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Introduction

SUSAN K. MARTIN

It is axiomatic that the only constant is change itself. All societal institutions, libraries certainly included, can be viewed through the lens of this constant change over the years, decades, and centuries. A previous editor of Library Trends has said: “The various issues of Library Trends are usually concerned with the past and/or the present circumstances of a given topic in an attempt to understand and to explain the developments that have taken place (Goldhor, 1997, p. 1).

This issue on library fund-raising and development, by the very nature of the topic it addresses, straddles the immediate past, our present concerns, and attempts to foresee the situations in which libraries and librarians may find themselves in the future. Development and fund-raising are complex tasks, and ones that the librarians of today are typically not educated to pursue. However, it is not merely libraries, but all eleemosynary and other nonprofit institutions, private and public, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries that find themselves increasingly in need of the charitable support of individuals, foundations, corporations, and government programs in order to survive. The United States is not the only country in the world that does not provide direct support to these kinds of organizations, but it is far and away the leader. Our tax structure has therefore led to incentives to individuals and organizations to give away their dollars to the less wealthy institutions of the country—an arrangement not familiar to other countries or cultures. It seems only reasonable, and also necessary, to take full advantage of this motivation to give. As a result, libraries, universities, hospitals, and many other kinds of
organizations have created positions for development professionals—a term that one might not have understood as recently as a generation ago (or, in more concrete terms, as recently as 1975).

A handful of such institutions, some truly needy, some by now extremely wealthy, began to raise monies from external supporters a century ago or longer. The very large endowments boasted by Harvard and Yale University libraries, and by independent libraries such as the Linda Hall and New York Public Libraries, have come into being because of gifts and investments made long ago and wisely. Those whose institutions come more recently to the game of fund-raising may feel as though we are poorly off by comparison. In fact, we are now laying the groundwork for our successors of one or two generations from now. We won't have caught up with Harvard, but the endowments of our libraries and parent institutions, whether public or private, will be quite respectable. In fact, those institutions unable to raise funds to complement the budgets provided by their parent organizations may have found themselves in serious difficulty.

In my own career as a library administrator, fund-raising has been my primary task for more than fifteen years, through three positions—two as director of an academic library and one in a government agency. I have watched with interest as my colleagues at other institutions have jumped into this field, some with anguish and others with pleasure. We have shared the dilemma of attracting supporters to libraries which serve all but yet belong to none, particularly in large universities with competing interests such as athletics, performing arts, sciences, and student organizations, or in large cities with operas, symphonies, and other cultural activities. The master's degrees in library and information science, which barely prepared us for administration, much less fund-raising, will need to change in the coming years to allow graduating students to be more cognizant of, and proactive in, the economically constrained world in which they are likely to find themselves.

Thus, this issue of Library Trends is designed to probe the philosophical and organizational bases of library development and fund-raising, to look at the distinctions between development in academic and public libraries, and to infer some trends for the immediate future. None of the authors mentions it directly, but the stereotype of the librarian as an introspective and shy person will not withstand a future in which the needs are for librarians who must be visionary and persuasive.

The articles in this issue represent primarily academic libraries. It is these libraries that are in the midst of a spate of university capital campaigns, and whose leaders are increasingly conscious of the need to assert the library's development program. The definition of the organization to support the development program; the barriers placed before libraries wishing access to university alumni; the need to press library priorities to
become university priorities—all these have taken on an urgency not well known before the past two decades.

The issue does not contain an article about special collections. Again, readers must not assume that this is because special collections librarians do not need to worry about development, but rather that the general topics apply to special collections as well as to general librarians. In many libraries, special collections are the focus of fund-raising, acting as a lure to potential donors of dollars and gifts-in-kind. As an example, Harvard's Houghton Library—the special collections library—has had a Friends' group for many decades. It is only recently that the main library there has established a Friends' group to address more broadly the needs of the entire body of resources.

A third major topic is that of capital campaigns. Almost every article in this issue refers to capital campaigns, but there is no single article devoted entirely to this specialty. Capital campaigns are generally massive and complex activities. The role of the library in such campaigns is worthy of either an entire journal issue or a book. Those who have participated in bringing together this publication hope that it will be helpful to librarians in all kinds of libraries and all locations, and also to those administratively responsible for the information functions of an institution, whether it be a university, a municipality, or an association.

Robert Wedgeworth examines fund-raising and donor relations from the broader perspective of public relations and reflects on the philosophies and overarching principles of fund-raising. Having been responsible for this activity in a large professional association (the American Library Association), a graduate school, and a large research library, he is able to shed light on the genesis and context of library development.

It was with pleasure that I found the survey that had been conducted for the California State University system by Irene M. Hoffman, Amy Smith, and Leslie DiBona. I asked them to expand their assessment of this survey and its implications for all kinds of libraries in institutions of higher education. Some of the conclusions that they have reached may be seen as foregone; however, to my knowledge, no one before has done this kind of survey to allow us to say with a better degree of certainty that this area of our profession is moving in a specific direction. Their analyses of centralized versus decentralized fund-raising operations is particularly astute. With the permission of the editor, I contributed an article based on my own experiences of the past and thoughts about the future. This article addresses major gifts, the organization of fund-raising, staffing, and the role of the library development program within the academic community.

Annual fund programs that raise unrestricted dollars are gaining in significance in academic libraries. Jennifer Paustenbaugh and Lynn Trojahn explore the keys to success for an annual fund program and
describe the political issues that can hamper the progress of a library in establishing an annual fund. Some major barriers common to libraries, such as access to the institution’s alumni database, are discussed.

At Brown University, Merrily Taylor has carefully and very successfully established a friends of the libraries’ group that is now thriving. With her experience, she shares with the reader the steps required to go from either no external support, or unorganized external support, to external support that is self-organizing and nationwide or even worldwide. Among the topics she addresses are those of support for special collections versus support for libraries in general and the legal organization of Friends’ groups (as part of the library versus separate from the library and the university).

Edwin S. Clay, III, and Patricia C. Bangs describe a public library environment in which the library has successfully developed a public-private model for fund development. Most significant in their work is their effort to bring entrepreneurship to the library. The public library foundation—commonly used within the public library setting—is analyzed.

Finally, “just click here” could be used as the summation of Adam Corson-Finnerty’s proposition that the future of library development and fund-raising will be the continuation of the information technologies that we and millions of others use every day to send messages, buy products, advertise services, and communicate information. He suggests that we are not yet using these technologies properly for fund-raising although we were among the first to use them to convey our traditional products and services. “Cybergiving” is likely to become part of our lives in the immediate future.

I hope that these authors—some of whom are librarians, others development professionals—will provide a valuable resource for readers as they become further involved in development and fund-raising at their own institutions. For those who have thus far been unable to hurdle the political constraints imposed by a central development office, I hope that these articles will provide the ammunition with which to engage in new conversations about the necessity for the library to become active in this area. And for those already successfully involved with Friends’ groups, capital campaigns, and the like, we hope that you will be able to take some ideas away with you, and that you will contact us with ideas of your own.

Library fund-raising and development will grow and change along with our institutions, the economy, and other societal factors. This issue reflects an early step for a rather young specialty to come to grips with its underlying philosophies, successes, barriers, and relationships to the rest of the library and information field. Much more remains to be written about fund-raising in libraries. The units within associations such as the American Library Association that bring together librarians and development professionals who have a shared interest will undoubtedly stimulate
further examination of how people are prepared for the roles of library administrator and library development professionals.

One of the primary influences of a careful examination of library fund-raising will and should be the placement of the library as a priority within the parent institution. As we enter the twenty-first century, the age that we have called one of information, there must also be an implicit recognition of the library as a key player in this information society and one for which both internal and external support is necessary and critical.
Donor Relations as Public Relations: Toward a Philosophy of Fund-Raising

ROBERT WEDGEWORTH

ABSTRACT
In the mid-1970s, the late Betty Stearns, vice president of the Public Relations Board, Inc., introduced me to the concept of identifying and cultivating multiple publics related to nonprofit organizations. This marked the beginnings of a professional public relations program for the American Library Association (ALA) that did more than issue press releases. That experience continued to be useful. Most recently, it helped prepare me to work with Joan C. Hood, director of Library Development and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois, as we developed a multimillion-dollar campaign for library endowments. Over the years, I have found that whether soliciting and retaining members of organizations, building alumni loyalties, or cultivating donors, while techniques may differ, the process of identifying and developing constituencies is essentially the same.

BACKGROUND
Fund-raising is not a well-researched activity. Within the library field there is even less upon which to base the development of a philosophy of fund-raising. What we do know is that fund-raising at some institutions for many years has been used as a source of both recurring and current revenue. Libraries in private academic institutions have been engaged in fund-raising for decades. Some libraries in public academic institutions like Illinois have extensive experience in fund-raising as well. However, until recently, few of them included a separate development position on the library management team. Campus-wide fund-raising personnel have directed most academic library fund-raising. Most campus-wide fund-raising
personnel are guided by external consultants that almost uniformly recommend against separate library subcampaigns and library fund-raising professionals. While their reasoning is not entirely clear, it can be attributed to the experience of organizing academic fund-raising campaigns around alumni of the institution. Since the library has no major or minor degrees, identifying and cultivating library donors is more complex than for academic departments.

Where libraries have organized fund-raising activities, the campaign appears to be driven by the funding need rather than by any broader rationale that integrates fund-raising into the management of the institution. Therefore, there is little recognition that fund-raising creates new constituencies that must be influenced and that, in turn, influence the institution. This essay presents a rationale for understanding the broader implications of fund-raising in academic libraries and for organizing it as an integral component of public relations activities.

INTRODUCTION

The fiscal crisis in higher education in the United States is well known. A recent two-year study by the Commission on National Investment in Higher Education, established by the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) in 1994, examined the financial health of America’s higher education sector (Commission on National Investment in Higher Education, 1999). The central finding was that costs and demands upon higher education were rising at unsustainable rates. It recommended increased public funding of higher education and a wide range of institutional reforms. Among the reforms recommended was that, “substantial savings and improved library services can be obtained by focusing on the software needed to place library resources on the Internet rather than continuing to support individual research library collections” (Commission on National Investment in Higher Education, 1999, p. 15). The report notes that a shift in the educational requirements of the workforce will place increasing demands on all levels of education. Minority ethnic groups and immigrants will need increasing access to higher education if we are to bridge the growing gap in earnings between the rich and the poor in the United States. This shift has come at a time when public investment in higher education has been declining.

An earlier report by the Association of Research Libraries showed a decline in library support as a percentage of the institutional educational and general (E & G) expenditures from 1981 through 1992 and extended these findings through 1996. For the eighty-eight research libraries reporting, the average percentage of their institutional E & G represented by library expenditures fell from 3.91 percent in 1981-82 to 3.32 percent in 1992. The graph extending these data to 1996 shows a continuing decline to 3.25 percent (Stubbs, 1994).
A number of reforms are likely to be activated to address these funding concerns, and additional public funding will be sought. Nevertheless, private funding is viewed increasingly as a means to ensure that libraries in higher education, private and public, can meet increased demands and costs. Many institutions have already mounted major fund-raising campaigns to increase endowments and to finance current programs including libraries.

Fund-raising as an activity for libraries is not new. However, fund-raising as an organized integral function of library management is new. For some time now, fund-raising professionals have used the term “development” to include not only fund-raising but also the planning and goal-setting activities that guide those activities. More recently, at the parent institution level in higher education, fund-raising has been incorporated with alumni relations and public relations under the current term of “institutional advancement” in some institutions. Both terms — “development” and “institutional advancement” — recognize the essential nature of activities that manage communications between an institution and its public constituencies for the specialized purpose of fund-raising. However, for purposes of this essay, the term “fund-raising” will be used and the broader set of activities implied by development and institutional advancement will be discussed as a specialized form of public relations.

**Academic Library Fund-Raising Experience**

A 1995 survey of fund-raising activities at 517 U.S. colleges and universities revealed that, while only 66 percent of all academic libraries engaged in fund-raising, 95 percent of the research libraries did. The most popular reasons given for fund-raising were technology costs (63.4 percent), parent organization encouragement (51.8 percent), cost of library materials (51.2 percent), and budget limitations (51.2 percent). The most popular “other reason” given was library construction. Of the libraries surveyed, government grants, book sales, and foundation grants were the most common types of fund-raising activities. Among the research libraries, nine types of fund-raising activities were used by at least 50 percent of the libraries, including foundation grants, government grants, Friends groups, book sales, institution-wide campaigns, corporate support, direct mail, major gifts, and annual funds. The most successful fund-raising activities among these institutions were foundation grants, institution-wide campaigns, Friends groups, major gifts, and direct mail appeals. The least successful were government grants and used book sales. Among prospective donors, the most success was experienced with former donors, friends, and alumni of the institutions. The results indicate that private academic institutions are more successful at fund-raising than public institutions. Private institutions favor foundations, while public institutions favor
government grants. Used book sales are popular but generally yield little income (Latour, 1995).

This study suggests that there are a number of academic libraries, especially research libraries, that are actively engaged in fund-raising. Although the experience varies with location and local circumstances, there is enough success to encourage the growth of fund-raising activity. Much library fund-raising activity is encouraged by the parent institution to address budget limitations in general as well as the growing costs of library materials and new technologies.

It is axiomatic that external consultants who make the initial recommendations about the goals and objectives of the campaign guide institution-wide fund-raising campaigns within academic institutions. The evaluation of such campaigns is usually based on the amount of money raised compared to the targets set. Much of the literature on fund-raising focuses on the processes and techniques employed. A book by Edles (1993), for example, is a complete step-by-step approach to fund-raising. He outlines six requirements that successful campaigns must fulfill:

1. The goals of your campaign must be compelling to ensure intense donor commitment.
2. Your organization’s growth patterns must be easily perceived.
3. Your organization or its key leaders must be strongly visible to the people whose support you expect.
4. Your chief executive and volunteer leadership must be highly competent, totally committed, and be proven excellent fund-raisers.
5. Your campaign’s needs must be specific, attractive, people-oriented, and have a sense of urgency.
6. The results of your campaign must be measurable (Edles, 1993, p. 8).

Two of the six requirements focus on leadership. Unless an academic library has its own development officer who reports to the library director, the principal leadership and guidance must come from the parent institution. Since the principal external advisers to the campus usually express negative attitudes toward library campaigns, the library is at a disadvantage before the campaign begins. External consultants also will usually advise the campus against a separate subcampaign for the library. The rationale for this recommendation is that library campaigns are generally unsuccessful. But campaigns at institutions like Pennsylvania State University, the University of Illinois, and the University of Pennsylvania are examples of library fund-raising success. The outcome of institution-wide campaigns without a library subcampaign is that a significant amount of potential funding for the library will be lost since many library gifts are second and third gifts made by the same donor. Without a specific campaign to solicit gifts for the library, many of these gifts would not materialize.
In thinking about a philosophy of academic library fund-raising, the elements that would appear to have an influence on outcomes are assumptions, goals, donors, and the impact of fund-raising on the library.

**Fund-Raising Assumptions**

There are some who assume that many gifts to libraries are "unrestricted," thus providing greater flexibility of action for library planning. However, in most cases, the majority of the gifts in library campaigns are restricted in response to the library's statement of need. While some donors are generous enough or ambivalent enough to give their confidence to the library management in applying their gift, most donors have a specific idea usually in response to the library's solicitation. They wish to honor a favorite faculty member in a specific field by endowing purchases of library materials in that field, or they wish to support specific technologies, or they wish to endow positions in the library. The most common unrestricted gift comes with the opportunity to name a space. Since the space has already been financed as part of the building, any funds that are not needed to furnish and equip the space are available for general purposes unless restricted by the donor.

Many campaigns are presented in a way to suggest that their success depends on a large donor base. However, the emphasis most external consultants give to fund-raising campaigns focuses on major gifts. This almost guarantees that most of the funds raised will come from a small group of donors.

Some leaders of fund-raising campaigns believe that the worthiness of the cause is enough to persuade most donors to be generous. This may work well in fighting dreaded diseases or responding to the charitable calls to improve the human condition but may not be effective with libraries. Students and faculty will not die if the library campaign is not successful nor will they go without food or housing.

Therefore, if a small group of donors is likely to be the major source of funds to meet the fund-raising objectives and the gifts are restricted to specific uses, the library has to be very persuasive to steer the gifts in a direction that is mutually acceptable.

**Fund-Raising Goals**

More than process and techniques, what library fund-raising needs most is a rationale that guides thinking, planning, and action. That rationale begins with the selection of the goals to be achieved through fund-raising. Fund-raising goals should convey a vision or a sense of how the institution pictures itself in the future. They should be compelling enough to generate excitement about what that future will be. The goals should also require the institution to reach but should not be so unrealistic as to
be beyond its grasp. Finally, the goals should be timely in order to communicate some urgency to the need for assistance from potential donors.

When the ALA sought to raise funds to assist in the furnishing of a new building in the early 1980s, the goal was to make 50 East Huron the most visible library-related address in the world. Members were compelled to express their pride in the ALA by participation in the fund-raising campaign. The funding objective was modest ($100,000), but the significance of the goal had impact worldwide.

When Illinois launched a $15 million library fund-raising campaign in 1994, the goal was to make Illinois the most accessible research library in the nation, thus restoring and maintaining its leadership position among research libraries.

Both of these goals were presented as windows of opportunity that would not remain open indefinitely if action was not taken immediately. These goals challenged donors to invest in a future of which they could be justly proud.

Many goals of library fund-raising campaigns are expressed in terms that are too technical for the average donor to understand. For example, one could envision a goal for a library to be the modernization of its technology infrastructure. The goal is admirable in view of the current impact of technologies on the operation of libraries. However, the goal might be improved if stated in terms of access to materials using all appropriate technologies. It is useful for all goals that deal with collections, facilities, or technologies to be stated in terms of benefits to users rather than assuming that potential donors can make that connection. People-oriented goals are generally more compelling than institution-oriented goals. Therefore, the ALA goal mentioned above might have been more compelling if it had been stated in terms of improvements to member services.

**Potential Donors**

Academic libraries have numerous constituencies from which to draw potential donors. Perhaps the most knowledgeable donors are the faculty and other employees of the institution. Since they are in a position to observe the activities of the library and to be aware of the general needs of the library, they can readily understand fund-raising appeals. However, this group does not necessarily represent those who are the most capable donors. In any fund-raising campaign, the group that represents the best potential is comprised of those who have given previously. Alumni and Friends groups are in a position to be generally knowledgeable about the institution and tend to include capable donors. Foundations and government agencies with interests and programs that are relevant to libraries can offer good potential as donors. Here again, if a foundation or government agency has contributed to the institution in the past, there is some basis for believing that it may be inclined to do so again. However, programs
change and program officers leave these institutions, making them less reliable as recurring sources of funds than individuals.

For all potential donors, the process of creating and maintaining a relationship is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign. In the case of foundations, corporations, government agencies, and a few individuals, the relationship tends to be more formal, characterized by written proposals in which the library makes certain commitments in exchange for funding. Many individuals respond with gifts to a general written appeal with few, if any, commitments from the institution. However, whether individuals or donor organizations, the larger the amount of the gift, the greater the formality, especially if it involves deferred gifts or bequests in which potential heirs have an interest. It is this process of determining the exact nature of the exchange between the donor and the library that needs careful thought and planning in order to avoid undesirable outcomes of fund-raising.

DONOR RELATIONS AS PUBLIC RELATIONS

If we accept Grunig and Hunt's (1984) definition of public relations as, "the management of communication between an organization and its public" (p. 6), then we are led to conclude that the management of donor constituencies is a specialized form of public relations. The significance of this conclusion is that public relations is usually well integrated as a management function both at the level of the academic library and at the level of the parent institution. Its practitioners tend to be well informed of the mission and goals of the institution and operate consistently with the activities of the leadership. Fund-raising professionals, in many instances, are not considered integral to the management team and as such may not be as knowledgeable about the mission and goals of the library. This is especially true if the library does not direct the fund-raising professionals on a library fund-raising campaign.

“All sources of donors—foundations, corporations, and individuals—have the potential for infringing on the autonomy of charitable organizations through their gifts” (Kelly, 1991, p. 495). Given this propensity for donors to influence the institution through their gifts, it places a greater responsibility on fund-raising professionals to be cognizant of potential infringements on the autonomy of the institution receiving the gift.

A common occurrence in academic libraries arises due to a lack of understanding of how the library operates on campus. Formal gift proposals intended to support library materials in specialized areas can be drafted in ways that give academic departments more authority over library acquisition processes than is normally the case. The difference between providing a gift to an academic department for purposes of general library materials as distinct from a gift to the library for materials to support a given academic discipline can be quite significant. A more signifi-
cant example of infringement on the autonomy or a distortion of organizational goals would be where a donor proposes funding for materials in a field dear to the heart of the donor, but a field in which there is no academic program or faculty to direct such an interest. This occurs more commonly with gifts in kind—gift collections—especially in smaller institutions with collections of limited scope. Another hypothetical example might be a donor wishing to provide funding for a facility—e.g., a rare books library or a departmental library—that is not in the plans of the library.

Infringements on the autonomy of institutions through gifts and grants are more often a very beneficial development. The National Endowment for the Humanities and foundations like the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation have exerted an enormous influence on the nation’s academic libraries to encourage collection growth and investments in the personnel, technologies, and techniques for the preservation of library materials. This has been especially true of the largely private independent research libraries where NEH funds “were made available for programs and efforts that meshed well with the interests of many librarians and directors in ‘democratizing’ their institutions by expanding access and introducing additional services aimed at new constituencies” (Bergman [with Bowen and Nygren], 1996, p. 150).

Alexander (1996) documents the experience of museums in assessing the impact of funding on their operations and aspirations. Her study addresses, “how changes in funding are related to consensus and conflict inside museums, especially between the curatorial and administrative sides” (p. 4). Given the long experience of museums with philanthropy and fund-raising, it would be well for the library field to take note of their experience.

Within the American Library Association, we have witnessed the twists and turns of an organization struggling with the role of fund-raising in the organization. The separate 501C(3) organization established to manage ALA’s fund-raising activities (Fund For America’s Libraries) has recently been disbanded in favor of an internal organization. More recently, we have seen a growing controversy over the growth of corporate fund-raising to support certain aspects of the Annual Conference:

The moneys that flow in from these sources can be used for good things, of course, and sometimes are, but they do come with a hefty price tag. One of the chief debilitating effects resulting from such large sums coming from electronic-resource companies is the marginalization of book publishers, chiefly small presses, who sit woebegone and doe-eyed at little booths. The book publishers—even venerable ones whom you would think would be given a place of pride at a conference devoted to reading and learning—literally cannot afford the floor space gobbled up by the big vendors for their technological trunk shows. (Wisner, 1999, p. 42)
These are not isolated and unrelated events, but a pattern of emerging conflicts and tensions that inevitably surround fund-raising as an activity in the library field. While the benefits of fund-raising are not challenged here, there is a need to be aware of, and to guard against, unacceptable consequences of fund-raising.

CONCLUSION

As we look toward a philosophy of fund-raising or a rationale that helps to explain the nature of fund-raising in academic libraries, it may be helpful to put this activity in the broader context of public relations. Since it involves managing communications with a potentially influential constituency that could exert significant influence over the future of libraries, it needs to be integrated into the overall management function of the library as a specialized form of public relations. While donors have the best interests of the library in mind when contemplating gifts, that does not guarantee that the expressed intention will be consistent with the plans and operations of the library.

