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The purpose. The purpose of this study was to define the organizational and operational structures of four year state university related foundations. An additional purpose was to compile a listing of all four year state university related foundations in the United States.

Methodology. Data were obtained through the use of a questionnaire mailed to all four year state universities in the United States. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part one included a series of three demographic questions which identified the respondent at a certain level in each of three categories, number of students, kinds of degrees and number of alumni. Part two applied only to respondents of university related foundations and defined the characteristics of these foundations according to the responses to fourteen questions.

Results. In so far as the techniques employed may be valid, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. The relative majority of foundations were begun in the years 1960 to 1969.

2. Most foundations chose flexibility of operations as the primary reason for initiating their foundation.
3. Virtually all foundations have a Board of Directors.
4. Those categories of people most frequently represented on the Board of Directors are corporate officials, university administrators and women.
5. Most foundations have one to two professional and secretarial/clerical staff members.
6. Most foundations begin their fiscal year in July and end in June.
7. Foundation budgets, investments, donor numbers and dollars raised are generally related to the size of the university which the foundation serves.
8. Most foundations have annual fund, corporate and foundation solicitation programs.
9. Most foundations have written policies on investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising.
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CHAPTER I

THE NEED FOR A SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY RELATED FOUNDATIONS

Introduction

The nineteen sixties were expansive years with colleges and universities rapidly building facilities to house and accommodate the largest anticipated college age group higher education had seen to that point. The baby boom of the forties and early fifties was about to begin and educational facilities had not kept pace with the times. Legislatures found it easy to appropriate large sums of money for these facilities. The public had to be served and, in a short time, the facilities would be badly needed.

These same sixties proved to be progressive years. The United States put men on the moon, developed sophisticated weapons systems along with satellite weather, communication and reconnaissance systems and, in general, won the good will of many nations around the world. Education was heavily funded, especially the sciences. Research was also heavily endowed, for it was this kind of education that brought the United States its supremacy.

The sixties also proved to be years of tragedy and conflict. The Viet Nam war was the major cause of the conflict. Unlike other wars, the people of this country, and in particular the students, raised their voices against our involvement in the war. Campus' were the scenes of constant protests, marches and even bombings.
Because of such behavior, the public began to take a harder look at education.

A series of events in the seventies caused legislatures to demand cutbacks in funding for higher education. The baby boom ended in the seventies with the pool of students available for college beginning to dwindle. At this same time, an oil embargo imposed by the mideastern oil countries focused legislative attention on a serious energy problem in our country. This one factor alone contributed to a dramatic rise in inflation to double digit figures. As a result of these events, plus other influences, legislatures chose education to bear the brunt of the attack. New building construction was halted and enrollment quotas were established for public universities. A period of retrenchment had set in and public universities were the first to feel the crunch.

Although state universities had been in the fund raising field before, this activity began to take on new significance with the advent of limited budgets. Many state universities began to emphasize fund raising to the extent it has been done in private schools, which latter depend on fund raising for their existence. Private school fund raising in higher education has been highly organized and aggressive since its beginnings. But, in more recent years, public higher education institutions have rivaled private schools in organizations, dedication and in the overall results of raising funds.
Public institutions have had to constantly fight state legislatures for dollars to keep alive the quality of education in the public sector. In order to assure this quality, there has been a substantial rise in the number of fund raising programs on public campus', either in the form of development departments or university related foundations. The number of such departments and foundations has greatly increased in the sixties and seventies, so that today the majority of state universities have fund raising programs of significant proportions.

It appears that most public universities are opting for the university related foundation as a means of structuring a fund raising program. The data, however, have never been clear on this point. Less clear are the organizational and operational patterns of the foundations that do exist.

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of definitions used in this paper.  
Private college or university - a higher education institution primarily funded by gifts, grants, fees, tuition and endowments.  
Public college or university - a higher education institution either fully or partially funded by state, local or county funds.  
Philanthropic support - a gift or donation from private sources.  
Generally the terms philanthropic, voluntary and private support are used synonymously to reflect support from other than public or
government sources (Luck, 1974, p. 3).

Development department - a regular department within the university structure which has as its main function the raising of funds from private sources such as individuals, corporations, foundations and the like.

Private foundation - a private corporation which receives most or all of its funds from an individual, a few individuals or a specific corporation in order to dispense these funds for grant making purposes.

Public foundation - a private corporation which receives its funds from the general public and supports either a single charity or a variety of charitable activities.

Foundation system - a group of public foundations that have the same overall administration and operate under the same procedures and regulations.

Annual fund - a yearly solicitation or appeal for funds from alumni, friends or a basic constituency of an institution or group.

Deferred giving - a program of solicitation of funds through wills, bequests, trusts and life income plans.

Corporate solicitation - an appeal for funds from various business and industrial corporations.

Foundation solicitation - an appeal for funds from private foundations.

Special gifts - the solicitation of major gifts from private sources.
for a variety of causes such as major gift clubs, capital campaigns and the like.

Athletic fund raising - the solicitation of private gifts in support of intercollegiate athletic programs.

Statement of the Problem

Among existing four year state universities there is a wide variety of vehicles presently being used for the purpose of fund raising. There are university development departments (University of Michigan, Eastern Michigan University), i.e., the incorporation of the function of raising funds from private sources as one of the administrative support areas on the university campus subject to university regulations and procedures; university related foundations (University of Wisconsin, University of Colorado), i.e., privately incorporated foundations meeting the qualifications of IRC 501(c)(3) and established with a separate Board of Trustees from the University Board of Trustees for the purpose of receiving gifts for and transmitting these gifts to the university according to the wishes of the donors and the needs of the universities; research services (University of Wisconsin, Western Michigan University, Michigan State University), i.e., university departments under university regulation organized for the purpose of seeking grants and contracts from government agencies and private foundations for research projects and facilities; and combinations of these ranging
from a single person in a department with a combination of all three vehicles into one organization, to coexistent development departments and foundations on the same campus with the same basic functions.

The functions of these three vehicles differ somewhat depending on circumstances. University development departments are normally under the jurisdiction of the President or a Vice President of the university structure. As such, these departments are accountable to university officials for all functions in the same way any non-academic department within the university structure is accountable. Such functions as budget development and control, administrative supervision, personnel policies, travel and expense reporting and the like are all under university supervision and control. Although there are allowances for practices in development not strictly in accord with university policy and procedure, in most cases university development departments are generally held to the same limitations and restrictions as other university departments.

Many university development departments have Board of Directors which usually include university personnel as well as outsiders from the community at large. Some of the functions of these Boards are to recommend programatic, organizational and personnel policies to the development department and to the University Board of Trustees and to oversee the operations of the department within the guidelines established by the university administration and Board of
Trustees. Unlike the Board of Trustees of university related foundations, these Boards are in matters of policy and administration, subject to the ultimate decision of the University Board of Trustees. (Lyons, Note 1)

University related foundations, contrary to development departments, are wholly separate corporations from the university and exist for the purpose of raising funds for the universities to which they are committed. A typical example is the University of Wisconsin Foundation, the model for many other foundations.

The Articles of Association of the University of Wisconsin Foundation state that the Foundation is a corporation organized in the State of Wisconsin for two specific purposes:

"To aid the University of Wisconsin by solicitation for the benefit of said University of gifts or real property or personal property, or both, from individuals, associations, corporations, or other entities.

"To collect and receive gifts, bequests, devises or things of value, to accept the same subject to such conditions and trusts as may be imposed thereon, for the benefit of the University of Wisconsin, and to hold, administer, use or distribute the same, and to obligate itself and to execute and perform conditions or trusts, all for the benefit of the University of Wisconsin in the advancement of the scientific, literary and educational purposes thereof." (Articles of Association, 1945)

The chief administrative officer of a university related foundation is normally an executive director of the foundation who reports directly to a Board of Directors, which Board is the ultimate authority of the foundation. University interests are represented in two ways depending on the makeup of the Board. If a Board is
structured in such a way as to include university officials, it is presumed it is the university officials' function to assist the Board by defining university policies and interests to the Board. If a Board does not include university officials, the Board will normally seek guidance from university officials as to the policies and needs of the university. In the latter case, more often than not, university officials are constantly seeking funds from the foundation for a variety of needs.

The other vehicle for fund raising, as distinguished in the first part of this section, is Research Services. There are other nomenclatures for this particular vehicle including, but not limited to, Office of Grants and Contracts, Office of Gifts and Grants, Office of Research Grants and the like. The main function of research services, the term we shall use, is to coordinate research proposals from the faculty and present these research proposals to the United States Government or private corporations and foundations for funding. In general, research services are fully integrated departments of the university, since they deal with faculty in an ongoing way, and grants are made directly to the university school or department which is engaged in research. Although there are no data to substantiate it, it appears that a small number of these grants are received in university related foundations for investment and other reasons.

Research services differs from both development departments and
foundations, not so much by its organizational structure since it too is subject to university administrative policies and procedures, but more by the sources and ways in which it raises funds. The main source of funding for research projects is the United States Government. A secondary source is corporate research divisions or foundations, which give research grants in those areas of particular interest to them. This type of fund raising entails a multitude of details, such as lengthy and scientific proposals, filling out a myriad of government forms, a sort of politicking through the various government agencies, negotiation with agencies and corporate research people and strict reporting and follow up procedures. (Bock, Note 2)

As such, there are no data as to how many development departments, foundations, or combinations of these two in particular, exist among four year state universities.

As listed in the Education Directory of Higher Education 1976-77, there are 520 state controlled institutions in the United States. There is listed a chief development officer for only 219 of these universities. Although the figure is helpful, it does not tell us how many university related foundations there are at these universities.

The problem then becomes two-fold: there are no data to tell us how many university related foundations there are or where they are; and there are no data describing these foundations as to makeup and
operation. In other words, except by word of mouth, to this point we know very little about university related foundations.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study is to define four year state university related foundations and describe them in organizational and operational structure. Investigation has told us there is no central place where there are data on these foundations. This study will investigate the number of foundations in four year state universities in the United States and the characteristics of these foundations. The study will develop data on university related foundations in two general areas: 1) the number and location of each four year state university related foundation; and 2) a basic description of four year state university related foundations in terms of organizational and operational structures as categorized by size of student body, kinds of degrees distributed and number of living alumni of each university.

Our study will deal with many unanswered questions where no data are available.

Which universities have foundation and how are they organized?
Do they belong to a system of foundations?
Why were these foundations created?
Do they have Boards of Directors?
Who is on the Board?
How many professional and clerical staff do they have?

When does their fiscal year begin?

What kind of budgets do they have?

How much do they have invested?

What fund raising programs do they have and how many dollars have they raised in the past year?

Do they have policies for their various activities?

The response to these questions should give us some data in which to describe university related foundations at four year state universities.

This data will provide a basis for future studies of four year state university related foundations. Future studies on the flexibility of operations, productivity of organizations according to size and structure, options or programs which are most successful or unsuccessful, and structures which are most successful could serve to identify the elements of successful fund raising of university related foundations. These data can also be compared to university development departments to determine whether or not there is any real difference in these operations, especially as regards their productivity or flexibility.

Another possible avenue of investigation is comparison with private school operations. University related foundations are essentially a private system within a public system. One of the basic reasons for a private system in a state controlled environment
is a more flexible operation than the university system itself. As a private foundation, there is the possibility the operation is more like the private school system.

It is the hope of this paper that a basic knowledge of university related foundations, according to the size and kinds of degrees, will enable schools in the future to establish some criteria for successful organizational and operational patterns to assist in the all important task of raising funds for public universities.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study will deal with a population of all four year state controlled universities in the United States. This will exclude all private and federal universities, universities less than four years, e.g., junior colleges, certain professional schools, e.g., Cooley Law School, local controlled universities and the combination of local and state controlled universities.

In addition to this, the study will only investigate university related foundations as we have described them. Universities with combinations of development departments and university related foundations are included only on the basis of the university related foundation. Excluded on this basis are student foundations, all research services and graduate studies programs seeking research funds, alumni programs and all other programs not specifically
included as a designated university related foundation. Also excluded are private foundations as defined by the Tax Reform Act of 1969, charitable trusts and the like.

Four year state universities have been selected for study on the basis that characteristically they are enough alike and large enough in number to provide a separate category from private universities, two year or junior colleges and professional schools; the latter being relegated to one field of study.

The study itself is structured in such a way as to define categories even among four year state universities.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A Short History of Educational Fund Raising

The first colleges and universities were built, almost without exception, as a result of private gifts. (Cubberly, 1947, p. 73)

As the first among these private colleges, Harvard is a specific example.

... it pleased God to stir up the heart of one Mr. Harvard (a godly gentlemen and a lover of learning, then living among us) to give the one half of his estate (it being about £1700) toward the erecting of a college, and all his library. After him another gave £300; others after them cast in more, and the publique hand of the State added the rest. (Harris, 1889, p. 21)

It is interesting to note the dedication and generosity on the part of the people to such endeavors as new schools. The great tradition among the people of private support for education had a strong beginning in these early days and the rich and the wealthy were not the only ones to engage in this support. Again, the giving pattern for Harvard is an excellent example.

Among the magistrates themselves two hundred pounds was subscribed, a part in books. All did something, even the indigents. One subscribed a number of sheep; another nine schillings worth of cloth; one, a ten schilling pewter flagon; others, a fruit-dish, a sugar spoon, a silver tipped jug, one great salt, one small trencher salt, etc. From such small beginnings did the institution take its start. No rank, no class of men is unrepresented. The School was of the people. (Harris, p. 23)
The basic motive for that early voluntary support of private education appears to be religious. Seven of the first eight colleges were maintained by religious groups.

It was not until 1692 that the second college in the colonies was started at Williamsburg, Virginia, as the College of William and Mary ... Other colleges existing at present were established in the following order: Yale (1701), Princeton (1746), Pennsylvania (1751), Columbia (1754), Rutgers (1766), Dartmouth (1769). All of the above, except Pennsylvania, were sectarian in their support and maintenance. (Cressman & Benda, 1956, p. 38)

Unlike our modern states, where all taints of religion have been neutralized by law, the early settlers belonged to colonial states which, by covenant, upheld certain religious beliefs with each colony adapting a particular religion as the official religion of the colony. In the early colonial days, church and state were one, with the church exercising total control over the life of the ordinary person.

As a result of this kind of control, a curious thing happened to the schools. Since the meetings of the church and the town involved the same officials, the same places, the Meeting Houses, were used for meetings of both church and town groups. From the beginning, colonial legislation placed the schools under the civil law because of taxes for their support and because they were a public service. However, in due time, town halls were erected in addition to the Meeting Houses and, from then on, school affairs were conducted in the town halls of local civil government and not the Meeting Houses of the churches. Because of this separation and the growing influ-
ence of civil government, the churches gradually lost their hold on the schools and the schools eventually were wholly under civil legislation and dominance. (Cubberly, pp. 73-74)

Along with this circumstance, the great need for public schools embracing peoples of all faiths was foreseen early, when a short ten years after the Declaration of Independence provision was made for non-sectarian schools in the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, which established a pattern for the frontiers. "There shall be reserved one lot No. 16 of every Township for the maintenance of the public schools of the Township." (Cressman & Benda, p. 48) Later, the Ordinances set aside two lots in each new territory for the building of a public university.

The funding of these schools began to change since they were now wards of the state. Philanthropy never ceased, but the schools began to depend more on other sources of funds such as taxes, tuition and fees. Once the schools were severed from the church, the church no longer had the burden of support, which support was now the responsibility of the civil government. (Cubberly, pp. 179-180)

In many instances, the states had laws which effectively imposed a school tax for the support of the schools. State support was also received from lotteries, tolls, license fees, assessments, land grants and, in earlier days, a rate-bill, which was a charge levied upon the parent to supplement the school revenues and was assessed.
on each parent according to the number of children attending school. (Butts, 1953, p. 87)

When the colonies began to be more democratic and, therefore, non-sectarian, there was a movement among the people to appropriate these many private religious schools and form state institutions. Dartmouth College resisted this trend and went to the Supreme Court in 1819 for its independence. In a significant declaration, the Court prevented the legislature from "altering the Charter without the consent of the corporation." (Cressman & Benda, pp. 38-39)

By this decision, Dartmouth and other private schools were given the freedom to remain private if they wished to do so. Remaining private, however, was not an easy task.

Given the large number of colleges and the relative scarcity of money in the young country, a struggle for existence was inevitable. The fittest in this competition were the institutions that were successful at raising money. In this situation, philanthropy assumed crucial importance in the selection of survivors. For the colleges that received a constant flow of donations there was permanence and growth; those founded by men whose zeal exceeded their cash assets usually had short lives. Of course, voluntary private giving was not the only source of income. Receipts from tuition payments, including money raised by selling term and perpetual scholarships, helped to fill college treasures. (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 43)

Private colleges, since they depended to a great extent on private funding suffered in comparison with public colleges when states began to allocate public funds in the form of taxes, fees and other public support for state colleges. As a result, many of the early private colleges do not exist today.
Since the majority of private schools were sectarian, the movement westward and away from the so-called "religious" bounties of the early colonies was also a movement to more democratic, political and governmental structures. Because the people were organizing basically in political structures and, therefore, non-sectarian structures, the new schools themselves also became non-sectarian.

Nevertheless, this movement toward having state institutions that were more practical in nature did result in their establishment in a good many of the states, primarily those in the South and the new commonwealths that were being organized. Among those set up were North Carolina (1795), Georgia (1800), Ohio (1804), South Carolina (1805), Tennessee (1807), Indiana (1824), and Virginia (1825). Others were established in the states that were formed as the new nation pushed westward. (Cressman & Benda, p. 39)

The basic reason for these new colleges was a new type of education. This new education stemmed from a shift in emphasis from a pure classical education of Greek, Latin and other subjects more fitting to clergymen, to a more practical education which incorporated vocational subjects to help people make a living.

The vocational and practical aspects of these schools were the outgrowth of new values coming from a group of Americans different than our colonial forefathers. These new Americans were the merchants, farmers, and industrialists who had to forge their way to the top with their hard work and creative genius in the new world. Generally speaking, these businessmen were not college graduates, but persons who had worked in the practical everyday world and were
successful in their work. They became the new wealthy class and, with their practical insight, saw a need for an education more suited to the business world. As a result of this insight, they became philanthropists and all through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, new schools and programs were founded by their generosity.

Their monumental works in the nineteenth century include such famous places as Rensselaer College, Harvard's Lawrence Scientific School, Chandler School of Science and Arts, Thayer School of Civil Engineering at Dartmouth, Sheffield Scientific School at Yale, Wharton School of Finance at Pennsylvania University, College of Commerce and Administration funded by John D. Rockefeller at Chicago University, and George Eastman's near twenty million dollars for science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

All of these philanthropists, guided by interest in the practical education, greatly changed the scope of education in America.

Private philanthropy was not the only means by which practical higher education advanced in the United States. The federal government gave impetus to the movement with the Morrill Act of 1862, which created the land grant colleges. The Descriptive title of this measure was "an act donating Public Lands to the Several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts", and the state universities, many of which received land-grant money, usually defined higher education in a utilitarian fashion. In fact, considerably prior to the Morrill Act it was a state institution, the University of Virginia, that pioneered under Thomas Jefferson's leadership in reorienting its curriculum in a practical direction. Several colleges also undertook the addition of courses in applied science and technology without the aid of donations for that specific
purpose. But philanthropy provided the major impetus for the shift toward the practical in higher education. (Curti & Nash, p. 85)

Philanthropy continued to be a powerful agent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Some of the great universities of our day were founded then by men and women of great foresight and generosity. Such universities as Cornell, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, Tulane, Chicago, Clark and Duke are examples of this philanthropy.

From the early twentieth century on, philanthropic monies continued to pour into the well-established colleges and universities as the friends and alumni of higher education became more prevalent and more successful and had more to give. The philanthropic base for higher education was increasing in number of donors and monies raised.

As a result of this increased base, private colleges and universities developed extensive fund-raising programs. They intensified their fund-raising efforts by building large staffs, running capital campaigns and seeking funds from numerous private sources for their institutions.

In due time, these same efforts were made by public universities seeking to fund those programs which state funds would not support and provide quality to other already existing programs.

Today, both public and private colleges and universities are searching for those private funds to adequately support their
programs. Higher education is making a concerted effort to capture a significant portion of the charitable dollars available. Of all the charitable dollars raised in 1977-78, higher education institutions raised an estimated $3.040 billion. This estimate is a 13.9% increase over the previous year's total, which increase amounts to $370 million. (Council for Financial Aid, 1979, p. 3)

Although both private and public universities experienced significant increases in funds from private support, public colleges and universities reported a greater increase in voluntary support than did private colleges and universities.

"In their competition for voluntary support, the public institution reporting to CFAE averaged a higher dollar total than did their private counterparts for the fourth year running - $2,874,907 vs. $2,486,826. In 1976-77, public institutions averaged $2,477,272 vs. $2,262,102; in 1975-76, $2,147,330 vs. $2,073,939; in 1974-75, $2,163,831 vs. $1,833,636.

"In 1977-78, 27.5 percent of all the voluntary total support figure of $2,365,639,000 received by all four year colleges and universities were to public four years colleges and universities. This indicates a .9 percent increase from the 26.6 percent in 1976-77. This figure is up 103.0 percent over a decade ago." (Brakeley, John Price Jones, 1979, p. 6)

This is a significant indication of the growing emphasis being put on the raising of funds from the private sector for the support of public educational institutions. Many needs are being expressed by public as well as private institutions for additional funds. In the case of public insititutions, these needs were once being met by state and federal support. But this support is dwindling. As an
example, in the 1979-80 budget year, state support for the University of Wisconsin System is 44% of the total budget, down from 49% in the five previous years. (Young, Note 3) This is not a unique example. It is happening nationwide.

Aligned with this is the increase in private support as a percentage of the annual university or college budget. The last three years have seen a rise in the percentage of voluntary support for institutional expenditures from 5.6% in 1974-75 to 6.1% in 1977-78. (Council for Financial Aid, p. 6)

The patterns of funding have also changed. Although private colleges and universities generally maintain a ratio of 50-50 between current operation and capital purposes, over the past five years approximately 74% of the funds raised for public four year universities and colleges went for operational expenditures. This is up approximately 5% from a decade ago. (Brakeley, John Price Jones, pp. 6-7)

More than ever, fund raising for public institutions is becoming a necessity. The lessening of support from state and federal sources, as well as already high tuition levels, are forcing public institutions to generate funds from private sources or suffer the consequences of a less than quality education. The challenge for private funds is becoming more competitive and university related foundations are playing a major role in that competition.

"The road map for successful fund raising – particularly in the major campaign area – in the 80's is probably being
charted most decisively by state institutions which are building strong, independent foundations for special project and major-gift solicitation, along with active, capable alumni organizations interested in more than self-satisfaction and entertainment.

"Professional staff sizes have increased dramatically during the current decade. Few state institutions are without at least one independent foundation, or a similar entity under some other name, focused primarily on the acquisition of private gifts. Staff sizes should be leveling off at most of the high-gift income universities, but expansion will continue to take place in the great bulk of America's public higher education institutions."

(Brakeley, John Price Jones, p. 5)

The university related foundation appears to be the key to future fund raising in public institutions.

University Related Foundations

A number of vehicles exist for the transfer of private wealth to public need or charitable purposes. There are government taxes which demand a certain percentage of one's wealth to be shared for a common good and there is tithing, when one belongs to a religious constituency that requests a certain amount of one's income to carry out religious charitable purposes. And for the more affluent, there is the vehicle of a foundation.

Organizations to carry out the concepts of charity are to be found in early Egyptian, Greek and Roman records. The Ptolemies endowed a library in Alexandria; Plato bequeathed funds to support his Academy after his death; and in the early centuries A.D. in Rome, private associations for the relief of the poor, educational institutions, hospitals, foundling asylums, and old people's homes were established. In the Middle Ages, the Church became the chief dispenser of charity, and its role in the field of philanthropy has continued to be a dominant one. During the
Reformation in England, the guilds and companies replaced the Church as the administrators of many charitable gifts. A wave of philanthropy arose among the new middle classes leading to the establishment of permanent funds, usually trusts, for certain specific charitable objects administered by private individuals or corporations. Philanthropic societies and associations also developed and multiplied following the industrial revolution. (Fremont-Smith, 1965, p. 11)

The beginnings of foundations hinge on the beginnings of philanthropy and start in the earliest civilizations known to man. An historical sequence, as outlined above by Fremont-Smith, leads to our modern day concept of a foundation. The Egyptians, for religious purposes, developed the practice of leaving property in perpetuity to other than material or legal heirs. The Greeks further expanded on this with a "living legal heir", whereby they could leave property to anyone of their choosing during a person's lifetime. This concept is much like our will. Romans went even further when they declared one could leave bequests to associations. Cities and towns served as the first associations and recipients of these funds. Later, the church was appointed as official recipient or foundation and became the vehicle to pass funds to the poor and needy. At the time of the Corpus Juris Civilis in 550 A.D., the church foundations were given legal basis along with a series of safeguards to protect the foundations and the desires of donors. These safeguards were the forerunners of our modern foundation laws and included such practices as review of the testator's intention and the fulfillment of it, rules regarding
investment and management of funds, time limits on the use of gifts and the like. (Fremont-Smith, pp. 14-15)

In the seventh century, Mohammed recommended for Islam the establishment of a vaqf, which is similar to a charitable foundation. The accumulation of income is forbidden in the vaqf, but it has three usages: "... a man's duty to his own family, the maintenance of God's worship according to the tenets of Islam and charities in the English sense, including works of public utility." (Fremont-Smith, p. 16) Even today, the vaqf is still under religious rule and not subject to civil law in the countries of Islam.

Anglo-Saxon law followed Roman law closely and developed the term "corporation" from the Roman concept of a foundation. The original corporation basically described religious institutions such as parishes and religious orders. These institutions had the function of distributing charitable gifts to the poor and needy, much as the church did in the Roman Empire. In England, like in the Roman Empire, Ecclesiastical courts gradually assumed power over testamentary matters including gifts of charity. Eventually, the kings intervened and the powers of the church courts were silenced and the crown became the sovereign ruler in all matters.

During the long bout between the king and the church, a new form of conveyance came into being. It was called the "use".

The origin of this method of conveyance, which was the precursor of the modern trust, is not clear. Maitland
suggests that it first appeared in the thirteenth century when lands were conveyed to individuals who agreed to hold them for the use of the Franciscan Friars, whose order did not allow the holding of property, either individually or communally. (Fremont-Smith, p. 18)

Uses carried on for some time until the practice of conveyance to a religious corporation was specifically forbidden by law in 1391. Uses continued to grow and served as trusts since they were assignable and descendable. English law did not permit testamentary disposition of land, so land owners developed the use as a way to circumvent the law. Henry VIII in 1535 passed the Statute of Uses, which was an attempt to correct the abuses of the use. These statutes, by their strict interpretation, laid down the main lines for the development of the modern trust. (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973, Vol. 22, p. 280)

Another important contribution to modern day charitable foundations was the Statute of Charitable Uses enacted in 1601. This statute was meant to correct previous abuses in the administration of charitable gifts and encourage future gifts by delineating specific charitable purposes. After this statute was passed, ad hoc commissions were appointed to look into the maladministration of charitable funds. The effect of this was the encouragement of a great many new charitable trusts. Hospitals and almshouses, schools, colleges and other good public uses were added to the list of charities.

The commissions gradually disappeared and policing charitable
trusts became the work of the state. After a number of attempts to legislate compliance and registration of trusts, Parliament created a Charities Commission in 1819 to again monitor the charitable trusts for maladministration. It is interesting to note universities and public schools were removed from the scope of this commission. (Owen, 1964, pp. 590-591)

In 1853, the Charitable Trust Act was passed creating a permanent board of Charity Commissioners. Other laws concerning charitable trusts were passed through the years until, in 1950, the English Parliament established a Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Charitable Trusts. The committee reported to Parliament and in 1960 an act was passed to replace with new provisions the Charitable Trust Acts, 1853 to 1939, with respect to gifts of charities. (Owen, pp. 594-595)

Basically, this act did away with the old system of charitable trusts and created a new one. The lessons learned through the ages on charitable trusts were identified and put into law by this act.

Foundations in the United States, in general, followed the English system, where the doctrine of charitable trusts was usually upheld as a valid element of the law.

Charitable trusts were exempted from local taxation and the courts adopted an attitude of liberality to the legal meaning of charity. Incorporation by special act of the legislature was the usual method of establishing schools, hospitals, religious groups, and other operating charitable institutions. Fear of the rise in power of the church led to the passage of restrictions on the holding of property by charitable, particularly religious, corporations and in
some states the legislature was on occasion reluctant to grant charters to these groups. A policy of encouraging charity predominated, however, and as incorporation for business purposes increased, so did incorporation for charitable ventures of all types. (Fremont-Smith, p. 37)

After the American Revolution of 1776, the sentiment was strongly anti-English and most states went so far as to drop elements of English law they had accepted and now considered undesirable. For eight states, this included the doctrine of charitable trusts. Long years of court battles ensued in these states, New York particularly, in attempts to reinstate the charitable trust. It wasn't until 1893 that New York passed the "Tilden Act", declaring the validity of charitable trusts. Today, all states uphold the validity of charitable trusts. (Fremont-Smith, p. 39)

During the time of difficulty with charitable trusts, the vehicle of the corporation began to be widely used to conduct charitable activities. Among the private corporations, the most numerous were those for religious purposes. These corporations, in many cases, were considered to be trustees or agents for works of charity with the beneficiaries being the general public, as distinct from the corporate members themselves.

Legally a foundation is usually either a trust or a corporation. A foundation having the form of a trust is the product of an indenture, will, or similar instrument drawn up for philanthropic purposes by an individual (or institution) who donates the assets, identifies the purpose of the trust, and names the original trustees. Historically, the trust was the more usual legal form of foundation and the Foundation Center estimates that probably a third of all current foundations still are trusts. Today, however, the corporate form of the foundation has become more popular.
The corporation is established by a charter, granted by public authority, that identifies the legal existence of the foundation and specifies its powers and purposes. (Zurcher, 1972, p. 10)

Charitable foundations, as we know them today, have only begun in the United States in the last seventy years with well over 85% of the foundations begun since 1940. The Sixth Edition of The Foundation Directory indicates there are some 26,000 foundations currently existing today.

Foundations admit to many descriptions and definitions. The Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy defines a foundation as "primarily a grant-making organization supported by contributions from an individual, a company or a small group of persons". (Foundation, Private Giving, 1970, p. 39) This definition was in response to its clear purpose of studying grant-making foundations to recommend possible changes in the law for the control of these foundations. The Commission was a result of investigation by Congress and others of private foundation abuses.

One of the more comprehensive and, therefore, preferred definitions is that of F. Emerson Andrews (1956, p. 11) in his book Philanthropic Foundations.

A foundation may be defined as a non-governmental, non-profit organization having a principal fund of its own, managed by its own trustees or directors, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare.

There are a variety of descriptions of foundations within the
elements of this definition. These descriptions often overlap and any particular foundation should not be thought of as carved in stone so that it cannot shift in emphasis or characteristics.

Andrews (1956, p. 21) again, has provided a classification of foundations within his own definition.

The division into the following six classes is made chiefly for purposes of description.

1. General research foundations
2. Special purpose foundations
3. Family or personal foundations
4. Corporation foundations
5. Community trusts
6. Governmental foundations

The foundations most people are familiar with are the large research foundations. These include such foundations as the Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller and Kellogg Foundations. The primary donors of these foundations have been Messrs. Henry Ford, Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller and W.K. Kellogg. These foundations have developed worldwide medical systems and programs, educational systems for the needy of America and other lands, libraries, public television and countless other programs throughout the world.

Research foundations fund those projects that are left unfunded by private enterprise or government resources. They tend to fund the more creative and experimental projects of humankind.

Special purpose foundations are the oldest and most common of all foundations. The ancient Pharaohs set up foundations for the welfare of priests and the observance of religious ceremonies a
thousand years before Christ. Plato, who died in 347 B.C., set up a foundation with the income from his fields being used to support his academy. This lasted nearly 900 years. Special purpose foundations can be for almost any reason that qualifies as a special purpose.

Family foundations are usually established by a living person and serve as channels for a person's or family's charitable giving. Most of these foundations are small and operate on a local level.

Corporation foundations are basically "company" foundations or funds. Industrial or business corporations set up these foundations to direct their corporate giving on a yearly basis. Corporate foundations are not heavily endowed, but use the resources acquired from the corporation for distribution immediately. The General Mills Foundation, Ford Company Fund and U. S. Steel Foundation are examples of this type of foundation.

Community trusts are primarily established to serve the local community in which they exist. The many and various community social programs are assisted through these trusts.

The Milwaukee Foundation, Cleveland Foundation, Kalamazoo Foundation and New York community trust are examples of community trust foundations.

Governmental foundations are those set up by government for various purposes in science, education and art. The National Science Foundation and the National Endowment of the Arts are governmental foundations.
University related foundations could be construed to fit Andrew's definition of a foundation under the category of special purpose foundations. They do not fit the categories of research foundations, corporate, government, community trust or family foundations. Even though the source of funds may be different in many respects, the university related foundation has a special purpose objective, not unlike Plato's gift of his fields to generate an income to maintain an academy. The university related foundation is for the same purpose, to generate monies from gifts or endowments to continue the process of education at a university.

There are many similarities between the historical foundations we have discussed and university related foundations. University related foundations grew up through the charitable trust, the use, the vaqf and the corporation. The past history of these foundations is the history of the university related foundation. Now, however, the law has recognized the basic difference between these types of foundations and recent legislation has been enacted to separate these two bodies into related, but different legal concepts.

In defining university related foundations according to the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), there are three sections of the code that apply. The code describes university related foundations from a negative description or definition, that is, using exclusions rather than inclusions. Section 509(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code specifically deals with the definition of a private foundation.
and indirectly with a public charity which is a general term used for a university related foundation. Section 509(a) was a result of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 and it is the first time the term "private foundation" is used in the Code. Section 509(a) of the Code states:

(a) GENERAL RULE.--For purposes of this title, the term "private foundation" means a domestic or foreign organization described in section 501(c)(3) other than--
(1) an organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A) (other than clauses (vii) and (viii)).

From the excerpt, it is clear that sections 501(c)(3) and 170(b)(1)(A) are involved in the definition of a university related foundation.

In order to understand 509(a), we must first deal with sections 501(c)(3) and 170(b)(1)(A). IRC 501(c)(3)-1 states:

Organizations organized and operated for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

This section describes those charitable organizations that are exempt from federal income tax. It provides exemption for those organizations which are organized exclusively for one or more of the purposes specified in 501(c)(3). There are basically two tests for exemption under the Code, an organizational test and an operational test. The Code comments on the organizational test.

(b) Organizational test.--(1) In general. (i) An organization is organized exclusively for one or more exempt purposes only if its articles or organization...
(a) Limit the purposes of such organization to one or more exempt purposes, and
(b) Do not expressly empower the organization to engage, otherwise than as an insubstantial part of its activities, in activities which in themselves are not in furtherance of one or more exempt purposes. (IRC 501(c)(3)(b)(1)(a)(b))

University related foundations meet this test and are exempt organizations under the Code by reason of their very purpose.

University related foundations are organized to assist state universities, which universities are exempt under IRC 501(c)(3). The assistance rendered to a state university by a foundation is the raising of funds for and transmitting these funds to the university for its academic purposes.

Articles stating that the organization is created solely "to receive contributions and pay them over to organizations which are described in 501(c)(3) and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code" are sufficient for purposes of the organization test. If the articles state that the organization is formed for "charitable purposes", such articles ordinarily will be sufficient for purposes of the organizational test. (Hopkins & Meyers, 1975, p. 35)

The operations test is based on the purposes for which the organization exists. These purposes must be charitable and consuming. The Code states:

(c) Operational test--(1) Primary activities. An organization will be regarded as "operated exclusively" for one or more exempt purposes only if it engages primarily in activities which accomplish one or more of such exempt purposes specified in section 501(c)(3). An organization will not be so regarded if more than an insubstantial part of its activities is not in furtherance of an exempt purpose. (IRC 501(c)(3)(6)(c))
As stated above, the exempt purpose of a university related foundation is to serve one or more educational institutions which are controlled by a state legislature. This purpose falls within the confines of the operational test as defined by the Code.

Section 170 of the Code deals with charitable contributions and allowance of certain levels of deductions for contributions. Contributions to organizations described as private foundations in 509(a) are limited to 20% of the taxpayers contribution base or adjusted gross income for the taxable year. Contrasted with that, charitable gifts or contributions to 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) organizations are deductible to a limit of 50% of the taxpayers contribution base. Section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) states:

(b) Percentage limitations.--
(1) Individuals.--In the case of an individual, the deduction provided in subsection(a) shall be limited as provided in the succeeding subparagraphs.
(A) General rule.--Any charitable contribution to--
(iv) an organization which normally receives a substantial part of its support (exclusive of income received in the exercise or performance by such organization of its charitable, educational, or other purpose or function constituting the basis for its exemption under section 501(a)) from the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof or from direct or indirect contributions for the general public, and, which is organized and operated exclusively to receive, hold, invest, and administer property and to make expenditures to or for the benefit of a college or university which is an organization referred to in clause (ii) of this subparagraph and which is an agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or which is owned or operated by a State or political subdivision thereof or by any agency or instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions.
Section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv), as quoted above, provides the exclusion of a university related foundation from the definition of a private foundation based on its status in the Internal Revenue Code for purposes of tax deductions. This exclusion has a history in the Code.

Prior to 1954, there were no recognized differences in the law between charitable organizations. Foundations and other charitable organizations were treated under the same codes and regulations, one of which was a 20% deduction from the taxpayers contributions base for a donation to a foundation.

In 1954, Congress began to treat educational, religious and hospital charities differently by permitting an additional 10% deduction from the taxpayers contributions base for contributions to these organizations. Under this new permission, organizations qualifying under 170(b)(1)(A) became 30% charitable organizations, in contrast to the other 20% organizations. In 1964, this category of 30% charitable organizations was enacted in the Code and expanded to include other public and publicly supported organizations. (Philanthropy in the Seventies, 1980, pp. 12-13)

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 made several additional changes. It identified the 20% organizations as "private foundations" and the former 30% organizations by implication as public charities. It also raised the 30% deduction to 50% for these public charities. Section 509 of the Internal Revenue Code was added to further
delineate the definition of the public charity.

Organizations which are deemed not to be private foundations by reason of IRC section 509(a)(1) are essentially those in the old 30-percent deduction category. These organizations are described in IRC sections 170(b)(1)(A)(i) through (vi). (Hopkins & Meyers, pp. 190-191)

The organizations classified as public charities in these two sections of the Internal Revenue Code are churches, educational organizations, medical care and research organizations, supporting foundations, governmental units and certain publicly supported organizations. For purposes of our study, the category of supporting foundations encompasses university related foundations.

"IRC section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) provides public charity status for certain organizations providing support for public colleges and universities. These entities are quite useful in attracting private giving for such institutions, with these gifts not subject to the direction of the particular state legislature.

"Specifically, the organization must normally receive a substantial part of its support (exclusive of income received in the exercise or performance of its exempt activities) from the United States or from direct or indirect contributions from the general public. It must be organized and operated exclusively to receive, hold, invest, and administer property and to make expenditures to or for the benefit of a college or university (including a land grant college or university) which is a public charity and which is an agency or instrumentality of a state or political subdivision thereof, or which is owned or operated by a state or political subdivision thereof or by an agency or instrumentality of one or more states or political subdivisions.

"Such expenditures include those made for any one or more of the normal functions of colleges and universities, such as the acquisition and maintenance of real property comprising part of the campus area; the erection of college or
university buildings; the acquisition and maintenance of equipment and furnishings used for, or in conjunction with normal functions of colleges and universities; or expenditures for scholarships, libraries and student loans."

(Hopkins & Meyers, p. 212)

It is clear that university related foundations are becoming more firmly situated in the Code and the Code is working slowly toward a definition of them. Up to now, the Code has treated these foundations as tax exempt by virtue of their status as 501(c)(3) organizations as stated in 170(b)(1)(A)(iv). Section 509(a), as quoted previously, is not in itself definitional, but instead, cross references to the organizations in 170(b)(1)(A)(i) through (vi) and 501(c)(3). (Institute on Charitable Giving, 1977, p. 67)

The approach of the new statutory definition of a "private foundation" is to say that all "organizations described in section 501(c)(3)" are "private foundations" except those that meet one of four tests. Thus, if your organization is "an organization described in" Section 501(c)(3), it is also a "private foundation" unless it meets one of these four tests, some of which are complex and quite technical. (Foundations and the Tax Reform Act of 1969, 1970, p. 4)

The four qualifying tests for status "other than" a private foundation are:

1. Organizations, contributions to which by individuals qualify as charitable contribution deductions up to 50% of the individuals contribution base. (Foundations and the Tax Reform Act of 1969, p. 4)

2. Organizations which do not receive more than one third of their support from their own investments and which do normally receive more than one third of their support from publicly-supported organizations or from individual contributions of less than $5,000. (Foundations and the Tax Bill, 1969, p. 4)
3. Organizations organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of organizations meeting both tests one and two and which are controlled by such organizations or operated in connection with such organizations. (Foundations and the Tax Reform Act of 1969, p. 4)

4. Organizations organized and operated exclusively for the testing of public safety. (Foundations and the Tax Reform Act of 1969, p. 4)

Those organizations that meet one of the four tests are considered public charities. The Code nowhere defines what this term means, but it appears these organizations are so called "because they satisfy statutory requirements designed to ensure that the organizations are responsive to the general public." (Institute on Charitable Giving, p. 67)

As we have seen, both from historical perspective and the Internal Revenue Code, the concept of a university related foundation is relatively new compared to the long tradition of grant-making or private foundations. The first recorded university related foundation was established in 1891 at the University of Kansas and was named the Kansas University Endowment Association. (Cale, 1961, p. 17) Growth among university related foundations was slow and not until the 1950's did major universities begin to establish foundations in any significant numbers. The real surge came in the 1960's and 1970's for most universities. In Michigan alone, two major universities, Michigan State University and Western Michigan University have initiated university related foundations after 1976. Other universities are planning similar type structures
for their development programs in the near future.

The patterns of structure and organization are, generally speaking, the same among the older and larger foundations with some differences. These foundations have a Board of Directors, an Executive Director or President who is directly responsible to the Board, a staff for fund raising and investment and similar programs for fund raising and public relations. The differences lie in the details of how they are organized. Three examples will help to clarify these differences.

The Kansas University Endowment Association is directed by a Board of Trustees of 60 people including ex-officio members, the Chancellor of the University and the President of the University Alumni Association. The President of the Association is the chief executive officer of the Association, and the staff numbers 35, including clerical staff. (Martin, Note 4) An Executive Committee of 12 persons control the spending of funds for University purposes, acting on recommendations of the Chancellor of the University. A seven member Finance Committee from the Board supervises the investments for the Association. All investments are handled in house. (Kansas University Endowment Association Articles of Incorporation, 1893)

The Indiana University Foundation, founded in 1936, is somewhat different in makeup from the Kansas University Endowment Association. The Indiana Foundation is directed by a 29 member
Board of Directors made up of three members from the University Board of Trustees and appointed by the Board of Directors, and an additional 26 members appointed by the Board of Directors. A President administers the Foundation and has a staff of 57, including clerical staff. (O'Rourke, Note 5) The Board of Directors authorizes the expenditures for the University, after consultation with the appropriate University authorities. The Foundation staff manages the assets of the Foundation endowment. (Armstrong, 1979)

The University of Wisconsin Foundation, founded in 1945, has a slightly different structure than the previous two foundations. The Foundation has a 32 member Board of Directors which oversees the Foundation with ex-officio officers being the Executive Secretary of the University of Wisconsin Alumni Association, the President of the Alumni Association and former chairpersons of the Board of Directors. In addition, the Foundation can elect to membership in the Foundation 500 members. Each member has voting rights at the annual meeting. An Executive Committee of 14 members of the Board meets quarterly to direct the activities of the Foundation. A Finance Committee of nine Board members oversees the budget and investments of the Foundation. The Executive Director manages the Foundation with an additional staff of 11, including clerical staff. Expenditures for the University are made on the advice of University officials and authorized by the Executive Committee. (Articles of Association, 1945)
Each of these three foundations are the fund raising arm of their respective universities and the charters of the three foundations point out clearly that the only purpose for which each foundation exists is to raise funds for the universities to which they are related. The programs of fund raising include the annual fund, corporate and private foundation solicitation, life income plans for deferred gifts and major giving solicitation.

The Kansas University Endowment Association was founded because of the appropriation by the State of Kansas of all private funds given to the University. (Cale, p. 21) Once the state appropriated these gifts, they applied them to the university budget, replacing state funds in those areas for which the donors had designated these funds. As a result of this tactic, all private gifts became a part of the state budget allocation in Kansas.

The Endowment Association was a way of creating a private system within a public system. Effectively, the establishment of the Association kept private funds from becoming public budget funds and allowed the donor's intentions to be served as specified.

University related foundations are the same in concept as the association, i.e., a private system within a public system. They function independently of the university they serve. At the same time, they exist for the single purpose of serving their universities by raising funds for the advancement of these universities.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The lack of basic data on the subject of university related foundations dictated the kind of study to be done. A survey was chosen as the best means for accomplishing the listing of all university related foundations and for the development of descriptive norms of university related foundations, which listing and description have been described as the objectives of the study. The study was designed to accomplish both of these objectives within one survey instrument, a questionnaire.

The study focused on two main aspects of university related foundations, the organizational patterns and the operational patterns. The data collected generated a picture of the functions within these aspects.

The study was also stratified into three categories, each of which had three levels. This enabled comparisons to be made among the various levels within these categories.

Instrument of the Study

The study instrument (see Appendix A), or questionnaire, was developed in a number of steps. In the original search for a topic for a dissertation, an idea of comparison between university related foundations and development departments on the basis of flexibility
and effectiveness was investigated. After doing some preliminary research on this subject, it became evident this idea did not have the basic resource material or facts for adequate study. The research for the comparison study prompted the present survey.

In the course of this preliminary research for a comparison of development departments and university related foundations, a questionnaire was drawn up to define the relationships between university related foundations and development departments. The survey instrument in this study uses a portion of the original questionnaire drawn for comparison purposes.

In an earlier study, a questionnaire for the Mid-America Conference had been developed for a study relating to this group. The questionnaire used for that study, and devised by this author, had covered the basic development functions among these ten universities. That questionnaire was partially appropriated and converted to a portion of the questionnaire for this study.

The survey instrument for our study on foundations was made up from these previous questionnaires and refined for this study. After being refined, it was tested by sending it to 14 universities, including a mixture of those that had a university related foundation and those that did not have a foundation (see Appendix B). Thirteen universities responded to the questionnaire. The responses were received and reviewed and a new questionnaire was designed for the study. In several cases, phone calls and personal interviews
with the respondents of the test questionnaire were held in developing the final questionnaire.

Several factors had to be taken into account in determining the length, coverage, tabulations, analysis and ease of response to the questionnaire. This was to be a study of all four year state controlled universities in the United States, which meant a universal sample or population. Not only was the population large, 501 universities, but each question would be broken down into three categories of three units each, for a total of nine response categories. In addition to these factors, the timing was bad. This was the time when universities were being heavily investigated for holding stocks in companies doing business in South Africa and foundations were beset with problems of challenges to their investments. It was anticipated foundations sensitive to this kind of data would not be willing to share it in a questionnaire.

These complications argued for a rather simple but effective questionnaire. Working on the principle that long surveys get short answers, it was decided to forgo essay questions and include as many check and completion type questions as possible to adequately cover the material and, at the same time, assure an accurate response. Again, with a view toward computerization of responses, the questions were so arranged as to make tabulation fairly easy without losing or distorting material.

Since there were no previous studies in this area, the instru-
ment was developed specifically for this study. The instrument
came with the respondent’s name, position, university name, address
and phone number. The remainder of the survey instrument was set up
in two sections. The first was an introductory section dealing with
demographic questions. The second was to be answered only by those
having university related foundations. The first question of the
introductory section asked the respondent to check the definition
that applied to the fund raising agency which presently existed at
his or her institution. Under this, four choices were listed, the
definition of a development department; the definition of a founda-
tion; a combination of the two above or none of the above. The aim
of this question was to determine whether or not the responding
organization was or had a foundation.

The next three questions, 2, 3, and 4 were seeking data
necessary for stratification of the study. Question 2 asked for the
number of full time equivalent students attending the university in
the Fall of 1977. Question 3 asked for the number of degrees
awarded in each of three categories, B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. The last
question of the introductory section asked for the number of living
alumni from the university.

Respondents were then instructed on the questionnaire to respond
to the next part only if they had a university related foundation.
All others were asked to return the questionnaire as is.

Section II began with question 5 and asked for the legal name
and address of the foundation. Questions 6 through 19 were aimed at identifying data to be used for a description of foundations. The questions were organized around two main descriptive ideas, an organizational pattern and an operational pattern. Such questions as "Does the foundation have a Board of Directors?" and, if so, "Check the groups which have representation on the Board", are obviously aimed at identifying how foundations are organized. On the other hand, questions asking for the "total dollar amount invested by the foundation" and "dollars raised by the foundation in 1977" give us an operational picture of foundations.

The other questions in this descriptive section relating to the organization of the foundation asked for the year of founding the organization, reasons for initiating the foundation, whether or not the foundation was one of a system of foundations in the state, which of the given organizational patterns apply to this particular foundation, and the number of staff at the foundation including professional and secretarial/clerical.

The operational patterns asked for the fiscal year of the foundation, the budget, the fund raising program, the number of donors in 1977 and the operational policies. The responses to these questions comprised the data base for the study.

Population and Sample

One of the primary objectives of the study was to define a list
of all university related foundations which exist at four year state universities. The population to be surveyed, then, was all four year state controlled universities in the United States. This constituted a universal sample.

The 1976-77 Directory of Higher Education was used to determine the population itself. Five hundred and twenty state controlled four year universities were listed in the Directory. Upon reviewing these names and addresses, it was determined that 19 universities did not fit the criteria for the population. Universities were eliminated on the basis of being either a special school, such as a medical school or law school, or partially controlled by federal, county or municipal administrations. A total of 501 universities remained in the population.

Data Collection and Treatment

After the survey instrument was constructed, it became apparent that reaching the right people for a response would be difficult. The Education Directory of Higher Education 1976-77, listed all university administrators for each university by name, including 219 development people, but no foundations or foundation people were indicated in the listing. It was decided to address the development people who were listed in the Directory personally and for others not listed, use the title Director of Development. The address list for all respondents was taken from The Education Directory of Higher
Education 1976-77.

In order to achieve a more dependable response, it was determined to send a cover letter with the questionnaire. The one organization that had had contact with all development operations was the Council for the Support and Advancement of Education (CASE). An appeal was made to V. Michael Born, Vice President of CASE, to solicit the assistance of CASE in contacting the foundations.

A cover letter was drawn bearing the signature of V. Micheal Born, Vice President of CASE (see Appendix C). The cover letter explained the nature of the survey and its usefulness to CASE and asked the addressee's participation and cooperation in returning the material in an enclosed envelope. The cover letter, plus the questionnaire, asked the respondent to route the questionnaire to the proper person for a response.

The back of the cover letter gave particular directions for completing the questionnaire (see Appendix D). The directions set a time limit for the return of the questionnaire, spelled out for whom the survey was intended, the exclusions of the survey and requested the respondent to answer the questions as completely as possible.

The package was then assembled for mailing. It included a cover letter, a questionnaire, a pre-paid business envelope addressed to CASE Survey, University of Wisconsin Foundation, 702 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin, 53706. The outside envelope had a hand stamped
SPECIAL on it in black color. The entire package was mailed in a CASE envelope with a hand typed salutation. The outside envelope was stamped by machine. The inside response envelope had a stamp on it. It was hoped these endorsements would prompt a good response.

The survey was mailed by first class mail in July of 1978 and responses came in over a period of seven months.

Since this was not only a study of a description of foundations, but also a study to establish a complete listing of university related foundations, a second mailing was sent in July of 1979. This mailing was a two-part postcard with one part being a response card (see Appendix E). The response card asked for the legal name and address of a university related foundation, if there was one at the institution. On the postcard mailing, the foundation was defined as a 501(c)(3) foundation. The postcard mailing asked for a response to the same four choices of what kind of fund raising vehicle existed at the university as in the questionnaire of the first mailing. Respondents had a choice of a foundation, a development department, a combination of these two or none of the above.

Only those institutions not replying to the first mailing received cards. The same addresses were used but one change was made in the salutation, all cards were addressed to the Director of Development and none addressed personally.

The responses to the first mailing were coded and keypunched on cards by the Wisconsin Research Survey Laboratory. The survey was
then run by the academic computer center in frequencies and percentiles. In those questions where averages were sought, a tape was run by hand on a calculator and averages were determined by levels within the categories of stratification. The latter procedure was used for the averages due to the inability of the program on computer to handle 10 or more digits. The data were assembled into a series of tables for analysis.

The responses to the second mailing were integrated with those responses of the first mailing which indicated they were or had a university related foundation. From these integrated responses, a listing of all university related foundations was constructed alphabetically by state and are found in Appendix F.

Stratification of the Study

The study was stratified into three categories and into three levels in each category. The three main categories were the number of full time equivalent students, the number of living alumni and the kinds of degrees awarded. Data were collected in each of these categories and then broken down into the three levels after observation of the data. In the case of the number of full time students attending, the raw data were tabulated on a tape and frequencies were constructed at 5,000 intervals from 0 to 40,000. After observation of the data, three levels were chosen to reflect universities on three different scales, small, medium and large.
The latter terms were defined on the basis of the 5,000 increments (see Table 3). Small universities were defined as those with 0 to 4,999 full time equivalent students. Medium universities have 5,000 to 19,999 students and large universities have 20,000 plus students. Each of these levels received a code or classification letter with small equal to A, medium to B and large to C. Each response was coded and the frequencies were then run by computer from data cards.

Question 3 differentiated universities on the basis of kinds of degrees awarded. The question asked for the number of graduates in each of three degrees, B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. Three levels were then established, the B.A. level, M.A. level and Ph.D. level. The three levels were then coded and the frequencies recorded by computer as to the highest level of degree awarded by each university. The code or classification letters used are D for the Ph.D. level, E for the M.A. level and F for the B.A. level (see Table 3).

Stratification was also done by number of living alumni for each university. The procedure was similar to that for full time equivalent students. A tape was run on the raw data and frequencies were constructed at 5,000 intervals from 0 to 100,000. After observation of this data, again, three levels were chosen to reflect universities on three different scales, small, medium and large. Small universities were defined as those with the number of living alumni from 0 to 24,999, medium from 25,000 to 99,999 and large as those
over 100,000. The small university was coded and classified as G, the medium as H and the large as I (see Table 3).

Summary

The study is a basic survey of university related foundations with a questionnaire as an instrument. The instrument was divided into two sections, a demographic section and a data section.

The instrument was designed to do two things, provide a listing of university related foundations and provide data for a description of these foundations in two areas, foundation organizational patterns and operational patterns.

The instrument was sent to 501 four year state universities in the United States, or a universal sample. The instrument was mailed with a cover letter and special cautions were taken to ensure a good response.

A second mailing, a double postcard, followed the first mailing. This was to complete the listing of university related foundations.

The responses to the first mailing were coded, keypunched and run on computer for frequencies and percentiles for assembly into tables.

These data were stratified into three main categories, namely, number of full time students, number of living alumni and kinds of degrees awarded. Each of these categories had three levels, either
large, medium or small, or B.A., M.A. or Ph.D. These data served as the basis for the data analysis.
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Data Analysis

The data collected in this survey bring into focus a number of facts about the organization and operation of university related foundations. As indicated in the previous section on stratification, these data are examined by size and quality within the established categories. The categories have been identified by levels in each category.

For purposes of this study, university related foundations which responded to the first mailing in July of 1978 will be used in the analysis of data. For the listing of foundations, however, respondents to both mailings will be used (see Appendix F).

The population used in the study was all four year state universities in the United States. Eliminating special schools and non-state controlled universities, the number of universities eligible to participate was 501. The first mailing went to all of these universities and, out of the 501 mailed, 196 (39.1%) responses were received (see Table 1). One hundred and fifty five (30.9%) of the 196 responses came from university related foundations. This group constituted the sample for data analysis.

A second postcard mailing was sent to the remaining 305 universities and 224 (73.4%) responses were received. Of those responding, 184 (60.3%) had foundations.
Table 1
Responses to the Study Mailing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Sequence</th>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Foundation Responses</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Mailing</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>196 39.1</td>
<td>155* 30.9</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(questionnaire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Mailing</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>224 73.4</td>
<td>184* 60.3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(postcard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mailing</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>420 83.8</td>
<td>339* 67.6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple foundations at various universities are not included in this number.
Table 1 shows that out of a total mailing of 501, 420 (83.8%) responded to one of the two mailings. Among the total respondents, there were 339 university related foundations. In other words, over 2/3 of the respondents to both mailings had university related foundations (Note 6).

The responses in Table 1 reveal that 155 foundations (30.9%) answered the questionnaire. This number was assumed to be sufficient for the data analysis. It was anticipated that not many more would answer the questionnaire if sent a second time because of the sensitive nature of the material.

Table 2 is an arrangement of the data from Table 1 according to the kind of response given to the two mailings (Note 7). The choice of response was among four options of fund raising vehicles existing at universities. The first question on the survey instrument listed the four options as: a university development department under university administration and a part of the university structure; a not-for-profit private corporation recognized by IRS under 501(c)(3) existing for the express purpose of receiving, investing, and dispensing funds for a university, that is, a foundation; a combination of development department and foundation and none of the above. These four choices were repeated on the postcard mailing in briefer form.

Of the total number of universities responding to the first mailing, 15.8% had only a development department, 20.9% had only a
Table 2

Responses by Mailings to the Four Choices of Fund Raising Vehicles in Each University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>First Mailing</th>
<th>Second Mailing</th>
<th>Total Mailing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Department</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Development/</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
foundation, 58.2% had a combination of development department and foundation and 5.1% had none of the above for their fund raising vehicle.

The second mailing of 305 double postcards was sent to the non-respondents of the first mailing, bringing the total respondents to 420 or 83.8% of the total population. Of this total group, 14.3% had only development departments, 26.4% had only foundations, 54.3% had combinations of development departments and foundations and 5.0% had none of the above for their fund raising vehicle. A total of 81 universities or 16.2% failed to respond to either mailing.

Classification of the Categories

Introductory questions, 2, 3, and 4 in the study instrument established the criteria to be used for the differentiation of foundations. This differentiation is based on data from the university to which the foundation is related. Three main categories were investigated, the number of students registered in the Fall of 1977, the kinds of degrees distributed and the number of living alumni. These categories have been shortened to read in the tables, number of students, kinds of degrees and number of alumni. Each of these categories has three levels of differentiation, either small, medium or large or B.A., M.A. or Ph.D., which are each classified by a mutually exclusive set of criteria. The criteria are classified or coded by letters of the alphabet. For example, in Table 3, A
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Table 3
Categories for Stratification of University Related Foundations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities Responding</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#  %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 41.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0-4,999 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 43.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,000-19,999 (medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 14.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20,000 + (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----------------------------

Kinds of Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#  %</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 41.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ph.D.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 38.7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M.A.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 14.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B.A.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 4.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----------------------------

Number of Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#  %</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79 51.0</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0-24,999  (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 35.5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>25,000-99,999 (medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 8.4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>100,000 + (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 5.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The text will refer to these universities as Ph.D., M.A., or B.A. universities.
indicates a small university of 0 to 4,999 students in attendance full time in the Fall of 1977. The letter D indicates a university which offers the Ph.D. as its highest degree. The letter H indicates a medium size university with 25,000 to 99,999 living alumni.

Table 3 spells out the data for the three categories. In the category number of students registered, 64 universities (41.3%) are classified as small. Sixty seven (43.2%) of the universities in the same category are classified as medium size, while 22 (14.2%) are classified as large, with two universities (1.3%) not responding.

In the category kinds of degrees, 65 (41.9%) of the universities responding award the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, while 60 (38.7%) award the B.A. and M.A. and 23 (14.8%) award only the B.A. Seven universities (4.5%) did not respond to the question.

In the category number of living alumni, 79 universities (51.0%) classified as small, 55 (35.5%) as medium and 13 (8.4%) as large, while 8 universities (5.2%) did not respond to the question.

The data show that most of the universities are small to medium size when placed in the two categories number of students and number of alumni. Large universities make up less than 15% of both of these categories. In the category kinds of degrees however, the data show universities awarding the Ph.D. and M.A. degrees are in the majority, with universities awarding only the B.A. less than 15% of the study. (Note 8)
Foundation Beginnings

In the survey instrument the question was asked, "In what year was the foundation officially begun?"

As a group, university related foundations are less than 90 years old (see Tables 4 and 5), having begun with the Kansas University Endowment Fund in 1891. The data indicate that only 4 university related foundations existed before 1930. Since that time, according to the data, an additional 148 state university related foundations were initiated. The data reveal that a substantial number of foundations do not appear until the 1950's with the highest growth in the 1960's and 1970's. The data show the period from 1960 on as the time from which most growth in the number of foundations took place.

Universities categorized by the number of students display some interesting contrasts. Among the small universities, only 8 foundations (12.4%) were established before 1960, while 53 foundations (82.9%) were established after 1960. In the medium size universities, 27 foundations (40.0%) were initiated before 1960 and 40 foundations (60.0%) after 1960, while among the large universities 15 foundations (68.2%) were begun before 1960 and 6 foundations (27.3%) after 1960.

When categorized according to the size of the alumni body, the data are similar to the data in the number of students with some
Table 4

The Official Year in Which the Foundation was Begun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A      B      C</td>
<td>D  E  F</td>
<td>G  H  I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1930</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>1  3  4  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>2  8  5  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>5 13 5  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>28 22 5  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1978</td>
<td>25 18 1  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3  0  1  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  3  1  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small      D = Ph.D.       G = small
B = medium     E = M.A.        H = medium
C = large      F = B.A.        I = large
slight variation. A total of 14 foundations (17.9%) were estab-
lished before 1960 among the small universities and a total of 63
(79.6%) were founded after 1960. The medium size universities
initiated 28 foundations (50.7%) before 1960 and 27 (49.3%) after
1960. The large universities began 7 foundations (53.9%) before
1960 and 5 foundations (38.5%) after 1960.

The category kinds of degrees has a similar trend to the other
categories. Ph.D. universities initiated 33 foundations (50.8%)
before 1960 and 31 (47.7%) after 1960. M.A. universities began 12
foundations (20.2%) before 1960 and 45 (74.8%) after 1960, while
B.A. universities began 3 foundations (12.9%) before 1960 and 20
(86.6%) after 1960.

In each category and each level of each category, the years 1960
through 1969 were the years in which the foundation growth was the
greatest, except for the larger universities which had equal growth
of foundations in the 1940's and 1950's. There appears to be a
slight tapering off of foundation beginnings in the 1970's, probably
due to the shorter span of 9 years, from 1970 through 1978, instead
of 10 years as in the other time spans.

Universities with the smallest number of students, smallest
number of alumni and granting only B.A.'s are almost parallel with
each other, having their highest number of foundation beginnings in
the 1960's and a slight tapering off in the 1970's. Contrary to
this, the medium size universities in the categories number of
Table 5
The Official Year in Which the Foundation was Begun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1930</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1978</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  D = Ph.D.  G = small
B = medium  F = M.A.  H = medium
C = large  G = B.A.  I = large
students and number of alumni, as well as those granting M.A.'s, show growth in the 1960's with a slight tapering off in the 1970's. A different pattern appears for those universities whose numbers are large in students and alumni and granting Ph.D.'s, with substantial growth in these foundations taking place in the 1940's through the 1960's but a definite decline in the 1970's.

Reasons for Foundations

The survey instrument asked the responding university foundations to identify the primary reason for initiating their foundations. Respondents had a choice among four responses: create a private system for investment purposes; more flexibility in operation; create a new Board of Directors or donors and other, with the latter allowing for a write-in response.

In the category number of students, flexibility of operations was chosen as the reason for initiating the foundation by a relative majority of university related foundations on all three levels, small, medium and large. Tables 6 and 7 indicate 29 foundations (45.3%) of small universities chose this as the primary reason for beginning their foundation while 29 foundations (43.3%) of medium size universities and 8 foundations (36.4%) of large universities also chose this reason as primary.

In the same category, investment purposes was chosen as the primary reason for initiating the foundation by 18 foundations
Table 6

The Primary Reason Chosen for Initiating the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Initiating Foundation</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = small</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = medium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = large</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Ph.D.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = M.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = B.A.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G = small</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H = medium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I = large</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Donors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small
B = medium
C = large
D = Ph.D.
E = M.A.
F = B.A.
G = small
H = medium
I = large
(28.1%) of small universities, 14 foundations (20.9%) of medium size universities and 7 foundations (31.8%) of large universities. Other was chosen as the primary reason for initiating the foundation by 13 foundations (20.3%) of small universities, 16 (23.9%) of medium size universities and 7 (31.8%) of large universities. As the data indicate, new directors or donors was chosen by less than 10% on all three levels as the primary reason for initiating the foundation.

In the category kinds of degrees awarded, flexibility of operation again was chosen as the reason for initiating the foundation by a relative majority of foundations on two levels, those of Ph.D. and M.A. universities, with the B.A. level university foundation sharing this as the primary reason along with investment purposes. Twenty nine foundations (44.6%) of Ph.D. universities and 25 foundations (41.7%) of M.A. level universities chose flexibility of operation as the primary reason for beginning their foundations, while 8 foundations (34.8%) of B.A. universities chose this as a reason. In the same category, investment purposes was chosen as the primary reason for initiating a foundation by 17 foundations (26.2%) of Ph.D. universities, 13 foundations (21.7%) of M.A. level universities and 8 foundations (34.8%) of B.A. level universities. Other was chosen as the primary reason for initiating the foundation by 14 foundations (21.5%) of Ph.D. level universities, 15 foundations (25.0%) of M.A. level universities and 7 foundations (30.4%) of B.A. level universities. New donors or directors again was chosen by less than
Table 7

The Primary Reason Chosen for Initiating the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Initiating Foundation</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% A</td>
<td>% B</td>
<td>% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Purposes</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of Operation</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Donors</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
10% on all three levels as the primary reason for initiating the foundation.

The category number of alumni closely parallels the category number of students, in that flexibility of operation is chosen as the primary reason for initiating the foundation by a relative majority on all three levels. Thirty five foundations (44.3%) of small universities chose flexibility of operation as the primary reason for initiating the foundation, while 23 foundations (41.8%) of medium size universities and 6 foundations (46.2%) of large universities also chose this as the primary reason. Investment purposes was chosen as the primary reason for initiating a foundation by 20 foundations (25.3%) of small universities, 15 foundations (27.3%) of medium size universities and 4 foundations (30.8%) of large universities. Eighteen foundations (22.8%) of small universities, 13 (23.6%) of medium and 3 (23.1%) of large universities chose other as the primary reason for beginning a foundation. New donors or directors again, like the other two categories, was chosen less than 10% on all three levels as the primary reason for initiating a foundation.

The data provide some interesting facts on just how important these reasons for initiating a foundation are compared to each other. If the range of percentage points is examined, it may be seen that on all levels in all three categories, the range for the choice of flexibility of operation is from 34.8% to 46.2%. This
range constitutes a relative majority on all levels. The range for the choice of investment purposes is from 20.9% to 34.8%, while that of other is from 20.3% to 31.8%. The latter two reasons for initiating foundations are very close seconds to flexibility of operation. The choice of new donors or directors of the foundation does not play an important role in beginning a new foundation. The range for new donors or directors is from 0 to 9% with three levels at zero.

Within the categories, there seems to be a general similarity when levels are compared to one another. One notable exception is found in the choice of new donors or directors, where this reason for beginning a foundation was not selected by even one foundation among foundations related to large universities in the category number of students, B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees and large universities in the category number of alumni.

In all categories the choices for initiating a foundation appear to be generally similar, with two exceptions. Foundations of large universities in the category number of students and those of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees have made choices which are fairly consistent among the top three choices.

It is not surprising that flexibility of operation is a frequent reason for having an independent foundation. Public universities are subject to state rules and regulations and fund raising activities, which are significantly different from academic activities,
are constantly subject to state intervention. Budget and personnel cuts are always a threat just when there is need for greater fund raising activity.

About 1/4 of the respondents in all categories chose investment purposes as the primary reason for initiating the foundation. Again, this is consistent with public universities whose freedom of investment is often highly regulated by the state. This reason is especially appropriate for those foundations that have no staff and are investment vehicles only.

Slightly over 1/5 of the respondents in all categories chose other as the primary reason for initiating their foundations. The respondents gave no hints as to how they interpreted other. Conjecture can only point to personnel or organizational problems such as a Vice President of Finance in a university in charge of a fund raising program or the like. Foundations appear to be formed in some cases to take the power of fund raising and allocation of funds out of some particular person's hands, or out of a particular office where philosophies of fund raising may clash.

Foundation Systems

In some states, public universities have been organized into a system with one central administrative office serving all the individual universities. Usually, the central office represents the state university system to the legislature, negotiates with the
Board of Regents or like bodies and oversees the policies affecting the system, among other duties.

Major university foundations within such systems occasionally serve as foundations for a number of universities. In no case do all schools within a state system belong to the one major foundation but, in those cases where there is a foundation system, at least two belong and sometimes as many as four or five universities belong to the one foundation.

Respondents were asked to check a yes or no answer to the question "Do you belong to a foundation system?" Although it was anticipated some respondents would not understand the question, it was determined the question ought to be asked anyway, since those who belong to a system will easily recognize the question and those who do not will respond negatively. This is apparently what happened.

Table 8 indicates a total of 13 universities belong to a foundation system. In the category number of students, 6 foundations (9.4%) of small universities, 5 (7.5%) of medium size and 2 (9.1%) of large universities all responded they belonged to a foundation system. Also responding "yes" in the kinds of degrees category were 3 foundations (4.6%) of Ph.D. granting universities, 8 (13.3%) of M.A. and 1 (4.3%) of B.A. granting universities. The category number of alumni had 8 foundations (10.1%) of small universities, 2 (3.6%) of medium size and 2 (15.4%) of large universities responding
Table 8

Foundations Which Belong to a Foundation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belong to A System</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 5 2</td>
<td>3 8 1</td>
<td>8 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57 59 16</td>
<td>56 50 22</td>
<td>68 52 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>6 2 0</td>
<td>3 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.4 7.5 9.1</td>
<td>4.6 13.3 4.3</td>
<td>10.1 3.6 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.1 88.1 72.7</td>
<td>86.2 83.3 95.7</td>
<td>86.1 94.5 53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.6 4.5 18.2</td>
<td>9.2 3.3 0.0</td>
<td>3.8 1.8 30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small          D = Ph.D
B = medium         E = M.A.
C = large          F = B.A.
G = small          H = medium
                    I = large
"yes" as to whether or not they belonged to a foundation system. Foundations responding "yes" as to whether or not they belonged to a foundation system were located in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Indiana, New York, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

As the data indicate, we would expect to find foundation systems on all levels in the three categories, since systems include varieties of universities.

**Foundation Board of Directors**

Among the 155 possible responses to the question "Does the foundation have a Board of Directors?", 153 foundations (98.7%) responded "yes", 1 (.6%) responded "no" and 1 (.6%) did not respond to the question (see Table 9). Virtually then, in all three categories on all three levels, foundations will have Boards of Directors. Since foundations are separate entities from the universities to which they are related, a Board of Directors will be the ultimate authority for policy and operational guidelines, including such functions as setting budgets and salaries, personnel appointments, overseeing the investment and distribution of funds, long-range planning and the like. It becomes important then to determine who, in general, is elected to hold a position on the Board.
Table 9

Foundations Which Have a Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small
B = medium
C = large
D = Ph.D
E = M.A.
F = B.A.
G = small
H = medium
I = large
Representation on the Board of Directors

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to check the groups which have representation on the foundation Board of Directors. The groups included university administrators, university faculty, students, minorities, women and corporate officials. Examination of Tables 10 and 11 shows some interesting data in the make-up of Boards of Directors of the foundations.

In all categories, university administrators, women and corporate officials make up the largest proportional representation on foundation Boards of Directors.

Among the three categories, and all levels within the categories, corporate officials are the highest in representation of any of the groups, with two exceptions. One exception is foundations of small universities in the category number of students, where 50 foundations (78.1%) have corporate officials represented on the Board and 51 (79.7%) have women represented. The other exception is in the category kinds of degrees, where women are represented on 53 (88.3%) of the Boards of foundations of M.A. universities and corporate officials are represented on 49 (81.7%) of these Boards. In the category number of alumni, both women and corporate officials are represented on 13 (100.0%) of the Boards of the foundations related to large universities.

Women and university administrators follow corporate officials closely in representation on Boards of foundations. In the category
### Table 10

**Groups Which Have Representation on the Board of Directors of the Foundation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Represented on Board</th>
<th>Number of Students Classified</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees Classified</th>
<th>Number of Alumni Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A   B   C</td>
<td>D   E   F</td>
<td>G   H   I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrators</td>
<td>46  57  19</td>
<td>55  45  19</td>
<td>62  45  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>30  33  8</td>
<td>27  32  10</td>
<td>40  24  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>11  14  4</td>
<td>11  12  4</td>
<td>14  12  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>26  22  6</td>
<td>17  24  10</td>
<td>29  17  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>51  51  19</td>
<td>47  53  18</td>
<td>63  41  13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Officials</td>
<td>50  61  21</td>
<td>58  49  20</td>
<td>67  46  13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
number of students, women are represented on 51 (79.7%) of the foundations of small universities and university administrators on 46 (71.9%) of these same Boards. In the foundations of medium size universities, women are on 51 (76.1%) of the Boards while administrators are on 57 (85.1%) of the Boards. Both women and administrators are on 19 Boards (86.4%) of the foundations of large universities.

In the category kinds of degrees, women are on 47 (72.3%) of the foundation Boards of Ph.D. universities, 53 (88.3%) of the foundation Boards of M.A. universities and 18 (78.3%) of the foundation Boards of B.A. universities. University administrators are on 55 (84.6%) of the foundation Boards of Ph.D. universities, 45 (75.0%) of the foundation Boards of M.A. universities and 19 (82.6%) of the foundation Boards of B.A. universities.

In the category number of alumni, women are on 63 (79.7%) of the foundation Boards of small universities, 41 (74.5%) of the foundation Boards of medium size universities and 13 (100.0%) of the foundation Boards of large universities. University administrators, on the other hand, are on 62 (78.5%) of the foundation Boards of small size universities, 45 (81.8%) of the foundation Boards of medium size universities and 11 (84.6%) of the foundation Boards of large universities.

The last three groups represented on Boards of foundations are faculty, minorities and students, in that order. Faculty are the
Table 11

Groups Which Have Representation on the Board of Directors of the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Represented on Board</th>
<th>Number of Students Classified</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees Classified</th>
<th>Number of Alumni Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% A</td>
<td>% B</td>
<td>% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrators</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Officials</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
fourth highest in representation on Boards on all levels and in all categories, with one exception. The exception is in the category number of alumni among the foundations of large universities, where minorities are on 5 (38.5%) of these Boards and faculty are represented on 4 (30.8%) of the same foundation Boards. In the category kinds of degrees, faculty and minorities share representation on the Boards of foundations of B.A. universities with 10 (43.5%) each.

Minorities are fifth in representation on Boards of Directors for all categories on all levels ranging between 26.2% on Boards of Ph.D. universities and 43.5% on Boards of B.A. universities.

Students are a distant sixth in representation with a low of 15.4% on Boards of large universities in the category number of alumni and a high of 21.8% on Boards of medium size universities in the category number of alumni.

It appears that 8 out of 10 Boards of foundations in all categories, at all levels, will have corporate officials and university administrators on them. Seven of 10 will have women on the Board, while 4 of 10 will have faculty on the Board. Three out of 10 Boards will have minorities on them and 2 of 10 will have students on the Board.

Professional and Secretarial/Clerical Staff

As a part of the survey, it was decided to ask foundations to identify the number of staff members in their foundation. A
previous study (Reilley, 1974) cautioned against identifying staff members by title or function, unless in general terms.

Foundation and development offices typically have a myriad of titles for the same functions and a myriad of functions for the same title. The one who heads the development office at a university, for example, may be the President, Assistant to the President, Vice President for Finance, Vice President for Development, Vice President for Alumni and Development and the like. Foundations have almost as many, if not more, titles for the head of the foundation, having titles such as Chairman, Vice Chairman, President, Vice President, Executive Director, Director and the like. Therefore, a more general approach had to be used instead of referring to specific titles.

In determining the size of foundation staffs, an open ended question was asked "How many staff members of each of the following types do you have in your foundation office?" Two general types of staff members were listed, professional and secretarial/clerical and respondents filled in the spaces provided for the numbers of professional staff and secretarial/clerical staff in their respective foundation. Because of the ambiguity in using titles, the simple designation of professional, including actual fund raisers, researchers, administrative assistants, etc., and secretarial/clerical was used. The data was displayed in raw frequency format which was then arranged into six groups beginning with 0 and ending
with 16 plus for both sets of staff members, professional and secretarial/clerical.

The data demonstrate there are a number of foundations that are merely "convenience" vehicles since they have no staff members. Comments among the respondents allude to this fact. "I do it in my spare time", "We use it for special purpose funds".

In the category number of students (see Table 12), 14 foundations (21.9%) of small universities and 12 foundations (17.9%) of medium size universities have no staff at all, either professional or secretarial/clerical. In contrast to this, the foundations for large universities are staffed by at least one or more persons of both professional and secretarial/clerical staff.

Greater differentiation in foundation staffing is demonstrated in this same category when we examine the staffs of 1 to 2 persons. Over 2/3 of the foundations (70.4%) of small universities are staffed by 1 to 2 professional persons. Forty two (65.6%) of these same foundations have secretarial/clerical staffs of 1 to 2 persons. The figures drop considerably for foundations of medium size universities with about 1/2, or 35 foundations (52.2%), with professional staffs of 1 to 2 persons and 31 (46.2%) with secretarial/clerical staffs of the same size. Foundations of large universities give evidence of a very different staffing pattern with only 2 (9.0%) having staffs of 1 to 2 professionals and 5 (22.7%) having staffs of 1 to 2 secretarial/clerical persons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>A Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>B Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>C Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 21.9</td>
<td>14 21.9</td>
<td>12 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>45 70.4</td>
<td>42 65.6</td>
<td>35 52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2  3.1</td>
<td>4  6.3</td>
<td>11 16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>0  2</td>
<td>4  6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>0 .0</td>
<td>1  1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3  4.7</td>
<td>2  3.1</td>
<td>4  6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  B = medium  C = large
Beyond the level of 1 to 2 persons, staffing patterns follow a different trend of figures as in the 1 to 2 person staffs. Instead of decreasing in numbers of staff, as happens in foundations of small universities in the 1 to 2 person staff, the numbers begin to increase in foundations of large universities as we move into larger staff sizes. There are no staffs with more than 5 professionals and only 2 (3.1%) with 6 to 10 secretarial/clerical staffs among foundations of small universities. The number of staff members rises when we examine the staffs of foundations related to medium size universities. Eleven foundations (16.4%) have professional staffs of 3 to 5 persons and 12 (17.9%) have secretarial/clerical staffs in this range. There are 4 foundations (6.0%) with professional staffs of 6 to 10 persons and 6 (9.0%) with secretarial/clerical staffs in this same range. Heavy concentrations of professional staff in foundations related to large universities are found in the 3 to 5 person range, with 6 foundations (27.2%) with this size staff and, in the staff size of 6 to 10 persons, there are 9 foundations (40.8%).

The professional staffs of the remainder of foundations of large universities are evenly divided with 2 foundations (9.0%) each in the ranges of 1 to 2, 11 to 15 and 16 plus persons. The secretarial/clerical staffs of these same foundations are almost evenly divided among the staffs of 1 to 2 persons to staffs of 16 plus.

The category number of students demonstrates clearly that a great many of the foundations are in name only, with little or no
staff. Among foundations of smaller universities, 59 (92.3%) have 2 or less professional staff members and 56 (87.5%) have 2 or less secretarial/clerical staff. Foundations of medium size universities have 47 (70.1%) with 2 or less professional staff and 43 (64.1%) with the same number of secretarial/clerical staff. On the other hand, foundations of large universities have only 2 (9.0%) with these small professional staffs of 2 or less and 5 (22.7%) with staffs of 2 or less secretarial/clerical persons. These figures serve to indicate that as one moves from the small related foundation to the large, the professional and secretarial/clerical staffs are increasing from the majorities of 2 or less in the small and medium to the majorities of 3 or more in the large foundations.

Foundations categorized by kinds of degrees (see Table 13) exhibit different staffing patterns than those categorized by number of students. Contrary to the category number of students, where foundations of large universities have both professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of at least 1 to 2 persons, the category kinds of degrees has some foundations on all levels without either professional or secretarial/clerical staffs.

Seven foundations (10.8%) of Ph.D. universities have no professional staff and 6 (9.2%) have no secretarial/clerical staff. Eleven foundations (18.3%) of M.A. universities have no professional staff and 12 (20.0%) have no secretarial/clerical staff. Of foundations of B.A. universities, 6 (26.1%) have no professional staff and
Table 13
The Number of Professional and Secretarial/Clerical Staff Members Employed in the Foundation

Kinds of Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>D Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>E Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>F Secretarial/Clerical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = Ph.D.        E = M.A.         F = B.A.
7 (30.4%) have no secretarial/clerical staff.

The relative majority of professional and secretarial/clerical staffs on all three levels of the category kinds of degrees have staff of 1 to 2 persons. Among foundations of Ph.D. universities, there are 22 (33.8%) which have 1 to 2 professional staff and 24 (36.9%) which have 1 to 2 secretarial/clerical staff. In contrast to these figures, foundations of M.A. universities have 42 (70.0%) with 1 to 2 professional staff and 38 (63.3%) with 1 to 2 secretarial/clerical staff. The figures for foundations of B.A. universities are 15 (65.2%) with 1 to 2 professional staff persons and 14 (60.9%) with 1 to 2 secretarial/clerical staff persons.

In foundations of Ph.D. universities, 29 (44.6%) have professional staffs of 0 to 2 persons and 28 (43.1%) have professional staffs of 3 to 10 persons. Thirty (46.1%) have secretarial/clerical staffs of 0 to 2 persons and 30 (46.0%) secretarial/clerical staffs of 3 to 16 plus persons. Among the foundations of M.A. universities, there are only 4 foundations (6.8%) with professional staffs larger than 2 persons and 8 foundations (13.3%) with secretarial/clerical staffs larger than 2 persons. Among foundations of B.A. universities, there is 1 foundation (4.3%) with both professional and secretarial/clerical staff of 3 to 5 persons and none larger than this.

The category number of alumni is similar to the category number of students in general patterns of staffing. Sixteen foundations
(20.3%) of small universities have no professional or secretarial/clerical staff. Nine foundations (16.4%) of medium size universities have no professional staff and 10 (18.2%) have no secretarial/clerical staff. All foundations of large universities have some staff of both kinds (See Table 14).

Including those foundations without any staff at all in this category, a total of 75 (95.0%) foundations of small universities have professional staffs of 2 or less persons and 68 (86.1%) have secretarial/clerical staffs of 2 or less. Among the foundations of medium size universities, a total of 40 foundations (72.8%) have 5 or less professional staff members and 41 (74.5%) have 5 or less secretarial/clerical staff members. Foundations of large universities have a relative majority of staff in the 6 to 10 person range, with 5 foundations (38.5%) having professional staff in this range and 3 (23.1%) having secretarial/clerical staff in the same range. Eight (61.6%) of the foundations of large universities have professional staff from 6 to 16 plus persons and 7 foundations (53.9%) have secretarial/clerical staff in this range.

In summary, it appears that foundation staffs are characteristically small, with the exception of those related to Ph.D. universities and large universities. Some foundations are in name only, and most likely serve as investment vehicles instead of fund raising vehicles. In general, secretarial/clerical staffs appear to be larger than the professional staffs.
Table 14

The Number of Professional and Secretarial/Clerical Staff Members Employed in the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
<th>G Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>H Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
<th>I Professional Secretarial/Clerical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = small
H = medium
I = large
Organizational Patterns

In Question 17 of the survey instrument, respondents were asked to select the figure among seven figures of organizational charts, plus an option for drawing one's own, that most closely approximates their present foundation organizational chart. The figures that were to be selected are in Appendix G. These figures were arranged in what was thought to be typical organizational formats for universities and foundations. The selections that were made are seen in Tables 15 and 16.

On the basis of number of times selected in any one category and at every level within each category, Figure VII is the choice of a relative majority of all the foundations.

The other figures on this basis of number of times selected, in order of preference, are Figure VIII, the option choice, Figure III, Figure V, Figure VI, Figure I, Figure II and lastly, Figure IV.

In the categories number of students and number of alumni, the choices appear to be exactly the same with some slight differences.

In the category number of students, 22 foundations (34.4%) of small universities chose Figure VII as the foundation organizational pattern which most closely resembles their own foundation organization, 12 (18.8%) chose Figure VIII, the option, and 11 (17.2%) chose Figure III. Among foundations of medium size universities, 33 (49.3%) chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern most closely approximating their own and 12 (17.9%) chose Figure VIII, the
Table 15

Selection of Organizational Pattern most like the Current Foundation Organizational Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Pattern</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VII</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VIII</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small
B = medium
C = large
D = Ph.D.
E = M.A.
F = B.A.
G = small
H = medium
I = large
option. Seven foundations (31.8%) of large universities in the category number of students chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern most closely approximating their own, while 5 foundations (22.7%) each chose Figures V and VI as the closest approximation of their organizational pattern. The remainder of choices were scattered throughout the other levels in the category.

The same pattern of choices exists in the category number of alumni. Among foundations of small universities, 34 (43.0%) chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern closest to their foundation, while 14 foundations (17.7%) each chose Figures III and VIII, the option. In the same category, 20 foundations (36.4%) of medium size universities chose Figure VII as the closest approximation of their organizational pattern while 9 (16.4%) chose Figure VIII, the option. Five foundations (38.5%) of large universities in the category number of alumni chose Figure VII as the closest approximation of their organizational patterns while 3 (23.1%) each chose Figures V and VI. The remaining choices were scattered throughout the category.

The category kinds of degrees is slightly different from the other two categories. In foundations of Ph.D. universities, 26 (40.0%) chose Figure VII as the current organizational pattern most like their foundation and 9 (13.8%) selected Figure VIII, the option, as their closest organizational pattern. Among foundations of M.A. universities, 24 foundations (40.0%) chose Figure VII as the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Pattern</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure I</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure II</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure III</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure IV</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure V</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VI</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VII</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure VIII</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small, B = medium, C = large, D = Ph.D., E = M.A., F = B.A., G = small, H = medium, I = large
current foundation organizational pattern most like theirs, 11 (18.3%) chose Figure III and 9 (15.0%) chose Figure VIII, the option. Ten foundations (43.5%) of B.A. universities chose Figure VII as the closest approximation of their foundation organizational pattern and 6 (26.1%) chose Figure VIII, the option. The remainder of choices, again, were scattered among the levels of the category.

In both categories number of students and number of alumni, foundations of small universities selected in order of preference as the current organizational pattern closest to their own Figures VII, VIII, the option, and III. Foundations of medium size universities selected Figures VII and VIII, the option, and foundations of large universities selected Figure VII, and selected equally Figures V and VI.

In the category kinds of degrees, those foundations of Ph.D. universities selected as the current foundation organizational patterns closest to their own in order of preference Figures VII and VIII, the option. Foundations of M.A. universities selected Figures VII, III and VIII, the option, and foundations of B.A. universities selected Figures VII and VIII, the option.

Figure VII is selected at every level in every category as the primary choice for the organizational pattern which is closest to the current foundation organization. The concept of organization in Figure VII agrees with Table 9, where virtually all foundations were found to have Boards of Directors. It also agrees with Tables 12,
13 and 14, which demonstrate foundations are generally small in numbers of staff members. Figure VII indicates the Board of Directors is the ultimate authority of the foundation with the Executive Director as the administrator of the foundation. In this concept, essentially all professional staff report to the Executive Director and are co-equal with one another. Since the majority of foundations are small in numbers of professional staff, Figure VII appears to be compatible with this concept where reporting relationships are limited. Figure VII displays a simple and uncomplicated organizational pattern whereas other figures, with the exception of Figure III, are more complicated with layers of reporting relationships. It also appears that the titles Executive Director and Associate Director are the most popular titles used by foundations.

Figure III was selected by foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni, and foundations of M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees, as a second or third choice to Figure VII. It is assumed to have been selected on the basis of many of the same reasons as the selection of Figure VII was made.

In those universities which have combinations of development departments and foundations, very often the staff is partially paid by the university and under the university administrative structure. Figure III reflects this situation since the foundation in these cases appears to be small and more of an investment vehicle
than a separate fund raising arm of the university.

In small foundations, the Director usually reports to the President as in Figure III and the Assistant Directors are co-equal and report to the Director. Like Figure VII, this is a simple and uncomplicated arrangement. In this case, the Board of Directors is not a significant factor in the role of the foundations, since the administrative power resides in the President who would aportion most of the budget for the foundation.

Although there is no indication in Figure III as to whether or not these foundations have Boards of Directors, we know from the data in the previous section on Boards of Directors (see Table 9) that over 98% of the levels that chose Figure III as a second or third choice for the closest organizational pattern have Boards of Directors. In such a case, the Board would be nominal and in all probability deal mainly with the investment aspects of the foundation.

Figure VIII, the option choice, was chosen 6 out of 9 times by the respondents as the second choice among all levels of the three categories for the foundation organization which most closely resembles their current foundation. Essentially, this means that none of the other seven choices of figures are suitable and the current foundation organization was unique. No explanation or detailed sketches were given by respondents for choosing Figure VIII.

From the data on the question of number of professional and
secretarial/clerical staff (see Tables 12, 13 and 14), we could conjecture that in many cases all seven figures given as organizational patterns were far too elaborate for the 1 and 2 person staff foundations. A typical figure for the latter type of foundation would be a Director with a secretary.

The presumption is also that these foundations have Boards of Directors which Boards again, would be nominal, especially in smaller foundations.

Tables 15 and 16 indicate foundations related to large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni are slightly different than other foundations. These foundations have chosen Figure VII as the first foundation organizational pattern most like their own, but the second and third choices, which are equal, are Figures V and VI. These figures are in contrast to those chosen by other levels in the categories which chose Figure III as the closest pattern.

Figures V and VI have similarities in that each has a Board of Directors as ultimate authority, an Executive Director and four layers of reporting relationships. However, the alignment of personnel of the two figures is different. In Figure V, the Executive Director reports to the Board and an Associate Director reports to the Executive Director. All Assistant Directors report to one Associate Director. In Figure VI, the Board is the ultimate authority with the Executive Director reporting to the Board and
multiple Associate Directors reporting to the Executive Director. Associate Directors each have Assistant Directors reporting to them. These reporting relationships are more complicated than Figure VII.

It is obvious from the choices of Figures V, VI and VII by the foundations of large universities that Boards of Directors play an important part in their organization. Unlike the other levels within all categories, Figure III does not apply to foundations of large universities.

Foundation Fiscal Year

The survey instrument attempted to define the financial year of the foundations. Each respondent was asked the question, "When does your financial year begin?" The responses are provided in Table 17.

Observation of the data makes clear that an overwhelming number of foundations begin their fiscal year in July and end in June. Sixty percent or 3/5 of all levels of the three categories chose the July to June fiscal year over the other two choices with two exceptions, foundations of M.A. schools in the category kinds of degrees and foundations of medium size schools in the category number of alumni. In each of these latter cases, the percentages were close enough to the 3/5 majority to not be viewed as significantly different.

A significant difference in the fiscal year July to June was
### Table 17
The Beginning of the Foundation Fiscal Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning of Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large

*Table 17 does not include the NA response since all foundations responded to the question.*
found, however, on two levels, one in foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees and the other in foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni. In both cases, over 80% or 4/5 of the foundations chose the July to June fiscal year. There is no known reason why this choice is so different than the rest of the levels.

Again, from observation of the data, it appears that about 1/5 of the respondents indicated January was the beginning of their fiscal year and somewhat under 1/5 chose other as the beginning of their fiscal year. The most notable deviation or exception to 1/5 of the foundations choosing January as the beginning of their fiscal year are foundations of B.A. universities where only 8.7% made this selection. The outstanding exception for those foundations choosing other as the beginning of the fiscal year are foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni where none selected other for their fiscal year beginning.

All foundations responded to the question choosing one of the three possibilities, July, January or other. A few foundations indicated they were in the midst of a change in fiscal years. The data, however, reflect their current fiscal year.

Foundation Budgets

Budgets display, in a real sense, what type or kind of effort and resources we are willing to put into our programs. Universities
with a limited amount of funds allocated for fund raising do not appear to have a great priority for such programs because the means to raise funds is controlled by the budget.

In order to discover what kind of effort four year state universities were making in fund raising, the question was asked in the survey instrument, "What was your total foundation budget, excluding salaries, for fiscal 1977?" Respondents answered the open ended question with the figures for their respective schools. The figures were added for each level and then divided by the number of foundations responding on that level to give us an average for each level in each category.

A look at Table 18 immediately confirms the pattern of fund raising budgets we would expect to see among state university foundations. In the two categories of foundations related to universities differentiated by size, that is, number of alumni and number of students, average budget sizes follow the sizes of the schools. In the category kinds of degrees, the average budgets again run from small to large beginning with foundations of B.A. universities to foundations of Ph.D. universities.

The average budgets for foundations of small universities in each category of size, number of students and number of alumni, is less than $40,000. This is also true of foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees. The average budgets of foundations of medium size universities run from $175,000 in the
Table 18

The Average Foundation Budget, Excluding Salaries, for the Foundation Fiscal Year 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average $ Budgeted (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Budgeted (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Budgeted (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/D/G</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/E/H</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/F/I</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
number of students category to $239,000 in the number of alumni category. The foundations of M.A. universities have average budgets of $85,000. Foundations of large universities in the category number of students have average budgets of $285,000 and those in the category number of alumni have average budgets of $307,000. Foundations of Ph.D. universities have average budgets of $218,000.

Foundations classified by kinds of degrees have lower average budget figures for each of the three levels than the other two categories, number of students and number of alumni. The two categories number of students and number of alumni are very close in average budget figures but again, the category number of students is lower in each level compared to the category number of alumni.

It appears that in the three categories, the foundations of medium size and M.A. universities budget an average 5 to 6 more times the funds than those foundations of small or B.A. universities, and those related to large or Ph.D. universities budget 8 to 9 more times the funds than those foundations of small or B.A. universities.

Foundation Investments

The question was asked on the survey instrument, "At the present time, what is the total dollar amount invested by the foundation?" Responses were made in specific dollar amounts which figures were added for each level and then averaged by the number of responses on
each level. Table 19 provides the average dollars invested in each level of each category.

In the categories of foundations related to size of university, number of students and number of alumni, the foundations of small universities invest on average a little over $500,000. The same statement can be made for foundations related to universities granting both B.A. and M.A. degrees as their highest degree. Foundations of medium size universities in the category number of students invest slightly over $2,250,000 on average, while foundations of medium size universities in the category number of alumni invest slightly over $3,250,000 on average.

Foundations of large universities are considerably different than the rest of foundations in investments. Those in the category number of students invest, on average, just over $13 million and those in the category number of alumni invest, on average, over $17 million. Foundations of Ph.D. universities invest about $6,600,000 or about half of the investment of those of large universities in the category number of students and slightly over a third of the investment of foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni.

The patterns of investments are, as expected, from small to large and run parallel to the sizes of universities from small to large. In the kinds of degrees category, the investments run from small to large, beginning with foundations related to B.A. univer-
Table 19

The Average Dollars Currently Invested by Foundations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average $ Invested (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Invested (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Invested (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/D/G</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/E/H</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>3,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/F/I</td>
<td>13,235</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>17,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small                  
B = medium                 
C = large                  
D = Ph.D.                  
E = M.A.                   
F = B.A.                   
G = small                  
H = medium                 
I = large
sities up to foundations related to Ph.D. universities.

Five foundations in each category indicated they had no investments at all.

Foundation Fund Raising Programs

Respondents to the survey were asked on the questionnaire to "place a check in the space below before those (fund raising) programs which presently exist at the foundation". The programs listed were annual fund, deferred giving, corporate solicitation, foundation solicitation, special gifts and athletic fund raising. These programs comprise a solid base of fund raising for both public and private universities. Table 20 and 21 provide the data on fund raising programs and foundation participation in these programs.

In the category number of students, the fund raising patterns of participation in each program run from small to large beginning with foundations of small universities to foundations of large universities. There is one exception to this pattern in the program of special gifts, where foundations of large universities are lower in percentage, 81.8%, than foundations of medium size universities, where 88.1% participate in the special gifts program.

The category number of alumni is almost identical with the category number of students in patterns of fund raising in the three levels. In the category number of alumni, the patterns again, run from small to large in percentages following closely the sizes of
Table 20

Fund Raising Programs Currently Existing at the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Foundation Programs</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fund</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Giving</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Solicitation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Solicitation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Gifts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fund Raising</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
universities to which the foundations are related. There are two exceptions to this general pattern. One is in the program of foundation solicitation, where 8 (61.5%) of the foundations of large universities have a foundation solicitation program and 40 (72.7%) of the foundations of medium size universities have a similar program. The other exception is in the area of special gifts. In this program, 64 (81.0%) of the foundations of small universities and 47 (85.5%) of the foundations of medium universities have special gifts programs, while only 10 (76.9%) of foundations of large universities have these programs.

In the category kinds of degrees, the pattern of percentages run from small to large with the small being those foundations related to universities awarding B.A.'s as their highest degree to large, or those awarding Ph.D.'s as their highest degree. There is one exception in the program of foundation solicitation. In this program, 43 (66.2%) of the foundations of Ph.D. universities have a program of foundation solicitation while 43 foundations (71.7%) of M.A. universities have such a program.

The data tell us the majority of all schools have a variety of fund raising programs in varying degrees. As is to be expected, in the two categories related to size of universities, number of students and number of alumni, foundations of small universities have the least percentage of participation in programs and foundations of large universities have the most percentage of participa-
Table 21

Fund Raising Programs Currently Existing at the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Foundation Programs</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fund</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Giving</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Solicitation</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Solicitation</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Gifts</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fund Raising</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
tion. This is true also in the category kinds of degrees, where foundations of B.A. universities have the least percentage of participation in the programs and those of Ph.D. universities have the most percentage of participation. A look at each fund raising program will give us a better perspective on the programs currently existing at the foundations.

Two thirds or more of foundations in all three categories at all levels have an annual fund program. This is basically a mail program to alumni and friends on a yearly basis. The annual fund is considered by most fund raisers to be the basis of all fund raising, especially for educational institutions.

The annual fund in some foundations is a general term for all types of fund raising that is done by the foundation. At the end of the fiscal year, all gifts of whatever types are reported under the annual fund. In most foundations however, the annual fund is a segregated fund and only those gifts generated by specific mailings are reported as annual fund gifts. It would be expected that the annual fund program would have the highest percentage of participation by all foundations, but such is not the case according to the data. The special gifts program appears to have more participation in general than the annual fund.

Deferred giving is a highly specialized area and, at times, demands a certain amount of expertise in estate planning. The foundation has to have programs or vehicles to which the deferred
gifts can be given in order to have a full program of deferred gifts. Such plans as pooled income funds, unitrusts and annuity trusts, and other such vehicles are necessary for the reception of deferred gifts in any quantity. As we observe the data, we see less than 40% of the foundations of small universities in both categories number of students and number of alumni have deferred giving programs and only 5 foundations (21.7%) of B.A. universities have the program. Slightly over 70% of the foundations of M.A. universities have these same programs. Over 95% of the foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni have a deferred gifts program. And 84.6% of foundations of Ph.D. universities have them also. Presumably, the foundations of smaller universities cannot afford to staff for a specialized area like deferred giving. Foundations of larger universities have taken the opposite position apparently and developed this area with more budget and staff than some of the other fund raising areas.

Corporate solicitation is difficult for state universities. The difficulty arises from the many corporations which have a policy of funding only private universities to the exclusion of state universities. The data on corporate solicitation by foundations related to state universities is, therefore, surprising in its results. With one exception, over 60% of the foundations in the three categories on all levels have corporate solicitation programs. One would expect the norm of corporate solicitation to be considerably
less because of the difficult circumstances public universities have in raising corporate funds. The one exception is in foundations of B.A. universities where only 47.8% have corporate solicitation programs compared to the 60% or over for all other levels.

Within all levels, foundations of large universities and Ph.D. universities are the strongest in corporate solicitation. Between 80% and 90% of these foundations have corporate programs. Among foundations of medium size and M.A. universities, participation in corporate programs runs between 70% and 80%. With the exception of foundations of B.A. universities, 60% to 70% of the foundations of small universities have corporate programs.

A program for the solicitation of private foundations is found in over 60% of the foundations in all three categories on all levels with one exception, the foundations of B.A. universities. Here only 47.8% have foundation solicitation programs. The range of foundations having foundation solicitation programs on all other levels is from 60% to 73%.

Contrary to the other fund raising programs, the foundation solicitation program has some reverse figures of participation on various levels. The expectation is that foundations of large universities will again have the larger figures of participation, but such is not the case. Foundations of Ph.D. universities have a lower percentage of participation in foundation solicitation than foundations of M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees.
and those of large universities in the category number of alumni have a lower percentage of participation in foundation solicitation than foundations of medium size universities in the same category. This may be due to the fact that private foundation grants are mainly for research purposes and in most cases large or research universities have a separate vehicle situated within the university structure for dealing with these grants. In other words, research grants, with some exceptions, are not received in most of the fund raising foundations of large research universities.

Special gift fund raising programs are those solicitations for president's clubs, special class funds, special project funds and the like. With one exception, over 75% or 3/4 of the foundations on all levels in all categories have special gifts programs. The exception is in the category kinds of degrees where 19 (43.3%) of the foundations of B.A. universities have special gifts programs. The figure for special gifts is a significant one considering the fact that almost 70% of all foundations have an annual fund program.

The athletic fund raising program follows the typical pattern we have seen in all levels in all categories of the percentages of participation moving from small to large, following closely the sizes of universities to which the foundations are related. The same sequence is also true in the category kinds of degrees, with participation moving from small or B.A. universities to large or Ph.D. universities.
Athletic fund raising is the program among all the fund raising programs with the least percentage of foundation participation. The data on Table 21 show that foundations of Ph.D. universities, medium size universities in the category number of students and large universities in the category number of alumni, are slightly over 50% in participation in athletic fund raising, whereas the remainder of foundations in all levels are slightly to considerably under 50% in athletic fund raising participation.

The reason for the lower percentage of participation in athletic fund raising may be that most athletic fund raising is done by the athletic department outside of foundation involvement. Very often athletic departments hire their own fund raiser and send their funds through private channels. Some schools have a separate foundation for athletic fund raising.

Foundation Donor Numbers

In an attempt to further define university related foundation characteristics, the question was asked on the survey instrument, "How many donors did your foundation have in 1977?" The responses were in raw numbers which were added for each level of each category and then divided by the number of responses on that level. This procedure produced an average number of donors for each level in each category which is displayed in Table 22.

Observation of the data indicates an expected pattern in all
Table 22
The Average Number of Donors to the Foundation in 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average # of Donors (000)</td>
<td>Average # of Donors (000)</td>
<td>Average # of Donors (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/D/G</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/E/H</td>
<td>3,506</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>4,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/F/I</td>
<td>11,278</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>14,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small, B = medium, C = large
D = Ph.D., E = M.A., F = B.A.
G = small, H = medium, I = large
three categories. The number of average donors begin small in foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni and grow to large in foundations of large universities in the same categories. The same sequence is true in the category kinds of degrees, with small numbers of average donors in foundations of B.A. universities and large numbers in foundations of Ph.D. universities. This pattern of from small to large in average donor numbers becomes more evident in the analysis of the data.

There are four levels where average donor numbers fall below 1,000. In the categories number of students and number of alumni, foundations of small universities both have average donor numbers less than 1,000. In the category kinds of degrees, foundations of both B.A. and M.A. universities also have average donor numbers less than 1,000.

Unlike foundations of M.A. universities, where donor numbers are less than 1,000, those foundations of medium size universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni have a dramatic rise in the average number of donors to 3,506 and 4,721 respectively. These rises indicate, in general, a larger pool of donors and larger staffs and budgets in order to achieve these results.

Foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees average 6,835 donors. This is approximately 12 times the
average number of donors of foundations of B.A. universities and 7
times those of foundations of M.A. universities.

In the category number of students, foundations of large univer-
sities average 11,278 donors. This is approximately 19 times the
average number of donors of foundations related to small univer-
sities in the same category and about 3 times the number of average
donors of foundations of medium size universities also in the same
category.

Foundations of large universities in the category number of
alumni average 14,951 donors. This average is approximately 17
times more than the average number of donors for foundations of
small universities in this category and 3 times that of foundations
of medium size universities in the same category.

Foundation Dollars Raised

In the last four years, public universities have out performed
private universities in fund raising from private sources in average
dollar total. (Brakely, 1977-78, p. 6) This trend has been due in
large part to the severe financial conditions and stresses public
universities have had to endure in recent years. Under these
conditions and stresses, public universities have had no other
choice than to go to the private sector for those funds which will
enable them to carry on quality programs.

As a part of the survey on university related foundations, it
was determined to find out just how effective the foundations of public universities are in raising funds from the private sector. The question was asked on the survey instrument, "How many total dollars did your foundation raise in 1977?" Responses were in raw dollar figures which were totaled for each level in each category and divided by the number of responses within the level for an average dollar amount for each level. These data are displayed in Table 23.

The data show an ascending pattern of average dollars raised beginning on the level of foundations of small universities to the level of foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni. The same pattern exists in the category kinds of degrees, beginning with small average dollars raised on the levels of foundations of B.A. universities to large average dollars raised on the level of foundations of Ph.D. universities. This is not a significant pattern considering the sizes of the various universities to which the foundations are related, but there are some interesting differences within the levels as displayed in the data.

The data show foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni, as well as foundations of B.A. and M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees, have average dollars raised figures of less than $300,000. Foundations of B.A. universities raised less than 1/2 this amount.
Table 23

The Average Dollars Raised by the Foundation in 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average $ Raised (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Raised (000)</td>
<td>Average $ Raised (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/D/G</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/E/H</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/F/I</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  D = Ph.D.  G = small
B = medium  E = M.A.  H = medium
C = large   F = B.A.  I = large
The most divergent average dollars raised figures are found in the level of those foundations of medium size universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni and those of M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees. The average dollars raised in 1977 for foundations of M.A. universities is $290,000, while those at the medium level in the category number of students raised somewhat under a million dollars at $926,000. Foundations of medium size universities in the category number of alumni raised somewhat under two million dollars at $1,902,000. These figures, although diverse, follow earlier findings in that the category number of alumni is normally the leader in all three levels of average dollar amounts, followed by the category number of students and then the category kinds of degrees.

On another level, foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni raised, on average, between six and seven million dollars in 1977. Foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees raised an average of $3,014,000 in 1977.

Foundation Policies

Every organization has a set of informal guidelines for operational procedures. Often these are not explicitly announced in a written document, but are either verbal or derived from a number of different written statements made in the course of time. In an
attempt to discover the policies which actually are a part of the foundation operational structure, the question was asked on the survey instrument, "For each of the following, indicate whether or not you have at least some written policies." The items to be checked included investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising. Tables 24 and 25 spell out the responses to the statement. The data display some interesting contrasts in written policies among the foundations.

Two of the categories, number of students and number of alumni, appear to be parallel with minor differences in percentages, except for two levels. One exception is in foundations of large universities in the area of operations. In the category number of alumni, 9 foundations (53.8%) of large universities have written policies, compared to 15 (68.2%) of the same size foundations in the category number of students. The other exception is in foundations of small universities in the area of deferred gifts. Thirteen foundations (20.3%) of small universities in the category number of students have written policies on deferred gifts, compared to 26 (32.9%) of the same size foundations in the category number of alumni.

The category kinds of degrees appears to be parallel to the two other categories with the exception that, in general, the percentages are somewhat lower on each level than the levels of the other two categories. There is one exception to the parallel in the area of expenses. Foundations of Ph.D. universities do not follow the
Table 24

Foundation Activities for Which There are Written Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs with Written Policies</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Gifts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Raising</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small  
B = medium  
C = large  
D = Ph.D.  
E = M.A.  
F = B.A.  
G = small  
H = medium  
I = large
pattern with 39 (60.0%) having written policies on expenses, while 38 foundations (63.3%) related to M.A. universities have written policies in the same area.

Further analysis of the Tables by program or activity should provide additional insight into how foundations compare in written policies.

If foundations were state institutions like the universities to which they are related, more than likely 100% of them would report written policies on investments. Such is not the case with university related foundations, however, which are private corporations. The data in Table 25 indicate that for those foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni, a little over half have written policies on investments. Foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees report less than half, 43.5%, have written policies for investments. Approximately 3/4 of foundations of medium size universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni report written policies on investments along with over 3/5 of the foundations of M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees. Foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni report over 90% have written policies on investments. Close to this figure are foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees at 83.1% with written policies.
Table 25
Foundation Activities for Which There are Written Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs with Written Policies</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Kinds of Degrees</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Gifts</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Raising</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = small
B = medium
C = large
D = Ph.D.
E = M.A.
F = B.A.
G = small
H = medium
I = large
It appears from these data and previous data that the more there is to invest, the more policies there are. Nearly all foundations with average investments of 11 to 14 million dollars have written policies covering their investments while those with minimal investments often do not have written policies according to the data.

On the subject of written policies for expenses, almost all universities belonging to a state system would have elaborate written policies covering expenses used in doing work for the university. Foundations appear to be more informal than the state institutions to which they are related. Less than half of the foundations of small universities in the two categories of size, number of students and number of alumni, and foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees have written policies covering expense items. The other foundations in all levels in all three categories fall in the range of 59% to 70% for written policies on expenses.

In the area of operations, over 60% of the foundations in all categories in all levels have written policies with two exceptions, which exceptions are quite different from each other. One exception is foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees where only 13 (56.5%) have written policies covering operations. The other is at the other end of the spectrum, in the category number of alumni, where only 7 foundations (53.8%) of large universities have written policies on operations. Among all levels, those
foundations of medium size universities and those of M.A. universities have the most written policies in operations with percentages running from 73% to 79%.

Deferred gifts are a special area where many complications can arise and it would seem some regulations as far as gift reception and reporting are necessary. This does not appear to be the case, however, among most foundations. This area, more than any other, varies with the size or kind of university to which the foundation is related. Less than a third of foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni, as well as those of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees, have written policies in deferred giving.

Over 50% of foundations of medium size universities in the two categories, number of students and number of alumni, have written policies in this area, while only 35% of the foundations of M.A. universities have these policies. In foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni, over 75% have written policies on deferred gifts. Foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees are somewhat behind the other two categories with 63.1% having written policies on deferred gifts.

In the area of general fund raising, between 50% and 70% of all foundations in all three categories have written policies. Foundations of small universities in the categories number of students and
number of alumni and foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees have written policies in a range of 50% to 56%. Foundations of medium size universities in the categories number of alumni and number of students and foundations of M.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees have written policies in a range of 58% to 66%, while foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni and Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees have written policies in a range of 64% to 70%.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the first chapter it was established that there was a need to study university related foundations of four year state universities. The problems investigated were how many and where are the university related foundations among these universities and what are their organizational and operational structures. A questionnaire was devised to collect data on a series of pertinent questions, which data would supply us with answers to our original investigation.

A test questionnaire was sent to 14 universities, including some with university related foundations and some with only development departments. After reviewing the test questionnaire, the final survey instrument was devised and sent to 501 four year state universities. A second mailing was sent to the non-respondents of the first mailing. The data were collected, coded and run on computer for tabulation purposes.

Chapter IV dealt with the analysis of the data gathered by this survey instrument. The aim of Chapter V is to recapitulate the 14 questions as analyzed and present summary findings of these data.

After this summary, conclusions will be drawn in the form of organizational and operational structures for each level of each category of foundation studied. The final section will deal with
recommendations.

Summary of Principal Findings

Chapter IV presented the findings from the survey instrument as they related to university related foundations. These data were analyzed according to three categories, number of students, number of alumni and kinds of degrees with three levels in each category. The concluding chapter, Chapter V, examines the results of these findings.

1. The relative majority of foundations were begun in the years 1960 to 1969.

Observation of the data shows us that in each level of each category the relative majority of foundations were established between 1960 and 1969. The categories, number of students and number of alumni, closely parallel each other in percentage of foundations established between 1960 and 1969. Forty three and three tenths percent of foundations of small universities in the category number of students were established in this period as against 45.5% of the same level of foundations in the category number of alumni. The majority, 52.0%, of foundations of B.A. universities in the category kinds of degrees were begun in 1960 to 1969. Among foundations of medium size universities, 33.0% of those in the category number of students were established between 1960 to 1969 as compared to 25.5% of those in the category number of
alumni. In the category kinds of degrees, 39.8% of the foundations of M.A. universities were begun in the years 1960 to 1969.

The relative majority of foundations of large universities were established in the years 1960 to 1969, but this majority was shared with other time spans. In the category number of students, 22.8% of foundations of large universities were established in the years 1960 to 1969. However, the same number of foundations of large universities were established in the years 1940 to 1949 and 1950 to 1959. In the category number of alumni, 23.1% of foundations of large universities were established in the years 1960 to 1969, with this figure shared with the years 1940 to 1949. A relative majority of 29.3% of foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees were begun in the years 1960 to 1969.

2. The majority of foundations of large universities and Ph.D. universities were established before the year 1960.

In the category number of alumni, 67.2% of foundations of large universities were established before 1960 and 27.3% after 1960. Fifty three and nine tenths percent of foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni were established before 1960 and 38.5% after 1960. The data show 50.8% of the foundations of Ph.D. universities were established before 1960 and 47.7% after 1960.

3. The majority of foundations of small and medium size universities and B.A. and M.A. universities were established after 1960.

In the category number of students, 82.9% of foundations of
small universities and 60.6% of foundations of medium size universities were established after 1960. Seventy nine and six tenths percent of foundations of small universities in the category number of alumni were established after 1960. In the category kinds of degrees, 86.6% of foundations of B.A. universities and 74.8% of foundations of M.A. universities were established after 1960.

By exception, 50.7% of foundations of medium size universities in the category number of alumni were established before 1960 as contrasted with 49.3% established after 1960.

4. Most foundations chose flexibility of operation as the primary reason for initiating their foundation.

In the category number of students, 45.3% of foundations of small universities, 43.3% of foundations of medium size universities and 36.4% of foundations of large universities chose flexibility of operations as the primary reason for initiating their foundations.

Among foundations in the category kinds of degrees, 44.6% related to Ph.D. universities, 41.7% of M.A. universities and 34.8% of B.A. universities also chose flexibility of operation as the primary reason for initiating their foundation.

Flexibility of operation was chosen as the primary reason for initiating the foundation by a relative majority of foundations in the category number of alumni. In this category, this choice was made by 44.3% of foundations of small universities, 41.8% of foundations of medium size universities and 46.2% of foundations of large
universities.

All these figures constitute a relative majority in each category.

5. Slightly over one fifth of all foundations chose investment purposes and another one fifth chose other reasons as the primary reasons for initiating their foundations.

In the category number of students, 28.1% of foundations of small universities chose investment purposes and 20.0% chose other as the primary reason for beginning their foundation. Foundations of medium size universities chose investment purposes and other by 20.9% and 23.9%, respectively, and foundations of large universities chose both investment purposes and other by the same percentage, 31.8%.

In the category kinds of degrees, essentially the same choices were made as the category number of students. Twenty six and two tenths percent of foundations of Ph.D. universities chose investment purposes and 21.5% chose other as the primary reasons for beginning their foundations. Foundations of M.A. universities chose investment purposes and other by 21.7% and 25.0%, respectively, and foundations of B.A. universities chose investment purposes by 34.8% and other by 30.4%.

The category number of alumni followed the same pattern as the other two categories. Twenty five and three tenths percent of foundations of small universities chose investment purposes and
22.8% chose other as the primary reason for initiating their foundations. Among foundations of medium size universities, 27.3% chose investment purposes and 23.6% chose other as reasons for beginning their foundations. Investment purposes was chosen by 30.8% of foundations of large universities and other was chosen by 23.1% of the same level foundations as the primary reason for beginning their foundation.

6. New Directors or Donors was not a significant choice as a reason for initiating a foundation.

In all three categories, the choice of new directors or donors fell below 10% in each level within each category. Foundations of large universities and B.A. universities did not choose new directors or donors once as a reason for beginning a new foundation.

7. Foundations that belong to a system were found in each level of the three categories.

In the category number of students, 9.4% of foundations of small universities responded they belong to a foundation system. The same response was given in the same category by 7.5% of foundations of medium size universities and 9.1% of foundations of large universities. Responding "yes" to the question as to whether or not they belong to a foundation system in the category kinds of degrees were 4.6% of foundations of Ph.D. universities, 13.3% of foundations of M.A. universities and 4.3% of foundations of B.A. universities. Ten and one tenth percent of foundations of small universities in the
category number of alumni belonged to a foundation system as did
3.6% of foundations of medium size universities and 15.4% of founda-
tions of large universities in the same category.

8. **The number of foundations in a foundation system is limited.**

The data in Table 8 show that a total of 13 foundations out of a
total of 155 foundations belong to a foundation system. In the
category number of students, 6 foundations of small universities, 5
foundations of medium size universities and 2 foundations of large
universities belong to a foundation system. This constitutes the
highest number of universities belonging to a foundation system
among the three categories.

9. **Virtually all foundations have a Board of Directors.**

Table 9 shows that only 1 foundation out of 155 reported it did
not have a Board of Directors. This one foundation is found in
different levels in the three categories. It is a foundation
related to a small university in the category number of students, a
foundation of a Ph.D. university in the category kinds of degrees
and a foundation of a medium size university in the category number
of alumni.

10. **In all levels of the three categories, those groups of people
most represented on the foundation Board of Directors are corporate
officials, university administrators and women.**

The percentage range of representation of corporate officials on
foundation Boards of Directors runs from 78.1% in foundations of
small universities in the category number of students to 100.0% in foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni. The range for university administrators is from 71.9% in foundations of small universities in the category number of students to 86.4% in foundations of large universities in the same category. Representation of women on foundation Boards of Directors is in the range of 72.3% in foundations of Ph.D. universities to 100.0% in foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni.

11. Less than half of all foundations have students and minorities on their Boards of Directors.

The range of student representation on foundation Boards of Directors is from 15.4% in foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni to 21.8% in foundations of medium size universities in the same category. Minorities range from 26.2% in foundations of Ph.D. universities to 40.6% in foundations of small universities in the category number of students. Faculty generally are less than half of foundation Boards of Directors with two exceptions, M.A. universities (53.3%) and small universities (50.6%) in the category number of alumni.

12. There are a number of foundations at all levels of the three categories, with the exception of foundations of large universities, with no staff members either professional or secretarial/clerical.

In the category number of students, 21.9% of foundations of small universities have neither professional nor secretarial/
clerical staff and 17.9% of foundations of medium size universities have neither professional nor secretarial/clerical staff also. In the category kinds of degrees, 10.8% of foundations of Ph.D. universities do not have professional staff and 9.2% do not have secretarial/clerical staff. Among foundations of M.A. universities, 18.3% do not have professional staff and 20.0% do not have secretarial/clerical staff. Twenty six and one tenth percent of foundations of B.A. universities have no professional staff and 30.4% have no secretarial/clerical staff.

In the category number of alumni, 20.3% of foundations of small universities have neither professional nor secretarial/clerical staff. Sixteen and four tenths percent of foundations of medium size universities have no professional staff and 18.2% have no secretarial/clerical staff.

13. **Foundations of large universities have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs with a minimum of at least one of each.**

The data show large universities in both categories, number of students and number of alumni, as having at least 1 or more staff members.

14. **Most foundations, except foundations of large universities, have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of one to two persons.**

Foundations of small universities and those of B.A. and M.A. universities have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of 1 to 2 persons in the range of 60.0% to 75.0%. Fifty two and two
tenths percent of foundations of medium size universities in the
category number of students have professional staffs of 1 to 2
persons and 46.2% of these foundations have secretarial/clerical
staffs of the same size. Foundations of medium size universities in
the category number of alumni and foundations of Ph.D. universities
have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of 1 to 2 persons
in the range of 33.0% to 37.0%. These figures constitute a relative
majority on each of these levels.

15. Most foundations of large universities have professional staffs
between six and ten persons.

In the category number of students, 40.8% of foundations of
large universities had professional staffs of 6 to 10 persons. In
the category of number of alumni, 38.5% of the foundations of large
universities had similar size staffs.

16. The secretarial/clerical staffs of foundations tend to be
slightly larger than the professional staffs.

In eight out of nine levels among the three categories, the
secretarial/clerical staffs are larger than the professional
staffs. This is clear from the data. Secretarial/clerical staffs
extend one or two staff levels beyond the professional in the upper
ranges of staff levels, e.g., in the category number of students the
secretarial/clerical staffs extend beyond the professional in 6 to
10 person staffs in foundations of small universities and 11 to 15
person staffs in foundations of medium size universities.
Secretarial/clerical staffs are often larger in numbers than professional staffs as the data show in staffs of 3 to 5 persons and 6 to 10 persons in foundations of small and medium size universities in the category number of students.

17. Most foundations in all levels in the three categories selected Figure VII as the organizational pattern which most closely approximated their own.

The foundations of small, medium and large universities in the category number of students chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern which most closely approximated their own by 34.4%, 49.3% and 31.8% respectively. Among the levels of the category kinds of degrees, 40.0% of foundations of Ph.D. universities, 40.0% of foundations of M.A. universities and 43.5% of foundations of B.A. universities chose Figure VII for the same reason also. In the category number of alumni, 43.0%, 36.4% and 38.5% of foundations of small, medium and large universities, respectively, chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern most closely approximating their own.

18. Foundation organizational patterns are in many cases unique.

Figure VIII, an option for drawing one’s own organizational pattern in preference to selecting one of the seven given patterns, was chosen by most foundations as the next most popular choice to Figure VII. In the category number of students, Figure VIII was selected by 18.8% and 17.9% of the foundations of small and medium universities, respectively, paralleling the category of number of students.
alumni where 17.7% and 16.4% of foundations of the same respective size universities chose patterns unique to their foundations. Similar selections were made by foundations of Ph.D. universities (13.8%), M.A. universities (15.0%), and B.A. universities (26.1%).

19. Most foundations begin their fiscal year in July and end it in June.

Almost three fifths of all foundations have a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 31. Approximately one fifth of foundations begin their fiscal year January 1 and end December 31 and other foundations have a variety of fiscal years.

20. Foundation budgets are generally related to the size of the university which the Foundation serves.

As the data show, foundations of medium size and M.A. universities budget an average of five to six times more funds than foundations of small or B.A. universities and foundations of large or Ph.D. universities budget eight or nine times more funds than the small or B.A. universities.

21. Foundations of small and B.A. universities budget less than $40,000 annually for their programs.

The data show foundations of B.A. universities budgeting the lowest figure of $23,000 followed by foundations of small universities in the category of number of students at $33,000 and foundations of small universities in the category of number of alumni at $39,000.
22. Foundations of medium size and M.A. universities have a wide divergence of budget figures ranging from $85,000 to $239,000.

Foundations of M.A. universities spend an average of less than $100,000 on their fund raising programs while those of medium size universities in the category number of alumni spend an average of almost a quarter of a million dollars on their programs. Foundations of medium size universities in the category number of students spend an average of $175,000 annually on their programs.

23. The budgets for foundations of large and Ph.D. universities range between $210,000 and $310,000.

Foundations of Ph.D. universities have average budgets of $218,000. Foundations of large universities in the categories number of students and number of alumni have average budgets of $285,000 and $307,000 respectively.

24. An average of a little over $500,000 is invested by foundations of small, B.A. and M.A. universities.

Five hundred twenty three thousand dollars is invested by foundations of small universities in the category number of students, $571,000 by foundations of B.A. universities, $572,000 by foundations of M.A. universities and $621,000 by foundations of small universities in the category number of alumni.

25. Investments for foundations of medium size universities average between two and four million dollars.

Foundations of medium size universities in the category number
of students average $2,273,000 in investments, while the same
foundations in the category number of alumni average $3,782,000 in
investments.

26. **Foundations of large universities average between thirteen and
eighteen million dollars in investments.**

In the categories number of students and number of alumni, foundations of large universities average $13,235,000 and
$17,339,000 in investments respectively. Foundations of Ph.D.
universities average about half of those of large universities in
the category of number of students or $6,660,000.

27. **Virtually two thirds of all foundations have an annual fund program.**

The data show every level of foundation in the three categories
have annual fund programs by a 2/3 majority with one exception,
foundations of medium size universities (65.5%) in the category of
number of alumni.

28. **Foundation participation in fund raising programs of deferred
giving is differentiated by levels within the categories.**

The data show 4/5 of foundations of large universities and Ph.D.
universities have deferred giving programs and over 2/3 of
foundations of medium size universities have similar programs.
Contrasted with these figures, less than 1/2 of the foundations of
small universities and B.A. and M.A. universities have deferred
giving programs.
29. **Foundation corporate solicitation programs are differentiated by levels within the three categories.**

Four fifths of foundations of large and Ph.D. universities have programs of corporate solicitation. These same programs are found in over 2/3 of foundations of medium and M.A. universities and 3/5 of foundations of small universities. Less than 1/2 of foundations of B.A. universities have corporate solicitation programs.

30. **Virtually three fifths of all foundations have foundation solicitation programs.**

Foundations of B.A. universities do not fall within these figures, with only 47.8% having foundation solicitation programs. In the category number of students, the percentages of participation in foundation solicitation are 62.5%, 65.7% and 68.2% for foundations of small, medium and large universities, respectively. The percentages for the category number of alumni are 60.8%, 72.7% and 61.5% respectively for foundations of small, medium and large universities. In the category kinds of degrees, 66.2% of foundations of Ph.D. universities and 71.7% of foundations of M.A. universities have foundation solicitation programs.

31. **Three quarters of all foundations have a special gifts fund raising program, with the exception of foundations of B.A. universities.**

The percentages of participation in special gifts programs for foundations of small, medium and large universities in the category
number of students are 78.1%, 88.1% and 81.8% respectively. For the category number of alumni, they are 81.0%, 85.5% and 76.9% respectively for foundations of small, medium and large universities. In the category kinds of degrees, 83.1% of foundations of Ph.D. universities, 81.7% of foundations of M.A. universities and a low of 43.3% of foundations of B.A. universities participate in special gifts programs.

32. Slightly over half of the foundations of large and Ph.D. universities have athletic fund raising programs.

Sixty three and six tenths percent of foundations of large universities in the category number of students have athletic fund raising programs. The foundations of Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees and large universities in the category number of alumni participate in athletic fund raising at the same percentage, 53.8%.

33. Less than 50% of almost all foundations of small and medium size universities and B.A. and M.A. universities have athletic fund raising programs.

Foundations of small and medium size universities in the category number of students participate in athletic fund raising at 35.9% and 50.7% respectively. The latter is the only exception to a 50% standard for participation in this program by foundations of small and medium size universities. In the category kinds of degrees, 43.3% of foundations of M.A. universities and 26.1% of
foundations of B.A. universities have athletic fund raising programs. In the category number of alumni, 47.3% of foundations of medium size universities and 45.6% of foundations of small universities have the program.

34. **Foundations of small, B.A. and M.A. universities have average donor numbers of less than a 1,000.**

In the categories number of students and number of alumni, foundations of small universities have average donor numbers of 579 and 896 respectively. In the category kinds of degrees, foundations of B.A. and M.A. universities have average donor numbers of 548 and 934 respectively.

35. **Average donor numbers of foundations of medium size universities are between 3,500 and 4,750.**

In the categories number of students and number of alumni, the average donor numbers of foundations of medium size universities are 3,506 and 4,721 respectively.

36. **Foundations of large universities average between 11,000 and 15,000 donors a year.**

In the categories number of students and number of alumni, the average donor numbers of foundations of large universities is 11,278 and 14,951 respectively. Ph.D. average donor numbers are about 1/2 of those of foundations of large universities at 6,835.

37. **Foundations of small, B.A. and M.A. universities raised an average of less than $300,000 in 1977.**
In the categories number of students and number of alumni, the average dollars raised in 1977 in foundations of small universities were $191,000 and $217,000 respectively. In the category kinds of degrees, the foundations of B.A. and M.A. universities had average dollars raised of $126,000 and $290,000 respectively.

38. Foundations of medium size universities raise, on average, between $900,000 and $2,000,000.

The data show foundations of medium size universities in the category number of students raise $926,000, while foundations of the same size universities in the category number of alumni raise $1,902,000.

39. Foundations of large universities have average dollars raised of six to seven million dollars.

The data indicate foundations of large universities in the category number of students raise an average of $6,188,000 and foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni raise $6,928,000. Ph.D. universities in the category kinds of degrees raise, on average, $3,014,000, or about 1/2 of that raised by foundations of large universities.

40. Three fifths of virtually all foundations of large and Ph.D. universities have written policies in the areas of investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising.

Observation of the data show that in each of the areas there are written policies at or above the 60% level with one exception,
foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni in the area of operations where only 53.8% of these foundations have written policies. The percentages of those foundations having written policies range from 68.2% in three areas of expenses, operations and general fund raising to 90.9% in the area of investments for foundations of large universities in the category number of students. In the category kinds of degrees, foundations with written policies range from 60.0% in the area of expenses to 83.1% in the area of investments for foundations of Ph.D. universities. In the third category, number of alumni, the range is from 69.2% (excluding operations) in two areas of expenses and general fund raising to 92.3% in the area of investments.

41. Fifty percent of all foundations of medium size and M.A. universities have written policies in the areas of investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising, with one exception.

The one exception is in foundations of M.A. universities in the area of deferred gifts where only 35.0% have written policies. Observation of the data show that most other areas are well over the 50.0% standard. In the category number of students, foundations of medium size universities range in percentage of written policies from 55.2% in the area of deferred giving to 74.6% in the areas of investments and operations. With the exclusion of deferred giving, the range in the category kinds of degrees is from 58.3% in the area
of general fund raising to 73.3% in the area of operations. The range of percentage of written policies is from 52.7% in the area of deferred giving to 76.4% in the area of investments for the category number of alumni.

42. In general, over 50.0% of foundations of small and B.A. universities have written policies in investments, operations and general fund raising and less than 50.0% have written policies in expenses and deferred gifts.

The percentages for foundations of small and B.A. universities with written policies for the three categories, number of students, kinds of degrees and number of alumni in the area of investments are 51.6%, 43.5% and 58.2% respectively. Foundations of B.A. universities are the exception to the 50.0% standard in this one case. The same foundations, in the same order of categories, have percentages of written policies of 62.5%, 56.5% and 67.1%, respectively, in the area of operations and 50.0%, 52.2% and 55.7%, respectively, in the area of general fund raising.

These same foundations fall below the 50.0% standard for written policies in the areas of expenses and deferred gifts. In the three categories, number of students, kinds of degrees and number of alumni, these foundations have percentages of 43.8%, 26.1% and 49.4%, respectively, for written policies in the area of expenses and 20.3%, 17.4% and 32.9%, respectively, in the area of deferred gifts.
Conclusions

In any single enterprise, there are various factors that need to be organized to accomplish the task at hand. An organizational structure is the relationship between these factors in the enterprise. (Spriegel, 1960, p. 45) In the case of a manufacturing firm, the people working or producing, the materials for production and the management process must be organized into a structure to achieve coordination of these factors for any product to be manufactured.

Although the factors are different for a university related foundation, the same principles apply.

I feel we need a structural framework because, whatever else it is, an organization is a set of structural relations among those who make up its membership. I see structure in terms of vertical, horizontal, and diagonal relations among individuals and organizational units. (Whyte, 1969, p. 714)

University related foundations are organizations with these same structural relationships. Managing a foundation is a complicated procedure, involving extensive record keeping, research, continuous mailings and personal calls, correspondence, gift receiving and receipting, investments, distribution of funds and the like. These functions, usually the work of many people, need to be coordinated and processed. In order to achieve the maximum of efficiency, organizational structures are needed. Structures must coordinate reporting relationships, distribution of workload, proper budgeting,
policy and decision making and the like. All these combine into one organization and efficiency of operation depends on the particular theory of organization used by the organization.

There is no one correct theory of organizational structure. People and circumstances vary in each organization and, because of this, structures also differ widely. The best way to approach an organizational theory is to determine what are the actual patterns of structure as defined in practice by the appropriate organizations, in this case, university related foundations.

The divisions of the following section are somewhat arbitrary since organizational structures and operational structures overlap a great deal. We have applied operational structures to cover those aspects of university related foundations which deal with the processes or operations of a foundation. The organizational structure, on the other hand, has been viewed as a static set up more like a traditional organizational chart.

"Most views of organizations are really structure views of the system; that is, they speak only to the questions of what the system would look like if it were to be stopped for an instant and photographed.

"But process – the action by means of which the stroboscopic picture at one instant in time becomes something different the next time the light flashes on – is inseparably related to, and certainly no less important than, structure. The vital, dynamic, operating process is what we are trying to understand." (Beckett, 1971, p. 145)

Foundations are vital and dynamic organizations. They admit of many different forms and structures. The organizational structure
of the foundation provides "the framework within which managerial and operating tasks are performed." (Albers, 1961, p. 81) The operational structure provides us with a picture of a moving and dynamic organization. This involves the financial operations, fund raising activities and operating policies.

The following section deals with the organizational and operational structures of university related foundations as we find them by categories and levels within categories. Each level of foundation is described according to an organizational structure including the beginning years of the foundation, primary reason for the foundation, whether the foundation is part of a system or not, whether or not the foundation has a Board of Directors, who are represented on that Board of Directors, what the pattern of organization is in the foundation, how many professional and secretarial/clerical staff are employed by the foundation and what the foundation fiscal year is. In addition, each of the same foundations are described according to an operational structure including the foundation budget, the average funds held in investment in the foundation, the programs of fund raising in the foundation, the average number of donors to the foundation, the average dollars raised in one year by the foundation and the areas in which the foundation has written policies.

The following conclusions appear to be justified on the basis on the data obtained in the study and the findings derived from the
data. The conclusions are a description of each level of foundation in each of the three categories discussed in Chapter IV. The data used in this section are considered typical of the foundations which are described.

Foundations of Small Universities in the Category Number of Students

Organizational Patterns.

These foundations are, by definition, foundations of universities that had 0 to 4,999 students registered in the Fall semester of 1977. They were typically initiated after the year 1960 for the primary reason of flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations. These foundations have a Board of Directors, which has a majority representation each of university administrators, women and corporate officials on it. Students, faculty and minorities are not typically on the Board. Foundations in this level have professional staffs of one to two persons and secretarial/clerical staffs of one to two persons also. Figure VII was chosen as the typical organization pattern closest to their own. This Figure has a Board of Directors as the ultimate authority in the foundation with an Executive Director reporting to the Board and all other professional personnel reporting to the Executive Director. The fiscal year for these foundations begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

Foundations of these small universities in the category number
of students have an average budget of $33,000 and hold average investments of $523,000. Among the fund raising programs are the annual fund, corporate and foundation solicitation and special gifts programs. They have average donor numbers of 529 and the average dollars raised are $191,000. They have written policies on investments, operations and general fund raising.

Foundations of Medium Size Universities in the Category Number of Students

Organizational Patterns.

These are foundations of universities that had 5,000 to 19,999 students registered in the Fall of 1977. These foundations were typically begun after 1960 for the primary reason of a more flexible operation. They do not belong to a foundation system typically. They have a Board of Directors and, like the foundations of small universities, university administrators, women and corporate officials each are represented on the Board in the majority. Foundations in this level have professional staffs of one to two persons and secretarial/clerical staffs of one to two persons also. They typically chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern closest to their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

These foundations have average budgets of $175,000 and hold average investments of $2,273,000. They have fund raising programs
of the annual fund, deferred giving, corporate and foundation solicitation, special gifts and athletic fund raising. They have average donor numbers of 3,506 and the average dollars raised are $926,000. They have written policies covering investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising.

**Foundations of Large Universities in the Category Number of Students**

**Organizational Patterns.**

These foundations are, by definition, foundations of universities whose student body was 20,000 or more in the Fall semester of 1977. Unlike the other two levels of foundations in this category, these foundations were typically begun before 1960. They were initiated for the purpose of flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations typically. They have a Board of Directors and the highest proportional representation on the Board is held by university administrators, women and corporate officials. These foundations typically have professional staffs of 6 to 10 persons and secretarial/clerical staffs of 6 or more persons. They chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern most like their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

**Operational Patterns.**

The average budget of foundations of large universities in the category number of students is $285,000 and the average investments held are $13,235,000. These foundations have a full fund raising program with annual fund, deferred giving, corporate and foundation
solicitation, special gifts and athletic fund raising. They have average donor numbers of 11,278 and average dollars raised of $6,188,000. They have written policies on investments, expenses, operations, deferred giving and general fund raising.

Foundations of Universities Which Award the Ph.D. as their Highest Degree

Organizational Patterns.

By definition, these are foundations related to universities that award the Ph.D. as their highest degree. They were begun, typically, before 1960 for the primary reason of flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations. They have a Board of Directors and university administrators, women and corporate officials have the highest proportional representation on the Board of Directors. These foundations have a typical professional staff of 3 or more persons and a secretarial/clerical staff of 3 or more persons also. They chose Figure VII as the figure which most closely resembles their own foundation organizational pattern. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

Foundations of Ph.D. universities have an average budget of $218,000 with an average of $6,660,000 held in investments. They have annual fund, deferred giving, corporate and foundations solicitation, special gifts and athletic fund raising programs. These foundations have average donor numbers of 6,835 and the average
dollars raised is $3,014,000. They have written policies on investments, expenses, operations, deferred giving and general fund raising.

**Foundations of Universities Which Award the M.A. as the Highest Degree**

**Organizational Patterns.**

These foundations are related to universities which award as their highest degree an M.A. Typically, they began since 1960 for the reason of a more flexible operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations. They have a Board of Directors which Board has a majority representation each of university administrators, faculty, women and corporate officials. These foundations have a professional staff of 1 to 2 persons and a secretarial/clerical staff of 1 to 2 persons also. They chose Figure VII as the figure closest to their own organizational pattern. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

**Operational Patterns.**

The average budget of foundations of universities awarding an M.A. is $85,000. They have average investments of $572,000. Their fund raising programs consist of annual fund, corporate and foundation solicitation and special gifts. They have average donor numbers of 934 in 1977 and the average dollars raised is $290,000. Their written policies cover investments, expenses, operations and general fund raising.
Foundations of Universities Which Award the B.A. as the Highest Degree

Operational Patterns.

Foundations of B.A. universities are defined as those foundations which are related to universities awarding a B.A. as the highest degree. These foundations began typically after 1960. They began for two reasons, flexibility of operation and as investment vehicles separate from the state under whose control the universities to which they were related were. They do not belong to a system of foundations as is also typical of the other two levels in this category. They have a Board of Directors and the highest proportional representation on this Board is found among university administrators, women and corporate officials. The typical professional staff numbers are 1 to 2 persons with the same numbers for the secretarial/clerical staff. These foundations chose Figure VII as the organizational pattern which most closely resembles their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

The foundations of B.A. universities have an average budget of $23,000 and hold average investments of $571,000. The fund raising program consists of the annual fund. The average donor numbers of these foundations are 548 donors. They raise an average of $126,000. They have written policies covering operations and general fund raising.
Foundations of Small Universities in the Category Number of Alumni

Organizational Patterns.

Foundations in this category are defined as foundations related to universities which have 0 to 24,999 living alumni in 1977. These foundations began since 1960 for the primary reason of flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations. These foundations have a Board of Directors which board has the greatest proportional representation from university administrators, faculty, women and corporate officials. They have a typical professional staff of 1 to 2 persons and a secretarial/clerical staff of the same size. When asked to choose an organizational pattern among eight figures, they chose Figure VII as the pattern which most closely resembles their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

Foundations of small universities in the category number of alumni have average budgets of $39,000 and hold average investments of $621,000. Their fund raising programs consists of the annual fund, corporate and foundation solicitation and special gifts. They have average donor numbers of 896 and the average dollars raised are $217,000. They have written policies covering investments, operations and general fund raising.

Foundations of Medium Size Universities in the Category Number of Alumni
Organizational Patterns.

These foundations are, by definition, foundations of universities which have 25,000 to 99,999 living alumni in the year 1977. Typically, they began before the year 1960 for the reason of flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a foundation system. They have a Board of Directors which has a majority representation each of university administrators, women and corporate officials. Foundations of this level have typical professional staffs of 3 or more persons and secretarial/clerical staffs of 3 of more persons also. They chose Figure VII as the typical organizational pattern closest to their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

Operational Patterns.

Foundations of medium size universities in the category number of alumni have average budgets of $239,000 and hold average investments of $3,782,000. Their fund raising programs include annual fund, deferred giving, corporate and foundation solicitation and special gifts. These foundations have average donor numbers of 4,721 and the average dollars raised is $1,902,000. They have written policies on investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising.

Foundations of Large Universities in the Category Number of Alumni

Organizational Patterns.

These foundations are related to universities of 100,000 or more
living alumni in the year 1977. They were begun before 1960 and the primary reason for their beginning was flexibility of operation. They do not belong to a system of foundations. These foundations have a Board of Directors, which Board has a majority representation of university administrators, women and corporate officials on it. The typical professional staff is 6 or more persons. The typical secretarial/clerical staff is also 6 or more persons. These foundations chose Figure VII as the figure representing the organizational pattern closest to their own. Their fiscal year begins in July and ends in June.

**Operational Patterns.**

Foundations of large universities in the category number of alumni have an average budget of $307,000 and hold average investments of $17,339,000. Their fund raising programs are annual fund, deferred giving, corporate and foundation solicitation, special gifts and athletic fund raising. Foundations at this level have average donor numbers of 14,951 and the average dollars raised are $6,928,000. They have written policies covering investments, expenses, operations, deferred gifts and general fund raising.

In addition to the above specific conclusions as applied to each level of each category, there are a number of general conclusions that provide helpful knowledge about four year state university related foundations. As a result of this study and experience in the field, the following conclusions appear to be justified on the
basis of the findings of the study.

1. **Flexibility of operation is the primary reason for initiating foundations.**

   State universities, like other state institutions, are subject to state allocation of funds, budget legislation, state audits and regulation of operations. Development departments, which are an integral part of a university administration, are subject to these regulations. Private foundations related to these state universities provide a way of creating a private system for fund raising and investment of funds outside of state control. This appears to be the reason for the relative majority of all foundations choosing flexibility of operation as the primary reason for initiating the foundation. This reason was chosen in preference to the other reasons of new donors or directors and investment purposes.

2. **Virtually all foundations have a Board of Directors.**

   Foundations are private corporations and, as such, have independent control. A Board of Directors, in an American system, is the corporate control of a private corporation. Of all the foundations in the study, only one reported it did not have a Board of Directors.

3. **The largest proportional representation on the Board of Directors of foundations are corporate officials, university administrators and women.**

   The conclusion refers to the fact that these three groups of people are represented on the Board of Directors of foundations by
at least one person. It does not refer to how many there are of each group on the various Boards. In terms of representation on Boards, the percentage range for university administrators in the three categories on all levels is from 71.9% to 86.4%. The range for women is from 72.3% to 100.0% and the range for corporate officials is from 78.1% to 100.0%. The ranges for the other groups represented on the Board of Directors is less than 50.0%. Corporate officials are most important to foundations for their high level contacts and donor capability. Women are also important, since they hold most of the personal wealth in the United States.

4. Except for foundations of large universities, foundations typically have one to two professional and secretarial/clerical staff members.

As defined by the study, less than 15.0% of the foundations are of large universities. These foundations typically have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of six or more people. In contrast to this, the vast majority of foundations of small and medium size universities have professional and secretarial/clerical staffs of one to two persons.

It appears there is a good reason for these latter numbers. Most foundations are in combination with development departments and, therefore, most of the active fund raising is done by the development department. The foundation, on the other hand, serves as the receptacle for the funds raised and also as the investment
vehicle for these funds. A small staff of a foundation director and a secretary would be typical of this kind of arrangement.

5. Between 16% and 22% of the foundations of small and medium size universities have no staff members at all, either professional or secretarial/clerical.

This appears to be clearly a case where the foundation is an investment vehicle only. Each of these foundations have a Board of Directors, which Board appears to have as its chief function the management of funds for the foundation.

6. Most foundations begin their fiscal year in July and end it in June.

The data show 60% or more of the foundations in the three categories on all levels begin their fiscal year in July. The presumption is this fiscal year coincides with the fiscal year of the university to which the foundation is related but there are no facts to substantiate this presumption.

7. The foundation organizational structure chosen by the relative majority of all foundations as representing the organizational pattern most closely approximating their own is Figure VII which includes a Board of Directors as ultimate authority with an Executive Director reporting directly to the Board and all other staff reporting to the Executive Director.

This choice of organizational pattern agrees with previous data in the study. Each foundation was found to have a Board of
Directors as Table 9 demonstrates. And Tables 12, 13 and 14 show foundations are generally small in numbers of staff members. Both of these findings agree with the concept in Figure VII.

Figure VII is an uncomplicated organizational pattern with simple reporting relationships. This same figure was chosen by foundations of large universities even with larger staffs. It appears from this data that foundations have a fairly consistent organizational pattern.

8. Foundation budgets, investments, donor numbers and dollars raised are generally related to the size of the university which the foundation serves.

As expected, these numbers are small when related to foundations of small universities and grow larger as we move to medium and large size universities. In the categories of size, the ranges for average budgets for foundations of small, medium and large universities are \$33,000 to \$39,000, \$175,000 to \$239,000 and \$285,000 to \$307,000 respectively.

In these same categories, the ranges for average investments for foundations of small, medium and large universities are from \$523,000 to \$621,000, \$2,273,000 to \$3,782,000 and \$13,235,000 to \$17,339,000 respectively.

Average donor numbers in the categories of size follow the same pattern from small to large with ranges from 579 to 896, 3,506 to 4,721 and 11,278 to 14,951 respectively.
Again the data show an ascending pattern of average dollars raised beginning with foundations of small universities to foundations of large universities in the categories of size. The range for foundations of small universities for average dollars raised is from $191,000 to $217,000. For medium size universities the range is from $926,000 to $1,902,000 and for foundations of large universities the range is $6,188,000 to $6,928,000.

9. Most foundations have annual fund, special gift, corporate and foundation solicitation programs.

The annual fund is the basis of most fund raising and we find high percentages of all foundations in the three categories with this type program. It is essentially a mail program and relatively easy for a one or two person staff to accomplish. Special gift programs are also fairly easy to accomplish since they target special large donors and class gifts. It would appear reasonable that most foundations have these programs.

The numbers of foundations with corporate and foundation solicitation programs is surprising. Many corporations have a published policy of not giving to state universities. It becomes difficult for state universities to solicit corporations under these conditions. Foundation solicitation also is difficult since it usually involves the writing of proposals and numerous contacts. It is surprising that the percentage of foundations soliciting foundations is so high considering the difficulties associated with these kinds
of programs.

10. **Most foundations have written policies on investments, expenses, operations, and general fund raising.**

The expectation is foundations will have written policies on investments and expenses since these are not unusual in most organizations that handle investments or are sales oriented. It would appear reasonable to have policies on investments where a trust is given to the foundation for a state institution. Again, donors often ask about investment policy, especially when a number of options are available to them.

In those foundations which are combined with development departments, written policies on expenses also are expected since the state university will most certainly have these policies in detail.

Written policies on operations cover organization, programs, functions and the like. It appears most foundations have these policies.

Policies regarding general fund raising also are widely used. These policies relate to the ethical and financial practices associated with fund raising.

**Recommendations**

This survey has been directed toward the organizational and operational structures and characteristics of four year state university foundations. The survey has prompted and left unanswered
many questions about these foundations. The following are some recommendations for future studies on the subject of four year state universities:

1. The relationship between foundations of four year state universities and private universities of comparable size on the questions in the survey instrument.

A foundation of a state university is an attempt to create a private system for fund raising and investment purposes. The issue is to compare this foundation type with a totally private system with regard to flexibility of operation, staff size, fund raising programs and outcomes, and the like. Such data would provide foundation officials with possible better criteria for foundation management.

2. The relationship between four year state university related foundations and development departments in those universities which have these two vehicles in combination.

Most foundations appear to be in combination with a development department on university campus'. There are no data to confirm the workings of this combination, i.e., whether the foundation is actually a functioning foundation or an investment vehicle alone. Data on flexibility and organizational patterns should prove especially helpful to new or changing foundations.

3. The relationship between foundations of four year state universities and development departments of separate universities as
to flexibility of operation and effectiveness in fund raising.

Since 1960, there has been a considerable rise in the number of university related foundations. It has been advocated these foundations are necessary for independence and freedom of operation. There is no research to confirm that university related foundations are necessarily more flexible or more effective in fund raising or investment practices.

4. The relationship between flexibility of operation and effectiveness in fund raising among four year state university related foundations.

Such a study could determine the optimal organizational patterns for flexibility of operations and the resulting effectiveness in fund raising. The examination of this relationship could provide some standards for size of university related foundation versus cost effectiveness.

5. The relationships of staff size, budget, donor numbers and fund raising programs to the dollars raised by different classifications of foundations of four year state university related foundations.

These data, although included on an average basis in the current study, need to be specifically dealt with in a future study. These data are important for the eventual determination of productivity for foundations.

6. The relationships of Boards of Directors to foundations.
This future study would deal with how many Board members there are, what constituency each represents, the functions of the Board, gift leadership capacity and actual leadership and the like. A study of this kind could establish criteria for Board membership and directions for Board activities.

This survey is a beginning research effort on university related foundations of four year state universities. There remains much to be done in the area of research to develop meaningful data for the directions and growth of these foundations.
REFERENCE NOTES

1. A private conversation with Wendell Lyons, Director of Development, University of Michigan, June, 1975.


5. A telephone conversation with Kris O'Rourke, Assistant Director, University of Indiana Foundation, March, 1980.

6. The data on the number of foundations responding and the listing of foundations appears contradictory, since the former number is 339, while the latter is 375 (see Appendix F). The discrepancy is explained by the fact that 339 respondents indicated the existence of at least one foundation related to their university. In a number of cases, there were multiple foundations related to one university.

7. Some respondents did not return the second part of the two part postcard mailing, which part indicated the four choices of fund raising vehicles used at the university. The other section which was returned allowed for two choices, no foundation or a foundation. The figures in Table 2 include the latter where only two choices were available.

8. In reading the text foundations will be referred to as foundations of small, medium or large universities or foundations of B.A., M.A. or Ph.D. universities according to the levels and categories in which they are placed. In the categories number of students and number of alumni, the three levels are small, medium and large. In the category kinds of degrees, the levels are B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. universities.
APPENDIX A

Questionnaire
Section I Introductory Questions

1. Check the definition that applies to the fund-raising agency which presently exists at your institution:
   A. ___ A university Development Department under the jurisdiction and direction of university laws and administration, an official part of the university structure.
   B. ___ A not-for-profit private corporation recognized by IRS under IRC 501 (C) (3) and instituted for the express purpose of accepting, investing and dispensing funds for a university or college, that is, a Foundation.
   C. ___ A combination of both (A + B) of the above.
   D. ___ None of the above.

2. How many full time equivalent (FTE) students were registered for the 1977 Fall semester? ______________

3. How many degrees did you distribute at graduation this past year?
   Ph. D/Ed. D. ________ MA/MS ________ BA/BS ________

4. What is the total number of living alumni from your school? __________

If you have a university related Foundation, please answer the questions in Section II. If you do not have a Foundation, please return the questionnaire as is.
Section II Foundations

5. What is the legal name and address of your Foundation?

NAME ________________________________________________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________________________________________________________ ZIP ________

6. In what year was the Foundation officially begun? __________

7. Does the Foundation have a Board of Directors? Yes ____ No ____

8. If the answer to question 7 is “yes”, check the groups below which have representation on the Board

_____ University Administrators   _____ Minorities
_____ University Faculty   _____ Women
_____ Students   _____ Corporate Officials

9. Do you belong to a Foundation System? Yes ____ No ____

10. Check below the primary reason for initiating the Foundation.

_____ Create a private system for Investment purposes.
_____ More flexibility in operation
_____ Create a new Board of Directors or donors
_____ Other ________________________________

11. At the present time what is the total dollar amount invested by the Foundation? $ _________________

12. Place a check in the spaces below before those programs which presently exist at the Foundation:

_____ Annual Fund   _____ Foundation Solicitation
_____ Deferred Giving   _____ Special Gifts
_____ Corporate Solicitation   _____ Athletic Fund Raising

13. How many donors did your Foundation have in 1977? __________________________

14. When does your fiscal year begin? _____ January   _____ July   _____ Other

15. How many total dollars did your Foundation raise in 1977? __________________________

16. What was your total foundation budget, excluding salaries, for fiscal 1977? __________________________
Refer to the following section entitled Selection of Organizational Patterns and check the organizational pattern that most closely approximates your present Foundation organization.

A. President
   Vice President
   Director
   Associate Director
   Assistant Director

B. President
   Vice President
   Director
   Associate Director
   Assistant Director

Selection of Organizational Patterns
C. 

President

Director

Assistant Director

Assistant Director

Assistant to Director

D. 

President

Vice President

Director

Associate Director

Assistant Director

Assistant Director

Assistant to Director

E. 

Board of Directors

Executive Director

Associate Director

Assistant Director

Assistant Director

Assistant Director
18. How many staff members of each of the following types do you have in your Foundation Office?

- Professional—include actual fund raisers, research, administrative assistants, etc.
- Secretarial and clerical

19. For each of the following indicate by a check mark whether or not you have at least some written policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Policies</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel and expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General fund raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

University to Which the Test Questionnaire was Sent
Ball State University
Bowling Green University
Michigan State University
Ohio State University
Purdue University
University of Colorado Foundation
University of Illinois
University of Indiana
University of Iowa
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Western Michigan
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay
University of Wisconsin - Madison
APPENDIX C

Cover Letter
May 1978

Dear CASE Colleague:

CASE is sponsoring a research effort concerned with methods used by public four-year institutions in soliciting funds from the private sector. Timothy A. Reilley of the University of Wisconsin Foundation is assisting CASE in this project.

The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to public four-year institutions in order to gather information needed for this research effort. I would appreciate it if you would route this questionnaire to the person at your institution in charge of raising private funds.

This particular project is not concerned with student foundations, programs which seek government funds, research foundations, or professional foundations related to universities or colleges. The specific focus is on the unit at your institution which is concerned with programs such as annual giving, capital, corporate and foundation giving, and deferred giving programs.

The CASE Reference Center receives a number of requests for information on raising private funds at public colleges and universities. I feel this research effort will do much to help others.

Sincerely,

V. Michael Born, Ph.D.
Vice President

P.S. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by June 16.
APPENDIX D

Directions for Completing the Questionnaire
Directions for completing the "Survey on Development Agencies of Four Year State Universities." This questionnaire refers to that unit at your university which conducts the annual fund, corporation solicitation, deferred giving and the like.

1. Please fill in every question. If no choice appears that fits your situation, please provide an answer in an adjoining space or on an extra sheet.

2. Throughout the questionnaire, the use of 1977 refers to the fiscal year 1977.

3. The questionnaire excludes student foundations, university agencies seeking government grants, research foundations, professional foundations (i.e. medical, law), and the like.

4. The questionnaire should take less than nine minutes to answer if last year's budget and gift receipt numbers are immediately available.

5. All answers will be coded and treated as confidential material.

6. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

   CASE SURVEY
   UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN FOUNDATION
   702 LANGDON STREET
   MADISON, WISCONSIN  53706
APPENDIX E

Post Card Questionnaire
Does your university have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     |    | 1. A university related foundation
|     |    | IRC 501(c)(3)
|     |    | 2. A university development department fully integrated into university administration
|     |    | 3. A combination of both
|     |    | 4. None of the above

CASE SURVEY
c/o Timothy A. Reilley
University of Wisconsin Foundation
702 Langdon Street
Madison, WI  53706
If your university has a University related foundation, please fill in the correct name and address of the foundation.

Name

Address

We do not have a university related foundation.

STAMP

Director of Development
THE University
Anytown, USA 00000
APPENDIX F

List of Foundations
ALABAMA

Alabama A & M University Foundation
P.O. Box 254
Normal, AL 37562

Alabama State University Foundation
P.O. Box 271
Montgomery, AL 36101

Athens College Foundation
Athens College
Box 213
Athens, AL 35611

Auburn University Foundation
116 Foy Union Building
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36830

Troy State University Foundation, Inc.
TSU Box L
Troy, AL 36081

Capstone Foundation
University of Alabama
P.O. Box 1436
University, AL 35486

University of Alabama/Huntsville Foundation
404 Madison Street
Huntsville, AL 35801

University of Montevallo Foundation
Station 301
Montevallo, AL 35115

ALASKA

University of Alaska Foundation
P.O. Box 1
Fairbanks, AK 99707

University of Alaska Foundation
619 Eleventh Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99708
ARIZONA

Arizona State University Foundation
601 East Apache Boulevard
Tempe, AZ  85281

The University of Arizona Foundation
University of Arizona
Administration Building
Room 601
Tucson, AZ  85721

ARKANSAS

Arkansas State University Foundation, Inc.
Drawer CCCC
State University, AR  72467

University of Arkansas Foundation
University of Arkansas at Fayetteville
Fayetteville, AR  72701

CALIFORNIA

California Maritime Academy Foundation
P.O. Box 1392
Vallejo, CA  94590

California State College Bakersfield Foundation
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA  93309

California State University
Dominguez Hills Foundation
Carson, CA  90747

Foundation for California State College at San Bernardino
5500 State College Parkway
San Bernardino, CA  92407

Sonoma State University Academic Foundation, Inc.
1801 East Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, CA  94928

Stanislaus State College Foundation
800 Monte Vista Avenue
Turlock, CA  95380
California Polytechnic State University Foundation
San Luis Obispo, CA  93407

Cal Poly Kellogg Unit Foundation, Inc.
3801 West Temple Avenue
Pomona, CA  91768

The University Foundation, California State University, Chico
California State University at Chico
Chico, CA  95929

California State University, Fresno Foundation
California State University, Fresno
Fresno, CA  93740

California State University, Long Beach Foundation
Long Beach, CA  90840

California State University Los Angeles Foundation
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA  90032

California State University Foundation, Northridge
18111 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, CA  91330

Homboldt State University Foundation
Arcata, CA  95521

San Jose State University Foundation
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA  95192

University of California Berkeley Foundation
North Gate Hall
University of California Berkeley
Berkeley, CA  94720

California Aggie Foundation
University of California at Davis
Davis, CA  95616

University of California Hastings Law Center Foundation
25 Taylor Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA  94102

The UCI Foundation
University of California Irvine
651 Administration Building
Irvine, CA  92717
The UCLA Foundation
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

University of California at Riverside Foundation
P.O. Box 112
Riverside, CA 92521

University of California San Diego Foundation
212 Administrative Complex Q-011
La Jolla, CA 92092

University of California at Santa Barbara Foundation
University Relations Office
University of California at Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

University of California Santa Cruz Foundation
Room 257, Central Services
University of California Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

COLORADO

Adams State College Foundation
Adams State College
Alamosa, CO 81102

Colorado School of Mines Foundation, Inc.
1800 Jackson Street
Golden, CO 80401

Colorado State University Foundation
645 South Shields
Fort Collins, CO 80523

Fort Lewis College Foundation, Inc.
110 Administration Building
Fort Lewis College
Durango, CO 81301

Mesa College Foundation
P.O. Box 2647
Grand Junction, CO 81501

MSC Foundation, Inc.
Metropolitan State College
1006 Eleventh Street, Box 11
Denver, CO 80204
University of Colorado Foundation, Inc.
1305 University Avenue
Boulder, CO 80309
Includes these universities:
University of Colorado Boulder
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Colorado Medical Center at Denver

University of Northern Colorado Foundation, Inc.
Greeley, CO 80639

University of Southern Colorado Foundation
220 North Bonforte Boulevard
Pueblo, CO 81001

Western State College Foundation
120 North Boulevard
Gunnison, CO 81230

CONNECTICUT

Central Connecticut State College Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 612
New Britain, CT 06050

Eastern Connecticut State College Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 431
Willimantic, CT 06226

Southern Connecticut State College Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 3144
New Haven, CT 06515

The University of Connecticut Foundation, Inc.
Hillside Road U-190
Storrs, CT 06268

Western Connecticut State College Foundation, Inc.
181 White Street
Danbury, CT 06810

FLORIDA

Florida Atlantic University Foundation, Inc.
500 Northwest 20th Street
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Florida International University Foundation, Inc.
Florida International University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, FL 33199
Florida State University Foundation, Inc.
Hecht House, Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

University of Central Florida Foundation, Inc.
Box 25000
Orlando, FL 32816

University of Florida Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 14425
Gainesville, FL 32604

University of South Florida Foundation, Inc.
SVC 518
Tampa, FL 33620

University of West Florida Foundation, Inc.
c/o The University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32504

GEORGIA

Albany State College Foundation
504 College Drive
Albany, GA 31705

Augusta College Foundation, Inc.
Augusta College
2500 Walton Way
Augusta, GA 30904

Columbus College Foundation, Inc.
Columbus College
Algonquin Drive
Columbus, GA 31907

The Fort Valley State College Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 5703
The Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, GA 31030

Georgia College Foundation
Georgia College
Milledgeville, GA 31061

Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc.
Atlanta, GA 30332
Georgia Southern College Foundation, Inc.
Landrum Box 8053
Statesboro, GA  30458

Georgia State University Foundation
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA  30303

North Georgia College Foundation
Dahlonego, CA  30533

Savannah State College Foundation
P.O. Box 585
Savannah, GA  31402

Valdosta State College Foundation
17 West Hall, VSC
North Patterson Street
Valdosta, GA  31601

West Georgia College Foundation, Inc.
West Georgia College
Carrollton, GA  30118

HAWAII

University of Hawaii Foundation
Hawaii Hall #6
2500 Campus Road
Honolulu, HI  96822

IDAHO

Boise State University Foundation, Inc.
1910 University Drive
Boise, ID  83725

Idaho State University Foundation, Inc.
Campus Box 8050
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID  83209

The University of Idaho Foundation
104 Administration Building
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID  83843
ILLINOIS

Chicago State University Foundation
95th Street and King Drive
Chicago, IL  60628

Eastern Illinois University Foundation
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL  61920

Governors State University Foundation
Governors State University
Park Forest South, IL  60466

Illinois State University Foundation
Normal, IL  61761

Northeastern Illinois University Foundation
5500 North St. Louis
Chicago, IL  60625

Northern Illinois University Foundation
Lowden Hall
DeKalb, IL  60115

Sangamon State University Foundation
Sangamon State University
Springfield, IL  62708

Souther Illinois University Foundation
909 West Chautauqua
Carbondale, IL  62901

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville Foundation
Souther Illinois University
Edwardsville, IL  62026

University of Illinois Foundation
224 Illini Union
Urbana, IL  61874

Western Illinois University Foundation
205 Sherman Hall
Macomb, IL  61455

INDIANA

Ball State University Foundation
114 South Franklin Street
Muncie, IN  47303
Indiana State University Foundation
650 Cherry Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809

Indiana State University Evansville Foundation
8600 University Boulevard
Evansville, IN 47712

Indiana University Foundation
P.O. Box 500
Bloomington, IN 47401

Indiana University Foundation - Northwest
Indiana University Northwest
3400 Broadway
Gary, IN 46403

Indiana University Foundation
St. Rd. 46 Bypass
Showalter House
Bloomington, IN 47401
Includes these universities:
Indiana University Bloomington
Indiana University South Bend
Indiana University Southeast

Purdue Alumni Foundation
Purdue Memorial Union
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Vincennes University Foundation
Vincennes University
Vincennes, IN 47591

IOWA

Iowa State University Achievement Fund/Foundation
242 Memorial Union
Ames, IA 50010

State University of Iowa Foundation
Alumni Center
Iowa City, IA 52242

University of Northern Iowa Foundation
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
KANSAS

Emporia State University Endowment Association, Inc.
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801

Pittsburg State Alumni Association
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, KS 66762

Kansas State University Foundation
Hollis House, 1408 Denison
Manhattan, KS 66502

The Kansas University Endowment Association
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Wichita State University Endowment Association
1845 Fairmount
Campus Box 2
Wichita, KS 67208

KENTUCKY

Eastern Kentucky University Foundation
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475

Kentucky State University Foundation, Inc.
c/o Office of Development
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY 40601

Murray State University Foundation
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

University of Louisville Foundation, Inc.
2301 South Third Street
Louisville, KY 40208

College Heights Foundation, Inc.
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

LOUISIANA

LSU Foundation
Louisiana State University
122 System Building
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
Louisiana Tech Alumni Foundation
Tech Station
Box 4965
Ruston, LA 72409

Northeast Louisiana University Foundation
Northeast Station
Monroe, LA 71209

Northwestern State University Foundation, Inc.
Office of External Affairs
Natchitoches, LA 71497

Southern University Foundation
P.O. Box 9562
Baton Rouge, LA 70813

Southern University in New Orleans Foundation
6400 Press Drive
New Orleans, LA 70126

University of Southern Louisiana Foundation
P.O. Drawer 44920
Lafayette, LA 70504

MAINE

Foundation of the University at Presque Isle
Presque Isle, ME 04769

MARYLAND

Bowie State College Foundation, Inc.
Bowie State College
Bowie, MD 20715

Coppie State College Development Foundation
2500 West North Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21216

Frostburg State College Foundation
Frostburg State College
Frostburg, MD 21532

Morgan State University Foundation
Coldspring Lanet Hillen Road
Baltimore, MD 21239

Salisbury State College Foundation, Inc.
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, MD 21801
Towson State University Foundation
Room 318
Administration Building
Towson, MD 21204

University of Baltimore Educational Foundation
847 North Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

University of Maryland Foundation, Inc.
University of Maryland
Wilson H. Elkins Building
Adelphi, MD 20783

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Maritime Academy Alumni Association Foundation
59 Main Street
Plymouth, MA 20360

Southeastern Massachusetts University Foundation, Inc.
North Dartmouth, MA 02747

University of Lowell Foundation, Inc.
University of Lowell
Durgin Hall
One University Avenue
Lowell, MA 01854

MICHIGAN

Grand Valley College Foundation
Grand Valley College
Administration - 11 JHZ
Allendale, MI 49401

Michigan State University Foundation
220 Nisbet Building
1407 South Harrison Road
East Lansing, MI 48824

Michigan Tech Fund
Michigan Technological University
Houghton, MI 49931

Saginaw Valley State College Foundation
2250 Pierce Road
University Center, MI 48710
Western Michigan University Foundation
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

MINNESOTA

Bemidji State University Foundation
Box 198
Bemidji State University
Bemidji, MN 56601

The Associate Fund
Minnesota State University
Box 12
Mankato, MN 56001

Metropolitan State University Foundation
Metropolitan State University
121 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, MN 55101

Moorhead State University Foundation
Moorhead State University
Moorhead, MN 56560

Southwest State University Foundation
AS 318 - SSU Campus
Marshall, MN 56258

University of Minnesota Foundation
107 Walter Library
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Includes these universities:
University of Minnesota Minneapolis
University of Minnesota Duluth

Winona State University Foundation
Winona State University
Winona, MN 55987

MISSISSIPPI

Alcorn State University Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 390
Lorman, MS 39096

Delta State University Foundation, Inc.
Delta State University
P.O. Box 3141
Cleveland, MS 38733
Jackson State University Development Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 17050
Jackson State University
Jackson, MS 39217

Mississippi State University Development Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 423
Mississippi State, MS 39762

Mississippi State University for Women Foundation
P.O. Box W-701
Columbus, MS 39701

The University of Mississippi Foundation
Office of University Development
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

MISSOURI

Central Missouri State University Foundation, inc.
Office of Institutional Development
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, MO 64093

Lincoln University Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 1225
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Northwest Missouri State University Education Foundation, Inc.
Northwest Missouri State University
Maryville, MO 64468

The University of Kansas City Foundation
University of Missouri at Kansas City
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110

MONTANA

Eastern Montana College Foundation
1500 North 30th Street
McMullen Hall 211
Billings, MT 59101

Montana Tech Alumni Foundation
Mineral Research Center
Butte, MT 59701
The Endowment Research Foundation  
Montana State University  
Bozeman, MT 59715

Northern Montana College Development Foundation  
Northern Montana College  
P.O. Box 1691  
Havre, MT 59501

University of Montana Foundation  
209 University Hall  
Missoula, MT 59801

Higher Education Foundation of Western Montana College  
Western Montana College  
Business Office  
Dillon, MT 59725

NEBRASKA

Chadron State Foundation  
Chadron State College  
Chadron, NE 69337

The Kearney State College Foundation, Inc.  
Kearney State College  
Kearney, NE 68847

University of Nebraska Foundation  
Regents Hall  
3835 Holdrege  
Lincoln, NE 68503

University of Nebraska at Omaha Alumni Association  
60th and Dodge  
Omaha, NE 68182

Wayne State Foundation  
Wayne State University  
Wayne, NE 68787

NEW JERSEY

Montclair State College Development Fund, Inc.  
College Hall  
Montclair State College  
Upper Montclair, NJ 07043

Ramapo College Development Fund  
505 Ramapo Valley Road  
Mahwah, NJ 07430
Richard Stockton State College Foundation
Stockton State College
Pomona, NJ 08240

Rutgers University Foundation
191 College Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
   Includes these universities:
   Rutgers University New Brunswick
   Rutgers University Newark

Foundation of the College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
100 Bergen Street
Newark, NJ 07103

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University Portales Foundation
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130

New Mexico Tech Research Foundation
Campus Station c/o President
Socorro, NM 87801

The New Mexico State University Foundation, Inc.
Box 3590
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Wats Foundation
Box 680
Western New Mexico University
Silver City, NM 88061

NEW YORK

Alfred University Research Foundation
Alfred University
Alfred, NY 14802

The University Foundation at Albany
State University of New York at Albany
AD 239
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12222

The Foundation of the State University of New York at Binghamton, Inc.
Vestal Parkway East
Binghamton, NY 13901
University of Buffalo Foundation, Inc.
250 Winspear Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14215

Stony Brook Foundation, Inc.
State University of New York at Stony Brook
P.O. Box 666
Stony Brook, NY 11790

New York State College of Forestry Foundation, Inc.
SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, NY 13210

State University College at Brockport Foundation, Inc.
Box 283
Brockport, NY 14420

Buffalo State College Foundation, Inc.
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14222

College Development Foundation of Cortland
SUNY College at Cortland
Cortland, NY 13045

Fredonia College Foundation, Inc.
2145 Fenton Hall
State University of New York
Fredonia, NY 14063

The Geneseo Foundation, Inc.
State University of New York at Geneseo
P.O. Box 425
Geneseo, NY 14454

Percy I Bugbee Foundation
State University of New York at Oneonta
Oneonta, NY 13820

State University College of Oswego Foundation, Inc.
Culkin Hall
State University College of Oswego
Oswego, NY 13126

Plattsburgh College Foundation, Inc.
State University College
Plattsburgh, NY 12901

The Purchase College Foundation
Purchase College
Purchase, NY 10577
Upper Division College Foundation at Utica/Rome, Inc.
State University of New York Utica/Rome
811 Cort Street
Utica, NY 13502

Empire State College Foundation, Inc.
Empire State College
2 Union Avenue
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Maritime College at Fort Schuyler Foundation, Inc.
Fort Schuyler
Bronx, NY 10465

Research Foundation
State University of New York
P.O. Box 9
Albany, NY 12201

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University Foundation, Inc.
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28607

East Carolina University Foundation
East Carolina University
Mamie Jenkins Building
Greenville, NC 27834

Elizabeth City State University Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 1467
Elizabeth City, NC 27909

Fayetteville State University Foundation
Administration Building
Fayetteville, NC 28301

North Carolina A & T University Foundation
1606 Salem Street
Greensboro, NC 27410

North Carolina Central University Foundation
P.O. Box 19363
North Carolina Central University
Durham, NC 27707

North Carolina School of the Arts Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 12189
Winston-Salem, NC 27107
Office of Foundations and Development
Box 5067
Raleigh, NC 27650
Includes these university foundations:
North Carolina Agricultural Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Design Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina State University Education Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Engineering Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Forestry Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Humanities Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina 4-H Development Fund, Inc.
North Carolina State University Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Pulp and Paper Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Textile Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Tobacco Foundation, Inc.
North Carolina Veterinary Science Foundation, Inc.

Office of Development
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
203 Steele Building
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
Includes these university foundations:
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Foundation
The Board of Trustees of the Endowment Funds of The
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Institutional Development Foundation, Inc.
Alumni Annual Giving
The Ackland Associates
The Botanical Garden Foundation, Inc.
The Business Foundation of North Carolina, Inc.
The Friends of the Library
The Journalism Foundation
The Law Alumni Association, Inc.
The Law Foundation, Inc.
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Arts and Sciences Foundation, Inc.
The Dental Foundation
The Medical Foundation of North Carolina, Inc.
The North Carolina Pharmaceutical Research Foundation, Inc.
The North Carolina Public Health Fund, Inc.
The Educational Foundation, Inc.

The Foundation at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Inc.
1490 Northwestern Bank Building
Charlotte, NC 28223
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Alumni House
Greensboro, NC 27412
Includes these foundations:
  Excellence Fund, Inc.
  Home Economics Foundation, Inc.
  Weatherspoon Gallery Association

The Foundation at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington
P.O. Box 3775
Wilmington, NC 28406

Development Foundation of Western Carolina University, Inc.
P.O. Drawer Western Carolina University
Wilmington, NC 28406

Winston-Salem State University Foundation
Winston-Salem, NC 27102

NORTH DAKOTA

Dickinson State College Foundation
Room 119 - May Hall
Dickinson State College
Dickinson, ND 58601

Mayville State College Foundation
Mayville State College
Mayville, ND 58257

Minot State College Development Foundation
Minot State College
Minot, ND 58701

North Dakota State University Development Foundation
State University Station
Fargo, ND 58105

OHIO

Bowling Green State University Foundation, Inc.
c/o Alumni Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403

The Central State University Foundation, Inc.
Central State University
Wilberforce, OH 45384

The Cleveland State University Development Foundation, Inc.
2605 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115
Kent State University Foundation, Inc.
120 Kent Student Center
Kent, OH  44242

Medical College of Ohio at Toledo Foundation
C.S. 10008
Toledo, OH  43699

Miami University Foundation
Oxford, OH  45056

The Ohio University Fund, Inc.
P.O. Drawer 869
Athens, OH  45701

The University of Akron Development Foundation
320 East Buchtel Avenue
Akron, OH  44325

The University of Toledo Corporation
2801 West Bancroft Street
Toledo, OH  43606

The Wright State University Foundation, Inc.
Wright State University
Dayton, OH  45435

Youngstown Education Foundation
603 Wick Avenue
Youngstown, OH  44502

OKLAHOMA

Cameron University Foundation, Inc.
2088 West Gore Boulevard
Lawton, OK  73505

Central State University Foundation
Central State University
Edmond, OK  73034

East Central State College Foundation, Inc.
East Central State College
Ada, OK  74820

Langston University Development Foundation
P.O. Box 719
Langston, OK  73050

Northwestern Oklahoma State University Foundation, Inc.
Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Alva, OK  73717
Oklahoma State University Development Foundation  
Student Union South  
Stillwater, OK  74074  

University of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc.  
660 Parrington Oval, Room 214  
Norman, OK  73019  

University of Science & Arts of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3678  
Chickasha, OK  73018  

OREGON  

Eastern Oregon State College Foundation  
8th & K  
LaGrande, OR  97850  

Oregon College of Education Development Foundation  
Oregon College of Education  
Monmouth, OR  97631  

Oregon Tech Development Foundation  
Oregon Institute of Technology  
Oretech Branch PO  
Klamath Falls, OR  97601  

Oregon State University Foundation  
ADS A-524, Oregon State University  
Corallis, OR  97331  

Portland State University Foundation, Inc.  
P.O. Box 243  
Portland, OR  97207  

University of Oregon Development Fund  
P.O. Box 3346  
Eugene, OR  97403  

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation  
3181 Southwest Sam Jackson Park Road  
Portland, OR  97201  

PENNSYLVANIA  

The Bloomsburg Foundation, Inc.  
Community Activities Office  
Bloomsburg State College  
Bloomsburg, PA  19815
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General Alumni Association of California State College, Inc.
P.O. Box 666
California, PA 15419

Cheyney Development Fund
Box 91
Cheyney, PA 19319

The Service and Research Foundation of E.S.S.C., Inc.
East Stroudsburg State College
East Stroudsburg, PA 18301

The Edinboro Foundation
Edinboro Mall
Edinboro, PA 16412

Foundation for Indiana University of Pennsylvania
John Sutton Hall - Suite 3215
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705

Kutztown College Foundation
Kutztown College
Box 151
Kutztown, PA 19530

Lincoln University Foundation
Lincoln University
Lincoln, PA 19352

Friends of Lock Haven State College
Lock Haven State College
Lock Haven, PA 17745

The Mansfield Foundation
Mansfield State College
P.O. Box 431
Mansfield, PA 16933

Millersville College Foundation
Millersville College
Millersville, PA 17551

Behrend College Gifts and Endowments Foundation
Pennsylvania State University Behrend
Station Road
Erie, PA 16510

The Shippensburg State College Foundation
Shippensburg State College - Box 476
Shippensburg, PA 17257
Slippery Rock Foundation, Inc.
Slippery Rock State College
Slippery Rock, PA 16057

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island College Foundation
Rhode Island College
600 Mouth Pleasant Avenue
Providence, RI 20908

University of Rhode Island Foundation
21 Davis Hall
Kingston, RI 02881

SOUTH CAROLINA

The Citadel Development Foundation
The Citadel
Charleston, SC 29409

Clemson University Foundation
Clemson University
207 Sikes Hall
Clemson, SC 29631

College of Charleston Foundation
66 George Street
Charleston, SC 29412

The Francis Marion College Foundation
P.O. Box 7500
Florence, SC 29501

The Lander Foundation
Lander College
Greenwood, SC 29646

Health Sciences Foundation of the Medical University of South Carolina
171 Ashley Avenue
Charleston, SC 29403

South Carolina State College Educational Foundation
P.O. Box 1566
South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, SC 29117

University of South Carolina Educational Foundation
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
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Coastal Educational Foundation  
University of South Carolina at Conway  
Route 6, Box 275  
Conway, SC  29526

Carolina Piedmont Foundation  
University of South Carolina at Spartanburg  
Spartanburg, SC  29303

The Winthrop College Foundation  
Winthrop College  
Rock Hill, SC  29733

SOUTH DAKOTA

Black Hills State College Foundation  
1200 University Avenue  
Spearfish, SD  57783

Dakota State College Scholarship Foundation  
Dakota State College  
Madison, SD  57042

The Northern State College Foundation  
Northern State College  
Aberdeen, SD  57401

South Dakota State University Foundation  
Tompkins Alumni Center  
South Dakota State University  
Brookings, SD  57007

The University of South Dakota Foundation  
Clark at University  
Vermillion, SD  57069

University of South Dakota Springfield Foundation  
University of South Dakota Springfield  
Springfield, SD  57062

TENNESSEE

The Austin Peay State University Foundation  
The Austin Peay State University  
P.O. Box 688  
Clarksville, TN  37040

East Tennessee State University Foundation  
East Tennessee State University  
P.O. Box 24130 A  
Johnson City, TN  37601
Memphis State University Foundation
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

Middle Tennessee State University Foundation
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Tennessee State University Foundation
3500 Centennial Boulevard
Nashville, TN 37203

Tennessee Technological University
Box 5047
Cookeville, TN 38501
Includes these foundations:
Agriculture Foundation
Athletics Foundation
Business Administration Foundation
Education Foundation
Engineering Foundation
Fine Arts Foundation
Science and Humanities Foundation
Development Council

TENNESSEE

Angelo State University Foundation
2600 West Avenue
San Angelo, TX 96901

East Texas State University Foundation, Inc.
East Texas State University
Commerce, TX 75428

Lamar University Foundation
Lamar University
Beaumont, TX 77710

Midwestern State University Foundation, Inc.
c/o Office of University Affairs
Midwestern State University
Wichita Falls, TX 76308

North Texas State University Educational Foundation, Inc.
Box 13825
North Texas Station
Denton, TX 76201
Southwest Texas State University Development Foundation
Alumni House
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, TX 78666

Stephen F. Austin State University Foundation
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, TX 75962

Sul Ross Foundation, Inc.
Sul Ross State University
P.O. Box C-116
Alpine, TX 79830

University System of South Texas Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 1238
Kingsville, TX 78363

University System of South Texas
P.O. Box 6765
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Tarleton State University Development Foundation
P.O. Box T 309
Tarleton State University
Stephenville, TX 76402

Texas A & M University Development Foundation
Box J 7
Aggieland Station
College Station, TX 77844

North Texas State University Health Science Center
Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine
North Texas State University Health Science Center
Montgomery at Camp Bowl
Fort Worth, TX 76107

The University of Texas at Tyler Educational Foundation, Inc.
c/o People's National Bank
P.O. Box 2001
Tyler, TX 75710

University of Houston Foundation
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004

Texas Tech University Foundation
Texas Tech University
P.O. Box 4650
Lubbock, TX 79409
Texas Woman's University Foundation
P.O. Box 22939
Texas Woman's University Station
Denton, TX 76204

University of Texas at Arlington Foundation
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, TX 70619

University of Texas at El Paso "Excellence Fund"
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

The Houston Health Science Center Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 20036
Houston, TX 77025

West Texas State University Foundation
P.O. Box 909 WT
Canyon, TX 79016

UTAH

University of Utah Development Foundation
306 Park Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Utah State University Foundation
1309 East 700 North
UMC 93
Logan, UT 84322

Weber State College Development Fund
Weber State College
Ogden, UT 84408

VIRGINIA

George Mason University Foundation
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Longwood College Foundation, Inc.
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901

James Madison University Foundation, Inc.
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
Mary Washington College Foundation, Inc.
Mary Washington College
College Avenue
Fredericksburg, VA 22401

Norfolk State University Foundation
Norfolk State University
Norfolk, VA 23504

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA 23508
  Includes these foundations:
  Old Dominion University Education Foundation
  Old Dominion University Intercollegiate Foundation

Radford College Foundation, Inc.
Radford College
Box 5796
Radford College, VA 24142

These foundations are connected with the University of Virginia at Charlottesville:

  The University of Virginia Fund
  P.O. Box 3446, University Station
  Charlottesville, VA 22903

  The Law School Foundation
  University of Virginia
  Charlottesville, VA 22903

  The Darden Graduate Business School Sponsors
  University of Virginia
  P.O. Box 6550
  Charlottesville, VA 22903

  The Virginia Student Aid Foundation
  University of Virginia
  P.O. Box 7525
  Charlottesville, VA 22903

  The Medical School Foundation
  University of Virginia
  P.O. Box 324, School of Medicine
  Charlottesville, VA 22903

  The Virginia Engineering Foundation
  Thornton Hall
  University of Virginia
  Charlottesville, VA 22903
The School of Education Foundation  
Ruffner Hall  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Medical College of Virginia Foundation  
P.O. Box 234  
JMCV Station  
Richmond, VA 23298

Richmond Professional Institute  
901 West Franklin Street  
Richmond, VA 23284

Virginia Military Institute Foundation, Inc.  
P.O. Box 932  
Lexington, VA 22450

Virginia Polytechnic Institute Educational Foundation, Inc.  
220 Burruss Hall  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

WASHINGTON

Eastern Washington University Foundation  
216 Showalter Hall  
Eastern Washington University  
Cheney, WA 99004

The Evergreen State College Foundation  
The Evergreen State College  
Daniel J. Evans Library (3105)  
Olympia, WA 98505

Washington State University Foundation  
120 Freoch Administration Building  
Washington State University  
Pullman, WA 99164

The Western Foundation  
Western Washington University  
Bellingham, WA 98225

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield State College Foundation  
Bluefield State College  
Bluefield, WA 24701
Fairmont State College Foundation  
Fairmont State College  
Foundation Office  
Locust Avenue  
Fairmont, WV  26554

Glenville State College Alumni Foundation  
200 High Street  
Glenville, WV  26351

The Marshall University Foundation, Inc.  
Marshall University  
16th Street at Fourth Avenue  
Huntington, WV  25701

Shepherd College Foundation  
Shepherd College  
Shepherdstown, WV  25443

West Liberty State College Foundation, Inc.  
West Liberty State College  
West Liberty, WV  26074

West Virginia College of Graduate Studies Foundation, Inc.  
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies  
Institute, WV  25112

Tech Foundation, Inc.  
West Virginia Institute of Technology  
Box 22  
Montgomery, WV  25136

Greenbrier Osteopathic College Foundation, Inc.  
400 North Lee Street  
Lewisburg, WV  24901

West Virginia State College Foundation  
West Virginia State College  
Institute, WI  25112

West Virginia University Foundation, Inc.  
P.O. Box 894  
617 Spruce Street  
Morgantown, WV  26505

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin Eau Claire Foundation, Inc.  
105 Garfield  
Eau Claire, WI  54701
University of Wisconsin Green Bay
University of Wisconsin Foundation
702 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53706

University of Wisconsin LaCrosse Foundation, Inc.
1725 State Street
LaCrosse, WI 54601

University of Wisconsin Foundation
702 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53706

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Foundation, Inc.
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
800 Algoma Boulevard
Oshkosh, WI 54901

University of Wisconsin Platteville Foundation
Room 425
Karrmann Library
Platteville, WI 53818

University of Wisconsin River Falls Foundation
University of Wisconsin River Falls
River Falls, WI 54022

University of Wisconsin Stevens Point Foundation, Inc.
2100 Main Street
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Stout University Foundation, Inc.
c/o University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menominee, WI 54751

University of Wisconsin Superior Foundation, Inc.
University of Wisconsin Superior
Superior, WI 54880

University of Wisconsin Whitewater Foundation, Inc.
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, WI 53190

**WYOMING**

The University of Wyoming Foundation
P.O. Box 3963, University Station
Laramie, WY 82071
APPENDIX G

Selection of Organizational Patterns
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