This memorandum summarizes findings from the 2022 Survey on Collaboration Between Advancement and Academic Affairs conducted in collaboration with the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS). This study arose from the need for fundraising professionals and academic leaders to collaborate effectively in the context of rising financial and enrollment pressures on higher ed institutions. Despite the increasing need for revenue from fundraising, many schools find it difficult to develop productive partnerships between advancement and academic affairs.

There is little research in this area beyond the trade literature in philanthropy, encouraging “transparency” and “inclusivity,” or featuring titles like “Five Ways to Engage Faculty in Fundraising,” or “How to Promote Faculty Engagement in Development Efforts.” Given the paucity of research investigating collaboration in this critical area, our hope is that this study sparks and informs conversations among practitioners and researchers.

Why is collaboration more difficult at some schools than others? What can we learn about how advancement and academic affairs professionals work together or what they understand about one another’s work and priorities? How does this line up with our existing intuitions? How can institutional leaders promote communication and cooperation between the professionals most responsible for student learning and those who are charged with securing support for that mission? Are there ways that leaders can support and develop these essential collaborative relationships?

To address these questions, we developed and administered an online branching survey that asked parallel questions to advancement/development professionals and academic leaders (including faculty and academic administrators with faculty status.) The survey contained both closed and open-ended questions and was administered at 31 higher education institutions.

---

1 I am indebted to Charlie Blaich and Kathy Wise, who saw the potential benefit of this study for the HEDS membership and other schools. This work also benefited tremendously from the comments provided by Laura Palucki Blake of Harvey Mudd College. However, the final reports for each institution and this report are immeasurably better because of the editorial advice and guidance from Alston Boyd. Any shortcomings are mine and are likely a consequence of ignoring his wise counsel.

2 Fictional titles, though they will seem recognizable to most readers.

3 The study’s principle investigators, Frank Boyd (HEDS Senior Research Fellow and Vice President in the Higher Education Division of McAlister and Quinn) and Carlo Robustelli (Vice President of Advancement at Dickenson College), developed the survey in collaboration with a committee comprised of Diane Wilder (Haverford College), Ellen Peters (University of Puget Sound), Annie Hargrave (Guilford College), Laura Palucki Blake (Harvey Mudd College), Jacqueline Macneil (Eckerd College), Susana Santos (Whittier College), and Kait Wilcox (Grinnell College).
across the United States, ranging in size from 850 students to over 30,000. In total, 1,848 individuals completed the survey (512 advancement/development; 1,316 faculty) during the administration window from December 2021 to April 2022. In addition, each school was given the option of designing and including a set of questions tailored to their institution. Responses to those questions are not included in the results presented here.

Each institution has received a summary memo of their results as well as the raw data file for their institution, allowing them to compare the findings from their campus to those from the entire study. It is our hope that the data and findings will provide participating institutions with the information to begin (or continue) conversations about these crucial collaborative relationships.

The survey queries respondents about three aspects of cooperation with their counterparts: attitudes towards cooperation, prior experience with cooperation, and knowledge of their counterparts’ work. There are obvious and important connections between these areas, and the findings suggest how these dimensions are related.

**Attitudes**
The survey asked about the respondents’ attitudes regarding their institution’s priorities for fundraising, the importance of collaboration with their counterparts, and the awareness of each other’s work.

_**Institutional priorities.**_ Successful collaboration depends on a shared sense of priorities, and one of the key responsibilities of institutional leadership is to convey to institutional constituencies the strategic goals that they wish to inform the work of faculty and staff. It is a tremendous advantage when academicians and advancement have a shared understanding of institutional goals; conversely, it can be hard to promote collaboration when colleagues don’t agree on the desired outcome. Do academic leaders share with their advancement colleagues an understanding of the operational priorities for advancement on campus? We asked both groups to ordinally rank the institutional priorities for fundraising operations (1-7, with 1 being the highest priority).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.07 Cultivating prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72 Identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Augustana College, Centre College, Coe College, Dickinson College, Eckerd College, Furman University, Goucher College, Grand View University, Guilford College, Hampden-Sydney College, Haverford College, Illinois Wesleyan University, Jacksonville University, James Madison University, Lafayette College, Macalester College, Monmouth College, Providence College, Randolph-Macon College, St. Francis University, St. Norbert College, Susquehanna University, Union College, University of Alaska Southeast, University of Puget Sound, Valparaiso University, Warburg College, Washington and Jefferson, Whitman College, Whittier College, Whitworth University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>Engaging in stewardship of donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>Participating in constituent engagement events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>Applying for foundation grants in support of faculty member’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Drafting applications for institution-level grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>Managing of IT for fundraising and donor data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>Drafting applications for institution-level grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for faculty and advancement professionals represent the average priority ranking assigned by respondents across all 31 institutions surveyed for each functional area in fundraising. Of course, the scores for each individual institution depend on a variety of campus-specific conditions. For instance, schools in the middle of capital campaigns are likely to concentrate on major gifts, while institutions under budget pressures are likely to concentrate on current-use funds. It bears emphasizing that there is no arrangement of these functions that is necessarily ideal, since the optimal ordering will vary depending on current institutional goals.

