Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?

by

Cindy Oi Yan Gouveia

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Cindy Oi Yan Gouveia 2018

Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?

Cindy Oi Yan Gouveia

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

2018

Abstract

Conceptualized because I found a paucity of standardized requirements for fundraising positions, this exploratory/descriptive research study explored whether fundraising is an emerging profession in the context of Ontario's English language Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT). The study relied on both quantitative and qualitative data through a survey and interviews with five participant groups: college knowledge leaders, fundraisers and teachers in eight Ontario colleges, students enrolled in a full-time fundraising program, and donors who had contributed to an Ontario college within the previous five to 10 years.

Focusing on fundraising post 1995, the study sought to explore the extent to which the five classical traits of professions identified in the literature, were evident in Ontario college fundraising activity, namely: autonomy, a formal course of study, a unique body of knowledge, professional associations with a formal code of ethics, and state regulations.

The sample size was relatively small because of the focus of the research. Additionally, the findings of the study are not generalizable, as participants were not randomly selected from the population. However, as an exploratory/descriptive study and because of the paucity of

scholarly data related to the specific research focus, the findings will add to an overall understanding of the topic.

The literature review for the research revolved around the history of philanthropy in Canada as it relates to laws and taxes, origins of fundraising in Ontario colleges, and traits or characteristics that define a profession.

The findings concluded that fundraising is not yet a profession, but it is in the process of evolving into one as some traits associated with a profession were visible in the data; other traits were at various stages of development. In fact, when fundraising in Ontario colleges was analyzed for the presence of trait criteria, I found that none of the requirements of the identified characteristics were fully met. The study concluded that there was room for more research in the area of fundraising as a profession in Ontario and there was a need for the development of Canada-specific fundraising policies as well as deeper inquiry into the professionalization of fundraisers.

Acknowledgements

The unconditional support from my family was the catalyst that enabled me to complete my dissertation. Firstly, to my parents, Albert and Irene who modelled tenacity and perseverance throughout my life. Two people who never gave up, regardless of the circumstances. To my sister, Yan Yan, who demonstrated what it means to fight and win, despite the most difficult circumstances. To my brother, Jeff, who's humour and optimism always kept me going.

To my daughter, Brittany who is my oxygen and my son, Russell who is my heart. Without you, I would have never decided to embark on this journey.

And to the one person who never gave up on me, even when I was ready to give up on myself; my loving husband and best friend, Tony. Your patience, encouragement and love is how I got here. You walked alongside me throughout this journey and without you, I wouldn't have reached the finish line. This is for you, this is for us.

To my thesis committee Dr. Leesa Wheelahan and Dr. Marjorie McColm. Your feedback and guidance has helped me become a different kind of thinker. Thank you for your gift of time and wisdom.

To my thesis supervisor, Dr. Katharine Janzen. You are one of the most distinguished and supportive academics to exist. I consider myself more than fortunate to have had your expertise, time, patience, encouragement and hours of feedback that kept me on track, even during the times where I derailed. All my gratitude goes out to you for the work you have done for myself, and future students who should have the good fortune to have you as their thesis supervisor. This would not have been possible without you.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Terms and Definitions	xii
Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)	xii
Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP).....	xii
Association for Professional Researchers for Advancement Canada (APRA Canada)	xii
Association for Research on Non-Profit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA)	xii
Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) – List of Charities.....	xii
Canadian Association of Gift Planners (CAGP).....	xiii
Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) International	xiii
Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)	xiii
Community Foundations of Canada (CFC)	xiv
Colleges Ontario (CO)	xiv
Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT)	xiv
KCI Philanthropy	xiv
Philanthropic Foundations of Canada (PFC)	xv
Professional Association of Volunteer Leaders – Ontario (PAVR-O)	xv
The Council on Foundations	xv
The Foundation Centre.....	xv
 Chapter One: Introduction	 1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem Situation.....	3
Purpose of the Research.....	4
Rationale/Significance of the Study.....	4
Personal Rationale.....	5
Research Questions	7
Theoretical Framework	7
Conceptual Framework	10
Scope.....	10
Limitations	12

Methodological Assumptions	13
Summary of Chapter One	14
Chapter Two: Literature Review	15
Scope and Limitations of Literature Reviewed.....	15
The History of Philanthropy in Canada: Law and Taxes	16
The Commissioners for Special Purposes of the Income Tax v. John Frederick Pemsel	17
Higher Education Financing – Whose Responsibility Is It?	22
The Changing Higher Education Landscape.....	22
Fiscal Situation in Ontario’s Colleges.....	23
Why Fundraise in Ontario’s Colleges?	27
Reasons for Fundraising	28
Diversification	29
Strategic Autonomy	29
Matching	30
Particularism	33
Local Responsiveness	34
What Do We Know?	35
Themes in Fundraising	36
Diversity in Fundraising	36
Strategic Philanthropy.....	39
Legal Definition of a Charity in Canada.....	40
Accountability and Measurements in the Charitable Sector	42
Turnover in Fundraising	44
Fundraising as a Profession	45
History of Philanthropy in Canadian Universities	45
Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Funding Trends	47
Higher Education Fundraising: An External Perspective	49
United Kingdom	49
United States	50
Australia.....	50
Professions	51
History of Other Professions.....	55

Gender Dynamics in Professions	57
Characteristics of a Profession	58
Autonomy	60
Unique Body of Knowledge	60
Formal Course of Study	61
State Legislation	62
Professional Associates with Codes of Ethics	63
Discussion	64
Summary of Chapter Two.....	66
 Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology	67
Research Question #1	67
Research Question #2	68
Research Question #3	68
Research Question #4	68
Research Question #5	68
Research Design.....	68
Research Methodology	69
Site Selection	69
Participant Selection	70
Data Collection and Recording	73
Instrumentation	73
Data Collection and Recording.....	74
Establishing Credibility.....	77
Data Analysis	78
Methodological Assumptions	79
Limitations	80
Ethical Issues/Considerations	80
Summary of Chapter Three.....	83
 Chapter Four: Research Findings and Analysis	85
Description of Sites/Context	85
Organizational Context and Naming	87

The Gendered Nature of the Profession	89
Research Question # 1 asked: “How do the participating fundraisers decide upon their area of work? Who decides the fundraising strategies, areas of focus and annual plans?” (Autonomy Criterion)	91
Interview Data.....	91
Knowledge Leaders in the Colleges	91
Teachers	93
Survey Data.....	94
Conclusion	96
Research Question #2 asked: “What fundraising related programs or courses have fundraisers in Ontario’s colleges studied as part of their formal course of studies?” (Formal Course of Study Criterion)	98
Document Analysis	98
Programs Offered.....	99
Certification as Fundraisers	100
Interview Data.....	101
Donors.....	101
Teachers	103
Knowledge Leaders	103
Survey Data.....	104
Students.....	104
Fundraisers.....	105
Discussion	106
Fundraising Programs in Ontario Colleges.....	106
Education Required for Fundraisers	108
Conclusion	110
Research Question #3 asked: “What professional associations are key informants aware of/or required to be a part of, in order to fundraise?” (Professional Association with Code of Ethics Criterion)	111
Document Analysis	111
Interview Data.....	113
Donors.....	113
Knowledge Leaders	114
Teachers	115
Survey Data.....	116
Conclusion	117

Research Question #4 asked: “What are the legislative requirements that Ontario college Fundraisers are required to operate within? What are the repercussions to individuals or organizations should they not follow these requirements?” (State Legislation Criterion).....	118
Document Analysis	118
Knowledge Leaders	122
Interview Data.....	124
Teachers.....	124
Donors.....	125
Survey Data.....	127
Fundraisers.....	127
Students.....	127
Conclusion	127
Research Question #5 asked, “What do key informants perceive to be the unique knowledge established for fundraising? How do they access this information?” (Unique Body of Knowledge Criterion).....	130
Interview Data.....	130
Knowledge Leaders	131
Teachers	132
Survey Data.....	134
Fundraisers.....	134
Students.....	134
Conclusion	134
Summary of Chapter Four.....	135
 Chapter Five: Conclusions and Implications of the Findings	 137
Alignment of Findings with the Defining Criteria of a Profession	137
Autonomy of Practitioners.....	137
Formal Course of Study	139
Association with a Code of Ethics	143
Legislation.....	145
Unique Body of Knowledge	148
Conclusion	149
Implications for Policy and Practice	149
Canadian-Specific Resources for Students in Fundraising Programs	150

Impact of New Funding Formula for Ontario Colleges on Fundraising	150
Creation of Provincial Legislation for Fundraisers.....	151
Implications for Further Research.....	153
Conclusion	153

List of Tables

Table 1. Donor Rate and Total Amounts Donated by Canadians in 2007 and 2010	24
Table 2. The Eight Ontario Colleges Selected for this Study	70
Table 3. Data Sources that Answer the Research Questions.....	76
Table 4. Summary of Course Information in Ontario's College of Applied Arts and Technology	99
Table 5. Summary of Legislative Requirements for a Canadian Charity	123
Table 6. Comparison of the Curricula of Two Ontario College Fundraising Programs	140

List of Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework – Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession.....	11
Figure 2. Ontario Colleges Total Operating Grant per Full Time Equivalent	27
Figure 3. Map of Ontario Colleges	86
Figure 4. Fundraiser Survey: Q4 – Is the college's advancement/development department	95
Figure 5. Fundraiser Survey: Q8 – What is your educational background?	106
Figure 6. Fundraiser Survey: Q17 – Are you aware of any provincial/federal/municipal legislation by which fundraisers must operate within?.....	128

References.....	156
-----------------	-----

Appendices.....	177
Appendix A – Classification of Ontario Colleges	177
Appendix B – Knowledge Experts' Invitation to Participate	180
Appendix Bi – Knowledge Experts' Interview Questions.....	183
Appendix C – Invitation to Fundraisers and Informed Consent (Web-Based).....	184
Appendix Ci – Invitation to Fundraisers and Informed Consent (Paper-Based Survey).....	191
Appendix D – Donor Invitation and Informed Consent	194
Appendix Di – Donor Interview Questions	197
Appendix E – Student Focus Group Invitations and Informed Consent.....	198

Appendix Ei – Invitation to Student Survey and Informed Consent	201
Appendix Eii – Student Focus Group Discussion Questions.....	204
Appendix F – Teacher/Professor Invitation and Informed Consent	205
Appendix Fi – Teacher/Professor Interview Questions	208
Appendix G – Lawshe’s Content Validity Checklist.....	209
Appendix H – Fundraising Programs in Ontario Colleges	211
Appendix Hi – Ontario College Fundraising Program Courses and Topics	212
Appendix I – College Websites with Code of Ethics and/or Donor Bill of Rights.....	213
Appendix J – Donor Bill of Rights	214
Appendix K – Code of Ethical Standard.....	215
Appendix L – Memo PSE Cutbacks Nov. 1995	216

Terms and Definitions

Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) - The Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) is the professional association of individuals and organizations that generate philanthropic support for a wide variety of charitable institutions. There are regional and local chapters of this association. The Association's membership consists of 30,000 people representing fundraisers from all sectors (healthcare, education, social welfare, special interest, etc.) and fundraising-related organizations. There are over 230 local chapters across Canada, United States, Mexico and China. (<http://www.afpnet.org/>)

Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP) - The Association for Healthcare Philanthropy is the only association dedicated exclusively to advancing and promoting the healthcare development profession. There are over 5,000 members that are involved in fundraising in the healthcare sector and operate in United States and Canada. (<http://www.ahp.org/>)

Association for Professional Researchers for Advancement Canada (APRA Canada) – is a membership based organization that is open to Canadian researchers, front-line fundraisers and others with an interest in the field of advancement research. (<https://www.apracanada.ca/>)

Association for Research on Non-Profit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) - is a leading interdisciplinary community of people dedicated to fostering through research and education, the creation, application and dissemination of knowledge about nonprofit organizations, philanthropy, civil society and voluntary action. (<http://www.arnova.org/>)

Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) – List of Charities – is part of the CRA website that provides an online resource to search registered charities in Canada. The site provides financial,

board membership and tax return information. (<https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/charities-listings.html>)

Canadian Association of Gift Planners (CAGP) - CAGP is the only organization in Canada that brings together charitable representatives and donor advisors in one professional association. The membership of this organization includes individuals who “are experts with a unique body of knowledge regarding a range of giving options, such as bequests, gifts of securities, gifts of insurance” (Canadian Association of Gift Planners, 2015). According to the CAGP 2104 Annual Report, there are 1,058 members representing all areas of philanthropy. (<https://www.cagp-acpdp.org/>)

Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) International - CFRE International offers the only internationally-recognized baseline professional credential for philanthropic fundraising executives. The CFRE is an independent not-for-profit devoted to advancing the professionalism and education of fundraisers. The minimum requirements necessary to apply for the credential are: three years of fundraising experience, fundraising-specific education (Continuing Education, Authoring, Academic Degrees, Service Learning) and Professional Performance (Actual funds raised, Communications Projects, Management Projects). There are 5,451 members worldwide who have been certified as of 2014 (Certified Fund Raising Executive, 2014). (<http://www.cfre.org/>)

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) - The Council for Advancement and Support of Education is a professional association serving educational institutions and the advancement professionals who work on their behalf in alumni relations, communications, development, marketing and allied areas. There are more than 81,000 individual members, representing over 3,670 colleges and universities, primary and secondary

independent and international schools and nonprofit organizations in over 80 countries (Council for Advancement and Support in Education, 2016). (<http://www.case.org/>)

Community Foundations of Canada (CFC) – is the national organization for Canada's 191 Community Foundations. CFC provides support to these Foundations to align their giving with community initiatives. (<http://communityfoundations.ca/>)

Colleges Ontario (CO) – Colleges Ontario, on its website states:

Colleges Ontario is the advocacy organization for the province's 24 colleges of applied arts and technology. Colleges Ontario is committed to the future strength of the province and the country. We advance policies and awareness campaigns to ensure Ontario produces the highly skilled workforce that is essential to our province's prosperity. We are committed to an Ontario where everyone has the opportunity to succeed.

(<http://www.collegesontario.org/>)

Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT) – are the twenty-four colleges in Ontario, two of which are French-speaking, that make up the Ontario college system. The CAATs were established in 1965 by the Honourable William G. