attend a conference focused on race and giving, are a different demographic than the development professional who would attend a regional or national CASE conference.

Be clear when talking about race and giving. Another recommendation for policy, that is similarly related, is regarding the professional development conferences and trainings on diversity. These conferences must be more intentional in the naming used for the conference. For example, in 2017, the Chronicle of Philanthropy hosted their Philanthropy Next Conference with the title, America’s Emerging Donor (Grantstation, 2018). This conference topic peaked my interest as I was focused on researching race and fund development practices, so I looked into the conference topics more. It was only after a deeper investigation that I learned this conference was being held, and that it included a pre-conference about women and philanthropy and several break-out sessions on non-White donors, LGBT donors, and young donors. After bringing up this conference topic to my interviewees, and hearing them ask for me to clarify the topic, or if I was asking a question about race, it become very clear during the analysis of their responses that they were not sure what exactly this conference topic was supposed to be about and therefore, it became striking to me how race neutral of language was selected for this conference name. This choice in language is not specific enough to emphasize to the advancement profession who we need to be thinking about as “America’s Emerging Donor.” I recommend that not only should more national conferences focus on donor race and giving preferences to help expand development officers’ knowledge about this donor population, but the language used for conference topics, themes, and title should not be race neutral or generic. National professional resources, like the Chronicle of Philanthropy, must be specific in the language used to educate professionals on race and giving in order to continue to break down the cultural racism that exists and fuels the argument that White donors are the most ideal donor.

National Associations Research. More research on race and giving must be conducted at the national level for the profession. Although the work of graduate students and higher education researchers is vitally important to expanding the empirical evidence in the profession related to identity-based philanthropy. More investment in research at the national professional association level is critical for improving knowledge for advance professionals on race and giving. As I wrote previously, there is some existing research to support that people of color are philanthropic when engaged in identity-based philanthropy (W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2012), but the absence of empirical information on this topic is one of the most noteworthy changes that the profession needs to tackle. A profession wide concentration on generating this data must occur.

CFRE certification. Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) certification is a highly regarded accreditation for fundraising professionals. CFRE International certification was founded in 2001 through the merging of the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP)'s certification programs. CFRE International is the now the certifying agency responsible for the governance and management of the only universal standard credential offered to fundraising professionals (CFRE International, 2018). "CFRE International is an independent nonprofit organization whose sole mission is dedicated to setting standards in philanthropy through a valid and reliable certification process for fundraising professionals" (CFRE International, 2018, p.1). I believe that if this well respected accrediting organization, which offers this highly regarded certification process, implemented the requirement that a portion of the education hours for applicants be focused in an area related to diversity and philanthropy more development professionals' knowledge on this topic would increase. I recommended that at least 5 of the 80 required education hours for applicants come from training on social justice topics, philanthropy and identity, microaggressions, or cultural competencies. If CFRE implemented this requirement it would have a significant impact in elevating the importance of these topics within the profession.

CRM systems and database design. All philanthropic organizations are highly dependent on their donor databases for tracking donor giving, notes about donor preferences, and donor demographics. I recommend a change in policy for how these databases built in hope that a shift in their design will impact how the data is utilized by development professionals, ranging from the prospect research team to the front-line fundraisers. As my research indicated, very few development professionals referenced that a donor's race was a factor that they would research prior to a visit or consider before presenting a proposal or giving opportunity. Just the opposite occurred, in that most of the interviewees were unaware of why this factor would be of value to know and consider. Most did not even know if their institution collected this data or where to find it in their alumni database. I recommend a change in policy that all alumni records when moved into the customer relationship management (CRM) database, include the alumnus's race if they indicated it during their time as a student. There are only handful of companies supplying these CRM databases to institutions, and if all university foundations began to demand this level of data and ease to locate this information, the companies working in this space would have to implement this level of functionality to their database. Once the databases are designed to easily allow for the transfer of this data, it is important that all development professionals know where to find the information. Additionally, prospect researchers and gift officers must be trained to know that if this information is missing from the database, it is of extreme value to update, just like a donor's marital status, gender, etc. More training for both front line fundraisers and prospect researchers regarding why this information is valuable will help with this policy shift. Once the databases are designed for easily tracking this data, and staff is more aware of the expectation to update this data, and where to find this information about a constituent, I am hopeful that there will be an increase in the number of professionals who consider donor racial identity as part of their work. Of course, this will not likely occur without required training for development professionals to help them understand the financial benefit and the value for personalizing their work if they know a donor's racial identity. More empirical research that demonstrates this value like the recent work of Drezner (2018) with the National Alumni Giving Experiment (NAGE) must be shared and read by foundation leadership in order to help their teams learn the benefit of being able to alter development appeals and approaches, rather than using a cookie cutter model for all.

Implications for literature and further research

My research has several implications for literature that currently exists on both critical race theory and on philanthropy. Additionally, there are numerous implications and opportunities for further research related to race and giving, which I believe, if explored, would continue to change the conversation around race and higher education philanthropy.

Expanding the literature. My study contributes to a growing segment of literature and research on colorblindness and Whiteness. Whiteness is a racial perspective that relies on colorblind ideologies and is defined more as a social concept than a culture (Leonardo, 2009). Because a central component of Whiteness is colorblindness, the data gathered during my study further helps to illuminate how both colorblindness and Whiteness operate within the fundraising profession. Much of the literature that exists within philanthropy and race, does not apply the theoretical frameworks of critical race theory or Whiteness and I believe that my study has helped to contribute to the literature using these constructs as points of analysis to better understand not only how development professionals practice their work, but how higher education development operations function in predominately White environments. The portion of this study that looked at language, images, campaign messages and development collateral expand the literature on White savior ideologies. Utilizing these concepts from existing literature is helpful in thinking about development in higher education. As discussed during the implications portion of this chapter, donors who embody the savior mentality as part of their mission in giving, requires further investigation in how non-profit institutions can delicately balance this donor viewpoint and honor the voice and agency for the community or individual who is benefiting from the philanthropy.

Expansion of sample. A suggestion for future research on race and higher education philanthropy would be to expand the sample to include an even broader range of development professionals beyond front-line fundraisers. This study only focused on the prospective of the development officers who work directly with donors. Talking with fund development professionals who work in donor stewardship, proposal writing, annual giving, or prospect research would be helpful for providing an even broader understanding of how, if it all, colorblind ideologies permeate these levels of the development field. Perhaps there are areas where it is more or less dominate in the culture or there are differences in the level of training related to those job functions, or different performance metrics, which might provide useful insight in shifting the way the profession thinks about race and giving.

An examination of the difference between community non-profit approaches and higher education development approaches would also provide valuable insight. Based on my conversations with advancement professionals who had previously worked in community non-profit, and my involvement with organizations like the Association of Fundraising Professionals, I think there is a difference in how this work is being conducted. This should be studied and explored more through a case study to compare the differences in development culture between community non-profit work and higher education development, with the ultimate goal of improving how development officers might expand their donor base. This type of research would serve to benefit all philanthropic organizations.

Examination of other identities. This study only asked development officers to think about their development practices in relationship to donor race, however, multiple times throughout this study, conversations surfaced about donor gender and donor sexuality. Further studies should explore how the profession is approaching a more explicit recognition of the value of recognizing and celebrating these identities in their work with donors. Several of the staff I interviewed shared examples of their awareness around a movement to engage more women in philanthropy or young alumni. These types of initiatives and other identities could be explored as an avenue to better understand how donor identity can be considered in a way that is respectful and not a one size fits all approach to development.

Diversity in the research sites. This study only included the perspective of development officers who work for large public universities. Further research with a more diverse set of institutional sites would likely provide more empirical evidence to guide the recommendations for changes in higher education development. For example, it would be very interesting to learn how, if at all, a colorblind approach is used by development officers if they work for a historical Black college or university. Replicating this study at specific institutions with a population of alumni that are more easily segmented by identity, such as an all-women's university, or Gallaudet University, or Howard University, would provide helpful data in providing a more robust picture of how other forms of stereotypes are at play in the profession.

Additionally, through my research on race and higher education development practices, I learned about several university development programs or foundations that are specifically working to address concerns over a lack of diversity in their work environment, and their donor make up. Replicating this study with institution sites that have implement specific initiatives directed towards increasing development officers' knowledge about identity-based philanthropy is important. Research conducted at university foundation sites where they are intentionally working to create a culture that values considering donor identity, and is made of up diverse development professionals, would be very important for helping to address the recommendations I made as a result of the findings in my study.

Institutions that have taken this step and are investing significant time and financial resources towards this mission should also be involved in a quantitative data analysis to examine the impact on fundraising and specifically within their non-White donor population. Other factors that would be important to measure is staff turnover and staff morale. I believe that with data to indicate the fiscal benefits of implementing an inclusive development program approach it would be much easier for other institutions to begin to follow this lead.

Concluding thoughts

This study set out to examine the practices and strategies used by higher education development professionals and higher education advancement organizations, specifically to identify if a colorblind approach was used when thinking about donor race and giving. Additionally, higher education development campaigns and language were studied to identify how if at all the use of savior ideologies, in fundraising, was connected to race. Last, this study sought to identify how if at all academic capitalism was influencing the work in the profession, and specifically, how it might play into how development officers consider race. The goal of the research was to identify practices or strategies that would help to enhance the profession's outreach to non-White donors and to identify the factors or practices that were likely inhibiting this engagement or fueling a colorblind approach to development.

What emerged were descriptions of a professional environment that is very fast paced, high pressure, and lacking a lot of strategic, long-term planning for how to engage the donors of the future who are more diverse than ever before. This study exposed a one size fits all approach to development as the default for development officers, who operated from a colorblind ideology of being fair and not wanting to make assumptions. A focus on the benefit for higher education advancement in shifting this culture and increasing the access to training and resources for development professionals around cultural difference and race emerged as one of the key recommendations from this study. The reconceptualization of donor race as a critical factor to acknowledge and consider requires a significant shift for most development professionals and has specific implications for the profession, for policy, and for future research.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1) Tell me about how you would describe your job?

If they ask for clarification suggest: Maybe a family member or someone you meet on an airplane?

2) Describe a typical work day for you? What is the typical cycle to your work, by week, time of year?
   PROBE about amount of pressure at work or leisure

3) What do you like the most about your job? The least?

4) What are you most proud of from your work in development?

5) What is the best advice you have been given as a professional working in development?
   a. If they supervise other development staff: What advice do you offer new development professionals?

6) What is the worst advice…

7) When we set up the interview, I asked you to think about campaign materials, or donor publications, from your work or your college/department that you would be willing to share with me that is your favorite. What did you select?
   a. What makes this piece significant for you? Why did you select this one to share with me?

8) Are you familiar with the top fundraising priorities for your department?
   a. Describe the priorities.
   b. Do you know how they were decided/identified?
   c. How stable are these priorities?

9) Do you have fundraising goals/metrics that you are encouraged or required to meet? How do you feel about these? How are you evaluated in meeting goals?
   a. **PROBE**- Has this push increased? How have you heard that this compares to the past? Have you heard that this has changed- it is worse than it used to be?
   b. Do you ever feel burdened with your workload and expectations? What are your expectations like and do you think you can meet those and still get more than 2 hours of sleep at night? Has this feeling changed over your career?

   PROBE- What is overwhelming? Do you think this impacts your work product or meeting your goals? How do you manage these conditions you are working within?

10) Describe your ideal donor.
PROBE- Where would you find that person?

PROBE
As you were describing this donor. Did you have a picture in your mind? Were they a man, a woman, young-old, white- non-white? Who were you thinking of?

11) How many donors are specifically in your portfolio?
    a. How many do you have a deep and comfortable relationship with?
    b. How does this number impact your work?
    c. Has the number changed over time? If yes, how?
    d. Have you heard that this has changed across units campus?
    e. Are most DOs carrying more donors in their portfolio?

12) Tell me, generally, about who the donors are who give to your department at $1,000 or more a year?
PROBE for EXPLICIT racial and ethnic makeup
PROBE for gender makeup
    a. Are these the same types of donors in your portfolio? How are the similar or different?

13) What giving opportunities in your department do you most like to tell donors about? Why?
    a. Are these the same giving opportunities that donors most gravitate towards for giving?
    b. Do the opportunities you like to present ever differ based on the donor's race?

14) As you think about your process for discovering/qualifying new donors, walk me through what you think are the best practices or what has been most successful for you?

    a. How do you think you came to know this process?
    b. Do you think this is a standard process or practice for the profession or more unique? Why?

15) The <institution> is losing out on academic talent from <local neighborhood>, due to an underrepresented population of students from <local neighborhood> attending, and we want to open more access from this area through scholarships. If you were charged with leading this campaign for your college/unit, what are the core messages you would include in that campaign? What story would you want to tell or convey with that message?
PROBE: What is messaging you think would resonate with the donor base?
PROBE: It's no secret that the kids in <local neighborhood> are low income and largely Latino. Would you engage that demographic in your outreach or how would you?

16) Generally, what is your sense of what motivates a donor to make a gift?
PROBE- If they answer about their relationship with the donor- ask about portfolio size and the time it takes to build a relationship and know a donor etc.

17) When you craft your ask or proposal what facts do you consider about the donor?
If they **did not** mention race…
You did not mention the donor's race, I am curious, why not?
If **they did mention the donor's race**, note that you are curious that they did consider the donor's race and ask them to elaborate on why this factor was important if they did not explain this already.

18) Does your institution or department note in your donor database facts about the donor like their marital status, age, race, graduation year, etc?
   a. If they **do not** track some of these
   PROBE- why do you believe that it is not standard practice to spend time keeping track of that particular fact. (i.e. Why do you think you are not recording the donor's race?)
   b. If they **DO** track this information
   PROBE- How if at all, would you utilize this information when working with a donor or making decisions? Would you pay attention to it?

19) When you think about different characteristics of donors, do you think there is any difference by ethnic background or race that influences these characteristics?
If respondent asks for clarification:

‘‘For example, that White individuals are NATURALLY more philanthropic OR that research has discovered that many donors of color give more to their church and do not necessarily report this when filing taxes or in surveys and that this skews data on who is a donor or even that White donors gravitate to giving to education over people of color."

IF respondent says YES

PROBE examples/ways of race differs
PROBE: WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE ROOTS OR ORIGINS OF THESE DIFFERENCES? (IF Respondent ASKS to clarify "roots", SAY: ‘‘BORN with. God given, cultural, etc.’’)

If respondent says NO
PROBE examples of how they have seen similarities across donors who are white and non-white

20) In general, when you think about approaching a Non-White prospective donor, do you alter your approach from working with a White donor?

a. How about in the development profession, what have you witnessed occur in the profession?

21) As I have come into the development profession recently, I have started to notice an emerging trend related to discussions about philanthropy and diversity. For example the Chronicle of Philanthropy's, Philanthropy Next conference this fall is focused on America's Emerging Donors. I also recently heard of large, public well known university that just added a development professional to their foundation team who has a job description focused on diversity, equity and inclusion. What is your perspective on this trend?

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

Title: Fund development efforts and racial stereotypes: Expanding the donor base?

Principal Investigator: Johanne Jensen-Ives, MA, Doctoral Candidate

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate. Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate.

You have been invited to participate in a research study exploring the experiences of fund development professionals in order to learn more about the best practices and strategies that development officers and higher education institutions use to qualify and solicit donors. The study will attempt to identify and distinguish if the strategies and philosophies employed in the prospect identification and qualification process are held by the individual fund development professionals or if these practices and assumptions are more institutionalized and indicative of the embedded racism and inequity that is found in many organizations. Finally, this research will explore the connection, if any, between racial stereotyping and the tactics of the development profession. You will be one of the 20 participants, if you choose to participate in this study. You were invited to participate in the study because you are a development professional working in higher education. This study is not funded and is being conducted by Johanne Jensen-Ives, a graduate student in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona. The faculty sponsor of this study is Dr. Gary Rhoades. Johanne can be contacted via email at johannej@email.arizona.edu or by phone at 520-465-4663. Dr. Rhoades can be reached via email at grhoades@email.arizona.edu

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects' research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

The study will include a one-on-one semi-structured interview lasting approximately 90 minutes, a request for a copy of a current resume and the completion of a short questionnaire, which will take approximately 5 minutes. Examples of some interview questions include: "What is the best advice you have been given as a professional working in development?" and "Generally, what is your sense of what motivates a donor to make a gift?" The interviews will be held at a time and place convenient for you, or if you are not able to identify a time in person, they will conducted via Skype or by phone. All interviews will be audio recorded. Please note that your participation is entirely voluntary, you may refuse to answer any question, and/or are able to quit at any time. If you choose to quit, your information will be destroyed immediately.
Participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Information collected from this study will be analyzed and studied in a manner that protects your identity and remains confidential. Your name will not appear on any study materials; instead, a pseudonym will be used. Any information you provide within this

study will remain confidential and stored in a password-protected computer file for a minimum of six years before being destroyed. As mentioned previously, efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where your information must be released.

Also, your records may be reviewed by:

- The University of Arizona Institutional Review Board

There are minimal risks within this study, such as sharing your resume, which will provide identifiable information such as your current and past employment. Additionally, your responses will be audio recorded, but provisions are in place to protect the data and you will have in option to review the transcriptions.

In participating in the study, you may benefit from airing views in a safe environment. Also, you are providing fund development professionals and higher education administrators with a greater understanding of the experiences of development professionals and practices used within the fund development profession. This understanding will ideally help inform improved practices for donor qualification, solicitation and the marketing of higher education campaigns.

If interested, you may receive a summary of research findings upon completion. This request can be made by emailing Johanne Ives at johannej@email.arizona.edu. You will also have the ability to review the transcript and notes from your interview.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Human Subjects Protection Program at 520-626-6721 or online at http://rgw.arizona.edu/compliance/human-subjects-protection-program.

I have read and understand this form. By participating in the above listed research activities, I have provided my consent to have my responses used for research purposes.

APPENDIX C: INVITATION TO PARTICIPANTS

To:
From: Johanne Ives

Subject: Research Participation Invitation: Fund Development Practices and Strategies

You have been publically identified as a campus professional working in fund development for <institution> in the <College of> through a search on your institutions' website. Based on your role within the institution, it would be my pleasure to have you participate in my research study. I am conducting a study examining the experiences of fund development professionals in order to learn more about the best practices and strategies that development officers and higher education institutions use to qualify and solicit donors. I am also interested in learning more about how different institutions market and share their capital campaigns with prospective donors.

I am a part-time doctoral student at the University of Arizona and a full-time professional working for the University Development Program as a development officer. This study will involve participation in a one-on-one interview (approx. 90 minutes), which will be audio-recorded, and ideally will take place in person, however if we are unable to find a time to meet in person we can also conduct the interview via Skype or through the phone. Additionally, I am asking for you to complete a short pre-interview questionnaire, which takes approximately 5 minutes and to share a current copy of your resume. I hope that you are willing to consider participating in my study. Should you be interested, please reply to this email by <date> and I will look forward to scheduling the interview with you when I am traveling in your area or by Skype or by phone.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at johannej@email.arizona.edu. Please feel free to also contact Dr. Gary Rhoades at grhoades@email.arizona.edu

Thank you!

Johanne Ives, MA
Assistant Director of Development and Doctoral Student
University of Arizona
johannej@email.arizona.edu

APPENDIX D: PRE-INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ______________________________ Date: ______________

Gender: ___________ Age: ____________

How do you identify (i.e. race, ethnicity): __________________________________

Highest level of education completed: ____________________________________

How long have you worked in the fund development field? ___________________

How long have you worked in Higher Education fund development?

____

Current Title: ____

Name of College/Department/Unit where employed (ex. College of Education):____

Name of Higher Education institution where employed (ex. University of Arizona):

____

How long have you been in your current role? ______________________________

What was the dollar amount of the largest gift you helped to secure? _________________________

Number of donors in your portfolio: ______________________________________

Number of development professionals who report to you: _____________________

APPENDIX E: EMAIL TO FOUNDATION STAFF AND DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS

Subject: Research Participation Invitation: Fund Development Practices and Strategies

Dear <Insert staff professionals' name>

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Johanne Ives, and I am a part-time doctoral student in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona and I am full-time University of Arizona staff member working in fund development for the Division of Student Affairs Enrollment Management, Academic Initiatives and Student Success. You have been publically identified as a higher education development professional working in fund development for <institution>. I was able to find your contact information through a search on your institutions' website.

I am currently working on my dissertation research, which is focused on fund development practices and strategies in higher education and I would love to have the opportunity to observe any of the following types of meetings (staff, executive team), trainings (new hires, all staff) or events (donor events, staff appreciations) that occur within your university development program, as it would greatly aid me in my research. Are any of these meetings something that you be interesting in allowing me to observe? I will be at the <institution site name> during <specific time frame>, conducting other research related to my study. All of the institution sites observed during my study will be confidential and no individual names will be used or identifying characteristics will be reported in my findings in order to protect the anonymity of those who participate in this study.

Last, I am also writing to ask for your assistance in referring me to development professionals within your department who may be interested in participating in a one on one interview to discuss their personal experiences working in development. Would you mind forwarding my email below to anyone who you think might be interested?

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me via email johannej@email.arizona.edu

Thank you and best regards,
Johanne Ives

APPENDIX F: NOTIFICATION OF OBSERVATION EMAIL

Hello All,

My name is Johanne Ives and I am a doctoral student in College of Education at the University of Arizona and I am partnering with the <Institution Name> on my doctoral research into the Fund Development Practices and Strategies used in Higher Education.

On Thursday October 26th, Travis (pseudonym) has invited me to attend the Executive Senior Staff Meeting for observation purposes. As a regular participant or a presenter at this meeting, I wanted to make you aware of my presence at this meeting and to share the attached consent waiver for observation.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to myself or Travis with any questions.

Thank you
Johanne

APPENDIX G: OBSERVATIONS CONSENT FORM

Title: Fund development efforts and racial stereotypes: Expanding the donor base?
Principal Investigator: Johanne Jensen-Ives, MA, Doctoral Candidate

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate. Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate.

Your institution has agreed to allow me to conduct observations of various meetings, trainings, workshops, donor events, etc. as part of my research exploring the experiences of fund development professionals in order to learn more about the best practices and strategies that development officers and higher education institutions use to qualify and solicit donors. The study will attempt to identify and distinguish if the strategies and philosophies employed in the prospect identification and qualification process are held by the individual fund development professionals or if these practices and assumptions are more institutionalized and indicative of the embedded racism and inequity that is found in many organizations. Finally, this research will explore the connection, if any, between racial stereotyping and the tactics of the development profession. Due to your attendance at one of these observation sessions, you may be involved in this study. This study is not funded and is being conducted by Johanne Jensen-Ives, a graduate student in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona. The faculty sponsor of this study is Dr. Gary Rhoades. Johanne can be contacted via email at johannej@email.arizona.edu or by phone at 520-465-4663. Dr. Rhoades can be reached via email at grhoades@email.arizona.edu

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects' research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

All of the institution sites observed during my study will be confidential and no individual names will be used or identifying characteristics will be reported in my findings, in order to protect the anonymity of those who participate in this study. The researcher will take typed written notes during the observation and no audio recording will be conducted.

Information collected from this study will be analyzed and studied in a manner that protects your identity and remains confidential. Your name will not appear on any study materials; instead, a pseudonym will be used for the host institution. Any notes taken during observation for this study will remain confidential and stored in a password-protected computer file. As mentioned previously, efforts will be made to keep study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released.

Also, observation records may be reviewed by:

- The University of Arizona Institutional Review Board

There are no foreseeable risks to attending an observation session within this study, as no identifying information will be collected.

In participating in this study, you are providing fund development professionals and higher education administrators with a greater understanding of the experiences of development professionals and practices used within the fund development profession. This understanding will ideally help inform improved practices for donor qualification, solicitation and the marketing of higher education campaigns.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Human Subjects Protection Program at 520-626-6721 or online at http://rgw.arizona.edu/compliance/human-subjects-protection-program.

By staying in the meetings, you have provided me with your authorization to observe you and use your non-identifiable information for research purposes.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society 20*(4) 441-464.

Anft, M. (2002). *Tapping ethnic wealth: Charities pursue minority giving as incomes rise among Blacks, Hispanics, and other groups*. Retrieved August 28, 2016 from https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Tapping-Ethnic-Wealth/184929?cid=cpfd_home.

Askew, E. (2011). (Re)Creating a world in seven days: Place, disability, and salvation in Extreme Makeover: Home Edition. *Disability Studies Quarterly 31*(2) 2-15.

Barry, M. L. (1999, July, 13). *Native-American philanthropy: Expanding social participation and self-determination.* Council on Foundations. *(*pp.31-105).

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). Central frames of color blind racism. *Racism without Racists.* 25-52. Rowman and Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-Blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States.* (2nd ed.). Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bonilla-Silva, E. & Dietrich, D. (2011). The sweet enchantment of color-blind racism in Obamerica. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 190-206.

Burke, P. (2003). Donor centered fundraising: How to hold on to your donors and raise much more money. Chicago, IL: Cygnus Applied Research.

Cabrales, J. A. (2013). An approach to engaging Latina/o alumni in giving initiatives. In N. D. Drezner (Eds.), *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors* (pp.61-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cabrera, N. L. (2012). Working through whiteness: White, male college students challenging racism. *The Review of Higher Education* 35(3), 375-401. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cammarota J. (2011). Blindsided by the Avatar: White saviors and allies out of Hollywood and in education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*(3), 242-259.

Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society. (2003). *Latino philanthropy literature review*. Retrieved January 27, 2019 from https://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUNY_GC/media/CUNY-Graduate-Center/PDF/Centers/Center%20on%20Philanthropy%20and%20Civil%20Society/LatinoLitReview-final.pdf.

Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) International. (15, August, 2018). *CFRE Candidate Handbook.* Retrieved on December 3, 2018 from http://www.cfre.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Candidate-Handbook-FINAL-October-2018.pdf.

Colby, S. L. & Ortman, J. M. (2014). *Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014-2060*. U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration. P25-1143, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Collin, M. (2009). What is 'poverty porn' and why does it matter for development. *Aid Thoughts*, *1*.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). (2016). About advancement. Retrieved June 19, 2016 from http://www.case.org/About_CASE/About_Advancement.html.

Council for the Aid to Education. (2015). Colleges and universities raise record $40.3 billion in 2015. Retrieved June 11, 2016 from http://cae.org/images/uploads/pdf/VSE_2015_Press_Release.pdf.

Council on Foundations. (1999). *Cultures of caring: Philanthropy in diverse American communities.* Washington: Council on Foundations.

Delgado, R. (2001). Delgado and Stefancic; Introduction and critical race theory themes. *Critical race theory; An Introduction.* Critical Race Theory Reader, 1-34. New York University.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2006). Critical race theory: An introduction. Retrieved June 25, 2016 from http://www.odec.umd.edu/CD/RACE/CRT.PDF.

Diaz, W. A. (1999). Philanthropy and the case of Latino communities in America. In C.T. Coltfelter & T. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in a changing America* (pp.275-292). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Drezner, N. D. (2005). Advancing Gallaudet: Alumni support for the nation's university of the deaf and hard-of-hearing and its similarities to black colleges and universities. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 5*(4), 301-315.

Drezner, N. D. (2013). *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Drezner, N. D. (2018). Alumni engagement in higher education: A matter of marketing and leveraging social identities. *Competition in Higher Education Branding and Marketing* (pp. 181-195).

Drezner, N. D. & Huehls, F. (2015). *Fundraising and institutional advancement: Theory, practice and new paradigms*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Duran, L. (2001). Caring for each other: Philanthropy in communities of color. Grassroots Fundraising Journal, 4-7.

Education Advisory Board. (2018). *What we do.* Retrieved on December 9, 2018 from https://www.eab.com/.

Flandez, R. (2012). The cost of high turnover in fundraising jobs. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved July 24, 2016 from https://www.philanthropy.com/article/The-Cost-of-High-Turnover-in/226573.

Gasman, M., & Bowman III, N. (2013). *Engaging Diverse College Alumni*. New York: Routledge.

Gasman, M & Sedgwick, K.V. (2005). Uplifting a people: African American philanthropy and education. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Grantstation. (2018). Philanthropy next 2017: America's emerging donors. Retrieved on December 8, 2018 from http://www.grantstation-pathfinder.com/content/philanthropy-next-2017-americas-emerging-donors.

Heller, D. (2001). The states and public higher education policy. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Humphreys, J.M. (2009). The multicultural economy 2009. *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions, 69*(3), 1-16.

Hussar, W.J., and Bailey, T.M. (2017). Projections of Education Statistics to 2025 (NCES 2017-019). U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Ignatiev, N. (1995). *How the Irish became White.* New York: Routledge.

IUPUI Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2018). Giving USA 2018.

Kaiser, S & Dolan, A.W. (2013). Women as a donor group to higher education. In N. D. Drezner (Eds.), *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors* (pp.61-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kellner, D. & Share, J. (2007). Critical media literacy, democracy, and the reconstruction of education. In D. Macedo & S.R. Steinberg (Eds.), Media literacy: A reader (pp. 3-23). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kelly, K. S. (1991). *Fund raising and public relations: A critical analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Linder, C. (2015). Navigating guilt, shame, and fear of appearing racist: A conceptual model of antiracist white feminist identity development. *Journal of College Student Development* 56(6), 535-550. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lopez, M & Gonzales-Barrera, A. (2014). *Women's college enrollment gains leave men behind.* Retrieved June 19, 2016 from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/06/womens-college-enrollment-gains-leave-men-behind/.

Maxwell, J (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Mesch, D. J., Brown, M.S., Moore, Z. I., & Hayat, A. D. (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving*. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing.* Wiley Online Library.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2012). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved October 27, 2013 from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2010). *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups*. Retrieved August 31, 2016 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010015.pdf.

Osili, U & Zarins, S. (2018, July, 3). Fewer Americans are giving money to charity but total donations are at record levels anyway. *The Conversation.* Retrieved on August 16, 2018 from https://theconversation.com/fewer-americans-are-giving-money-to-charity-but-total-donations-are-at-record-levels-anyway-98291.

Park, J. J. (2012). Asian American women's perspectives on historically white sorority life: A critical race theory and cultural capital analysis. *Oracle, 7*(2) 1-18.

Ramos, H. A. J. (1999). Latino philanthropy: Expanding U.S. models of giving and civic participation. In Council on Foundations (Ed.). *Cultures of caring* (pp.147-187). Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

Rhoades, G. & Sporn, B. (2002). New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States. *Tertiary Education and Management, 8*(1), 3-28.

Rivas-Vazquez, Ana Gloria. (1999). *New pools of Latino wealth: A case study of donors and potential donors in US Hispanic/Latino communities.* In Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy, ed. Diana Campoamor, William A. Diaz, and Henry A.J. Ramos. Houston: Arte Publico Press.

Roediger, D. R. (1994). *Towards the abolition of Whiteness: Essays on race, politics, and working class history*. New York: Verso.

Roediger, D. R. (2003). *The wages of Whiteness* (rev. ed.). New York: Vasso.

Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2017). Generation Z: Educating and Engaging the Next Generation of Students. *About Campus*, *22*(3), 21–26.

Seltzer, R. (2017, October, 17). *Aiming for billions: An increased focus on fund-raising meets a surging stock market to create ideal conditions for campaigns.* Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved January 30, 2019 from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/10/17/colleges-and-universities-set-high-targets-latest-fund-raising-campaigns.

Seltzer, R. (2018, February, 6). Personal giving pushes donations to colleges and universities to new level in 2017. *Insider Higher Ed.* Retrieved August 16, 2018 from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/02/06/personal-giving-pushes-donations-colleges-and-universities-new-level 2017?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=39b7d524ff-DNU20180111&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-39b7d524ff-197454877&mc_cid=39b7d524ff&mc_eid=cc1ea9da7d.

Siedman, I. (2007). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). The theory of academic capitalism. In *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education* (pp. 1-34). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

The College Board. (2016) Trends in Higher Education. Retrieved January 23, 2019 from https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/education-pays-2016-full-report.pdf.

The Nonprofit times. (2015, September, 21). Studies examine men vs. women in giving. *The Nonprofit Times.* Retrieved September 3, 2016 from http://www.thenonprofittimes.com/news-articles/studies-examine-men-vs-women-in-giving/.

Tsunoda, K. (2013). Chinese American philanthropy. In N. D. Drezner (Eds.), *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors* (pp.61-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

University of the South West (2017, September, 8). *Fall 2017 Official Enrollment Report.* Retrieved December 29, 2018 from.

University of the West Coast (2017). *Quick Facts.*

U.S. Department of Commerce. (2018). *United States census bureau quick facts.* Retrieved February 6, 2019 from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/az,nm/RHI725217.

Vega, Tanzina. (2016, January 26). Why the racial wealth gap won't go away. *CNN Money*. Retrieved August 26, 2016 from http://money.cnn.com/2016/01/25/news/economy/racial-wealth-gap/.

Warren, P. E., & Walker, I. (1991). Empathy, effectiveness and donations to charity: Social psychology's contribution. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 304*(4), 325-337.

Webber-Thrush, D. (2008, October) A gift of her own: Women wield more financial power than ever and their strength is growing. What does it mean for educational philanthropy? Retrieved September 15, 2016 from http://im.dev.virginia.edu/wp/engagementcommunity/files/2011/11/A_Gift_of_Her_Own.pdf.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (2012). *Cultures of giving: Energizing and expanding philanthropy by and for community of color.* Battle Creek, MI: Author.

White, J. A. (2007). The hollow and the ghetto: Space, race, and the politics of poverty. *Politics & Gender, 3*(2), 271-280.