Still, the consistency between the ordinal rankings produced by academic affairs and advancement indicates that both groups share some understanding of their institutions’ fundraising priorities. Both advancement professionals and academic leaders agree that the top priority is cultivating donors, with the next two priorities being “identifying prospective donors” and “engaging in stewardship.” The management of IT infrastructure and institutional grant-seeking occupied the last two spots for both academic leaders and advancement.

**Importance of Collaboration.** The survey presupposes that institutions *should* promote collaboration between academic leaders and advancement. Still, we asked each constituency how they view collaboration, specifically and particularly the importance of collaboration for the respondent’s work. Chart 2 summarizes those results. Advancement professionals generally place a higher emphasis on collaboration than their academic colleagues. One advancement professional shared, “I would LOVE it if the faculty became more engaged with major and planned gifts.” A very common sentiment expressed was an eagerness to know about faculty interaction with alumni. Many
expressed the need for help with responses such as, “identification of alumnae/i and donors for events and fundraising would be most helpful.

While many academic leaders understand that the resources raised by advancement can be important for their work, some faculty members see their professional responsibilities as independent of the fundraising function. Many faculty comments noted their limited understanding of fundraising, making it difficult for them to gauge the importance of collaboration. One comment from a faculty member reflected a relatively common sentiment:

“I really have no idea what the advancement office does (besides bring in money, which is a pretty vague statement). I'd be happy to offer faculty support or work collaboratively, but I just don't know what to do or how to help.”

Other faculty members were more ambivalent, with one stating, “I'll admit that I'm pretty detached from all of this.” However, more faculty and academic leaders signaled the importance they place on collaboration with advancement. One respondent stated, “I really don't have much of an understanding of how I could be more engaged in any of them, but I am open to the idea.” Many more offered comments in the following vein: “I would be very interested in working in all aspects of advancement, any way I could be of help. I am especially interested in pitching projects and/or programs.”

**Awareness of Colleagues’ Work.** On balance, advancement and academic affairs agree that collaboration is at least somewhat important. Less than 20 percent of either group of respondents said that collaboration was not important at all, but that begs the question of how well the two groups understand and appreciate the work that their counterparts do. Successful collaboration requires some understanding of, and respect for, the work that both kinds of professionals do on campus.

Do academic leaders perceive that colleagues in advancement are aware of their work, and vice versa? Chart 3 graphically presents the answer to this question. The answer appears to be: “not really.” Nearly three-quarters of academic leaders perceive that their colleagues in advancement are only “slightly aware” or “not at all aware” of their work. For those who responded “not at all” or only “slightly aware”, we provided an open-ended opportunity to explain. One respondent volunteered that, “I'm not even sure where or how this information would be shared. At best, I feel that some knowledge gets shared via word of mouth.” Some respondents expressed interest in how they might share their work with colleagues in advancement, and others shared that they understood the advancement office to be understaffed.
Perceptions of counterpart awareness were slightly less pessimistic among advancement respondents, with 60.8% reporting that their faculty colleagues are “slightly aware” or “not at all aware” of their fundraising efforts. By way of explanation, one respondent suggested, “Our work for the most part is not a priority or focus of the faculty,” and others suggested that resources provided a constraint on mutual awareness: “Lean staffing on both sides means we don't have the extra time needed to provide more of this type of education - on either side.”

**Attitudes about grant-seeking.** Finally, the survey asked respondents’ attitudes about one area in which faculty and advancement professionals are likely to collaborate: grant-seeking. The organizational home of the grant office is often but not always in advancement, and institutional grant applications require coordination between advancement and academic affairs. Chart 4 presents the respondents’ evaluation of three functional areas in grant-seeking: identifying external resources, providing additional support for drafting and submission, and collecting additional information about opportunities related to the respondents’ work. Their responses are arrayed on a scale of 1-100, indicating the degree to which respondents believe that additional support in each function would help secure more external grants. The responses were similar among faculty and advancement professionals, while differing very slightly in magnitude.

Most of the institutions in the study have grants offices, often with small staffs between 1-4 people, though there are several participating institutions who do not have an FTE that is dedicated to support grants work. Capacity matters, since prospecting the grant opportunities from the federal government and private foundations is resource intensive. Each group reported that identifying external resources related to the institution’s strategic goals would significantly enhance capacity (faculty 68/100; advancement 69/100). The same goes for the drafting and submission of grant applications. Faculty and advancement both indicate that additional support in this area would increase capacity (faculty 68/100; advancement 62/100). Finally, both groups volunteered that information about grants related to their work would be valuable. This response in combination with the others on Chart 4 expresses the

---

5 Note the scale of Chart 4 is shorter, running from 54-70. Both advancement and academic respondents reported that enhancing each of these functions would increase their capacity to secure grant funding. The scale is shortened to better illustrate the variation among the three functions.
straightforward position that increased capacity would be a boon to efforts at securing external grants.

**Behavior: How do Advancement and Academic Affairs Collaborate?**

Aside from their attitudes about collaboration, the survey asked the respondents to reflect on their experiences. How are colleagues cooperating with each other? In what areas are academic leaders and advancement professionals collaborating? We asked respondents how often they had collaborated on some of the most common fundraising functions. The results are summarized in Chart 5.

The most frequent area of collaboration for both advancement and academics is with constituent engagement (faculty: 32.7%; advancement: 49.2%). This is hardly unexpected given the wide range of contexts in which faculty might collaborate with advancement while engaging school constituents. For instance, most faculty members will participate—even sporadically—in recruitment efforts for students, such as their version of Parents’ Day, homecoming events, and so on.

Advancement also reports higher levels of collaboration with their academic counterparts in some of the core work of fundraising: the cultivation and stewardship of donors (faculty: 14.5%; advancement: 34%). When meeting with prospective donors, gift officers often partner with faculty members. One respondent remarked, “It’s all about building on relationships that many of our donors began when they were students.” Another remarked that they wish faculty understood “….the impact that they have in showing our college.”

For their part, faculty and academic leaders report that the second most common area of cooperation is when they apply for grants related to their scholarly work.\(^6\) The sponsored

\(^6\) We return to this issue later in the report.
research or corporate and foundation relations office is often part of the advancement operation, so the preparation and submission of proposals requires that faculty draw on the expertise of this office.

When collaborating, individuals in academic affairs and advancement tend to work with only a few counterparts, in many cases only one colleague in the other area. Chart 6 shows that very few professionals in either academic affairs or advancement have working relationships with multiple colleagues. Perhaps even more striking, a full 34% of faculty do not collaborate with any advancement colleagues in an average year. There are many factors that might explain this statistic, especially given the modest advancement staff size at many institutions and the increasing workload experienced by faculty and academic administrators. Some advancement responses suggest that schools could better help faculty understand their crucial role in securing gifts.

were asked to volunteer areas of collaboration with which they would like more involvement. One very common response was “Applying for foundation grants in support of faculty work.” Many of the other comments focused on interacting with donors and specifically securing resources for their program.

Knowledge and Perceptions of Fundraising and Colleagues’ Work
This final section addresses questions about knowledge and the perception of knowledge, first considering whether the respondents have a shared understanding of the best strategies for fundraising. Then, the discussion turns to how respondents perceive that their work is understood by their counterparts.

The literature on philanthropic giving is clear: the most effective way to increase fundraising dollars is to enhance the donors’ connections to the institution. The process of drawing alumni and friends closer to the school expands the pool of donors, and it also increases the size of gifts to the institution. For some schools, however, short term exigencies often mean that fundraising activity must focus on other activities.7 Advancement clearly understands the importance of connecting to constituencies, with nearly 70% of respondents indicating that the most effective for increasing fundraising revenue is to draw potential donors closer to the school.. Similarly, a plurality of faculty and academic leaders identified this activity as the most important, though at a significantly lower percentage (47%).

---

7 It is far beyond the scope of this study, but many schools face budget pressures that make current-use gifts more important than major gifts, which can be deferred or restricted. Fundraisers can feel squeezed between the instruction to increase the “dollars in the door,” even as they are charged with increasing total giving.
The data in Chart 7 provides an overview how respondents understand these strategies. Academic respondents also placed importance on “better educating donors about institutional strengths” and “putting bolder aspirational plans” in front of donors.

These findings show that a majority of advancement respondents and a sizable plurality of faculty participants correctly identify the most effective mode of fundraising. Still, there are no institutions that would not benefit from an ongoing conversation about fundraising goals, strategies, and techniques. A number of faculty shared that they have little contact with advancement, and as a result their understanding of operations remains weak. One respondent wrote “I have never spoken to anyone in advancement outside the context of work with alumni.”

Effective collaboration requires an understanding of the respective responsibilities of advancement officers and of faculty. Equally important, however, is that each constituent trusts that his or her collaborators understand the nature and goals of his or her own work.
Throughout the open-ended responses to the survey, both advancement professionals and faculty expressed the belief that their counterparts don’t understand their jobs. Those perceptions are evident in the data presented in Charts 8 and 9, which illustrate the proportion of respondents who believe their counterparts have little or no knowledge of their work.

Chart 8 summarizes the responses from faculty, indicating that more than half of all respondents believe that advancement has little or no knowledge of six out of seven areas of the faculty’s professional responsibility. More than 60 percent of faculty believe that their advancement colleagues don’t understand the professional incentives (and, by extension, the disincentives) for them to engage in fundraising activities. They hold similar perceptions about advancement professionals understanding of the needs of their department, the tenure/promotion process, teaching demands, and scholarship.

Chart 9 presents a similar summary of how advancement respondents perceive their faculty colleague’s knowledge of fundraising work. Advancement professionals have a discouraging
view of their colleagues’ understanding of the different processes that are fundamental to fundraising work.

This perception explains many of the open-ended responses provided by fundraisers.

Fundraisers frequently expressed a desire for faculty to understand more about how gifts are realized. One advancement respondent commented that, “Developing a major gift prospect takes years. And a major gift may take 20 years, as many contacts and half as many proposals to achieve.” A number of these comments focused on the long-term, non-linear process of cultivation for major gifts, emphasizing “…that fundraising is primarily long-term relationship-building with prospective donors on multiple levels and through multiple contacts at the university over time.”

Still, when asked to volunteer two things that fundraisers wish that faculty understood about their work, the most common response emphasized the importance of faculty in successfully cultivated donors. A typical comment read, “We respect the work that they do and recognize their importance as connections to our alumni/future leaders. We want you to be open to partnering with us because working together will create better fundraising outcomes.”

Conclusions
The findings that are summarized in this report should be seen as an invitation for discussion on campuses, and there is great reason for optimism about the potential for collaboration between fundraisers and academicians. Here are some key conclusions that can be drawn from this report.
• The vast majority of respondents express an eagerness to collaborate with their counterparts, which suggests that most campuses have the capacity for expanded cooperation.

• Most campuses have a significant opportunity to support future collaboration by ensuring that fundraising tactics and goals are clearly and repeatedly articulated.

• A non-trivial percentage of faculty members do not have a clear sense of how fundraisers attempt to connect donor interests to institutional mission.

• Advancement professionals sometimes express a disconnect from faculty and their work, especially how their workload in some instances makes it difficult to consistently partner on fundraising.

• Leadership matters. Collaboration can be hindered when constituencies do not understand the current fundraising priorities, or fully comprehend how activities are related to longer- and short-term goals.

We will be sharing further analyses of these data in the coming months in an effort to get a stronger sense of the causal relationships that explain these summary findings. Moreover, we are exploring ways to support and inform an ongoing discourse about this very important relationship in higher education.
Welcome to the HEDS Survey on Collaboration between Advancement and Academic Affairs. Thank you for agreeing to participate!

We are giving this survey to advancement/development professionals and faculty (including academic administrators with faculty status) at colleges and universities to better understand how the members of these two communities understand one another’s work and identify ways to make their collaboration easier and more productive.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. There are no penalties if you decide not to participate or if you choose to skip any questions. The survey is very short and should take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

Your responses are anonymous. HEDS will send [Institution Name] its survey results after (a) we group your responses with those of other individuals, and (b) strip from the data information that might identify you (e.g., your name, email address).

Please note, anything you write in text boxes in response to open-ended questions will be sent to [Institution Name] exactly as you write it. If you do not want people at your institution to know who you are, please do not write anything in your text responses that might identify you.

By clicking “Next,” you indicate that you’ve agreed to participate in the survey. Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

Respondents will see a “Next” button here.

1. What is your role at [Institution Name]?
   □ Advancement/development professional
   □ Academic Affairs/Faculty

Respondents who answer “Advancement” will see Questions 2-11. Those who answer “Academic Affairs/Faculty” will be taken to Question 12.

Questions 2-11 and 27 are for advancement/development professionals. Questions 12-21 and 28-29 are for faculty. Everyone will see Questions 22-26.

Advancement/development professionals will see the next set of questions.

In the next two questions, we ask about your experiences with faculty at your institution. If you have not had any experience with something or do not have any basis for a response, please select “Never” or “No knowledge.”

2. Indicate the frequency with which you collaborate with faculty colleagues in the following areas of your work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Collaboration</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes used for identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in stewardship of donors</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for foundation or other extramural grants in support of faculty work</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting applications for institutional grants</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in constituent engagement events</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Over the course of a normal year, how many different faculty members do you typically work with to reach your advancement goals?

- Zero
- 1 – 5
- 6 – 10
- More than 10

4. Describe the level of knowledge that your faculty colleagues have about the following areas of your work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very knowledgeable</th>
<th>Generally knowledgeable</th>
<th>Some knowledge</th>
<th>Little knowledge</th>
<th>No knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes used for identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches for the cultivation of donors</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches for stewardship of donors</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction between restricted and unrestricted gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction between current use funds and endowment gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means and methods for constituent engagement</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to develop support from large foundations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fundraising priorities are established</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of IT for fundraising and donor data</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please rank the current importance for your institution of the following operational areas in advancement from 1 (Most important) to 7 (Least important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes for identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in stewardship of donors</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for foundation grants in support of faculty member’s work</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting applications for institution-level grants</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of IT for fundraising and donor data</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in constituent engagement events</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With which of the activities listed in the previous question would you like faculty to be more engaged?


7. To what extent are your faculty colleagues aware of your work?

- Very aware
- Aware
- Slightly aware
- Not at all aware

If advancement professionals indicate that faculty are only “Slightly aware” or “Not at all aware” of their work in Q6, they will see the following question.
7a. In the previous question, you indicated that faculty colleagues are “Slightly aware” or “Not at all aware” of your work in advancement/development. Why do you think faculty lack awareness of your work?

8. How important is collaboration with faculty for you to be effective in your work?
- Very important
- Important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

9. To what extent would the following enhance [your institution’s] capacity to secure more external grants (100=most opportunity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional information about grant opportunities related to fundraising goals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support in drafting and submitting grant applications</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying external resources related to your institution’s strategic goals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The key to raising more money each year is:
- Asking more people more often
- Getting current and prospective donors more engaged in the institution
- Putting bolder aspiration plans in front of donors
- Better educating donors about institutional strengths
- Stressing the critical needs of the institution
- Showcasing the best faculty

11. What are two things that you wish your faculty colleagues knew about your work at [Institution Name]?

Faculty will see the next set of questions.

In the next two sets of questions, we ask about your experiences with advancement/development professionals at your institution. If you have not had any experience with something or do not have any basis for a response, please select “No knowledge” or “Never.”

12. Indicate the frequency with which you collaborate with colleagues from advancement/development in the following activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes used for identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in stewardship of donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for foundation grants in support of faculty member’s work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting applications for institution-level grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in constituent engagement events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of IT for fundraising and donor data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Over the course of a normal year, how many different colleagues in advancement do you typically work with?

   - Zero
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - More than 10

14. Describe the level of knowledge that your colleagues in advancement/development have about the following areas of your work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very knowledgeable</th>
<th>Generally knowledgeable</th>
<th>Some knowledge</th>
<th>Little knowledge</th>
<th>No knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time demands for teaching students at your institution</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of your non-teaching professional responsibilities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service responsibilities of faculty</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource needs of your artistic/scholarly work</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource needs of your department</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands on you for the tenure/promotion process at your institution</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional incentives for faculty to engage in fundraising</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please rank the current importance for your institution of the following activities in advancement from 1 (Most important) to 6 (Least important).

   - Current importance
     - 1 = Most important, 6 = Least important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent relations</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes for identifying prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating prospective donors for major gifts</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in stewardship of donors</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for foundation grants in support of faculty member’s work</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting applications for institution-level grants</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in alumni engagement events</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. With which of the activities listed in the previous question would you like to be more engaged?

17. To what extent are advancement/development professionals at your institution aware of your work?
If faculty indicate that advancement/development professionals are only “Slightly aware” or “Not at all aware” of their work in Q14, they will see the following question.

17a. In the previous question, you indicated that your colleagues in advancement are “Slightly aware” or “Not at all aware” of your work at the institution. Why do you think your colleagues in advancement lack awareness of your work?

18. To what extent would the following enhance [your institution’s] capacity to secure more external grants (100=most opportunity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional information about grant opportunities related to your work</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support in drafting and submitting grant applications</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying external resources related to your institution’s strategic goals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How important is collaboration with advancement/development professionals for you to be effective in your work?
   □ Very important
   □ Important
   □ Slightly important
   □ Not important at all

20. The key to raising more money each year is:
   □ Asking more people more often
   □ Getting current and prospective donors more engaged in the institution
   □ Putting bolder aspiration plans in front of donors
   □ Better educating donors about institutional strengths
   □ Stressing the critical needs of the institution
   □ Showcasing the best faculty

21. What are two things that you wish your advancement colleagues knew about your work at [Institution Name]?

All respondents—advancement/development professionals and faculty—will see the following questions, Q12-26.

Note: Institutions may add up to five questions that are specific to their local context. These questions can be for advancement staff, academic affairs/faculty, or both.
In this last section, we ask questions about your identity, background, and affiliation with [Institution Name]. You may choose not to respond to any of these questions. We use responses to these questions to develop a picture of how different colleagues have different experiences with collaboration at your institution.

22. What is your gender identity?
   □ Man
   □ Woman
   □ Nonbinary, please self-describe: ____________
   □ Prefer not to respond

23. Please indicate the race or races with which you identify. (Choose one or more)
   □ American Indian or Alaska Native
   □ Asian
   □ Black or African American
   □ Hispanic or Latina/o
   □ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   □ White
   □ Prefer not to respond

24. How long have you been at [Institution Name]?
   □ 1-3 years
   □ 4-8 years
   □ 9-15 years
   □ 16+ years
   □ Prefer not to respond

25. How long have you been in your current role at [Institution Name]?
   □ 1-3 years
   □ 4-8 years
   □ 9-15 years
   □ 16+ years
   □ Prefer not to respond

26. Please select your age group:
   □ 18-24
   □ 25-34
   □ 35-44
   □ 45-54
   □ 55 or older
   □ Prefer not to respond
Question 27 will only be shown to advancement respondents.

27. Please indicate your primary area in advancement.
   □ Alumni engagement
   □ Parent relations
   □ Annual fund
   □ Corporate and foundation relations
   □ Advancement events
   □ Prospect research
   □ Major gifts
   □ Planned giving
   □ Administrative support
   □ Other

Questions 28-29 will only be shown to faculty respondents.

24. Please indicate your academic rank.
   □ Instructor/lecturer
   □ Assistant professor
   □ Associate professor
   □ Professor
   □ Other
   □ Prefer not to respond

25. Are you a tenure-track faculty member?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Prefer not to respond

[The following message appears after respondents click the “Submit” button.]

Thank you for taking the time to answer the questions on the Survey on Collaboration between Advancement and Academic Affairs! We appreciate your feedback.