Overall, the best protection the library can have to sustain its autonomy, while advancing its fund-raising objectives, is the institutionalization of the fund-raising process. To the extent that the organization's mission and purpose is firmly incorporated into the campaign goals, it tends to minimize inappropriate gifts. To the extent that library fund-raising campaigns are led by fund-raising professionals based in the library, they are likely to be more knowledgeable about the specialized needs and constraints of the library in fund-raising campaigns. For smaller institutions or institutions where professional fund-raising personnel may not be available, special programs to educate and inform these professionals responsible for library gifts may suffice. To the extent that the fund-raising process articulates well with the overall efforts to manage communications with external as well as internal constituencies, it will tend to minimize tensions between fund-raising personnel and other staff.

While research, cultivation, solicitation, and recognition will still be the fundamentals of the fund-raising process, its incorporation into the broader efforts of library management to improve the library's visibility, tell the library story, set a vision for the library of the future, and gain support from key constituencies is likely to result not only in successful fund-raising campaigns but also in a more effective organization.

Ensuring that the leadership of the academic institution understands these objectives and periodically evaluates the effectiveness of communication with the several library publics is essential to the development and implementation of an effective philosophy of fund-raising.
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Factors for Success: Academic Library Development Survey Results
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ABSTRACT
Library advancement has become a new area of need and specialization in academic libraries of all types. The results of a nationwide survey (see Appendix) provide information on this new trend and bring a better understanding of how academic library fund-raising programs are structured. The survey results are used to identify characteristics and elements of the fund-raising program that lead to success. The results also provide suggestions and items for consideration to assist library directors in their planning of new library advancement programs.

INTRODUCTION
Academic libraries have become active players in the fund-raising game. Over the past three years, we have witnessed a tremendous growth in fund-raising activities across the United States and Canada. Indicators of this trend include the growth of library fund-raising groups such as ALADN (the Academic Library Advancement and Development Network), the emergence of library fund-raising listservs such as LIBDEV, and a steady increase in the number of publications and presentations on fund-raising. As Charles Kratz (1998), 1997/98 president of ALA's Library Administration and Management Association, stated: “For some time now, libraries have been confronted by the reality of budgetary restrictions and the
spiraling cost of library materials and services. One perplexing aspect of this reality is that it will not go away . . . . This has made fund-raising an increasingly essential function for library leaders and managers" (p. 196).

Internally within the California State University system, we also noted some significant signals that fund-raising was becoming a library priority. Our first indication that a dramatic change was taking place within the profession was in our own institution. The California State University Libraries Strategic Plan (1994) states:

[...]

Today, seventeen of the twenty-three CSU campus libraries have a fund-raising program in place.

This emerging area of specialization has many implications. The two most critical are the skill set that will be required for library directors and the education and professional training that will be necessary to properly educate and prepare new professionals for this task.

This growing trend in academic library fund-raising was the catalyst for this study. As we noted this dramatic trend among ourselves, we began to wonder if what was happening within the CSU was in some way indicative of a larger trend among libraries nationally. Was fund-raising becoming a more prominent priority for other academic libraries? What was the professional background of the fund-raising staff? How much money was being committed to the fund-raising effort, and how much was being raised? We were curious to hear more about fund-raising successes in libraries as well as the makeup of their donor pool.

ABOUT THE SURVEY

The concept of the survey began with the hypothesis that fund-raising was becoming increasingly more prevalent throughout the academic library community. We wanted to learn more about the types of institutions engaged in fund-raising, the educational and professional background of development directors, and how these individuals are classified and compensated. We were also curious to learn how other libraries have progressed, what fund-raising programs were used and were successful and, finally, how we could begin to create a profile for success that could be beneficial for library administrators seeking to establish fund-raising programs. The goal of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the trends within academic library fund-raising and to determine benchmark
information that could be used in establishing library fund-raising pro-
grams in the future.

In 1996, the three authors, all from CSU campuses at the time, began work on the Academic Library Development Survey. The survey instrument was constructed to obtain information in three major areas:

1. Who is doing the fund-raising?
2. What is actually occurring in these fund-raising programs: how are they managed, how much do they raise, what are the funding priorities, and what programs seem to work?
3. What are the factors that help determine success?

After the survey instrument was completed (see Appendix), a decision on how to distribute it had to be made. Since there exists no formal listing of libraries engaged in fund-raising, the best approach for distribution was to utilize appropriate listservs. We selected listservs from ALADN (LIBDEV); Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL-Forum); Library Administration and Management Association, Fund-raising and Financial Development Section (LAMA-FRFDS); and California Academic & Research Libraries (CARL). However, due to the nature of listservs, we could not be certain of how many surveys were actually distributed. For example, we could estimate the number of subscribers on each list but could not know how many of these individuals passed the survey on to other staff. Nevertheless, we felt that this method of distribution was valuable, cost effective, and provided the greatest amount of visibility for our study.

In addition to distribution via listservs, direct mailings of the survey went to the thirty-five members of DORAL (Development Officers in Research & Academic Libraries) and to the 206 academic libraries within the state of California. This latter grouping received the survey as a result of a research grant from CARL. The grant provided an opportunity to analyze a California subset of the national study data to assess trends taking place within California as compared to the rest of the nation (Hoffman, Smith, & DiBona, 1998).

Follow-up mailings of the survey were sent to all DORAL members and California libraries, and reminder messages, with a copy of the survey attached, were posted to each listserv two additional times. We carefully monitored the receipt of all completed surveys to avoid duplication. In all, 157 surveys were completed and returned, representing ninety library development programs nationwide.

The Survey Results
In analyzing the data, we concentrated on three major areas of interest to learn more about the fund-raisers and their library fund-raising programs. We also studied the results to determine a few key factors that lead to success.
WHO IS DOING THE FUND-RAISING?

This area of the survey was designed to gain a better understanding of the types of people involved in library fund-raising, what types of institutions are involved, and what the responsibilities and compensation are for library development directors.

Education

Of the respondents, 54 percent were from graduate and undergraduate institutions, 36 percent from ARL institutions, and 65 percent from public institutions. The majority of individuals responsible for library development were women (71 percent). More than half the respondents—52 percent—were in their first fund-raising job, with an average length of time in the position at zero to three years. Of the respondents, 45 percent were in newly created positions.

The survey showed that, 76 percent of the respondents held a master’s degree (52 percent were degrees in library science and 45 percent held degrees in other disciplines). Only 3 percent of the survey respondents indicated any formal education in fund-raising. This implies that, for the most part, fund-raising is something that is learned on the job by the majority of respondents.

These results indicate that the professionals in academic library development are evenly split between professional librarians and professionals with degrees in other areas. Those development directors with library degrees, however, were more likely to have other library responsibilities than their counterparts who did not have the M.L.S. degree. These other responsibilities include public relations (76 percent), grants (52 percent), management (51 percent), strategic planning (48 percent), budget (54 percent), collection development (32 percent), statistical reporting (31 percent), reference (25 percent), and human resources (21 percent).

In the analysis, we compared salary (as of 1998) and educational degree. This cross tabulation illustrated a relatively equal split between those with degrees in librarianship and those with “other” degrees (see Table 1). At the upper end of the compensation range, librarians earn more than “other” degreed professionals do. Those earning $76,000 and above

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Library Degrees</th>
<th>“Other” Masters Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$76,000 and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$66,000 - $75,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,000 - $65,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26,000 - $40,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $26,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are all librarians, and most of those are library directors who do fund-raising as part of their job responsibilities.

Of those surveyed, women library development professionals earn more than men except at the upper salary range of $76,000 and above. The largest concentration of library development professionals (45 percent) earn between $41,000 and $65,999.

Experience

When it came to experience in fund-raising, half of the respondents indicated between zero to five years in fund-raising. Of these, most fall into the range of one to three years experience. However, 37 percent of all respondents indicated zero to five years experience in libraries and, of that group, nearly one-third have been in libraries one year or less. Another indicator of how new library fund-raisers are is the finding that 30 percent have been in their positions one to three years, two-thirds of whom have been on the job for less than one year.

Funding and Reporting Structure

Funding for these positions is handled in a variety of ways. In most cases (71 percent) the library provides funding. In 18 percent of the cases, funding is through the campus development office, and 2 percent of the library fund-raising programs support themselves. The library and the central advancement office jointly fund positions in 9 percent of the cases.

Academic library fund-raising usually occurs within the context of the campus-wide advancement program. Because of this, there are a variety of reporting models in use between the development director and the library director. Approximately 79 percent of the development directors report to the library director. This structure seems to occur most often in younger programs, suggesting that the library administration creates the position independently of campus development. Only 3 percent report solely to the head of university development, and 19 percent have a dual or “dotted-line” reporting relationship between the library director and/or the campus director of development. This type of dual reporting is more predominant in mature library programs and is more typical of university development programs in general.

Table 2.
Job Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>35 (24% tenured or tenure-track)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title, Salary, and Work

Nearly 85 percent of all the library development directors who responded to the survey work full-time. Regardless of classification (see Table 2), 70 percent participate as members of the library management team.

When position titles are compared to salary, library development directors are comparably compensated up to the salary of $66,000, whether classed as management staff or faculty. More faculty than management staff earn between $66,000 and $75,000; however, compensation for faculty drops dramatically while development directors classed as management staff (more than any other category) earn $76,000 or above. Staff and "other" classifications earn considerably less and most fall within the $26,000 to $40,000 range. This trend again seems to be more prevalent in newer programs where fund-raising has not yet been given a full-time focus.

THE FUND-RAISING PROGRAMS

According to survey results, library fund-raising programs are proliferating. Most of the survey responses came from programs that have been in existence for ten years or less (see Table 3). We received only one response from a program in existence for twenty-five years. Where this trend is happening becomes clearer when we look at the types of libraries that responded to the survey. The majority of respondents, 81 percent, 63 percent of which are public institutions, are from non-ARL libraries. While these numbers may not be representative of all library programs, it is clear that there has been a national surge in new programs beginning in recent years.

Table 3.
AGE OF FUND-RAISING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3 years of age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 10 years of age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>85 total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOALS AND COSTS OF FUND-RAISING

Fund-raising goals were another area of interest. The average goal was $1.1 million per year. This number is skewed because some institutions were involved in a capital campaign at the time of their response and included their campaign goals when answering this question. About 79 percent indicated goals of up to $1 million; however, the average annual goal seemed to be in the $600,000 range.

To begin to gauge the amount of private support being raised by academic library fund raisers, we asked for the estimated average amount
raised annually (this time excluding campaign year averages). More than 45 percent of the respondents raised up to $100,000 annually. However, when we broke down the private support by type of institution, we found that public institutions raised an average of $450,000 while private institutions raised an average of almost $900,000.

The following breakdown of types of gifts also provides insight: 47 percent of all gifts are outright cash gifts from individuals; 29 percent are planned gifts; 17 percent are gifts in kind; and 19 percent are gifts from corporations and foundations (excluding sponsored research and federal grant programs).

The cost of doing fund-raising was another consideration. Results again are closely linked to the newer programs. For example, responses indicated that budgets to run library fund-raising programs, on average, were $12,000 per year. However, the more successful programs spent $25,000 annually (not including salaries) to support their programs. Nearly 81 percent of the programs have some type of clerical support. Older, more established, program budgets can run as high as $150,000, not including staffing costs.

**LIBRARY DONORS, FRIENDS, AND ADVISORY GROUPS**

To be successful in library fund-raising, libraries need donors. Whether we agree or not, the age-old argument that “the library doesn’t have alumni” does affect the size of the donor pool. We found that, in comparison with campus units that have alumni, the library donor pools are quite small (see Table 4). Only one respondent, who had just concluded a capital campaign, indicated a donor pool of more than 10,000 active donors.

Table 4.
Size of Donor Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Active Donors</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1,500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,501 - 6,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The characteristics of the donor pool are also of interest. Friends and community members make up the largest group of 40 percent followed by alumni at 29 percent; foundations/corporations at 11 percent; parents at 8 percent; and students at 5 percent.

The traditional Friends groups play a major role within the library fund-raising arena. While 76 percent of the respondents have a Friends
group, only 58 percent of these groups are part of the library’s fund-raising program. More than 56 percent include the Friends groups in the annual fund solicitations. In 83 percent of the libraries, the development directors have some administrative responsibility for Friends, yet, in spite of this, 75 percent spend less than 5 percent of their time managing the Friends group activities.

Advisory boards seem to be fairly common; 45 percent of the respondents have a development board, 67 percent a Friends advisory board. In 15 percent of the cases, these two boards were one and the same; however, in 57 percent of the responses, the two boards were totally separate with no relationship with each other.

**FUND-RAISING PRIORITIES**

Another goal of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the fund-raising programmatic priorities within the academic library community. To do this we developed a list of twelve priorities and asked respondents to rank them. These are the results in priority order (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Fund-Raising Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Major gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Endowments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grow (expand) endowments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop planned gifts (bequests, trusts, annuities, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Corporate and/or foundation grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prospecting for planned gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grow (expand) the annual fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Capital campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grow (expand) the Friends group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Special gifts/mini-campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop the annual giving program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Establish Friends group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in this table, the attraction of major gifts is the number one priority for survey respondents. Clearly, academic library fund-raisers understand the importance of major gifts to their programs. Major gifts are seen to be at the heart of a successful fund-raising program. A major gift initiative requires special attention and a significant commitment of time and resources to have it pay off. In the long run, 90 percent of the money raised comes from major gift donors (Steele & Elder, 1992, p. 65).

We were also curious about the types of fund-raising activities being utilized to attract private funding in academic libraries and how successful they are. The top five fund-raising programs and their success ratings are shown in Table 6.
Table 6.
Top Five Fund-Raising Activities and Program Success Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund-Raising Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Book plating (in honor/memory of)</td>
<td>Very successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Endowments (tied with) Social Events/Donor recognition events</td>
<td>Very successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planned giving and bequests program</td>
<td>Moderately successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Annual fund</td>
<td>Moderately successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fund-raising events (tied with) direct mail campaigns</td>
<td>Moderately successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTORS OF SUCCESS**

One of the goals of this survey was to identify factors for success in academic library fund-raising. First, we had to define “success” for the purposes of this study. The most important indicator of success was the amount of money raised in the fund-raising program. Clearly, this “bottom-line” approach does not take into consideration many other factors that can determine success, so we looked at dollars raised in conjunction with the following key factors to determine success:

- **Age of the program.** The most statistically significant factor was the age of the library fund-raising program. As most of us know, it takes time and cultivation of prospects to raise money and, as a result, the number of years engaged in fund-raising efforts is a critical factor of success. The most successful program in terms of dollars raised is the one that has been in existence for twenty-five years. Next, on average, are those programs in existence for 6 to 15 years. In fact, programs seven years or older raise the most funds although some younger programs have had success. Not surprisingly, average funds raised are insignificant for the first two years of a program and seem to remain quite low until the sixth year. This information is important for those libraries planning to implement a fund-raising program. The new program may take several years of support before the benefits of the program are visible.

- **Size of the donor pool.** The next significant indicator was the number of donors in the database. Not surprisingly, libraries with the largest donor pools have the greatest success. It turns out that these libraries are the ones with mature fund-raising programs. This fact then established a direct correlation between the age of the program, size of the donor base, and amount raised.

- **Involvement of the library director.** Another success factor was the involvement of the library director in the fund-raising effort. Involvement could loosely be defined as any type of hands-on fund-raising, including developing donor strategies, setting fund-raising goals, do-
nor cultivation, campaign planning, and gift solicitations. We found
that those institutions with the highest dollars raised had directors
who were involved in fund-raising, on average, 50 percent of the time.
We also asked the development directors to provide a rating indicat-
ing their perception of the director's involvement. According to the
results, 24 percent of the library directors are always involved (i.e.,
accompany the director of development on visits to donors, etc.), 46
percent are usually involved, 28 percent occasionally involved, and
only 2 percent are never involved.

- **Time on task.** Another indicator of success is the amount of time de-
voted to fund-raising activities. As mentioned earlier, some library de-
velopment directors have a range of assignments broader than just
focusing on raising external dollars. However, those who spend the
largest percentage of their time on fund-raising raised the most funds.
Development directors who spend at least 75 percent of their time
with donors raise more funds for their libraries than do those who
spend 50 percent or less time. These individuals also have the greatest
success overall in raising funds for their programs. Statistically, devel-
opment directors without other library responsibilities raise more funds.
Development directors hired specifically to raise funds garner more
funds by almost four-fold.

The number one priority, according to survey results, is major gifts.
Historically, time spent on cultivating major gifts has the most signifi-

cant impact on fund-raising success. However, major gifts require much
time and energy over an extended period of time before results start
to show. Time on task also allows the development director to focus
ergy on fewer big gifts rather than on a larger number of small gifts.
The overall benefits to the program are increased dollars for specific
programs with less cost per dollar raised.

- **Type of institutions.** The survey results showed that private institutions
are raising more funds annually than public institutions, which is not
a surprise. According to the Council for Aid to Education (1999), pri-

vate institutions of all types (research, liberal arts, two-year) raise more
than public institutions. Part of this success can be based on the fact
that the role of philanthropy has been woven into the culture of pri-

vate institutions. On average, private universities have been involved
in fund-raising efforts much longer than many of their public counter-
parts. Public and, in particular, state-supported institutions are strug-
gling to change the perception that funding is adequate and is the
primary responsibility of the legislature.

The survey also showed that research universities far surpass all other
types of institutions in raising funds. The average for these institu-
tions is $1,100,000 raised annually as compared to community colleges
at an average of $100,000.
Friends groups that are a part of the annual giving programs raised substantially more funds than Friends groups that are not.

Programs with the highest fund-raising goals raised the most. This fact might seem obvious. Although these figures seem to indicate involvement in a capital campaign, it appears that those institutions that aim high in their goals, even without a campaign, have greater success in reaching their goals than do those with more conservative expectations. One can speculate, however, that a mature program has larger goals based on historical data from years of fund-raising, while a newer program may have less information on which to base realistic goal setting.

Programs that are connected to the central advancement effort raise substantially more funds. A variety of factors may be operative with this link to a central structure. More than likely it is the level of support and access to central fund-raising services (such as annual fund, planned gifts, and prospect research) that enables a program to thrive, as compared to a program that has been required to sustain a comprehensive fund-raising effort on its own. Central support may also serve to provide a higher level of visibility for library needs which in turn can help to showcase the library more effectively or provide greater access to unrestricted donors.

Development directors with four or more years in fund-raising raise more funds. Again, seven years appears as a "peak" number of years.

CONCLUSION

What does all this tell us? Academic library fund-raising is a growing trend in the profession. It is no longer limited to private institutions but is emerging as a driving force in the public sector as well. Successful fund-raising takes time, resources, and commitment. The program itself needs a chance to mature, and the development officer and the director of the library need to focus their energies on the task at hand. The more time the development officer can focus on fund-raising, the greater the chance for success.

Various factors affect success. Even if each factor is present, there is no guarantee that success will occur. A new fund-raising program may take several years of support before the benefits of the program are visible but, overall, the effort seems to be worthwhile.

"Is fund-raising a science—or an art?... There are certainly tried and true fund-raising formulas and development procedures. But because these formulas and procedures evolve from experiences of human nature, one can view fund-raising as both an art and a science" (Gornish, 1998, p. 94). With these thoughts in mind, the factors of success represent the collective experience of the survey respondents. The results are not in any way exhaustive but begin to identify patterns and trends within the realm of
academic library fund-raising. These results are a starting point to begin to quantify and qualify library fund-raising activities in the academic arena. They also form the foundation for identifying key areas for consideration in the creation and evolution of new fund-raising programs and address directions for strategic planning and staffing of college and university library-development organizations.

NOTES
1 CARL inaugurated its annual Research Award program the same year we launched the survey. The award is designed to provide funding for special projects that benefit the California academic library community. Because of the anticipated benefits of our development survey, we submitted a proposal to CARL and, in October 1997, this proposal was the recipient of the first annual CARL Research Grant Award.
2 Not surprisingly, the California trends mirrored those taking place on a national level. Because of the sheer number of public academic libraries in the state, new academic library programs increased significantly. However, when compared to national trends, these numbers are representative of what is taking place across the country.
3 There are no true degree programs for fund-raising; however, there are a number of continuing education opportunities available for fund-raising professionals. These include coursework, certificate programs, and seminars (some for continuing education credit and some for no credit) offered by a variety of universities, private schools, associations, and other nonprofits.
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ACADEMIC LIBRARY FUND-RAISING SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to examine, analyze, and assess the growing trend of fund-raising in academic libraries. This survey will be used to construct a profile of the academic library fund-raiser, what our backgrounds are, how our positions vary, how much we raise, who are our donors, what are our programs.

We will make every effort to keep responses confidential. If you would like complete anonymity, please return your survey via U.S. mail. If you would like a paper copy of this survey to complete, or if you know of someone who may wish a copy, please let us know. DEADLINE IS OCTOBER 18, 1996

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

1. What is your gender?
   ___ female
   ___ male

2. What is your highest education level?
   ___ Bachelor
   ___ Masters
   ___ Doctorate
   ___ other: __________

3. In what area(s) is (are) your degree(s) or certificate(s)?
   ___ Librarianship
   ___ Fund-raising
   ___ Both
   ___ other: __________

4. How many years have you worked in fund-raising?
   ___ years

5. How many years have you worked in libraries?
   ___ years

6. Is this your first fund-raising position?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

7. Have you had any continuing education in fund-raising?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
   Please describe: _____________________________________________
8. What is your annual salary (or equivalent)?
   ___ 18K-25K
   ___ 26K-40K
   ___ 41K-50K
   ___ 51K-65K
   ___ 66K-75K
   ___ 76K and above

SECTION II: ABOUT YOUR JOB

9. What is your position title? ________________________________

10. Is your position (check all that apply):
    ___ full-time
    ___ part-time
    ___ temporary
    ___ permanent
    ___ volunteer
    ___ other (please describe) ________________________________

11. What is your current job classification?
    ___ staff
    ___ management staff
    ___ faculty
    ___ other: ______

12. Is your position tenure track or tenured?
    ___ Yes, tenure track or tenured
    ___ Not tenure track or tenured
    ___ Does not apply

13. Do you have retreat rights?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No
    ___ Does not apply

14. Was this a newly created position when you were hired?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No

15. Were you hired specifically to do fund-raising?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No

16. If no, (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    ___ were you appointed from within to do fund-raising?
17. To whom do you report?
   ___ Library Dean/Library Director
   ___ Director of Development
   ___ both
   ___ other: ________________________________

18. Is your position
   ___ funded by the library
   ___ funded by campus development
   ___ funded by the library fund-raising program
   ___ volunteer
   ___ other (please describe) ________________________________

19. How long have you been in this position?
   ___ less than 1 year
   ___ 1-3 years
   ___ 3-5 years
   ___ more than 5 years

20. Is this position a part of the library management team?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

21. How much of the library fund-raising activities are your responsibility?
   ___ 100%
   ___ 75%
   ___ 50%
   ___ 25%
   ___ 10%

22. Percent of your time spent on fund-raising:
   ___ 100% (if 100% go directly to question #23)
   ___ 75%
   ___ 50%
   ___ 25%
   ___ 10%

23. If less than 100% of your time is spent on fund-raising, please describe the other type(s) of work: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ___ reference work
   ___ collection development
   ___ management
human resources
strategic planning
statistical reporting
budget
public relations
grant writing and grants development
other:

24. Percent of time spent with major donors:
   100%
   75%
   50%
   25%
   10%

25. Do you have a support staff?
   Yes
   No

26. Is your clerical support
   full-time
   part-time
   shared
   none at all

27. Is your clerical support
   paid by library
   paid by campus
   paid from fund-raising funds
   volunteer
   student assistant

SECTION III: ABOUT YOUR LIBRARY

28. What kind of institution?
   graduate
   graduate & undergraduate
   undergraduate
   community college
   other

29. Is your library a member of the ARL (Association of Research Libraries)?
   Yes
   No
30. Is your institution
   — Public
   — Private?

31. What is your annual library budget? ____________________

SECTION IV: FUND-RAISING

32. How long has your library had a fund-raising program?
   — years

33. How would you describe your fund-raising program?
   — new program
   — developing program
   — established program
   — mature program

34. What is your annual fund-raising goal? ____________________

35. Who sets this goal? ______________________________________

36. How much is your annual fund-raising budget? ________________

37. Who sets this amount? ______________________________________

38. Do you have a Friends group?
   — Yes
   — No

39. Percent of time spent with Friends group:
    — 100%   — 75%   — 50%
    — 25%   — 10%   — less than 10%

40. Is your Friends group:
    — part of main fund-raising program
    — run under separate organization

41. Is your Friends group part of the annual giving program?
    — Yes
    — No

42. What is your administrative responsibility to the Friends group?
    — advisory
    — liaison
    — primary manager
    — none at all
    — other: ____________________

43. What percentage of the library director’s time is devoted to fund-raising?
44. How would you describe your library director's involvement with fund-raising?
   __  always involved
   __  usually involved
   __  occasionally involved
   __  never involved

45. Is your fund-raising program a part of the campus-wide advancement program?
   __  Yes
   __  No

46. Is your campus advancement program
   __  centralized
   __  decentralized
   __  combination

47. On average, how much do you raise annually through your library's fund-raising effort?
   $________________

48. How many donors in your donor database?
   ____________

49. Please assign percentages to your donor pool:
   __%  Friends of the library
   __%  alumni
   __%  parents
   __%  students
   __%  foundations/corporations
   __%  community members

50. Do you have a development advisory board?
    __  Yes
    __  No

51. Do you have a friends advisory board?
    __  Yes
    __  No
52. Are these boards one and the same?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

53. If not, what is their relationship?
   ___ No relationship
   ___ Friends board is a subgroup of development board
   ___ Development board is a subgroup of Friends board
   ___ Other (please describe) ____________________________

SECTION VI: PROGRAMS

54. What is the breakdown of donations?
   ___ % cash gifts
   ___ % gifts-in-kind
   ___ % bequests/planned gifts
   ___ % foundation/corp gifts

55. What are the fund-raising priorities for your library?
   1—not a priority, 5= high priority
   ___ establish endowments
   ___ grow endowments
   ___ establish friends group
   ___ grow friends group
   ___ major gifts
   ___ corporation/foundation grants
   ___ planned gifts prospecting
   ___ develop planned gifts
   ___ establish annual giving program
   ___ grow annual giving program
   ___ capital campaign
   ___ special gifts/mini campaigns
   ___ other: ________________________
   ___ other: ________________________

56. What types of programs have you done and how successfully?
   0=too soon to tell/1= not successful/5=very successful
   ___ book plating
   ___ phonathons
   ___ endowments
   ___ capital campaigns
   ___ fund-raising events
   ___ social events
   ___ bequests
   ___ athletics partnerships
__ alumni partnerships
__ planned gifts
__ annual fund
__ direct mail
__ emeriti
__ special gifts/mini-campaigns
__ brick campaigns
__ other:____________________
__ other:____________________

57. Are you still involved in any of these programs? If so, which ones?
(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
__ book plating
__ phonathons
__ endowments
__ capital campaigns
__ fund-raising events
__ social events
__ bequests
__ athletics partnerships
__ alumni partnerships
__ planned gifts
__ annual fund
__ direct mail
__ emeriti
__ special gifts/mini-campaigns
__ brick campaigns
__ other:____________________
__ other:____________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!!!
Academic Library Fund-Raising: Organization, Process, and Politics

SUSAN K. MARTIN

ABSTRACT

In recent years, the traditional functions of the library have been supplemented by new functions and structures, among them information technology and development. Fund-raising, part of development, is of critical importance to schools and departments of universities, which are increasingly engaged in capital campaigns and major gift programs. While libraries have the disadvantage of not having a built-in constituency, they do have the ability of acquiring and building such a constituency with the capability of supporting the library's monetary and programmatic goals. The fund-raising environment is discussed as well as techniques for enhancing a library's major gifts program.

INTRODUCTION

Fund-raising is truly an art. There exists little real research on the topic, although the literature in this area is increasing in size, scope, and quality. Many questions raised about specific areas of fund-raising must be answered with the phrase "it depends": the answer depends on the kind and size of institution under discussion; the nature of the potential or actual constituency; the maturity of the institution; and various other factors. In recent years, academic centers have been established to study philanthropy at a theoretical level, particularly as it affects nonprofit institutions. However, the interest of librarians involved in starting or continuing a fund-raising program remains on the immediate environment, the politics, and the "how-to's" of developing external resources on behalf of library programs. This article will address issues of major gifts, capital cam-
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campaigns, organization, staffing, constituency, and the role of the library development program within the academic community.

THE NEW KID ON THE BLOCK

Until the mid-1960s, most academic libraries could consider themselves the "heart of the university"—an island not only of tranquillity but also of bibliographic expertise that was found nowhere else in the university. Alone among its colleagues in academia, the library collected, organized, and made available the repository of the knowledge of humanity or that part of it suited to the requirements of each college or university as a locus of teaching and research. With the possible exception of unofficial departmental or seminar reading rooms, no one else on campus collected the literature, cataloged it, lent and borrowed books on interlibrary loan, and operated large reading rooms and other public service facilities such as periodicals rooms, government documents departments, or special collections and manuscripts divisions. While the faculty could argue then and now about what resources are acquired for the collection, librarians were alone as performers of these often-arcane tasks. If anyone else on campus were to embark on a library-like activity, they often came to the library for advice and frequently used standards and procedures developed by the library. Therefore, with the exception of advice on collections, there was no urgent need for librarians to coordinate their work with anyone else in the university on a daily basis.

In the past thirty years, this "splendid isolation" has been removed: two of our most significant current functions have come into being in these decades and, in both cases, they imitate or duplicate what is done elsewhere on campus rather than being unique to the library. These functions are systems/automation and development. In both cases, someone else—some other unit—considers him- or herself the expert, requiring the library to cast its plans, actions, and often policies within the standards set elsewhere in the university. Libraries began to use computers in the 1960s and 1970s and tended to be the first unit on campus to use the computer for non-quantitative purposes. With the passage of time, the lead once held by libraries in applications of information technology has disappeared; the trend is for universities to have a chief information officer, one of whose tasks is to ensure that standards are in place for the use of computers throughout the institution. Now, instead of possessing just one set of knowledges and skills defined by more than a century of experience within a library environment, librarians must explain why the library application of information technology is different enough to warrant separate treatment, and what issues are of concern to the library and to no other department of the university.

Development is even further removed from the once-cozy and easily defined arena of the academic library. While the large private universities
have endowments that date back two or more centuries, few institutions of higher education have been involved in serious fund-raising for more than two or three decades. Driven by the fortunes made during the industrial revolution, philanthropy and charitable giving made their way into the landmark of American culture as recently as 100 years ago. At that time they concentrated more on correcting social ills than on enhancing the educational environment of what then was a very small minority of wealthy young men attending a small number of universities (Burlingame & Hulse, 1991, p. 20). Organizations such as the YMCA, Red Cross, and Hull House attracted the attention of the wealthy of the time. It was, of course, Andrew Carnegie who focused his attention on libraries, and for a number of decades public libraries were the beneficiaries of most of the dollars going to libraries.

Still today, public library directors have a noticeably more pronounced role in their political environments than do most academic library directors. The profession’s formal organizations in support of development and fund-raising have centered on the public library, which in the nineteenth century was considered a significant part of the movement toward a more literate, better educated, populace. Moving into the twenty-first century, the American Library Association still has the American Library Trustees Association—primarily for trustees of public libraries; the Friends of the Libraries/USA (FOLUSA) is also firmly rooted in a public library heritage.

MAJOR GIVING FOR THE LIBRARY

Many library fund-raising programs begin with the development of a support group, usually a Friends of the Library group and, in academia, annual fund drives. These techniques are essential for raising the visibility of the library within and around the campus community, and for conveying the message to the academic administration that it is indeed possible to raise money for library needs. Once a library has developed a group of supporters—and this may take many years—the next step is to ensure that a core subset of this group remains loyal (consistent annual giving) and begins to give at levels considerably higher than the minimum “dues.” With this group of people, the goal is to develop in them a feeling of personal commitment to the library, and to encourage them to begin to consider gifts of a larger size (Greenfield, 1999). In order to make a significant difference in the development of external resources, however, the library must be a full participant in the major gift programs of the institution together with the schools of the university, athletics, and financial aid.

WHAT IS A MAJOR GIFTS PROGRAM?

The answer to this question is that it depends on the institution and
its circumstances. The exact definition of a major gifts program may vary from one university to another, but at medium-size and large universities, it typically focuses on gifts of at least $50,000 and often may include only gifts of $100,000 and above (smaller fund-raising efforts, such as those for a community project which may have a total goal of $1 million or less, may consider gifts as small as $100 to be major gifts). These sums do not need to be given at one time in one fiscal year; they could be pledges by a donor over a specified number of years (usually no more than five) to create an endowment or support a particular project. Both interesting and helpful, major gifts for libraries often take the form of planned gifts: these gifts can be either outright bequests or can use one of various vehicles designed to create win-win situations for a donor and a charitable target such as a university, hospital, or other cause.

Development professionals and librarians disagree in their definitions of major gifts, particularly as applied to libraries. When the development office defines a major gift as any six figure gift or more, it can be difficult for librarians to argue that book fund endowments of $10,000 should be a part of the library's major gifts program. This author has had to stave off attempts on the part of a development office to establish the minimum book fund endowment as $75,000 (a compromise figure of $25,000 for a book fund endowment was reached). For donors who like to give in the form of endowment (and there are many people who don't care to give in this way), $10,000 over a five-year period, or $25,000 over the same period of time, can often be readily achieved. An informal survey of directors of ARL libraries showed that by far the majority of universities made book endowment funds possible at these two levels, although there were a few institutions allowing book endowment funds for as little as $5,000 or requiring as much as $50,000 or more (personal communication, ARL listserv, 1996).

Why should one struggle to persuade the development office that $10,000 or $25,000 are reasonable amounts for an endowment? Because, unlike almost any other area of the university, the library can make excellent use of the payout from a $10,000 or $25,000 endowment. Whether that payout is $500 or $1,250 annually, the library can purchase materials that are of benefit to the institution's students and faculty—and this fact can be very attractive to potential donors. An alumnus giving $1,000 annually can often be persuaded to consider increasing that gift to $2,000 or even $5,000 over five years to create an endowment. Recent Internet discussion (1999) indicates that fund-raisers are beginning to recognize that not all major gifts can come from the truly wealthy, and that the level of affluence in our society is such that major giving should be considered to come from the affluent middle and upper-middle class, over time, and with the many options that are available to them for making a significant difference to their favorite charity (http://www.charityvillage.com/charityvillage/research/rmaj2.html).
If one assumes that the library has a constituency, how does the development director or librarian determine which of its supporters are appropriate targets for a major gift solicitation? A good acquaintance with these supporters and their friends, if not an actual friendship, allows the librarian and his or her staff to identify those people who might be receptive to a major gifts proposal and, more importantly, are capable of making a commitment to such a gift. Information about approximate worth, approximate annual income, nature of home and neighborhood—are all factors that go into the research done by most development offices at universities of any size. Add to this the intelligence gleaned from members of the library’s advisory board or the Friend’s council, and the development team should be armed with sufficient information to make several cultivation calls. Greenfield (1999) says: “Major gift cultivation, solicitation, and recognition should all be part of the strategic action plan from the start; most of the effort, however, will be spent in cultivation, whereby each qualified donor and prospect is given the personal attention he or she needs to arrive at a big gift decision” (p. 243). Greenfield (1999, chap. 5) characterizes this level of giving as akin to making an investment decision, and indeed donors at the highest levels want to ensure that their dollars are accomplishing the desired end.

Organization and Staffing

The environment surrounding the library administrator who wishes to raise funds is relatively new to universities. With the rapid expansion of institutions of higher education in the 1960s, both governmental and private foundation sources determined that supporting academic and research libraries served the greater purpose of the educational enterprise in this country. Among these, the Department of Education, the Pew Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation played the most prominent roles until the late 1980s and early 1990s, enabling many libraries to engage in innovative and important projects that otherwise would have been impossible. To attract this funding, library directors identified those of their staff who could not only write well but could also make a persuasive case. This focus on corporate, foundation, and government sources of funds frequently caused librarians to ignore the individual donors available to them.

Since those years, however, much of the government funding has disappeared, leaving the National Endowment for the Humanities to focus on preservation and the building of the endowment. Of the private foundations, the Mellon Foundation has been the primary strong voice with its programmatic endorsement of library needs and innovations. Simultaneously (and not unsurprisingly), the coffers of the institutions of higher education have shrunk, leaving library directors in the position of seeking a foothold in their institutional development structures together with
academic and athletic programs. Conrad (1974) tells us not to worry, though: in foundation grant-seeking, "[the] odds are stacked against you. Foundations have little staff to review your project, they’re not very receptive to new or radical ideas, they reject many more proposals than they fund, and they give only 10 per cent of the total philanthropic dollars anyway!" (p. 78). Under these circumstances, the individual donor—whether alumnus, parent, or friend—suddenly became more prominent.

**Centralized or Decentralized Development**

Now, for the first time, librarians are attempting to persuade university administrations not only that libraries need external funding, but also that they are worthy of the effort required to find those funds in the same manner as do the schools and colleges of the university. There are some built-in hindrances to this development effort that exist at almost any academic institution:

- No one ever graduated from the library;
- There is a perception that it is difficult to raise funds for libraries; and
- The library is everyone’s second priority (while the first priority is the individual’s own academic program). (Martin, 1998, p. 3)

Structurally, these and other issues must be treated within the context of the organization’s overall approach to development and fund-raising: centralized, decentralized, or hybrid (Gearhart & St. Clair, 1994, p. 58). Depending on the model chosen, the impact for the library is significant. With a centralized model, the university development office directs development activities for the entire institution. In this case, the library might have a development officer, or part of a development officer, assigned to it, but that person would not be located physically in the library; instead, the library may have a secretary or administrative assistant for support of the Friends’ program. Often, the vice president for development decides that all development officers should keep the library’s needs in mind as they travel around the country in pursuit of major gifts, meeting with alumni, parents, and friends. The problem with this approach is that it simply doesn’t work; giving each development director responsibility for not only all the academic programs but also the library means that the word “library” is highly unlikely to be mentioned in the conversation unless the president of the institution has made it his or her top priority.

With the decentralized model, the entire development process is handled independently by each unit of the university. Depending on the university, the library might convince the development office to provide it with development officers but more frequently would need to create its own development positions and would retain control not only of the positions but also of the activities of the people in those positions. While this model sounds appealing, its significant disadvantage lies in exactly what
sounds appealing—the lack of communication with the central development structure. As noted elsewhere in this issue, central development is a source of support for many specialized areas of development such as planned giving, corporate and foundation giving, public relations, and events planning, to name a few (see the article by Taylor in this issue of Library Trends). Additionally, a totally independent library development structure would not have access to the broad base of constituents that it could have were there a link of some kind with the development office. A potentially disastrous situation can arise with a decentralized system in which many parts of the university try to approach a known potential benefactor, making it appear as though the right hand doesn’t know what the left is doing. One very likely outcome of this situation is that the benefactor will end up not supporting any part of the institution.

The hybrid model can serve both the institution and the library well. The university provides, in one way or another, a development officer for the library. If the university is engaged in a capital campaign, this person will probably be full time and will have some staff. Once the campaign is completed, institutional inertia suggests that the library will retain all or most of the development support that it had during the campaign. Most significantly, the development officer can report to either the development office or to the library, but the communication links to both departments should be strong. In this author’s experience, development officers reporting to central development but located within the library administrative office are extremely effective.

WHO AND HOW MANY?

How many people should be involved in development for an academic library? The answer is that it depends. It depends on whether the library is a priority in a capital campaign; the maturity of the library’s development program; the size and activity of the friends’ group; and the goal (annual or capital) set for the library, either by and for itself or by the university administration.

Development activities are not limited to those whose titles contain the word “development,” however. In most academic libraries, librarians throughout the organization can appropriately be encouraged to become active in the development process. Special collections and gifts librarians are natural candidates for such involvement; one benefit is that donors see not only the library director as a figurehead but also interact with the people who are engaged, on a daily basis, in putting into place the programs that their gifts make possible.

Critical to a library’s fund-raising effort is the position of director of development for the library, whatever organizational model is used. Experience shows that the director of the library’s development process can be a librarian but does not need to be. As indicated by Hoffman, Smith, and
DiBona in this issue of *Library Trends*, when a librarian takes on this role, there is a tendency for the organization to place additional responsibilities within the purview of the person, taking valuable time away from the business of defining a capital campaign, soliciting major gifts, or otherwise ensuring the success of the library’s development program. Particularly in a decentralized or hybrid model, professional development officers bring to the library the knowledge of techniques for creating success, alternative ways of achieving it and, probably most importantly, an existing network of communication with other development officers. This author’s experience suggests that professional development officers enjoy the multidimensionality of library fund-raising, often seeing it as more creative and challenging than raising funds for specific schools or academic areas (M. Bayers, personal communication, May 18, 1999).

The fund-raising activity must be vigorously supported by the library director in order to be successful. In addition, the director needs to take an *active* role in the development process, visiting potential donors with the director of development and participating with the team of development and library staff to create the best possible message for the library’s constituency, both internal and external. It is not at all unknown for a library director to spend 50 percent of his or her time on development activities and, in the early phases of a capital campaign, this number can creep up to 75 percent. Obviously, the library still needs to be managed; having an excellent team applies not only directly to development but also to the everyday operation of the library.

**What is the goal?**

As libraries increasingly and regularly become involved in fund-raising, and as that fund-raising effort goes beyond the annual fund and the Friends of the library, the library administration will need to identify annual goals, either independently or with the central development office. A circular argument begins at this point: does the library have enough of a constituency to meet its proposed goal? are there enough people involved in the development effort to create this constituency? if the constituency is small, then why place more staff resources behind this effort? With a small number of development staff, the goal must therefore be small.

It takes a bold administrator to break this vicious circle. If the library already has a Friends or annual fund program, a major gifts or campaign goal can be extrapolated from what the institution knows about the existing supporters of the library and what it surmises may be accomplished by a growing library development program. One rule of thumb suggests that, for an annual goal of $3-5 million (inclusive of major gifts, annual fund, gifts in kind, and any other income streams that the university may allow), a development structure should have one professional director of
development (M. Goodwin, personal communication, September 1995). In addition, as suggested elsewhere in this issue, the Friends of the library require staff support, as do the communications, mailings, and annual fund appeals on behalf of the library.

The largest academic library development office this author is aware of is comprised of six full-time staff: two development professionals and four support staff. The Georgetown University Library, with a campaign goal of $30 million, has one development professional and two support staff.

WHAT IF CENTRAL DEVELOPMENT SAYS NO?

Universities establish their internal priorities, of course, and have the kinds of economic constraints that have already been recognized and are widely known. It could be that, in the politics of fund-raising, the library director is told by the central development office that there will not be a full-time (or even part-time) director of development and no direct support for the library’s development efforts. What is the library administration to do?

The development office, as a service unit to the university at large, is carrying out the priorities given it by the academic administration of the university—that is, the priorities identified by the president and provost. Therefore, the development budget for the institution will support those areas which have been identified as priorities. If the library is not among these priorities, the library and its administration will have to make do with whatever resources they can muster on their own—and will find that they have company elsewhere in the university where academic units or other departments also have only limited services from the development office.

All is not lost however, and, in fact, the library is in a better position than most to address this situation. With a special collections department (see Taylor, in this issue of Library Trends) and a Friends group which has no relationship to the university other than to the library, library development can proceed apace, although it is unlikely to raise the multiple millions of dollars that it might were it a priority of the university. Neighbors of the university are pleased to become involved with the library, perceived as an institution of culture able to provide interesting discussions and programs and often access to the library’s collections, newsletters, and other benefits.

Creating a Friends of the library group, if none exists, can be accomplished with library resources using the contacts that the library already has with collectors and donors. The programmatic structure of a Friends group is appealing to people on and off campus; it can present an alternative view of the university to the world at large without appearing to compete for donors with other departments of the university. Many a library
has gradually formed an annual-giving constituency in this way without the official sanction of the college or university.

**CREATING A MAJOR-GIFTS CONSTITUENCY**

*The Library's Constituency within the University*

It has been reiterated here and elsewhere that one of the library's major hindrances in fund-raising is the lack of a natural constituency. On some campuses, even when the library has been identified as an institutional priority, the library's development officer is nonetheless denied access to any alumni of any of the schools. Most library development officers spend a great deal of time with other development officers within the university and also with university administrators, ensuring that there is an understanding of the library's needs and a recognition that fund-raising for the library does ultimately serve the purpose of the entire university.

Every university and college has alumni and friends for whom the library is an ideal target of attention, volunteerism, and philanthropy. Segmenting the university's total constituency into targets for library fund-raising is an important mechanism for providing the library with access to potential supporters without upsetting the normal "prospect assignment" structure of the institution. Reunion classes (those classes celebrating their tenth, fifteenth, twentieth, and so on reunions) are often not available for library cultivation, although typically members of reunion classes can target their reunion gifts to the library should they so desire. There are a few institutions with a tradition of a particular reunion class, such as the fiftieth reunion, giving their reunion gift to the library.

Development offices are usually delighted to allow the library to solicit alumni who have never given to the university or who gave last year but not so far this year (Last Year But Not This or LYBUNT). Experience shows, though, that alumni who didn’t give, really didn’t want to give; it takes an especially appealing letter, brochure, or argument to cause these people to write a check to the library. A library director must accept the offer of this mailing list with open eyes, recognizing that this mailing is probably the worst possible segment of the population to approach, particularly if the positive return is being measured by percentage of response rather than absolute numbers. A mailing of 50,000 may only generate 100 donations to the library. A .2 percent return will be regarded as worthless by professionals in the direct mail business and, of course, when the rule of thumb is a return of 2-5 percent, an order of magnitude less than that is a poor showing. However, if 100 new members of the Friends group manages to increase the size of the membership by 25 percent, and if the donations at least cover the cost of the mailing, the mailing will have done more good than harm.
Library development programs should take advantage of the emotional response to libraries and of the fact that, in many universities, there is a group of disaffected alumni—perhaps those classes that graduated during the Vietnam war era when the campus may have been in chaos or perhaps women who were among the first classes of coeducation in former male institutions. These alumni are now of an age to be ready to give something back to their university, but their experiences prevent them from identifying closely with a school, a department, or even the university as a whole. The library is often able to present itself as a positive force, and one that was a presence during those earlier years on campus.

There is not usually much that a librarian can do to persuade an academic dean or an athletic director to release one of his or her alumni to the library if the dean already has a relationship with the alumnus. The same holds true with parents; this author has had the experience of requesting a visit with parents who owned a nationally known bookstore—quite logical to try to attract these people to the library. However, the dean of the school attended by the child wished to retain access to those parents, and the library was never able to call on them.

Other techniques can be used to cull out of the large body of alumni and parents those people who might be encouraged to take an interest in the library. In those cases where several members of a single family attended the same institution, but usually majored in different areas, the library can represent the place on campus that is common to the experiences of all family members. Identifying alumni and parents whose occupational interests are related in some way or another to the activities of the library can be helpful: publishers, printers, authors, or people in some aspect of the information technologies industry may be persuaded to support the library. The development office’s research department can derive information that relates to the publicly available interests of the university’s alumni, parents, and friends. More interesting but much more difficult to acquire is information about people who collect books, manuscripts, and artwork; this is potentially a group rife with good prospects for the library—if the library can discover who they are.

**Gifts in Kind**

More than any other unit on campus, the library is likely to receive gifts in kind. Librarians are familiar with the phenomenon and with the irritation of receiving a collection of books that almost entirely duplicates what is already in the collection, of feeling the need to be nice to someone whose collection is really not of interest to the library but whose interests may be worth cultivating for prospective future gifts.

It is not unusual for a library’s special collections to be built entirely through gifts in kind. Where there is a history of such gift acceptance, potential donors are likely to be aware of the library’s willingness to ac-
cept gifts. It becomes easier for the library to build on success by identifying other book or manuscript collections for possible donation to the university.

But how does this relate to major gifts? If major gifts tend to be endowment or, at the very least, six-figure gifts, how can gifts in kind fit in? Shouldn’t they be considered annual gifts?

A case can be made for treating gifts in kind either as annual or as major gifts. When a collection of books comes in, to conform to IRS regulations, it should come with an external appraisal either already done or ready to be done while the books are in the library and at the expense of the donor. That appraisal may be regarded as equivalent to a gift of cash enabling the library to “purchase” the materials that were the actual gift. In most cases, gifts are nominal in value; however, in the case of valuable collections of manuscripts or books, the value is frequently added to the library’s total giving for the year. At Georgetown, for example, the financial system contains a cost center to which the values of significant gifts in kind are added. When the total gifts for the year are computed, the values of these collections automatically become a part of the library’s total. At this point, the library receives, on average, about $350,000 annually in gifts in kind—not a sum to be ignored.

**Travel to Make Friends**

In an academic environment, where many thousands of alumni and parents are scattered not only throughout the nation but the world, it is critical that a university establish a program that recognizes travel for deans and development directors as well as for local and regional alumni clubs. Often the alumni with the greatest capacity for giving back to the university are located some distance away; there must be a concerted effort to bring them back to the university and to make them feel a part of not only the institution’s past but also its future.

As the library director identifies potential donors either through the Friends of the library or other channels, he or she needs to establish a strategy for addressing each person, identifying the best fit between the library’s needs and the donor’s wishes. In a maturing development program, the director and the development officer will be required to travel up to one week each month, making appointments with leadership prospects and also some “discovery” calls. A leadership prospect with serious intentions of making a gift should normally be visited two or three times before the “ask”; unusual circumstances may alter this formula—sometimes an alumnus being seen for the first time may ask what he or she can do for the library, initiating an “ask” right at that moment. While such a request is a positive sign, the library probably has not had sufficient time by then to prepare a full response and may ask for a smaller amount than might be appropriate or accept a gift for a purpose that is not high priority.
Once a strong relationship with the donor has been established, the library and development directors work together to write a proposal for gift and a gift agreement that can be placed in front of the donor during the next visit. Leadership gifts (more than $1 million) are often requested by the president of the institution, but each case differs, and the nature of the relationship between the donor and the university will indicate who the appropriate solicitor is and in what environment. The library director doing the asking needs to take the advice of the author's director of development: "Look the donor directly in the eye, don't hesitate when asking for the gift, and keep your mouth closed after you have made the ask. Let the donor think about your request."

This environment forces a library director to manage time carefully and, more importantly, to ensure that ongoing library operations continue smoothly despite the frequent absence of the leader of the organization. In some ways, information technology assists; the traveling administrator these days almost invariably has a laptop computer on hand and can appear to those at home as though he or she were still in the office rather than halfway around the country or the world. But a travel schedule must be established with care; this author develops a calendar during the summer of each year, filling in the obligatory professional meetings, important on-campus meetings, and only then sitting down with the director of development to identify the days and/or weeks to be devoted to development travel.

If a library is attempting to appeal to people in remote locations to become supporters of the library, the development team faces the difficulty of deciding how to appeal to these non-local donors and how to make the library become a reality for them beyond a quarterly newsletter and a listing in an annual roll call. One method is to take the programs of the Friends on the road, determine where the largest concentrations of alumni and parents are, and focus the attention of the development travel in these areas. For most universities, New York City will be one of these regions. The librarian and development director may decide to travel as frequently as possible to New York, meeting people who are already library supporters, and making "discovery" calls to entice non-supporters to join the Friends. Once a certain critical mass of support has been established in a particular region, the Friends are able to consider offering programs to the supporters, university donors, and parents in that area.

As an example, the Georgetown University librarian and development director spent several years visiting donors and potential donors in New York, traveling to New York and vicinity from Washington three or four times each year. Within four years, they made the decision that a Friends program could be offered in New York. Since that time, the Friends group (at Georgetown University known as the Library Associates) has held two
events each year in New York, often bringing faculty members to New York to speak—and supporting the travel of those faculty.

Another travel technique is to look for places not being addressed by other parts of the university and making the library visible in that region. Again at Georgetown, no one was concentrating on the rather large group of alumni and parents in London. The university librarian and the director of development travel to London twice each year and, on one of those occasions, all the alumni and parents are invited to an associates’ event (in 1999 the speaker was Lord Jeffrey Archer, himself a Georgetown parent). A consequence of the attention that has been paid by the library to the London group is the formation by one of the alumni of a Library Millennium Book Fund, to which all British residents with a Georgetown connection are invited to contribute.

A philosophical dispute, whose answer is probably again “it depends,” focuses on the question of whether one should take longer trips—up to a week—and meet with as many people as possible, or shorter trips that are focused on one or two donors and one or two “asks.” Longer trips seem to be more worthwhile for locations that are more remote; perhaps one visits the south central part of the country, gaining appointments with donors in Texas, Oklahoma, and Missouri over a three-day period. If one is based on the east coast, it is very easy to make a one-day trip to New York or even to Chicago to ask just one prospect to consider a gift of $1 million—or even $100,000.

Some libraries have adequate travel budgets to support these efforts but most do not. In the latter case, there are two primary options: ask the development office to provide the travel budget or use some of the unrestricted money that comes in through the annual fund or Friends process. Most people recognize that “it takes money to make money,” and, while the latter approach is not something that one publicizes widely, a library administrator should not feel guilty about using funds that are intended to improve the circumstances of the library.

All the obvious courtesies must be attended to when traveling. The busy schedules of working professionals sometimes make life difficult for the person putting together the itinerary. Let’s say that the librarian and development director plan to go to New York for three days; there are three people whom they must see and ten others on the list to be visited just to become better acquainted. The library’s schedule is put together during the summer, so they know that this trip will take place from October 26-28, sandwiched between a Council of Deans meeting and the ARL fall meeting. They cannot call people until October 15 at the earliest; New York businessmen are notorious for not knowing what their calendars will look like more than a few days ahead of time. “Just give me a call when you’re in town, and we’ll see if we can get together” is a phrase that causes a groan; the person will most likely be out of town when the
development team arrives. They leave for New York with one lunch, one dinner, and two afternoon appointments scheduled and a long list of names and phone numbers to be called upon arrival.

One of the most frustrating conditions of fund-raising travel is not knowing until close to the time of the trip whether there will be enough appointments to make the trip worthwhile. There almost always is, but often it is touch-and-go with no certainty. On the other hand, one might have four visits in two days (not a very good trip, in this author's opinion) but may come home with a check for $10,000 from one of the alumni whose reunion is this year and who wants his reunion gift to go to the library. A success like this overshadows the frustration.

A librarian traveling with or without a development director should be well briefed in advance of the trip. A briefing book should have a copy of the itinerary, and also printouts from the university's fund-raising system, giving as much information as is known about the people to be visited. For major asks, special research must be requested in advance, and the results of that research should be in the travel briefing book.

Upon return to campus, the librarian must obviously write thank-you notes. Over time, a person may develop a series of form paragraphs to be put together appropriately for each letter. Of course, form letters are not appropriate in those cases where the librarian knows the donor particularly well or the meeting involved an unusual topic. As important, if not more so, the development director must ascertain that a contact report or memo is placed in the person's file in the development office. Any communication with donors or potential donors must be placed on file to support any future requests to approach that donor. Especially in the case of the library, with no built-in constituency, the description of communications or visits with a donor is important for building the case for access to that donor.

Constant visits to other locations to see library supporters will pay off in the long run by providing the library with a new constituency for major and annual gifts. These people, if happy with their association with the library, will carry the word further, and the circle of friends and supporters will grow.

**Capital Campaigns**

At a time when universities are fiscally constrained, capital campaigns have become a primary way to identify new resources for the university’s programs and to motivate current donors to provide additional support. Georgetown's former vice president for alumni and university relations says that capital campaigns "provide an excuse for an institution to get its act together" (K. Jones, personal communication, May 1995). Some institutions have become accustomed to remaining exclusively in campaign mode, often alternating a comprehensive campaign with focused campaigns intended to support individual parts of the university.
In preparation for a capital campaign, a university typically identifies the needs and priorities of its various units. Together with the academic schools or units, the library should go through a strategic planning process or similar exercise to articulate its needs for building and renovation, endowed collections, technology, endowed positions, preservation, or other programmatic and innovative areas. As standard procedure, the library—and the university as a whole—will identify needs far beyond the capability of the university to raise funds. For example, the needs, or wish list, might total $1 billion, but the development office and the president may think that the university's fund-raising capacity for that campaign is only $500 million. At that point, obviously, every unit will then be asked to revise its priorities to fit within a specified goal.

Once again, different universities work in different ways (i.e., it depends on the circumstance). For its 1990 campaign, Johns Hopkins University set a goal of $450 million and identified broad programmatic areas but did not target dollar amounts to specific academic schools, the library, and other units. In most cases, though, a particular dollar amount will be set as the campaign goal for the unit. One of the most important responsibilities of the library director is to ensure that the library is appropriately represented in the institutional campaign goal. If at all possible, the library should not be the unit with the lowest dollar goal; such a decision would send a negative message to both library donors and non-donors about the importance that the university ascribes to the library. Additionally, if the library's campaign is successful, there should be an opportunity to increase the goal, either within a university-wide increase or as a result of reallocation of goals within the university (the latter may politically be extremely difficult to accomplish).

With the library's goal defined, the director and appropriate staff members then create a menu of named gift opportunities to be presented to potential donors. In a campaign that focuses on endowment, with some restricted programmatic funds, the library would probably identify named endowments in accordance with university policy for collections, for technology, or for as-yet-unnamed spaces within the library. Endowed positions, either in support of existing positions or to establish new positions, are also excellent named gift opportunities. Named gift opportunities are limited only by the imaginations of the librarians and the donors and, indeed, the librarian will often find that the donor is driving a future library program more intensely than is completely comfortable.

The goal is now defined and the campaign is underway—except that it isn’t quite. The campaign is in the “quiet phase,” a period of time in which ostensibly no one knows about the campaign (even though everyone really does). Ideally, an institution “goes public” with a gala announcement of the campaign when at least half of the goal is in hand or irrevocably pledged. For example, Gallaudet University is in a campaign that will
end in 2001; the campaign began in 1998. The public phase of the cam-
paign began in October 1999 with more than half of the $30 million goal
reached. Here there is good news and bad news. The good news is that
the institution had a great deal of energy in the early years of the cam-
paign, and the library’s top donors can probably be counted on to make
an appropriate donation or pledge. The bad news is that when half of the
campaign is completed, there is still another half to go—this time with a
need to find new donors and prospects, a task that is in many ways much
more difficult than the first portion of the campaign.

Targets also need to be set for annual monetary goals to encompass
both annual fund dollars and major gifts. This annual plan of action is
established by examining the library’s list of outstanding proposals—pros-
ppects who will be solicited during the year—and the likelihood of major
proposals being funded or agreements being signed. To carry out a cam-
paign effectively, the university needs to set overall targets year by year as
a mechanism to ensure that the campaign will reach its goal. The annual
goals of each school or department flow into the process of defining insti-
tutional, overall, and annual goals.

The time required for development during a capital campaign inten-
sifies far beyond that normally demanded of a library director. If a library
is fortunate, the development office will assign additional staff to the li-
brary to assist with such functions as discovery calls, proposal writing, pub-
licity, and similar tasks. If not, then the library administration has to deter-
mine whether and how to incorporate the extra workload into everyone’s
regular schedule. It is ironic that the financial constraints being felt by
universities generally prevent the establishment of new positions, such as
those of development, whose very functions would be to increase the re-
sources available to the institution.

THE ROLE AND POLITICS OF LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN
THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

With either a centralized or hybrid model of development, universi-
ties adopt a protective system for their donors and prospects to ensure
that only one part of the university approaches that person or institution
for money at any one time—unless the donor indicates that he is willing
or anxious to support more than one part of the university. Typically, this
protection takes on the nature of a “clearance system” in which records
are meticulously kept about each donor or prospect and the communica-
tions that the person has had with the university. The development office
assigns responsibility for major prospects to appropriate parts of the uni-
versity; thus, an alumnus of the college of arts and science who has the
capacity to give a $500,000 gift will be “assigned” to the development di-
rector of the college. Similarly, library donors to the library will be as-
signed to the development director of the library.
In a capital campaign, with a financial target for the university and its subunits, there will be competition among the various areas of the university for access to the most significant alumni, parents, and other donors. The role of the director of the library and the director of development is to ensure that people who have expressed an interest in the library are "assigned" to the library as prospects. Additionally, the librarian must insist upon being a full participant in the campaign, as mentioned above.

The level of territoriality depends on the nature of the university; however, especially when it comes to money and the identification of sources of funding, even the most amicable of campuses can become competitive. When librarians persuade university administrators that their department is just as worthy of fund-raising as the teaching units, they may lose the venerated status that libraries usually have in academia and become just "one of the boys." Despite the fact that it seems reasonable for academic departments and schools to cooperate with the library to raise funds—e.g., to improve the collections in an area of interest to the department or school—the librarian may find it almost impossible to persuade a colleague dean or department chair to incorporate library collection support in a joint endeavor.

This means that the library, while not completely on its own, must be just as active as other parts of the university, traveling to meet prospects and donors, working with volunteer boards and committees, and following a systematic plan to achieve its monetary goal. The activities that a librarian must engage in to become successful in this environment are certainly not those that most librarians anticipated when they decided to pursue librarianship as a profession. But increasingly, librarians no longer have a choice about whether to engage in external fund-raising or not. It is expected of library directors just as it is of other top administrators in the university. The library comes to this game with some significant disadvantages but with a mission that speaks to many people and that can be turned to great advantage. The central development office should ultimately come to appreciate the benefits derived from talking with alumni, parents, and friends about the library, and academic administrators will eventually accept the new role of the library as an academic support service while its administrators are colleagues and competitors in the contest for funds.

Conclusion

The changing world of higher education has made it almost imperative for librarians to become fully engaged in the process of fund-raising and development for their libraries on behalf of their universities. Fighting the old saw that "it is impossible to raise money for libraries" are an increasing number of academic libraries participating in their institutions' capital campaigns with goals of $20 million, $30 million, or more. Library
administrators need to recognize this trend and take advantage of the very considerable goodwill that most people feel toward libraries.

Libraries need to build constituencies and define directions that make it clear to those both inside and outside the university what payoff results from investments in the university's library—the heart of the university. A library director at a university engaged in major fund-raising needs either to participate fully in this process or to ensure that the structure of the library includes competent staff who are able to take on this role. Organizing the library to successfully raise funds while simultaneously providing the best possible service to the campus community is a challenge that needs to be addressed, and sooner rather than later.

Each library director will have to work with his or her community, development office, potential and actual constituency, and administration to identify the best way in which to supplement increasingly scarce resources. Development, the library world's newest special function, serves as the means to insert the library's interests in not only annual fund and special fund-raising efforts but in major gifts and capital campaigns as well.
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ABSTRACT

Annual fund programs are the building blocks for every other major funding program of the academic library. Keys to library annual fund success include identifying the library's constituents, developing a compelling case for support, and determining how the solicitation message can be delivered most effectively subject to existing internal and external barriers. Examples of effective strategies used to overcome these barriers are provided from U.S. and Canadian academic libraries. With the annual fund program firmly established, the academic library is then well positioned to seek the major funds required for growth and innovation.

WHY ANNUAL FUNDS?

Annual fund programs are frequently called the foundation or the base of the giving pyramid. It can be tempting to focus solely on major gift programs at the middle of the pyramid or to singularly contemplate the vast intergenerational transfer of wealth awaiting those who focus on planned giving at the top of the pyramid. However, "Pyramids," as Greenfield (1999) observed, "are built from the bottom up" (p. 98). So essential is annual giving to the total well being of the development program that Rosso (1991) has called the annual fund "the cornerstone and the key to success for all aspects of the resources development program" (p. 51).
According to Nichols (1986), major or capital gift programs produce "funds to grow by" (p. 253) while annual fund programs provide equally crucial "funds to live by" (p. 253). In spite of the fact that annual funds bring in the "immediate dollars that help the college or university close the gap between revenues and expenditures" (Welch, 1980, p. 2), there is a popular myth that annual giving programs are somehow less important to the development program than major giving programs.

Nichols (1986) asserted that such thinking is myopic and mistaken for several reasons. First, annual giving dollars often provide income that is many times greater than the size of the endowment required to generate comparable funds. Second, annual giving provides a wide base of supporters and, hence, its frequent identification as the base of the giving pyramid. Third, "annual giving solicitations are important cultivation events in the life cycle of major donors" (p. 254). Sadler (1995) advised:

It is through the annual fund that relationships with donors are built. . . . It is difficult to have a successful campaign when your organization has no giving history from which to identify people who can give at appropriate levels. Cultivate relationships through the annual fund. Build trust and confidence in the organization's ability to manage resources well. (p. 33)

By their very nature, annual fund programs are conducted at least on a yearly basis and often more frequently. Although what distinguishes an annual gift from a major gift varies by institution; typically these annual gifts are contributions of less than $10,000.

In the past, annual fund solicitations have been targeted toward unrestricted gifts. However, the Council for Aid to Education (1998) reported: "For the past 15 or more years, unrestricted gifts to current operations have been roughly flat in constant dollar terms" (p. 13) and as a percentage of gifts received for current operations have steadily declined. In the last five years, unrestricted gifts have fallen from 31.2 percent of funds received for current operations in 1993 to 25.7 percent of the funds received for current operations in 1998 (Council for Aid to Education, 1999a, Table 7; Council for Aid to Education, 1995, Table 7). Greenfield (1999) concluded: "More and more, donors prefer specific projects, tangible items, and results whose value they can appreciate" (p. 102).

Annual Fund Programs for Libraries—The Context

Annual fund programs are the building blocks for every other major funding program of the academic library. Given the trend for academic library development programs to be created by the pressure of impending institution-wide capital fund-raising campaigns, it is not surprising to see some libraries bypass an annual fund program in an attempt to move directly to major gift fund-raising. While such a strategy may be successful in the short term, it does not bode well for a consistent growth-oriented
library development program in the long term. What will nurture and help grow all other development programs is a well-designed creative annual fund program.

Kemmis (1998) observed that: “The fund-raising experiences in libraries parallel those in the nonprofit sector” (p. 196). We maintain that, while the principles of annual fund programs are the same for academic libraries as for any other campus academic unit, academic libraries may face barriers to creating a successful annual fund program from inside the library as well as from within the institution. Fortunately, academic libraries are in an excellent position to build partnerships within the institution and can offer donors giving opportunities that are truly unique. The remainder of this discussion will examine the keys to a successful library annual fund program, will describe creative ways in which barriers have been overcome, and will report on some productive annual fund campaigns in U.S. and Canadian academic libraries.

**Building Successful Annual Fund Programs**

Perhaps the biggest challenge to, and most important key to, annual fund success is identifying the library’s constituents. Clark (1986) stated:

> [M]any institutional development professionals feel that the university library presents a real challenge in garnering support. They argue that the colleges have a ready-made constituency in their graduates, whereas the library offers no degree and has difficulty building a loyal base of support. On the other hand, the library supports all academic programs. Gifts to the library, therefore, indirectly benefit the colleges and their students whether in engineering, business, or liberal arts. (p. 20)

In addition to the natural constituencies of current and former students, faculty, staff, and other groups (such as community members and corporations) use the academic library and should be identified as potential contributors. Once identified, each of these constituencies should be segmented into definable and distinguishable campaigns within the annual fund program. Greenfield (1999) stated:

> Unfortunately, most organizations do not give much time or thought to identifying their more likely constituents as potential partners and candidates for active participation. Nor do they make an effort to understand their needs, wants, and desires to learn if the organization’s mission, vision, and values are a match. The all-too-common short-sighted view is to just ask as many people for money as you can afford to and do it as quickly as possible. (p. 102)

For instance, the benefits a contributing student will want are different from those which will appeal to faculty and staff and different again for a company or community member. The solicitation should reflect the differences in library use and the needs for that particular group.
The person selected to lead the annual fund campaign for a particular constituency should also reflect these differences. Some universities have ties with coaches who want to demonstrate their commitment to academics by supporting the library. Coaches as chairs of annual fund campaigns can work well with alumni and community campaigns but may not be a good choice for university employee campaigns. Presidents and provosts of the university may be a more credible match for campaigns targeting employees.

The second key is having a compelling case for support. Martin (1998) affirmed: “To persuade individuals or organizations to invest in the library, the library and university must articulate their goals, priorities, and therefore their funding needs” (p. 4). A project with a clear goal or definitive outcome will motivate current library donors to continue giving and will encourage prospective donors to make the first gift. At the University of New Mexico (UNM), Richard Peck, the former president of the institution, set a goal for the university libraries to break into the top fifty libraries in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) as part of an institutional goal to seek membership in the American Association of Universities. At the time, the UNM Libraries were ranked 108 of the 111 member libraries. A lofty yet attainable goal and a clear rationale for seeking financial support from a broad base of the university’s constituents combined to create a nearly irresistible case for support. Ultimately, the library and university achieved this decade-long goal.

Although a challenge, raising unrestricted funds may be a high priority for the library dean or director and will require a very strong case for support. At the Oklahoma State University Libraries, raising unrestricted funds has been a top priority for the Friends of the OSU Library since the group’s inception ten years ago. Stewardship updates throughout the year that demonstrate a great “return on investment” to Friends members and potential members, as well as the opportunity to have gifts of a certain level recognized with personalized bookplates in new library materials, have helped make the Friend’s annual fund campaign a vital source of these important funds. Nichols (1980) noted that: “In this age of philanthropic competition and accountability, the function of all worthwhile funds must be explained fully and well” whether the funds sought are for a specific project or are unrestricted in their purpose (p. 10).

Knowing where constituents are geographically located in relationship to the institution is another key to success. For example, academic libraries located in urban settings are more likely to find success in raising annual fund dollars through campus-based special events than libraries located in rural areas. Libraries in rural areas may have to rely more heavily on direct mail and telephone appeals to raise annual support and may find some constituencies such as corporate users to be a rather small group.
By itself, location will not determine success. A plan that fully recognizes both the limitations and attributes of location will succeed.

A fourth key is to determine the optimum time during the year in which to run each campaign. Some library annual fund campaigns will be dictated by the university calendar. For instance, Mary Stanley, library development officer at the University of Waterloo, has found that appeals to the parents of graduating seniors to buy a book in honor of their graduate seem to get the best results if they are sent out at least six to eight weeks prior to graduation (M. Stanley, personal communication, June 16, 1999). At Oklahoma State University, an otherwise sound appeal to the analogous group had a tremendously low response rate when a university official determined that the solicitation letter could be sent only to a list of the parents of students who actually were certified to graduate—a list produced almost a month after the excitement of graduation had passed. It was an expensive and frustrating lesson that timing can make or break an annual fund campaign.

The final key is to determine how the solicitation message can be delivered most effectively subject to existing internal or external barriers. Fundamental to this key is assessing who drives annual fund programs at the institution. At institutions with a centralized development structure and/or no development program at the library, the college or university may be in the driver’s seat with respect to the library’s annual fund program. In such cases, it is not unusual to see less specific and creative annual fund programs for libraries. Typically, the library is represented as one of the check-offs in a comprehensive campaign for the whole institution. Many institutions, even with an established library development program, feel fortunate to get this one inclusion to occur through central development offices. Unlike library-initiated campaigns, the central development office usually pays for solicitation materials and staff salaries. It is our observation that these campaigns are not as successful as library driven efforts with regard to numbers of new contributors and the amount of money raised toward the library’s greatest needs.

At institutions with a shared or decentralized development structure and/or a library with an established development program, the library may have a great deal of control over its annual fund program. When the library is in the driver’s seat, the annual fund program may consist of multiple annual fund campaigns in a variety of formats targeted at different groups.

**BREAKING DOWN THE BARRIERS**

*How Can We Afford This?*

Most of the barriers to successful library annual fund programs can be viewed within a framework of resource scarcity. From the smallest
state-assisted four-year college to the most well-endowed private research university, there is a widely held view on campuses that there is a scarcity of critical resources. First and foremost is money, which falls far short of covering ever-expanding programmatic, personnel, and plant needs of the typical institution. Also included as resources are alumni and friends, who provide private support; students, who pay tuition; legislative appropriations, which comprise a continuously shrinking piece of the pie for state-assisted institutions; and staff, who can develop and manage effective fund-raising programs.

Casual observation suggests that the more money and staff time the library is willing to dedicate to acquiring external resources, the more autonomy it will have over its development program and thus its annual fund program. In a resource-scarce environment, the commitment of financial resources to a well-conceived library development program is perhaps the single most important action a library dean or director can take. This decision sends a clear and indisputable message that the library is serious in its desire to seek and obtain private support.

However, making a short or one-time commitment to fund-raising in general, and annual fund support in particular, is not enough. To be successful, academic libraries need to make at least a three-year commitment toward raising money, with an adequate budget for identification and cultivation of donors, solicitation materials, and recognition items. The library dean or director should make the commitment with the attitude that this investment will pay off. Annual fund programs can be very expensive relative to other fund-raising projects. Even with seasoned programs, it can cost fifty cents to raise one dollar. Library administrators need to be aware of the initial costs and accept that these programs build the support base that will lead individuals to contribute more over time. The relative costs associated with raising these dollars will decrease over time.

Most internal resistance to library fund-raising is encountered in the effort to set priorities. In a climate where inflation in monograph and journal budgets consistently and significantly outpaces general inflation, academic libraries find it difficult to divert funds that are already inadequate for current needs and to invest them in projects in which returns may not be immediate and substantial. The mantra for any fund-raising effort is that it takes spending money to raise money. The most promising fund-raising programs are responsible for costs and stay within their budgets. Taking the time at the outset to prepare clear, written, and realistic expectations for the overall library development program is essential. Such an exercise will help define the qualifications of those who are selected to be involved with the program, will provide unambiguous criteria for evaluating results, and will offer the accountability requisite for internal support.
Whom Can We Ask?

Another critical barrier to overcome is obtaining access to the university's database of donors. This means not only being able to physically view the database but also, more importantly, having an opportunity equal with other academic units on campus to solicit donors and potential donors for the library. Hood (1993) urged: "The library should push for access to the university's central donor base, and make sure that this access is granted at the highest possible university level. Access will enable the library to identify, cultivate relations with, and solicit funds from alumni and other donors" (p. 2).

As previously noted, although the academic library supports all degree programs, no one receives a degree from the library—not even the alumni of graduate programs in library and information science. Many libraries have been successful in inviting other schools and colleges to permit the libraries to ask their non-donating alumni to contribute to the libraries. That alumni are the focus of these efforts is no mistake. The Council for Aid to Education (1999b) reported: "Alumni contributions continue to comprise the majority of all giving [to American colleges and universities]—an estimated $5.5 billion in 1998, or 30 percent of total contributions" (p. 1).

The University of Illinois Libraries brought numerous non-donating alumni into the fold of giving alumni by soliciting them for the library. And once they began giving to the library, many expanded their giving to include other areas of the university (Hood, 1993, p. 2). A similar approach by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries netted a number of new alumni donors for the libraries, including a $5,000 gift from one of these first-time donors (A. M. Michel, personal communication, March 6, 1997; LIBDEV listserv communication, April 18, 1997). In spite of the strong feelings of some college-based development officers, not all alumni feel a great affinity for the department or college from which they received their degree. Soliciting them for the library may be a highly effective way to involve them philanthropically in the life of the institution.

As academic libraries gain more experience in soliciting alumni with no prior giving history at the university, it is becoming clear that, even among these groups, selection and segmentation is important. The University of Pennsylvania Libraries have found that targeting non-donors who are Penn graduate degree recipients is far more productive than targeting non-donors with undergraduate degrees from their institution. According to Amelia Schmertz, assistant director of development: "It is clear that, at Penn at least, the grad students feel much more linked to the library than do undergrads" (A. Schmertz, LIBDEV listserv communication, June 11, 1999). The age of non-donors may also be a factor. Adam Corson-Finnerty, director of development for the University of Pennsylvania
Libraries, reported that a mailing to nondonors who had graduated more than twenty-five years ago was "a bust." He indicated that, in the future, he would direct such mailings to nondonors who had graduated ten to twenty years ago (A. Corson-Finnerty, LIBDEV listserv communication, May 7, 1999).

Leslie DiBona, director of development for the San Diego State University (SDSU) Library, reported that soliciting nondonors can be an effective way to get the library "on the radar screen" at the central development office. At a time when the SDSU library was not included in the mainstream of the institution's annual fund program, DiBona devised a simple, yet effective, plan from which the library and participating colleges benefitted. Deans from the colleges of Arts and Letters, Engineering, and Sciences gave permission for their nondonating alumni to be called on behalf of the library. Gifts received were placed in a library materials endowment fund restricted to the donor's college. Both the library development officer and the college development officer received a report listing these new donors. Donors from this campaign were treated as LYBUNTs (donors who made a gift last year but not this year) for the college and were solicited by the college the following year. In a one-year period, the SDSU library received gifts from well over 300 alumni who had previously been nondonors to the institution, with the average gift around $25.

In part because of this very respectable showing, the SDSU library has since been included in all aspects of the institutional annual fund program. The library now appears as an option on all annual fund direct mail appeals and is offered as a choice for those contacted by the telefund program. DiBona has even received a verbal commitment from the annual fund director that the library will be the focus of a spring 2000 calling program in which donors who have already made a gift to the institution during the fiscal year are solicited for the library (L. DiBona, LIBDEV listserv communication, April 17, 1997; and personal communication, July 13, 1999).

A number of academic libraries have put a new twist on the definition of "alumni." On many campuses, only the college or university food service employs more hourly student workers than the library. Treating former student employees as alumni and cultivating current student employees can have big payoffs. The Oklahoma State University Libraries have received two gifts of over $100,000 from former student employees who were identified through library annual fund solicitations. One of these donors established an endowment that provides two (and soon four) annual awards of $500 each for student employees selected as outstanding by their supervisor and a selection committee. At the Indiana University Libraries, each graduating student employee is recognized through the selection of a book plate in his/her honor. These programs allow the libraries to thank
this vital group of employees and, at the same time, cultivate future library donors.

In one of the more ambitious annual fund campaigns directed at this constituency, the Indiana University Foundation called approximately 8,000 former student employees of the Indiana University Libraries and invited them to make a gift to the libraries. According to Beverly Byl, executive director of library development at Indiana University and the person who initiated this campaign, the effort was a modest success in terms of the funds raised, but the libraries may reap significant financial rewards in the future. She was successful in having this group of former students coded as library student employees in the university's donor database and has also added many names of people with a natural affinity for the libraries to their mailing list. She has further opened the lines of communication with this group by adding a feature on a current and former student employee to the libraries' donor newsletter (B. Byl, personal communication, May 20, 1999).

The University of Georgia Libraries found that current library employees can also be a fruitful target of an annual fund campaign. In launching an ambitious $20 million campaign for the libraries, Chantel Dunham, director of development for the University of Georgia Libraries, determined that their campaign should start from the inside out. Presentations were given to different departments within the library to explain the campaign and to encourage staff participation. Participation, not the size of the gift, was paramount in this campaign. To encourage a positive response, the library director and three assistant university librarians personally agreed to match the staff and library faculty gifts one-for-one over a five-year period. In addition, the libraries created meaningful recognition and benefit opportunities to inspire support. After the personal presentations, the library sent out a mailing encouraging participation and providing information on payroll deduction procedures as well as gift information. Campaign progress was updated monthly in the interlibrary newsletter. Dunham reported that the five-month campaign was a great success. Including the matching funds, they raised $30,000 from library faculty and staff with numerous gifts in the $500 to $1,000 ranges. More importantly to this campaign, combined faculty and staff participation reached 53 percent with 100 percent participation from the library faculty. In addition, the campaign, which is scheduled for completion in June 2001, is mentioned to new employees, and they are asked if they would like to have their name on a bookplate, which requires a minimum gift of $20 (C. Dunham, personal communication, June 2, 1999).

The University of Kentucky Libraries took the employee campaign one step further when they involved all University of Kentucky (UK) employees in a special solicitation for the UK libraries. The purpose of this campaign, conducted during the 1991-92 academic year, was to raise money
to meet a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Challenge Grant for endowed book funds and to raise funds toward a new central library facility. Approximately 78 percent, or over 12,000 UK employees, contributed just over $1 million to the campaign.

Paula Pope, the UK libraries development officer, noted the techniques that worked in making this campaign flourish. The faculty and staff had never before—and have not since—been solicited for a university fund-raising campaign. In addition, the university president issued a moratorium on other college and department campaigns for the school year, denoting the importance of this match for the library. One staff member for every five was recruited and trained as a library campaign fund-raiser, and they were all assigned to solicit no more than five colleagues. Contributions could be made by payroll deduction and spread out over five years to maximize pledges for the match. Staff were assured that at no time would a list be published of donors to allow others to see who did and who did not give to the campaign. However, a specially designed UK pin was given to donors, and most donors wore it proudly—and still do.

Other noteworthy factors were that no cash campaign goal was ever established. Participation and numbers of contributors were encouraged, and a number of departments had 100 percent participation. The most notable among these departments was the Physical Plant Division, a large unit of the university that includes janitors, carpenters, and campus maintenance employees. Through this campaign, a number of employees asked that their payroll deduction be continued indefinitely after the end of the campaign. They had discovered that they did not miss the money and liked the idea of supporting the library in perpetuity. Ultimately, the NEH Challenge Grant was met and the building campaign for the new William T. Young Library was successfully completed with over $23 million raised in the process. UK employees have the satisfaction of knowing that the beautiful new library, which opened April 3, 1998, would not have been realized without their considerable base of support (P. Pope, personal communication, June 8, 1999).

Some academic libraries have been very successful in nurturing and growing Friends groups that provide annual financial support to the library. Such groups may include faculty, students, alumni, members of the community, and even corporate users of the library. Membership categories with benefits associated with various levels of yearly giving are typical of these organizations. Although further discussion of these sometimes complex groups is beyond the scope of this discussion, Friends’ groups can play an important role in building the academic library’s fund-raising constituency. Clark (1990) and Dolnick’s (1996) discussions of Friends of the library are particularly helpful for those seeking more information.
Making the library the focus of a new or existing program may pro-
vide another foot in the institutional door for library annual fund pro-
grams and afford access to an entirely new group of library donors. Re-
union giving programs are one such avenue which the University of Con-
necticut (UConn) libraries have found to be profitable. At UConn, the
last three fiftieth reunion classes have established monetary goals and raised
money for the UConn libraries. Linda Perrone, director of development
for the UConn libraries, noted that fiftieth reunion gift campaigns are a
new development initiative at the university. Not only did UConn have no
track record in working with reunion classes on gifts prior to this endeavor,
but the libraries also had no experience in working with special interest
groups to raise money for library initiatives. Although UConn's central
development office formally assigned class gift campaigns to the Director
of the Annual Fund, Perrone found that a strategic point person in the
specified area of interest (i.e., the libraries) was necessary to map out and
guide the solicitation process.

In 1997, the class of 1947 committed to raise $25,000 to furnish and
equip a new conference room in the Homer Babbidge Library. The
Babbidge Library, UConn's main library, was undergoing extensive reno-
vations at the time. In spite of a late start and a class with a minimal record
of philanthropic support for UConn, the class raised $29,000 in a six-month
period. The class of 1948 decided to emulate the Class of 1947 by not only
raising money for the libraries but also doubling its goal. They chose to
raise $50,000 to equip one of two new information technology centers in
the newly renovated Babbidge Library. With leadership from an experi-
enced volunteer chairperson and several classmates who agreed to per-
sonally solicit other class members, the class of 1948 successfully achieved
its $50,000 campaign goal.

The most recent fiftieth reunion class, the class of 1949, trumped the
class of 1948 by pledging to raise $100,000 to furnish and equip the new
dramatic arts and music library. Although this class fell short of its goal, it
did succeed in raising $60,000 by its June reunion. The class fund-raising
committee co-chairperson is currently soliciting several additional class
members with the capability of making leadership gifts in hopes of still
meeting the goal.

Perrone, while eager to cooperate and provide guidance, credited
much of the success of these reunion campaigns to UConn's annual fund
office. In addition to providing a comprehensive list of all class members
with their addresses, telephone numbers, and cumulative gift histories, it
assigned key annual fund student employees to make follow-up calls on
behalf of the reunion campaigns and sent the blanket solicitation letter
and pledge card to each reunion class member. Like most annual fund
campaigns, this was a labor-intensive activity. However, class members, the
annual fund office, and the library shared the work and the costs. For the
UConn libraries, the results have made it a worthwhile partnership (L. Perrone, personal communication, June 14, 1999).

Working to have the library included in a wider institutional effort may be an obvious, but nonetheless effective, way to get the library message in front of a broad audience of potential supporters. At the University of Waterloo, the library is more than just a check-off on the institution’s annual fund appeal. For the last two years, the institution’s development office has administered a secure Web site that allows potential donors to make contributions online. Mary Stanley reported that the library was automatically included in this innovative program because it was already participating in the institution’s traditional annual fund program. Visitors to the University of Waterloo Annual Fund Web site can navigate through the list of institutional priorities and click on the library priorities should they choose to do so. What Stanley suspected, however, was that the library was far more likely to be the beneficiary of gifts made online if library acquisitions were listed as a priority by the university's colleges. While library acquisitions have yet to be listed by all the colleges, her suspicion has been borne out. The majority of online gifts received by the library have come through the colleges’ priority lists (M. Stanley, personal communication, June 16, 1999).

The common thread among all these efforts is that library and/or development staff have found a way to “sell the library” to one or to several groups. However, translating the academic library’s goals, mission, accomplishments, and needs into a successful annual fund campaign can present another major barrier to success with library annual fund programs.

How Do We Sell the Library?

For those who love libraries, the idea that the library needs to be “sold” to make it a worthy recipient of financial support is a foreign idea. Unfortunately, marvelous collections, outstanding service, and even a scholarly ambiance may not be enough to attract financial support. Creative partnerships, noteworthy special events, and fund-raising programs that capitalize on the academic library’s unique role within the institution may be necessary to move the library’s development program—and especially its annual fund program—forward.

A number of academic libraries have developed well-publicized fund-raising partnerships with their institution’s athletic department or with an outstanding coach. The Pennsylvania State University Libraries’ long collaboration with football coaching legend Joe Paterno and the Indiana University Libraries’ relationship with Hoosier basketball coach Bob Knight are just two of these well-known efforts. Such partnerships can provide academic credibility to athletics and visibility and excitement to the libraries.
Since few people in New Mexico could rally fans like then Lobos' basketball coach Dave Bliss, he was asked to chair a campaign to raise money for the University of New Mexico General Library. The “Build a Future with Books” campaign was organized in 1995 to raise $1 million over two years. As part of this campaign, the “Books and Baskets” program, created by Bliss, raised $100,000 in pledges and cash for library acquisitions and for renovations at the Lobos’ basketball facility, the Pit. Bliss started the program to link athletics and academics in a team-motivated fund-raising effort. Symbolically, the 1995 Lobo basketball team photograph, used in the poster for the team’s season game schedule, was taken inside UNM’s Zimmerman Library to demonstrate the partnership between the library and athletics.

Bliss signed annual fund appeal letters to alumni and co-signed with other UNM administrators for faculty and staff mailings. Through “Books and Baskets,” he created an annual fund campaign that provided new sources of revenue as well as visibility for the UNM libraries’ bid to be within the top fifty ARL institutions. Bliss’s association with the libraries conveyed the notion that libraries are as competitive as athletics and that the similarities between the organizations could work together to create a better university for all students. Not only was this message very potent in direct mail solicitations, but Bliss’s name was also enormously valuable. Many people who otherwise never would have considered making a contribution to the UNM libraries did so upon receiving a letter from Bliss asking them to give.

As powerful an alliance as athletics can be for an academic library’s annual giving program, it is certainly not a partnership that will appeal to all constituencies. For the last few years, the University of Guelph Library has partnered with parents of Guelph students to benefit the library exclusively. Parents of incoming students are called by the university’s central development office and invited to make a gift that will benefit current and future generations of students—a gift to the library. In addition to this group, parents who contributed to the fund in the past are also asked to consider another annual gift to the library, and many of them take the opportunity to renew their support.

According to Michael Ridley, chief librarian at the University of Guelph Library, contributions to this important program have increased each year since its inception and now average between $80,000 and $100,000 annually. Unfortunately, the library’s pre-eminent spot in this partnership has come to a close with the start of this academic year. The library will now be one of several options to which parents can designate their support. Scholarship programs, representing one of the alternative options, have received newfound emphasis with matching funds provided by the Ontario provincial government. Ridley expects that, without such a multiplier for the library, proceeds for the library from the
parents' partnership will diminish at least temporarily (M. Ridley, personal communication, July 19, 1999).

Many academic libraries have seen the advantages of leveraging fund-raising dollars through challenge grants. While challenge grants are one of the oldest and most traditional techniques fund-raisers have used to maximize financial support, there is nothing traditional about the partnership the University of New Mexico libraries have forged. For the last five years, the UNM Regents have been the source of challenge grant funds for the UNM libraries. During this time, over $1.5 million has been raised for library collections, helping the libraries and the university meet the goal of significantly improving the library's ARL ranking. Matching dollars have varied throughout this effort and have ranged from an initial 1:1 match to a final 1:3 match as the campaign gained momentum.

Extremely positive media coverage about the partnership made the UNM Regents want to continue this relationship with the libraries even after the goal of a top fifty ARL ranking had been achieved. Because of inadequate space to accommodate growing collections and the need to cut journal allocations by $900,000 over this decade, the UNM libraries went back to the Regents and requested a different type of challenge grant this year. The proposal was for a three-year commitment to provide $100,000 from the Regents Challenge Grant annually to match the $200,000 the libraries committed to raise for journal acquisitions. Thus, in a three-year awards period, $900,000 will be raised for electronic and paper journals. The goal is to make up for a decade-long loss within the first three years of the new century. Although the UNM libraries will continue to raise money for books, this new Regents Challenge Grant offers another opportunity to educate the public about the library's needs, mission, and accomplishments while making up for lost ground in journal acquisitions.

Like the University of New Mexico Libraries, the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) Library saw the advantages of using a challenge grant to initiate a new fund-raising effort. With help from a California foundation, the UCSC Library was able to launch its first-ever telefund campaign with outstanding results. In a program the library has simply called the "Buy-A-Book" program, former and prospective donors to the library are asked to make a gift that will purchase a book. Margaret Gordon, assistant to the university librarian at UCSC, reported that, during the first years of the program, potential contributors were advised that their gifts would be matched through the generosity of a local foundation. This added impetus to make a gift helped get the program off the ground.

Today, donors who pledge a minimum of $50 are able to have a personalized bookplate placed inside the book and may recommend the subject area. What is notable about this program is that appropriate titles are
quickly selected from the library's current acquisitions area and donors are notified in the pledge confirmation letter about the book(s) that have been added to the collection because of their gifts. Gordon noted that this strategy is quite effective. The library has the highest pledge fulfillment rate—more than 85 percent—of any unit on campus. According to Gordon, people who pledge pay because they see almost immediately the tangible results of their gift giving (M. Gordon, personal communication, June 11, 1999).

Another academic library that has used books (and bookplates) at the center of its appeal is the University of South Florida (USF) Library. Through a direct mail solicitation, USF library supporters at the Tampa Campus are offered a lasting and meaningful way to celebrate a birthday, honor a graduate, commemorate an anniversary, or remember a loved one. Contributors can choose the wording to inscribe on a bookplate, which is placed in a book chosen in the subject area of the contributor's interest. A personalized bookplate requires a minimum gift of $50, a fairly standard contribution amount for many annual fund donors. Additionally, the mailer describing the bookplate program is included with other library correspondence and in folders of information prepared for community groups who visit the library as well as being placed at strategic locations throughout the library. Lizabeth Sismilich, director of development for the USF Tampa Campus Library, acknowledged that, for the USF libraries, the bookplate program has been the entryway into larger and more significant gifts. A number of the major gifts the library has received toward its $6.5 million goal in a $220 million institutional campaign have come from donors who made their first library gift through the bookplate program (L. Sismilich, personal communication, May 17, 1999; July 14, 1999).

Any discussion of efforts to market the academic library for the annual fund would be incomplete without at least a brief mention of special events. Special events that receive "quality direction and professional management" (Greenfield, 1999, p. 136) can provide an avenue for increased library awareness while bringing in annual fund gifts and prospective annual donors from new sources. Kelly (1998) advised:

[S]pecial events can play a critical role in fund-raising management; however, they are among the least efficient of all techniques when used to solicit annual gifts. Solicitation events generally cost a great deal—often one half or more of the money raised. They are extremely labor intensive—often requiring thousands of hours of staff and volunteer time. (p. 471)

Yet Kelly also reached the conclusion that many directors of annual fund programs for the academic library know: "If selected and implemented strategically... [special events] do have their place in the solicitation mix" (p. 473).
The University of New Mexico General Library has two signature events that provide high visibility, build and revitalize the library donor base, and add the spice and variety that helps maintain interest in their total development program. Both events utilize corporate sponsorships that contribute toward the expenses, so all ticket sales and other proceeds directly benefit the library. Norwest Banks has been a major sponsor of academic exhibits in the library as well as the primary sponsor of the library's benefit fashion show, the only haute-couture runway show in a university library in the world. KOOL 102, an Albuquerque "oldies" station, has been a major sponsor of a library benefit sock hop which has featured the talents of such entertainment legends as Chubby Checker and Mary Wilson of the Supremes. These events were very successful, annually netting $15,000 to $20,000 in expendable funds for the libraries while pumping out information throughout the broadcast day about the library and the needs of the university. Although both events were extremely time-consuming efforts, many of the individuals and companies that participated would not have known about the needs, mission, and goals of the library if they had not been asked to become involved in these affairs.

What Do We Do about Capital Campaigns?

It is not uncommon for annual fund programs to be stopped or sidetracked during a capital campaign. Nevertheless, in today's campaign fundraising environment where extraordinarily large goals are the norm, more and more institutions are counting annual giving in campaign totals. Should the library be in the fortunate position of deciding its own fate on this issue, Anne Lechartier at the American Library in Paris identified three reasons why it is so important to continue the annual fund program while a capital campaign is in progress. First, donors for the two types of appeals tend to be quite different with little overlap in giving. Those who give to the annual fund give smaller gifts than those who give for the capital campaign. Second, through the yearly—or more often—repetition of an annual appeal, giving to the annual fund becomes a habit. Individuals become accustomed to receiving the annual campaign letter, which serves to update and educate the public, and they get used to writing a yearly check, which ultimately helps the library with current needs. Finally, Lechartier observed that annual fund returns almost always increase yearly, despite the continuation of the building campaign (A. Lechartier, LIBDEV listserv communication, May 21, 1999).

This clarification of the difference in purpose between the two types of fund-raising programs demonstrates the need to provide a comprehensive program of fund-raising options. The annual fund provides an avenue for smaller and more frequent gifts. Major and capital projects allow larger contributors a way to give toward naming opportunities and other high profile projects. A wide range of projects that can appeal to individu-
als, companies, and foundations at many different giving levels is also im-
portant.

CONCLUSION

Annual fund programs are notoriously high cost and low contribu-
tion activities, but they continue to be “annual” programs because they
are repeatedly worth the money and the effort. Each year they bring in
new contributors who become “family members” of the library and the
institution. Greenfield (1999) stated: “In time, these faithful donors may
commit assets acquired over their lifetime to the organization through
major gifts, endowment gifts, planned gifts, and bequests from their es-
tate. All these good things become possible from a comprehensive pro-
gram of annual giving” (p. 99).

Identifying constituents, preparing a compelling case for support, and
determining the right message for the right audience at the right time are
the challenging keys to a successful long-term annual fund program. The
barriers to success are not insurmountable, as has been shown by the aca-
demic libraries used as examples throughout this text.

Building the annual fund program, the base of the total resource
development program, provides academic libraries with opportunities to
clarify their vision, focus on priorities, create new strategic alliances, and
capitalize on unique strengths while raising significant funds for current
needs. With the annual fund program firmly established, the academic
library is then well positioned to seek the major funds required for growth
and innovation.
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It's Hard to Make New Friends: What to Think About in Creating a Friends of the Library Group

Merrily E. Taylor

Abstract
The article covers key issues which must be considered as a library begins to create a Friends group, from the group's basic purpose to infrastructure issues such as staffing, programs, and other operating costs. The author makes the case that the success of a Friends group depends on the care with which these issues have been identified and addressed.

Introduction
As more and more libraries are urged by their boards or parent institutions to address ever-growing operations and collection needs by finding new sources of support, library administrators often contemplate the creation of a "Friends of the Library" group or, in some cases, the revitalization of a Friends group which exists but which is nearly moribund. While it is tempting to move in this direction, especially when senior administrators or eager volunteers are strongly encouraging the idea, initiating a Friends of the Library is not a trivial matter and a number of issues must be explored thoroughly before the final decision is made. Taking the time to contemplate these matters may risk a delay in the formation of a productive group but, in the long run, will enable the Friends to function smoothly and, in the worse case scenario, may prevent the creation of a group which the institution is poorly positioned to support.

The first question to ask in considering the formation of a Friends group is, What does the library want from a Friends group—what will be its primary role? Although it is sometimes taken for granted that Friends
groups are created primarily as another venue for fund-raising, this is not always the case. Indeed, one distinguished library director wrote: “The most successful organizations seem to be those that have had a broad charter from the beginning. Their founders have stressed close personal interest in the library; its general growth and effectiveness; articulation of its needs and problems to others; and not mere ‘money-getting’” (Rogers & Weber, 1971, p. 129).

**Definition of Purpose**

Broad-based or not, forming a Friends group without articulating a clear sense of its purpose(s) may lead to trouble and confusion down the line, especially if other units in your organization—e.g., the Development Office—view the Friends as either rivals or tools. It is for this reason that some institutions—such as the library at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota—initiated their Friends group by first creating a constitution and bylaws, clearly setting out the group’s purposes (Haeuser, 1986, p. 25).

A Friends group that has been created with a strong fund-raising orientation will need to make choices accordingly: membership guidelines may be shaped to limit involvement to “good prospects” or events designed to attract individuals with significant amounts of disposable income. A Friends group which is created primarily as a fund-raising entity may be more likely to be administered outside the library, for example, by the institutional development office—something which makes perfect sense if the group is, indeed, mostly about fund-raising. The critical point here is that, before establishing a Friends group which is intended to facilitate fund-raising, it is essential to: (1) recognize the fact and its implications, and (2) consult with other “stakeholders” in the organization who may legitimately see development as their own concern. The clear purpose of the group should be understood by all, and guidelines established for Friends operations within the institution’s general development policy and procedures. At Brown University, for example, the Friends may engage in direct fund-raising drives only in certain approved “windows” during the fiscal year, so as not to compete with critical university priorities such as the annual fund drive. It is important, moreover, to make a clean distinction between Friends-sponsored events, which may not always have immediate fund-raising aims, and events which are specifically intended to cultivate potential donors or generate new gifts. A failure to define the difference between the two may lead to hurt feelings in the Friends group when, for example, what appears to be a “Friends event” is limited to “A-List” donors only.

Whether one wishes to create a fund-raising group, or a broader-based Friends group which will generate new ties with the local community or cultivate book collectors over the long term, it is necessary to decide if
what the library wants from the Friends is feasible in the institutional setting and if it is worth the effort that must be put into the Friends. As Elaine B. Smyth and Robert S. Martin (1994) wrote in an article in *Rare Books and Manuscripts Librarianship*: “Many state universities are located in communities where the spirit of volunteerism and the dedication of the volunteers... greatly outweigh their ability and inclination to make major financial gifts... . Friends groups may be built successfully on the foundation of volunteer assistance, rather than concentrating on the moneyed few” (p. 26). True, but in that setting it would be futile to make the Friends the centerpiece of an institution’s major fund-raising campaign; it would be far more productive and cost-effective to work with the institutional development office to cultivate a handful of key donors. Conversely, in a high-pressure urban area where individuals may find it easier to write a check than to give of their time, defining a Friends group as “the moneyed few,” and expending considerable effort to raise the group’s perceptions of library needs, may make strategic sense.

Even if the library’s primary goal is to create a general support group, “it is extremely important to look at a... library’s local situation” (Smyth & Martin, 1994, p. 27), assess the possibility of community interest carefully, and think about alternatives for achieving the ends one might envision for a Friends group. Assuming that the library has the resources to underwrite the Friends, can the community support such a group? For example, is there a reasonable base of local alumni or other “logical” supporters who may take an interest? Critical to the initiation of the effort is finding the right core group to work with. The library needs people with strong local contacts, the willingness to commit time, organizational skills, and agreement with the library’s general approach (such people might not necessarily know much about the library or its collections, at least at first; they may have given a gift to the library, met the head of special collections in a social situation, or used the library extensively as an undergraduate). In other words, in looking for a core group for the Friends, one does not need to restrict the search to people who are “interested in the Library” per se. An enthusiastic well-connected nucleus of supporters can attract key individuals, generate excitement, and put together an appealing group which others in the community will want to join. If these volunteers are willing to put in the time, they can also keep Friends’ activities “perking” in the early days when resources may be limited but when a high profile is critical.

If a realistic analysis does not reveal a true core of local support, there are other mechanisms besides Friends groups for gaining outside assistance. In the late 1960s, the Wheaton College (Massachusetts) Library perceived the need for an outside body which could serve as a sounding board on library issues and as an advocacy group with the college administration. The creation of a Friends group was considered, but the idea
was set aside when it became clear that Wheaton's geographic location made it unlikely that individuals would journey from Boston, Massachusetts, and Providence, Rhode Island—the two nearest cities—to attend library events in Norton, Massachusetts. In addition, Wheaton College (then a school for women) did not have enough alumnae resident in the area to constitute a viable local Friends infrastructure. As a result of this analysis, Wheaton librarians decided to proceed with a small Visiting Committee made up of carefully selected alumnae, donors, friends, and librarians from other institutions. The Visiting Committee, which recently celebrated its 25th anniversary, meets once or twice a year, provides useful advice to Wheaton librarians and administrators, and fulfills many of the goals originally foreseen for a Friends group with a good deal less overhead.¹

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP

Once an institution has defined the primary purpose of a proposed Friends group, other decisions remain. Some questions may be dictated by the group's primary purpose; others apply regardless of that purpose. One key decision in libraries with a strong special collections presence is whether the Friends group is truly "The Friends of the Library" or is rather "The Friends of Special Collections." This decision will affect recruiting of members, sources of support, programs, the involvement of other library units and, in some cases, the locus of the Friends' administration within the institution. Many Friends groups, especially in older institutions, began as clubs for bibliophiles and presently retain a strong association with the book arts and with special collections. Consequently, Friends groups often originate in special collections and have a natural affinity for that area. For some special collections, indeed, support from a Friends group is critical to the survival of the department since the parent library—having defined special collections, rightly or wrongly, as "non-core"—provides little or no institutional funds for collections, equipment, or other daily needs. In this case, an attempt to "broaden" the perspective of the Friends to incorporate other library needs and issues, however compelling in the abstract, may be met with resistance from the head of special collections, the library director, or quite likely the established Friends membership.

Even if the Friends are not to be seen as an economic lifeline for special collections, it is well to recognize that, in most libraries, the majority of Friends events are built around exhibitions, unique acquisitions and gifts, and "name" collections—in other words, the business of special collections. This being the case, if a library is striving for a true "Friends of the Library," some thought needs to be given to the building and maintenance of a broadbased group. The Brown University Library has had some success with programs which appeal to the general public as well as to the bibliophile; since the Friends of the Library of Brown University was reconstituted
in 1983, programs have included a magic show, a visit to the recently renovated university observatory, a lecture by the Dean of the Graduate School on the library's role in graduate education, a Brown parent talking about her work as an author of children's books, and several programs demonstrating the library's latest technological capacities. A series of programs in 1997/98 was built around a special theme, "Friends talk to Friends," and offered members of the Brown faculty—who are themselves frequently Friends members—the opportunity to speak about their own work and research. Programs of this nature, while not outnumbering those with a bibliophilic theme, serve to attract a wider audience and signal that the Friends group is not only for book collectors.

Another question to be explored is how closely the Friends group will be affiliated with the library. Many Friends associations are fundamentally library-driven, with programs and directions established by librarians working with volunteers. Some Friends groups are independently chartered and run with limited direction from the library. Still others, primarily fund-raising-centered, are administered by another institutional entity, often an institutional "foundation" or development office. There is no single "correct" approach; the strategy chosen depends entirely on the direction the institution wants to take, and what is likely to work best given the local environment. If the Friends group is not to be library-administered, however, it is critical that the library retain a strong voice in planning and policy. Although Louisiana State University has had good luck with a Friends group that "largely runs itself," Smyth and Martin (1994) confirm that the Friends board "takes direction from and includes the Dean of Libraries, the Assistant Dean of Libraries for Special Collections, and the Assistant Dean of Libraries for Collection Development as ex officio members" (p. 26). An effective library voice in Friends planning should avoid the problems reported by some institutions, namely Friends groups which become ineffective through volunteer help which fails to deliver or, conversely, puts in too much time working on projects which benefit the library tangentially if at all.

Even if the central development office has administrative responsibility for the Friends and the group has fund-raising as its primary responsibility, there may be some stress between the library and the development office when it comes to the role of the Friends. Development offices may welcome a Friends group as a natural base for fund-raising but, at the same time, may not have much interest in the non-fund-raising aspects of the group, such as the long-term cultivation of collectors or the strengthening of community ties. For very legitimate reasons, development operations tend to be focused on the latest campaign goal and on the bottom line, whereas with Friends groups, "some entertainment events are strictly for members and there is no attempt to raise money" (Rogers & Weber, 1971, p. 129). In addition, the development office may see time invested in the
Friends as having too small a “return,” while the library may have a much longer-term point of view. Finally, it is important to remember that the strength of Friends groups arises, to some extent, from the degree to which the group feels closely connected to the library, its collections, and its staff; a Friends group with nominal library involvement, whether run independently or by a development office, will suffer if its programs become pro forma and too much like those offered by a host of other local groups.

Structure and Infrastructure

Once one has considered the primary role(s) of the Friends and the particular requirements imposed by the local environment, it is time to think about infrastructure. What (and eventually, how much) is likely to be required to support the Friends as an organization—mailings, record keeping, accounting, programs, membership drives, publications, space, and so on? It is difficult, of course, to estimate costs in the abstract, but the library must develop a rough idea of what it plans to do with and for the Friends; this understanding will help determine the feasibility of forming a group and will also affect potential dues, as well as the sort of programs which will be possible. As Rutherford D. Rogers and David Weber (1971) wrote in their still-relevant University Library Administration, “the breadth of the membership, the objectives of the Friends, the dues structure, and the perquisites of membership are interrelated” (p. 129). In considering this question, contemplate: What will the Friends expect from the library? What are the benefits of membership? What is envisioned as the “hook” which will draw new members? Will programs and publications be an incentive to membership? If so, how will the library fund these? Food, drink, and facilities cost money, and some speakers will expect a fee. If the library is that of a private institution, will Friends expect, and be given, access to the library? Most of these decisions have associated costs and, indeed, political aspects which must be considered—for example, who handles library access questions in the institution and how will that individual or department perceive offering this privilege to Friends, especially if there is an existing charge to “outside borrowers?” Is it likely that people will join the Friends, not to donate funds or to support the library in other ways but simply as a way to gain access, and is that desirable, given the prospective Friends purpose?

In this stage of planning, one must not forget the far-from-inconsequential issue of administrative support. A productive Friends group requires nurturing, encompassing everything from up-to-date membership records to someone “who knows my name when I call.” Some Friends groups make it a point to send out birthday cards to members or flowers when there has been a death in the family. Programs will not be well attended unless invitations go out promptly and are both accurate and
enticing. All of these things require ready and skilled support, and it is
dangerous to assume that this can be provided by the already-harried staff
in the director’s office or by volunteers who may be devoted but unable to
devote the necessary time at the critical moment. A fledgling Friends
group may be able to get by for awhile with “borrowed” or episodic clerical
help, but in the long run it is well to recognize that the group will need
steady reliable support and plan accordingly. This is a case where the
group’s very success creates an increasing workload and increased expec-
tations for businesslike administration and support.

How will the library support the Friends group while it’s being devel-
oped? Is there enough money to pay for start-up costs? Can the institution
absorb the necessary work with existing staff? Even if one assumes that the
Friends will eventually be self-supporting, it may be several years before
income begins to offset costs; in fact, this may never happen. Can the library
afford the Friends? If not, where can start-up and continuing support be
found? At Gustavus Adolphus, “the Development Office has, from the out-
set . . . assumed the overhead costs of organization, communication, and
public relations” (Haeuser, 1986, p. 27). On the other hand, at Brown Uni-
versity, a generous gift from a donor covered start-up costs for the group.
The continuing costs of staff support, events, publications and other mem-
bership-related operating costs are covered largely by Friends dues and
other Friends gifts with the library subsidizing expenses in excess of the
budget. The institution makes this investment with the full knowledge of
the university administration and the Friends board, because overall the
Friends are an excellent investment; their gifts to the institution over the
years, in cash and in kind, have far exceeded Brown’s costs in supporting
the group. Whatever the final approach, it is important to consider a Friends
cost/benefit analysis early in the planning stage. Smyth and Martin (1994)
put it well: “Will the efforts of library staff be repaid? Any development
venture, particularly one involving fund-raising events, risks failure, but if
the event succeeds, will the payoff be worthwhile?” (p. 27).

Finally, in the realm of infrastructure, it will be essential to determine
who, within the library, will have the primary day-to-day administrative re-
sponsibility for the Friends. In most libraries, administrative responsibility
for the Friends is centered in special collections for a number of reasons: as
noted above, Friends members are often book collectors; many Friends
events are centered around significant gifts, unique holdings, exhibits, or
other activities usually the province of special collections; and finally, spe-
cial collections librarians, as a result of their routine responsibilities, fre-
quently have valuable experience in working with alumni, donors, and oth-
ers who may be key elements in a successful Friends group. Centering the
Friends group in special collections need not mean, of course, that the
group’s benefits are restricted to that area. As Rogers and Weber (1971)
write:
No matter how broadly based a Friends organization may be in theory, it is likely to concentrate on rare and special collections . . . the challenge to the director is to channel this enthusiasm to areas of major need, thereby building strengths that could otherwise not be achieved, or through such channeling to release general funds that may be used to benefit other, more prosaic and less attractive but nonetheless essential parts of the library's program. (p. 130)

If a Friends group is not to be administered through special collections, the most likely alternative home for the group is the director's office or, if one exists, the unit responsible for library public relations and fund-raising. Just as it is important for Friends groups which are administered outside the library to have strong involvement and guidance from the library, so too it will be important for special collections to be closely involved in a Friends group which is directed from another department. To the extent that many Friends programs originate around special collections, special collections staff must be involved in planning, especially when a proposed program—for example, an exhibit—involves many weeks of preparation.

A responsible administrator must be in charge of the Friends, but librarians considering the creation of such a group need to recognize the critical role of the library director as well. The library director, when interested and involved, brings to the group the broadest organizational perspective, the ability to commit institutional resources to the effort, contacts with senior institutional officials which may be critical, and the "cachet" which is associated with the position, something which is important to many Friends. The director's active involvement, moreover, signals to the Friends that their efforts are important to the library, appreciated, and recognized. Rogers and Weber's (1971) conclusion on this point is that: "A successful Friends group will not succeed without a great deal of highly personalized attention of an important official of the library . . . although . . . [either the head of special collections or the director] may assume the primary responsibility, both of these officials are certain to be deeply involved if the group is to be successful" (p. 129).

CONCLUSION

A Friends of the Library group can be extremely useful to a library in ways both tangible and intangible. Friends provide gifts in cash and in kind, plan programs to highlight and showcase the collections, and serve as "roving ambassadors" in the community for the library's strengths as well as its needs. A handful of Friends are often substantial donors to the institution. But Friends provide other support as well, as outlined in the Spring 1999 edition of Among Friends, the newsletter of the Friends of the Library of Brown University. As the University Librarian wrote:
thank you simply for being there. Not all of our Library staff members are able to get to Friends events, but I wish more of them could, so as to experience, as I do, your sincere interest and support for what we do. It is wonderful to see both your fascination with our collections and your respect for those of us who have devoted our lives to libraries, and to this one in particular. As with all service operations, we occasionally experience days when the challenges before us seem overwhelming and the struggle thankless. Because we have our Friends, however, we know at heart that the challenges can be met, and that the gratitude is real! (Taylor, 1999, p.1)

As librarians contemplate the creation of a new Friends group, however, it is important that they remember not simply what the Friends may do for the library but what the library owes to its Friends. The Friends deserve well-planned, lively, quality programs, and publications which reflect high standards and topics which will capture Friends’ interest. They may reasonably expect some library “privileges” commensurate with the level of support they have provided. The Friends should feel that key library staff know them as individuals, and that their questions and concerns will be responded to promptly and cheerfully. And, at the most basic level, Friends must be assured that their membership records are maintained in a business-like way, that dues and donations are recorded expeditiously and accurately, and that they are recognized appropriately for their gifts. If a library can begin a Friends program with the assurance that the infrastructure for such support is in place—or that at least a plan for a Friends infrastructure exists—then it can be assured that its Friends group will be productive, supportive and, indeed, fun for all concerned.

Note

1 The author is a member of the Wheaton College Library Visiting Committee and, as a member, heard this history recounted by the Wheaton College librarians.
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Entrepreneurs in the Public Library: Reinventing an Institution

EDWIN S. CLAY, III AND PATRICIA C. BANGS

ABSTRACT
IN THIS CASE STUDY, THE AUTHORS DESCRIBE a library system in northern Virginia which has reinvented itself as a public service corporation. The Fairfax County Public Library in Fairfax, Virginia, has successfully developed a public-private model for fund development using a top managerial committee, known as the Enterprise Group, to integrate fund-development activities into every aspect of the library's operation. Balancing the need for additional revenue with the traditional mission of meeting the informational demands of its users in a cost-effective fashion, the library has been able to avoid the public relations and legal pitfalls that are inherent when public or nonprofit organizations attempt to find private sources of income.

INTRODUCTION
Since 1993, fund-raising and development have become a mainstay in the budget mix of libraries. According to Library Journal's 1999 Budget Report, fund-raising activities for libraries have grown 228 percent in the past six years. In just the last year, the number of libraries reporting fund-raising operations such as foundations jumped 62 percent (Bogart, 1999, p. 6). Obviously, this growth represents the increased need—due in part to the high cost of technology—for alternative funding sources as well as the constrained circumstances of local library budgets.
Public libraries have certainly contributed to this growth, evolving their fiscal development activities from simple used book sales to sophisticated corporate partnerships, grantsmanship, and direct marketing through foundations. As public libraries scurry to augment traditional sources of funding, they must face a number of difficulties, including the public relations consequences of embracing what is perceived as commercialization, threats to tax-exempt status, and the loss of control that can result when corporate funds are solicited.

J. Gregory Dees (1998), an associate professor at the Harvard Business School specializing in social entrepreneurship, suggested in a 1998 Harvard Business Review article that leaders of non-profits must carefully design their strategies on what he calls a "social enterprise spectrum" (p. 56). His definition of this term comprises a model that effectively mixes both the commercial and noncommercial aspects of a nonprofit organization, such as the public library. As he explains: "People want to make contributions to the common good, or to their vision of it. The challenge is to harness these social impulses and marry them to the best aspects of business practice in order to create a social sector that is as effective as it can be" (Dees, 1998, p. 67).

Adapting Entrepreneurship to the Public Library: A Case Study

The Fairfax County Public Library (FCPL), which serves nearly a million residents in northern Virginia, has adopted some of the concepts promulgated by Dees as it reinvents itself, not just as a library, but as a public service corporation.

While the Fairfax County Public Library is located in the affluent northern Virginia suburbs outside Washington, DC, like many library systems throughout the country in the past decade, it has faced shrinking funds. The library competes with seventy-one other county entities for limited tax funds. Its FY 1999 budget of $25,796,130 results in a per capita cost of $26.74. Compared to seven other major public library systems in the Washington, DC, area, FCPL's expenditures per capita rank near the bottom.

When county belt-tightening resulted in the loss to the library of about 100 positions in the early 1990s, culminating with the closing of four mini-branches three years ago, library management decided it needed to "go outside the box" to maintain and augment the quality service that Fairfax County residents had come to expect.

Innovative thinking has resulted in the establishment of a number of programs which provide fund-raising opportunities, including:

- the establishment of a Center for the Book, affiliated with the Library of Congress, which provides free programs for adults, as well as fund-raising programs;
• a volunteer program that promotes the idea that there is no job unsuitable for a volunteer, solicits volunteer help from corporations, and includes volunteer Web designers, Internet tutors for the public, and a volunteer-organized music recital program;

• a partnership between the library, its foundation, and two local utility companies which provided funding for a special environmental collection;

• staff training in managing patron problem behavior, which was recognized with a feature article in Public Libraries (Bangs, 1998) and a presentation at the Public Library Association. The sale of the Problem Behavior Manual (Fairfax County Public Library, 1997) developed for the training module has become a source of extra income for the library.

As a result of these and other efforts, in FY 1999, nearly 77 percent of Fairfax County residents owned FCPL library cards. There were nearly 5 million library visits and a record 10 million loans. An average of 5,465 new users registered each month. Circulation, which had dropped slightly in the early 1990s when funding was drastically cut, has increased by more than 1.5 million since 1993. More than 135,000 users attended more than 3,000 library programs, and the library earned a 94 percent approval rating in a community survey conducted by Goldhaber Research Associates.

The library must steer safely through the sometimes-difficult relationships that develop when nonprofit organizations seek outside funding. A recent series by Herbert Snyder (1998), “When Fund-Raising is Too Innovative” in Library Administration and Management, addresses two tax areas that must be considered when developing fund-raising programs: unrelated business income and tax-exempt status.

According to the Internal Revenue Service, business income must be earned in a way that advances the purposes for which the nonprofit organization was established. If the IRS determines income is unrelated, then a non-profit will either have to pay taxes on the income, sometimes at corporate rates, or risk the nonprofit status of the organization. As Snyder points out, these issues must be addressed before activities begin rather than discovering problems after bad publicity or an IRS audit.

Snyder suggests that libraries must develop a mission statement that clearly reflects their tax-exempt purposes. This allows every new project to be developed in relation to that statement (Snyder, 1998, p. 31). He also suggests that, as organizations grow and evolve, fund-raising must be evaluated in light of these changes. Snyder’s (1998) guidelines for avoiding tax-related problems include:

• developing specific policies and procedures for evaluating income-generating projects;
closely examining sources of income and spending policies to avoid becoming a victim of innovative fund-raising success;

- keeping good records, not just financial, but of the decision-making process; and

- consulting with a professional since tax law is so complex (p. 31).

FCPL considers fund-raising proposals in light of possible tax consequences to its nonprofit foundation. It has sought legal counsel and rejected fund-raising ideas that might jeopardize tax-exempt status. One such idea was the possibility of advertising an online bookseller on the library's Web site to gain a percentage of revenue from books sold. Legal advice determined that such a plan fell outside the library's fund-raising mission.

The library has also grappled with the complications of accepting corporate gifts that require matching or additional funding from the library. Because corporate and government deadlines can vary considerably, problems sometimes arise. For example, a developer offered to set aside space in a shopping mall for a library branch in an underserved area of Fairfax County. The library would provide all the interior furnishings. When the shopping center project was delayed, library funds had already been approved for the interior shelving, collection, and so on, creating problems that required some budget adjustment. While everything is now on schedule, the library will look carefully at any similar offers in the future.

The public relations consequences of accepting outside funding have caused problems for some nonprofits. Dees (1998) cites the recent experience of the American Medical Association, which had to cancel an exclusive arrangement with the Sunbeam Corporation. AMA members and others objected that the partnership with the manufacturer of health-related products such as thermometers and blood pressure monitors would jeopardize the organization's integrity (p. 55).

A sale of rare mathematics books by a university library in Great Britain caused a different sort of outcry from academics. When Keele University in Stoke-on-Trent, England, sold off 1,400 books in a rare collection to invest in library materials, computers, and Internet access, protestors called for an audit and tried to hold up export licenses for books sold to U.S. buyers (Swanton, 1999, p. 2).

FCPL staff voiced reservations when the library first began seeking corporate sponsors. Some felt corporations might wish to dictate the content of library collections. Successful partnerships have put many of those fears to rest. The library evaluates each potential corporate partnership in order to ensure that the library's mission and policies will not be compromised.

The library's foundation, its Center for the Book, Grants Office,
volunteer program, award-winning Web site, evaluation techniques, and staff training programs all benefit from an integrated creative approach to maximizing resources. Such activities often involve partnerships with corporations and other entrepreneurial activities. By redefining traditional limits, the library gives the citizens of Fairfax County the quality service they deserve in an era of scarce tax dollars.

**The Enterprise Group**

The FCPL library's Enterprise Group is the creative impetus for many of the programs that seek non-tax support to maintain quality service. The library director and several program managers meet bi-monthly for brainstorming sessions. The management style of the library has been likened to that of a corporation by a member of its Board of Trustees. Believing that FCPL has to make its own future, the library's approach is to break boundaries and to transform the library into a public service corporation where anything is possible.

Through the Enterprise Group, the library administration hopes to address attitudes and approaches that are key to successful nonprofit development programs, including:

- understanding that fund development is an institutional, not just an individual or departmental, commitment, and making sure fund-raising is not concentrated in one methodology, whether it is direct mail, special events, or a foundation;
- understanding that public relations and fund development go hand-in-hand; and
- knowing that fund development and fund raising are different (fund development relies on long-term relationships) (Lamkins, 1995, pp. 36-39).

Members of the library's Enterprise Group include the library director, the executive director of the library's foundation, the volunteer coordinator, the associate library director, the coordinator of the Center for the Book, and the public information officer. The group's goal is to create an integrated approach to exploring and developing creative sources of non-tax support for library services as well as to introduce new services to the community. Some of these sources might provide private funds, in-kind gifts for the collection, in-kind contributions of equipment and other nonbook resources, or volunteer programs that extend the library's ability to reach its community without a concomitant increase in the budget. A number of innovative initiatives have evolved from Enterprise Group discussions, one of which was the library's Center for the Book (CFB).

**The Center for the Book**

The Center for the Book uniquely addresses the combined needs of
programming and fund-raising. Created in 1997, the center is affiliated with the Virginia Center for the Book and seeks support through grants, donations, and gifts from individuals. It is the only Center for the Book in the Library of Congress program affiliated with a local library system; the typical CFB is associated with a state library. The CFB allows the library to support adult programming that had to be curtailed during an earlier budget crunch. The CFB’s goal is to offer eight programs a year, most of them free.

Its inaugural program was a Potomac riverboat cruise and fund-raiser with John Berendt, author of *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*. Other programs have included a visit from bestselling novelist Sharyn McCrumb; a series co-sponsored by the Peace Institute on Global Conflict; and a program by Samuel Papert, a noted expert on children and computers. Most recently, the center sponsored a fund-raising literary cruise in the Bahamas with poet laureate Rita Dove, crime-thriller author John Gilstrap, and Elizabeth Forsythe Hailey, author of *A Woman of Independent Means*. In May 1999, the center honored local authors with a special reception.

These events have become extremely popular. In all, since its founding two years ago, more than 1,500 individuals have attended adult Center for the Book programs. Prior to its inauguration, adult programming was scarce and erratically funded by local branch Friends groups. The CFB’s for-fee programs help to support its free programming, and the CFB’s affiliation with a national network of similar organizations allows it to share programming from other jurisdictions at little or no cost to the library.

**SUMMER READING PROGRAMMING**

The number of children attending the library’s summer reading program jumped 20 percent when the library initiated an incentive program with local companies such as Domino’s Pizza and Blockbuster Video, offering coupons to those who complete the program. More than fifteen businesses and other agencies sponsored the 1999 summer reading program and donated more than $1 million worth of free and discounted products and services to children who completed their reading requirements.

The library thanks these corporate sponsors with an innovative marketing tool that gives them additional publicity: screensavers on branch public computer terminals. Screensavers are words or graphics that display on a computer terminal when it is idle. The library’s graphic artists create colorful screensavers thanking the sponsors, which library staff then program to run whenever patrons are not using those terminals. Since FCPL has more than 700,000 registered users and almost 5 million visits to our branches each year, these screensavers give sponsors additional
visibility. Many sponsors have indicated that the screensavers were one of the most attractive aspects of our partnerships.

**Grants Office**

A major contributor to the Enterprise Group is the library’s Grants Office. The office was established two years ago with the goal of developing volunteer talent to research and apply for grants and partnerships for which FCPL or its foundation might be eligible. The office has already yielded rich results:

- a $7,500 grant from America Online to help start a Computer Clubhouse for disadvantaged youth;
- a National Endowment for the Humanities grant to host a “National Connections” book discussion series for adults learning to read;
- a partnership with the Inova Health System for the Office’s Health Information Project to increase the depth of the library’s medical resources; and
- a partnership with a local theater to host the library’s classical music recital series.

The staff of the office has also been instrumental in establishing partnerships for the library with other County agencies. One such exciting effort includes the partnership with the Department of Information Technology in the development and deployment of multimedia electronic kiosks that are housed in nine library branches. The kiosks have over 7,000 pages of information about county programs and services, and they permit citizens to transact business with the county, such as paying taxes, from library branches. Since the kiosk program was established three years ago, the interest in kiosks from other jurisdictions—both in Virginia and in other states—has exploded, and the county now serves as consultant on kiosk development to other organizations.

One of the office’s recent accomplishments is the $25,000 matching grant obtained for the library to digitize the contents of its Virginia Room, which houses historical records, documents, and memorabilia. Scanning of the items began in mid-1999 along with the development of full MARC records.

**Volunteer Services**

The library’s volunteer program has tripled in the past ten years, first under the leadership of the personnel director when tax funding first began to diminish and then under the stewardship of a paid volunteer coordinator hired in 1993. In all, more than 3,000 volunteers donated more than 142,000 hours last year.

Implementing the library’s philosophy that any task is possible for a volunteer, the volunteer coordinator offers an array of nontraditional vol-
unteer job opportunities, including those of Web and database designer, grant proposal researcher or writer, and recital manager and landscaper. Also, the library solicits corporate assistance in its volunteer efforts. For example, FCPL’s Volunteer Tech Force includes a corps of fifty-five technically knowledgeable volunteers, some representing technology firms in the region such as America Online, IBM, and EDS. Volunteers provide one-on-one tutoring as well as group workshops for individuals learning to navigate the Internet and use other library electronic resources. In FY 1999, forty-five Tech Force volunteers contributed more than 4,855 hours in tutorial activities as well as Web and database design. The contribution of these volunteers allows paid library staff to devote more time to public reference questions or other essential tasks rather than the technology instruction and troubleshooting that can sometimes take up valuable staff time.

Another unique volunteer project is the “Rising Star” concert recital series, headed by a retired music librarian who donates fourteen hours a week, and sponsored by the library’s Friends of Music. Through this concert series, the library supports one of its goals of meeting the recreational needs of its users.

The Friends of Music was established in the early 1970s to support the library’s music collection housed in one of its regional branches. The group bought a Steinway piano in 1974 (later replaced with a new seven-foot Steinway in 1987). The live recital series began as a simple Sunday concert in a branch meeting room but has evolved into a regionally-recognized series, reviewed by music critics for the Washington Post and other area newspapers.

The Friends of Music provide volunteer staffing for the eight-month series, which consists of sixteen recitals by professional classical musicians and a “Young Soloists” recital in which serious students of music compete to participate. In fall 1998, the library set up a partnership with the Alden Theatre, located in a local community center, and the recital series was moved from a library meeting room to a more acoustically accommodating and commercial location.

Between September 1998 and early summer 1999, more than 990 people attended the concert series. Music lovers in the community help support the series through membership in the Friends of Music, and the group is exploring a partnership with a local classical music radio station to assist in fund-raising.

THE LIBRARY FOUNDATION

While library foundations are often formed during capital improvement drives, the Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc. has been instrumental in developing the library’s collection in areas where tax dollars fell short. Prior to the establishment of the foundation, individual
Friends of the Library groups, affiliated with most branches, were the non-profit arms that provided much of the non-tax funding. Raising money primarily through used book sales (one Friends group raises more than $60,000 a year with a biannual sale), Friends were instrumental in providing early technology when county funds were unavailable. The foundation has helped to focus Friends’ activities beyond the needs of individual branches to encompass system needs as well.

The Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc., was established in 1994 to develop private funds to enable the library to achieve a margin of excellence—to provide materials, programming, and technological enhancements beyond the scope of public budgets. The Library Board of Trustees was concerned that establishing the foundation might result in the county allocating less tax dollars to the library. In fact, the reverse seems to be true. It was difficult to find county funds for the library’s first automated catalog more than fifteen years ago until $90,000 had been collected from Friends groups. This principle has worked just as well with the new foundation. When private funds begin to come in, the county feels a responsibility to contribute its fair share.

Other library systems have discovered similar reactions. In a September 1998 article in *American Libraries*, Deborah Jacobs, director of the Seattle Public Library, describes a conversation with then-mayor-elect Paul School as she opened a letter from a foundation that had just given the Seattle Public Library $2.5 million. The mayor-elect, Jacobs (1998) explained, “suddenly realized the strength behind the library’s commitment to fulfilling its vision for a first-class system” (p. 42). FCPL has had similar experiences. The County Board of Supervisors recently restored funds for the full development of a collection at a regional library that had opened many years earlier with a much smaller collection than required. The board is also considering providing funds to restore hours of operation to community libraries cut in the early 1990s. Both actions are, on the part of local officials, the result of increased awareness of community support for the library.

In 1999, the foundation presented the library with a check for more than $65,000 for the purchase of audio books. This amount represented the 1998 income from the Orrin W. Macleod Endowment, established in 1997 with a $1 million gift to the foundation from the estate of a library patron who used recorded books as his vision failed. Prior to his death, Macleod learned through newspaper accounts that the foundation was being established. He approached the library and foundation directors indicating his interest in setting up a bequest to a nonprofit organization rather than a government entity supported by tax dollars. To date, this gift has generated more than $207,000 for the purchase of audio books.

Other corporate and private donors have also expressed a preference
to donate to a nonprofit organization rather than a government entity. Without the foundation in place, the library might not have received the generous gift from Macleod and others.

In 1999, a $60,000 gift from two energy providers created the Columbia Energy Group/Washington Gas Energy & Environment Collection, which is housed at a regional branch. The collection includes 1,100 volumes, an online sciences database, and a computer station. Adult and children's material in the collection covers topics such as ecology; energy conservation, production, and distribution; and environmental law and policy. Print and video materials range from children's stories to policy treatises. The computer station provides access to a science database of complete articles from 150 popular and professional science periodicals, biographical data, and more. The database is accessible from all nineteen library branches and from patrons' home computers through the library's Web site.

In spring 1999, the foundation received a $25,000 Library Improvement Award from the Washington Post. In FY1999, total money and in-kind donations to the foundation exceeded $360,000 and supported the purchase of technology, programming, and many other needed items and services. Since its establishment five years ago, the foundation has raised approximately $2 million for the Fairfax County Public Library.

**Award-Winning Web Site Attracts Potential Partners**

The library's nationally recognized Web site (www.co.fairfax.va.us/library) is a business, reference, and public relations tool that communicates the library's fund-raising and development needs to a wider universe of users than just those who visit FCPL's branches. FCPL's Web site was launched in 1996 and now has 1,800 pages of information and links to over 1,000 Web sites carefully selected by librarians to meet the needs of the general public. The Internet Services Department staff, which now has 3.5 full-time equivalent positions, could not have established this Web site without partnerships with nearby universities, which have provided interns and volunteers as well as time offered by corporate volunteers. To date, volunteers have contributed more than 2,000 hours in Web development.

In 1998, the coordinator of the Library's Internet Services Department was named "Cybrarian of the Year" by MCI. In making this award, MCI contributed $1,000 to the library's foundation, which was used to purchase books, materials for Web development, and a year of MCI Internet access.

The library's Web site brings library services to individuals in unique and ever-expanding ways. Through the Web site, individuals can reserve and renew materials, register for certain programs, ask reference questions, and find volunteer and Friends of the Library applications. FCPL
made its catalog available through its Web site in October 1998, and during the online catalog’s first nine months of operation, it was accessed more than 107,000 times and used to reserve more than 50,000 items, representing 11 percent of the more than 433,000 total FCPL reserves for FY1999.

Another significant and growing use of the Web site is of FCPL databases. FCPL recently began to offer patrons, through its Web site, access to the following subscription databases which have complete articles and, in some cases, indexes and abstracts: INFOTRAC, EBSCOhost, GaleNet, SIRS, and PROQUEST Direct. Although all of these were not available during the full fiscal year, there were more than 343,000 searches and more than 650,000 “views” in FY1999. “Views” comprise articles and other discrete pieces of data such as maps or a biography. For comparative purposes, if a “view” is like checking out a book, the subscription databases are generating the volume of business of another regional library branch.

In FY1999 the library added a boon to genealogists and historians to its Web site: the Historical Newspaper Index. This gives users access to more than 1 million records indexing 200 years of articles from eight local newspapers. Thanks to a gargantuan volunteer effort that spanned ten years, users can search the historical newspaper index online by name, subject, or keyword and produce a list of publications, issues, page numbers, and brief content blurbs. The newspapers on which the indexes are based are located in the Virginia Room of the Fairfax County Public Library and can be viewed on microfilm. Individuals at remote distances can order articles from the library’s Virginia Room for a nominal fee. The online Historical Newspaper Index was featured in a Washington Post article and in a telecast meeting of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

The fact that the Web site is so dynamic and heavily used makes partnering with the library more attractive to corporations because we feature information about our corporate sponsors and donors on our Web site. For example, the Inova Health System, a local hospital corporation, cited the FCPL Web site’s excellent gateway to medical information as one reason for entering into a partnership with the library. Inova has committed $40,000 to the partnership, which will include jointly distributing health information via each organization’s Web sites, the library’s kiosks, and other media.

Training and Evaluation

Even staff training modules are evaluated as possible resources for outside income. One in particular has resulted in augmenting the library’s funds. A May 1998 feature in Public Libraries entitled “When Bad Things Happen in Good Libraries: Staff Tools for the ‘90s and Beyond” (Bangs, 1988, pp. 196-99) summarized the efforts of a Problem Behavior Task Force, formed in 1995 to revisit the issue of training staff to deal with disruptive
patron behavior. *The Problem Behavior Manual* (Fairfax County Public Library, 1997) developed for this training is now sold through the Public Library Association and has raised $15,000 for the library.

The Library's Office of Planning and Evaluation (OPE) serves as a major source of support when seeking outside funds. Unlike many public library systems that combine statistic-gathering activities with other management functions, FCPL's OPE is devoted exclusively to compiling information about FCPL.

The library's administration recognizes that information is key to making sound decisions about delivering good service to county residents and essential in convincing outside funders that their assistance is necessary and will be used appropriately.

Having a dedicated department for planning and evaluation makes FCPL unique among public libraries. The associate director who heads the department believes OPE provides a consistency in evaluation services and reporting usage that results in useful information. Using a variety of data-gathering tools, OPE monitors changes in community demographics and use patterns to ensure that resources are allocated most efficiently to meet community needs. These statistics are also essential when approaching grantors and other funding sources.

OPE shepherded a community survey conducted by George D'Elia for Goldhaber and Associates which indicated that FCPL is doing things right. The 1998 report stated that 81.7 percent of the respondents had personally used a Fairfax County Public Library in the last year, and 93.7 percent reported that they were satisfied with library services.

**Conclusion**

As Dees (1998) notes: "Strategic and structural innovation should focus on improving mission-related performance" (p. 67). The results of the above mentioned survey indicate FCPL is definitely maintaining its quality service while tapping outside sources for funding and support. But it is maintaining a mix on the social enterprise spectrum, ensuring that its public service goals and fund development objectives blend together. Fundraising activities, such as those sponsored by The Center for the Book, for example, are always balanced with free programming that the community of library users has come to expect. Through this integrated creative approach that pushes the envelope in types of programs, training, and sources of funding, FCPL has been able to evaluate fund-raising and entrepreneurial efforts and provide superior and cost-effective services to its community of users.
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Cybergifts

Adam Corson-Finnerty

Abstract

The Internet provides a valuable new fund-raising tool for libraries and other non-profit organizations. However, simply putting a "give now" button on your home page will not bring new gifts. Development directors should use the concept of "Permission Marketing" to structure an approach to building the constituency for your institution. And while the Web may attract visitors, it is e-mail that can be your most powerful fund-raising ally.

Introduction

Sometimes I find myself driving on an out-of-the way suburban street only to come across a scene straight out of Peanuts. Two children are sitting behind a makeshift lemonade stand with paper cups and a change box at the ready. Their mother is usually perched in a lawn chair behind them, both protecting and encouraging her little ones in what has to be their first foray into retail commerce. After Dad and a few neighbors have purchased their obligatory cup of lemonade, one wonders who else stops to make a purchase. There is little evidence that this is a thriving business.

It is astonishing that nonprofit organizations, making their first foray into online giving, often set up the equivalent of a lemonade stand in a suburban cul-de-sac. They create an uninteresting online donation form, bury it levels down on their Web sites, and wonder why nobody makes a gift in response. Thus there are sites intended to solicit donors that have
been up for a year or more and that have received less than twenty-five gifts. Is cyber-giving therefore a failure? Of course not. The only failure is a failure of imagination.

**BEYOND BROCHUREWARE**

The first stage of any invention is to think of it in terms of one's current frame of reference. Thus the automobile was the "horseless carriage," electronic message delivery is "e-mail," and Web sites have a "home page." Not surprisingly, then, most early pioneers of the World Wide Web thought in terms of print format. Their first impulse was to put their various brochures, press releases, annual reports, and newsletters online.

When it came to gifts, memberships, and purchases, most non-profit organizations started with what might be found on any brochure: a mailing address, an "800" number, and a "form" that readers were encouraged to "print out and mail." Or, for institutions that were really progressive, "print out and fax." These early efforts were the equivalent of the suburban lemonade stand—organizations built them, but nobody came.

The next level of innovation began to capture the power of e-mail. Web sites peppered their pages with "mail tos" allowing readers to easily click and send comments in a freeform box. Next were simple "cgi" scripts that allowed the creation of online forms. Now our visitors could fill in the blanks, click on "send," and communicate substantively with the library. That message could be a pledge in any amount. It could be a membership application with a "bill me" checkbox. It could even be a credit card number, expiration date, and gift designation. Voila! Cybergiving is born.

Currently, libraries have the capacity to accept credit card gifts online with varying levels of security. Those who are willing to pay the extra cost can also have real-time validation, direct transfer to a merchant account, full integration with accounting and donor-tracking systems, and automatically generated and personalized acknowledgments.

**FUTURE THINKING**

As we invent the future together, here are three "science fiction" ideas to ponder, each of which has vast implications for fund-raising.

The first idea is micropayments. One way or another, we will soon be able to spend small amounts of money online—perhaps 15 cents for a transaction. Whether this payment is made through digital cash or through micro-debit is immaterial. Think about how an institution might be able to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars through micropayments—even millions!

The second concept is convergence. While admittedly a stale buzzword, however it is finally tagged, one must consider the possibilities when voice, text, and image all flow smoothly through an individual's information
appliance. Prospects will be able to scan the library's site and, if desired, "click-up" a real-time conversation online. Virtual donor-initiated visits become possible. And, just to add an interesting twist, imagine that people cannot only speak to each other in real-time and see each other in real-time, but that speech can be translated into any of forty languages and dialects in real-time and vice versa. English becomes Parisian-accented French; French becomes Peter Jennings-style Canadian. Oh, and the computer smoothly renders mouths so that it appears that the speaker is actually speaking the translated language.

The final concept is identity. Imagine this: A surgeon receives an e-mail saying "Doctor, I understand that my son's survival depends on a lung transplant. You have my permission to operate." What surgeon in his right mind would proceed? Yet some day such identification mechanisms will be so rock-solid, the law will have caught up with the technology, and legally-binding decisions "online" will be commonplace. Enter a binding pledge through e-mail? No problem. Buy a house online? You bet. Transfer $10 million? Just say where you want it to go.

We are not even at the "toddler" stage in cybergiving. We are just learning to crawl. Yet there are already some very exciting examples of innovation out there, and some of them are beginning to produce gold.

**Donate Now**

The simplest method for cybergiving is to place a "donate now" or "click here to give" button on a library's Web site. The visitor clicks, receives a long or short form to fill out with the amount of the gift and credit card data, and clicks "send" or "complete gift." Ignoring a lot of behind-the-scenes processing, the gift is done. And the money (less processing fees) has gone to the library.

For most people who think of cybergiving, the above example practically defines the concept: create a credit card form, place links to it on the Web site, and wait for the money to arrive. In some cases, this approach does work.

Those of us who follow cybergiving were electrified by the news that the Red Cross had taken in over $1.2 million in online gifts for Balkan Relief from more than 9,000 donors in the first half of 1999 (Red Cross Press Release, 1999). Other relief organizations, like CARE and World Vision, also reported very significant giving during this same period (Miller, 1999, p. F1). Clearly, people were touched by stories of suffering in the Balkans and wanted to do something about it.

It would be a huge mistake to think that the Red Cross "breakthrough" heralds great things for the rest of us. About four years ago this author predicted that disaster relief organizations would be the first agencies to experience a flood of small online gifts. This prognostication came from the experience of working for the American Friends Service Committee
(AFSC) when the news of the holocaust in Cambodia first hit the world press. The AFSC was one of the few agencies that could channel aid to Cambodia, and tens of thousands of spontaneous donations came its way—office workers passed the hat in Texas, schoolchildren took up collections in New England, and little old ladies and college students wrote out checks and then found the AFSC address through the phone book or at their library. Such outpourings of public sentiment occur when publicity is widespread and the need is clear.

While the Red Cross does many things, it is best known for its work with natural and human-made disasters. Therefore a critical strategy for its site is to offer timely and accurate information about such disasters. The Red Cross decided that its site must enable visitors to quickly:

- find out what happened;
- find out what the Red Cross is doing about it;
- find out what you can do about it, including volunteering;
- donate on the spot.

All of this was in place when the refugee crisis in Kosovo began flooding the news. Gifts followed. Not just online gifts, but 800-number gifts, mailed gifts, and major gifts from foundations and individuals such as Bill and Melinda Gates.

And, my prediction was, that's it. Disaster relief will have early takeoff, but every other form of fund-raising will have to slog through the trenches for several more years. But I was wrong.

Next was politics. Politics has more than one thing in common with disasters, but the strong link with fund-raising is that politics can generate high emotions and, apparently, high levels of gift motivation. On February 1, 2000 John McCain scored a surprise victory over George W. Bush in New Hampshire. By noon of the next day, $300,000 had poured into his Web site. By the next day, the number had reached $1 million (Fallows, 2000, p. 59). By the end of February, *Fortune* magazine estimated that McCain has raised an astonishing $4.3 million via the Internet, and the other candidates also picked up a fair amount of money through their sites as well. Bush: $400,000; Bradley: $1.7 million; Gore: $1.1 million (Birnbaum, 2000, pp. 86-88).

But this is peanuts compared to the experience of MoveOn.org. According to a front-page story in *USA Today* (Drinkard, 1999), this "grassroots movement" has generated over $13 million in online pledges (p. 1A). If even half of that is paid, this drive will be by far the most successful example of Internet fund-raising in the medium's young history.

Here is what happened. Silicon Valley husband-and-wife team Joan Blades and Wes Boyd got fed up with the long drawn out campaign to punish Bill Clinton for his peccadilloes. They launched an online petition campaign asking others who felt the same way to urge Congress to "cen-
sure and move on” and to pass the petition along. The petition spread through the net community and soon over 500,000 petitions were clogging Capitol Hill computers (Drinkard, 1999, p. 1A).

Sometime later, they launched a “We will Remember” drive to raise funds to defeat legislators who were anti-Clinton activists (http://www.MoveOn.org). They placed an online pledge and donation form on their site and thus far have garnered $13 million in gifts and pledges—mostly pledges due by November 2000 at the latest (Drinkard, 1999, p. 1A).

They also launched a “We will Act” drive to collect pledges that people would work for candidates in this election. As of September 1, 1999, they have collected pledges of 776,485 hours of volunteer work (http://www.MoveOn.org).

Is this kind of success not only real but sustainable? Well, they have already distributed $336,000 to political candidates, and more donations and pledge-payment checks are coming in every day so, yes, it is definitely real, and experience thus far suggests sustainability as well (Drinkard, 1999, p. 1A).

This case is, in fact, so real that some political professionals are predicting vast changes in a very short period of time. USA Today found one pundit, John Phillips, who predicted that more than $25 million in political donations would be raised online by November 2000. By Election Day 2004, Phillips predicts, “as much as 80% of all money raised—$600 million or more—could flow through electronic channels” (Drinkard, 1999, p. 1A) (but note that Phillips sells political fund-raising software, so a few grains of salt may be in order).

One would hope that Bill Clinton is not the only “political cause” which will open people’s cyberwallets. How about gun control? One might suspect that the gun control movement would receive considerable support online following the series of terrible shooting episodes in 1999. MoveOn.org does have a gun control petition drive in motion and has collected 60,000 signatures thus far (http://www.MoveOn.org).

So a second area of online fund-raising is “taking off.” Even so, periods of high gift motivation are unusual for most charities most of the time. Clearly however, when such periods occur, a charity should be prepared to handle them. What might be examples of such times? Consider these situations:

- Your organization was just given a glowing segment on “60 minutes.”
- You have just announced a breakthrough treatment discovery for a major disease.
- Your come-from-behind football team just won the Rose Bowl, and your alumni are delirious with joy.
- Your library has just experienced a disastrous flood.
- It’s December 31st.
The year-end giving phenomenon is common to most charitable causes. Some donors wait until the last minute to make their gift and still be able to take advantage of a this-year tax deduction. When Brown University set up a donation site, they received a spurt of gifts in late December. They also noted that donors made gifts at unusual hours, such as 3 a.m. Someone will certainly come up with a "night owl" gift strategy beyond the obvious benefit that Web sites are available at all hours.

The trick, of course, is to work with the opportunity that is presented by a high-profile event, using well-known techniques: do a quick mailing, make phone calls, run ads. But the most immediate way to get the word out, and to suggest a related gift, is by e-mail.

There is much to be said about e-mail as a major fund-raising tool, and it will be said in due course. For the moment, however, note this advice: *Use every opportunity to collect e-mail addresses from constituents and would-be constituents.* Even if the library's development organization doesn't yet have a Web site, it will, and those e-mail addresses will be institutional "gold." If your current printed information forms don't have a line for e-mail addresses, throw them out. It will be worth the expense to print new ones.

**A Reason to Visit**

Having a good Web site with a "donate now" button is just the "beginning" of online fund-raising, not the culmination. A library can create the most attractive, most easy-to-donate, Web site in the world, but that doesn't mean that anyone will visit or that visitors will make gifts or pledges in support of the library's mission.

Librarians must ask themselves this question: Why would anyone want to visit my site? If there is not a good answer to that question, the library development effort has encountered a big problem in its use of technology to reach prospects.

Some charities assume that, if they create a Web site describing their mission, large numbers of people will surf over to see what they are about and that a percentage of those visitors will donate. This assumption could not be more wrong. Cyberspace is awash with tens of millions of Web pages. People will need a "reason" to visit your lemonade stand or you will end up with a lot of melting ice and watery lemonade.

**Pull and Push**

There are a few simple concepts that are worth keeping in mind as we review Internet-based fund-raising. One is "Pull." The other is "Push." Pull and push are the two ways to get attention in cyberspace. A pull strategy draws your prospect to your site. A push strategy takes your site or your message and puts it directly in front of your prospects.
Pull

Fund-raising sites need to have pull. The more visitors, the more opportunities the library has to present gift options.

Some sites “pull” visitors because they are information-rich. For those concerned about human rights, Amnesty International can relate exactly what is going on in practically every country in the world and, if there are abuses, then describe exactly what an individual can do about it (http://www.amnesty.org). For those concerned about cancer and who want to know about survival-rates and treatment options, then OncoLink is a good site (http://www.oncolink.org).

Some sites can pull visitors because they are product-rich. The Metropolitan Museum, with its upscale online shop, is an example. I happen to like neckties based on designs by M.C. Escher and William Morris, so I will go out of my way to find them and, happily, the Met currently has a Morris thistle tie that looks just right (http://metmuseum.org).

Some sites pull visitors because they are service-rich, enabling the visitor to accomplish a task online. A good example would be a digital library site, or any college Web site that allows prospective students the opportunity to apply online. Last summer, our family was delighted to discover that we could reserve a tent site at a tiny state campground in New Hampshire, at the last minute, and get an instant confirmation.

Another visitor attraction is entertainment. Some nonprofit sites include games, unique movie footage, contests, music, and online exhibitions. An example of an “entertainment” draw would be the Metropolitan Museum’s site on its re-opened Greek Galleries. This site offers a “preview” of eighteen objects, views of the galleries, a timeline “illustrated with signal works of art,” a map of the Mediterranean, and more. It is so alluring and so well done that I found it hard not to pause for an hour and dally there (see http://www.metmuseum.org/htmlfile/newexhib/greek/greek1.htm).

The Metropolitan site almost “says it all” in terms of good design and clever strategy. Consider its bottom menu bar, which constantly offers the following options:

- Membership
- Calendar
- Collections
- Exhibitions
- Information
- News
- Education
- Store
- Home
The most important pull strategy is involvement. If an organization can involve its visitors and entice them to come back again and again, then the fund-raising effort is operating at a very new and unusual level. Simply put, supporters will be able to move from visitor, to participant, to member of your community. A loyal member of your community is the highest kind of gift prospect.

Online education is one example of involvement. People who take an online course will visit that site repeatedly. They will be asking questions, viewing resources, downloading class material, consulting with the teacher one-to-one, and engaging with their fellow classmates in meaningful chat. Well-organized and well-staffed online courses are perhaps the most powerful devices for "engaging" your members and friends.

Recently, an Op-Ed page advertisement in the New York Times told readers about the "Virtual Jewish University," a new online offering from Israel's Bar-Ilan University (New York Times advertisement, 1999). The ad offered:

Thanks to VJU, [you] can take on-line, for-credit courses in English on the Judean Desert Scrolls, the history of Jerusalem, war and peace in the bible, Jewish holidays, the Jewish musical tradition and more. VJU students benefit from some of the world's most advanced long-distance learning technology: a virtual helicopter ride over Jerusalem, a chance to see and hear a Moroccan prayer service, video clips of archaeological digs, private conferences with professors and "chats" with fellow students.

This advertisement is compelling. Anyone with the slightest interest in Jewish subjects, and/or with an interest in Internet technology—or the hope of a free helicopter ride—would be very likely to cruise over and see what VJU is all about (http://www.bar-ilan.edu). This is an example of Push and Pull. As an inveterate New York Times reader, the ad was "pushed" in my face, and the content descriptions started to "pull" me to the site.

Online education will not be the sole province of traditional colleges and universities. Any nonprofit can offer a class online—of any duration and on any subject. This can be a perfect strategy for attracting visitors to the library's site and for making them long-term members of the library community.

Other examples of involvement include offering periodic chat sessions with "stars" or experts, online book clubs, online chat groups, online threaded discussion groups, and online "members-only" interactive groups. Princeton University offers interactive areas for their alumni in each class. Princeton also hosts online exchanges on broad topics in which any alumni can participate. Recent examples include discussions on real estate and biomedical issues (see http://tigernet.princeton.edu/). If you would like to see an example of an "open" alumni exchange, see
the one at Colby College (http://www.colby.edu/alumni/bulletin/index.html).

A very different example of involvement can be found at the Amnesty International site. There, the visitor can become involved in a campaign or take action to help free a prisoner of conscience (see http://www.amnesty.org). Similarly, The Nature Conservancy has a section called “Get Involved” and the World Wildlife Fund, USA, starts right off with a banner saying “Take Action: Protect Sharks” (http://www.tnc.org and http://www.worldwildlife.org/).

To summarize: sites should offer something that will pull visitors and not just once but repeatedly. Library Web designers should be clever, test ideas, and allow themselves to be surprised. Consider what unique information that the library has that might interest your potential constituents and build the site around it.

**Push**

A push strategy takes a site, or your message, and presents it very obviously to prospects. The most annoying instance of push is “spam” e-mail where a prospect receives an unrequested message about a product or service.

Advertisements and products are pushed at us all day long. They come to us on the radio, on television, from banner ads, from our newspaper, from telemarketing calls, from billboards, from pop-up coupons at the supermarket. Even “And-have-I-told-you-about-our-two-for-one-apple-crisp-special?” is a push.

Personally, I prefer the “pull” of the popcorn smell in a theater lobby or the “pull” of a measured dose of caffeine in a can of Diet Coke. Generally, the public dislikes spam, feeling it to be an unwanted intrusion.

So what is the rationale for using “push” methods for Internet fund-raising? Because, rightly done, it may be the most powerful tool we have for bringing in online gifts. Any organization with a Web presence can use traditional “push” methods to try to drive traffic to their site. This can be as simple as putting your URL in direct mail pieces to having a radio announcer say “or contact www.sywash.edu/go-team/newlockerrooms/donate.html.”

Banner ads are a good example. Some charities have taken to running such advertisements on heavily-visited sites and with good results. The Internet society *does* accept banner ads, the same way we accept advertisements during our favorite TV shows. Library development organizations could add to their tool kits banner advertisements inducing visitors to “click here” to learn about our organization.

Banner ads can be very sophisticated these days, and they will be getting even more sophisticated as time goes on. Any good development officer will know that paying hard money for banner ads is only one way to
proceed. The Yahoos and other portals could be persuaded to *donate* banner ads to your cause. Some of them have a good portion of their ad space unsold, which represents an opportunity for charities.

Internet push is in its infancy, and at this early stage one can imagine any number of other tactics that might be tried:

- sign up as a sponsor for a “free TV” giveaway and have Web-enabled multimedia promotions for library.edu built into the hard drive;
- give away pretty or clever screensaver software, and build promotions into the mix: the university’s beautiful campus in all four seasons, along with campus songs softly sung by the glee club, with an occasional pitch for your capital campaign and the library;
- emulate Pointcast and offer “push” channel services to your constituents. There are vendors who will set you up with a complete package, including news and stockmarket feeds.

Imagination will stimulate further ways to use this technology. Internet push is here to stay, and we cannot even imagine all the forms it will take in the future. But that’s then, and this is now. Right now, most of us are ignoring the most fabulous “push” technology available: e-mail.

**E-MAIL**

E-mail? Fabulous? How can this be? E-mail is old technology already. It’s downright boring. True, but how many of us have come to depend on e-mail to get our work done? To stay in touch with friends? To lightly remind our daughter at college that she still has a family at home who loves her dearly and would like to hear from her once in awhile? To request a service or ask a question or make a complaint or tell President Clinton what we think?

The statistics are staggering: total pieces of first class mail delivered in 1998 was 107 billion; total pieces of e-mail delivered in 1998 was 3.4 trillion (Business 2.0, April 1999).

The total marginal transport cost of sending first class mail to 100 additional addresses is $33.00. The total marginal cost of sending e-mail to 100 or 1 million additional addresses is $0.

Surveys indicate that 80 percent of the people who plunk down hard money for an Internet Service Provider cite e-mail as their main motivation. Many of us have older relatives who acquire computer systems in their 70s and 80s to join the e-mail circle that children and grandchildren have created. Children thought the Web was boring (especially at pre-cable-modem speeds) but have abandoned television and even the phone for e-mail.

Earlier, we cited the *USA Today* cover story on the astonishing success of MoveOn.org. Says Joan Blades: “[Online giving] makes it simpler for people to contribute. You don’t even have to find a stamp. It’s pretty danged
easy" (Drinkard, 1999, p. 1A). It’s pretty danged easy, says the woman who has raised more money online than anyone else. What made it easy was the high level of political passion that Boyd and Blades tapped into. They did not accomplish their results through direct mail or even direct e-mail. They were successful because people passed the message on to their friends through chain e-mail.

The power of chain e-mail is tremendous. Chain e-mail is not spam, though sometimes it feels like it. Chain e-mail is what one friend passes along to another. If it is something that people feel passionate about, or think is funny, or cute, or insightful, or compelling, or alarming; it can literally go around the world in minutes.

This past spring, a fifth grade class in a small Canadian town sent an e-mail out into the ether. They told the recipients that they were trying an experiment. Their teacher had told them that e-mail connects people all over the world. They asked anyone who got the message to pass it along, and to e-mail back to them and say where they lived in the world. They said they wanted to see how far the message would travel in thirty days. Many recipients (including this author’s wife as well as the editor of this issue of Library Trends) responded and passed the message on. After a day, participants received an automatically-generated message from the school’s ISP. Messages were avalanching in to the school. The responses had shut down their computer after the first few days.

Chain e-mail can be a very powerful marketing tool. In fact, it already has been dubbed viral marketing. Viral marketing is just an electronic version of “word of mouth” marketing. MoveOn.org will not be the only NPO to profit from this technique. How can other nonprofits use viral marketing and chain e-mail for fund-raising?

**Click to Give**

Tim Snyder, director of Advancement Technologies for Wake Forest University, recently discussed the establishment of online credit card giving mechanisms and its results in an e-mail exchange with this author. Wake Forest is using this technology very effectively. A number of Web-based gifts have been made, some in the $5,000 range. An e-mail with a link back to the giving site has proven an impressive way to collect on unpaid phonathon pledges. In fact, one alum who received an e-mail Annual Giving solicitation wrote back saying that if they promised to never phone solicit him again, but used e-mail instead, he would double his pledge.

These links are useful examples of the concept of e-mail’s power:

- [http://www.wfu.edu/alumni/giving/onlinegiving.html](http://www.wfu.edu/alumni/giving/onlinegiving.html)
- [http://stl.yahoo.com/aijoin/noname.html](http://stl.yahoo.com/aijoin/noname.html)
Permission E-Mail

Permission e-mail is simple to understand. It's e-mail that you have asked for, or agreed to receive, or haven't said no to. Permission e-mail generally starts with a straightforward post to a listserv. In the case of this author, a new listserv was forming, called Cybergifts, sponsored by charitychannel.com. The potential contents were described, and the signup mechanism was clear. It sounded relevant, so I signed up.

At some point in the signup process, I was told that Cybergifts would contain advertisements. I was also assured that it would be easy to sign off the list if I lost interest. Since that time, charitychannel.com has sought to extend my level of permission from one service to several. First, they started sending job advertisements. Then they sent postings about other listservs they were starting. Then they added e-mailed book reviews. These additional messages were not solicited, but each message assures the list subscriber that the subscription can be terminated at the desire of the subscriber. Anyone who has not elected to opt out has de facto “opted in” or given “negative permission.”

So now I am a “customer” of charitychannel, and they are slowly establishing “trust” with me. Will they seek to keep extending that trust and sell me additional services? I presume so. But since the benefits are worth it so far, I continue to extend permission.

Another name for permission e-mail is “opt-in” e-mail. The “E-Commerce Report” in the New York Times recently focused on this topic and found that commercial entities like Macy’s and J. Crew are making it a central part of their online marketing. People who elect to receive Macy’s opt-in communications make purchases five to seven times more frequently than other site visitors (Tadeschi, 1999, p. C5).

The principles of permission marketing are everywhere on the Net. They are, in the immortal and defining words of Seth Godin (1999), “anticipated, personal, and relevant”. Godin claims that the Internet is the most powerful “direct marketing” vehicle ever invented. Stronger than snail mail, more powerful than telemarketing, able to leap the vast distance between stranger and friend with a series of carefully-calibrated bounds. In his book, he asserts that traditional marketing is dying, and that Internet marketing will replace it. This transition will not occur if the Internet is thought of in TV terms as a dumb “broadcast” medium, but only if the Internet is seen in its own terms: as an incredible tool for one-to-one marketing (p. 43).

Several not-for-profit organizations are using their Web sites to establish two-way ongoing communication with their constituents. A good example is the Nature Conservancy (http://www.tnc.org) which offers:

Free! The Nature Conservancy e-News Every Month
Yes! I want to subscribe to The Nature Conservancy e-News! It’s a free, electronic newsletter that will help expand the Conservancy’s
efforts to protect our natural heritage!
With this subscription I'm eligible for the following benefits:

- Monthly issues of The Nature Conservancy e-News our free electronic newsletter that will keep you up to date on new initiatives on our web site.
- Opportunities to support the conservation work of The Nature Conservancy!
- Free 1999 Edition of The Nature Conservancy Screen Saver with beautiful nature images that represent our protection work.
- Shop with the Conservancy and support our work with purchases through our partner GreaterGood.com
- Volunteer opportunities and other local conservation news by visiting local chapter sites!
- Give us some feedback on our site—tell us what you are interested in—we want to hear from you!

Another example would be the CARE “e-mail update,” which offers readers a choice of several options:

Check the e-mail updates that you are interested in receiving.
Please send me updates when there is an emergency.
Please send me monthly updates on new features to the CARE Web site.
Please send me electronic versions of CARE’s newsletters and publications (when available).
Please send me information about key CARE events or other activities I can participate in.
Please send me information about opportunities to contribute to CARE.
(See http://www.care.org)

Both organizations are inviting visitors to enter into a dialogue. Both are quite “up front” about the fact that they will use this permission to ask for contributions.

When it comes to acquiring new constituents through an institutional Home Page, Godin (1999) makes a challenging proposal: create two home pages. One home page is for your members, committed constituents, and so on. That page is where you do business and have most of your resources. The other page is the one you promote, the one with the shortest and easiest-to-remember address, designed solely to attract visitors and gain permission to enter into a relationship with them (pp. 220-25). Once they have “raised their hand” by giving the organization their e-mail address and permission to mail to them, they can be pointed to the “members” page. This strategy may not be appropriate for all non-profit Web sites, but it does highlight the fact that an institution’s Web page should be clearly focused on turning “strangers” into friends.

CONCLUSION

What does the electronic world mean for nonprofit fund-raising? We have the tools needed to sell our “lemonade.” Earlier it was argued that
Internet fund-raising would not work if we just grafted a “give now” page onto our Web site and waited for people to drive by and toss money. Good Web fund-raising will require us to use the creative tools that are available—both “pull” and “push” tools—and to use our imagination.

Godin and his colleagues at Yoyodine, a “permission” marketer, honed their tools for commercial purposes. They found that, if they structured their offers correctly, they could go from 2 percent response rates to 36 percent response rates. Now Godin is VP for Direct Marketing at Yahoo! and we can follow the evolution of his craft by tuning in to that site.

In many ways, libraries are in a much better position than the companies for which Godin is pitching his message. They are trying to sell mouthwash or used cars. We are service organizations with a direct impact on human lives. There is a difference. Dell computer, as agile and clever as it may be on the Internet, is still a commercial entity aimed at “the bottom line.” Amazon.com, as friendly and “personalized” as it is, still is about the business of making money and boosting its stock value. Nonprofit organizations are about something else altogether.

Seth Godin is a for-profit marketer and a good one. In his book, he lays out something that he calls the “ladder of permission.” Basically, he is trying to help companies turn strangers into long-term and loyal customers. That happens, he argues, when companies establish trust and are focused on a mutually-beneficial relationship. Their goal is to keep customers, get them to buy again, get them to buy “up,” and get them to “cross” buy, or to buy more expensive goods and services and to buy new goods and services.

At the very core of his method is the strongest of motivators: self-interest. Says Godin: “Permission Marketers make every single interaction selfish for the customer. ‘What’s in it for me’ is the question that must be answered at every step.”

And that is not what non-profit organizations are about. When we ask for support for our work, we are not ultimately appealing to our donor’s selfish instincts. Rather, we are appealing to his or her self-less instincts. We are asking people to be compassionate, caring, empathetic: to take joy in helping a child, or a tree, or a homeless kitten, to nurture someone’s faith, to give someone a chance at a better life, to help someone get out of a drug habit or an abusive relationship.

We may joke about how “selfish” our donors can sometimes be. We may even become cynical about the premiums, the “naming opportunities,” the stewardship dinners. But the bottom line for nonprofit fund-raising is simply this: we are asking people to freely part with their money in order to help others.

Charitable and educational institutions part from the path that Godin takes. We don’t start with people cruising the net to see “what’s in it for me?” In general, we start with people who are concerned about some part
of the world and think that we may be able to help. If they end up giving us money and become loyal supporters (not loyal customers), it will be because they believe in our organization and have faith in our work.
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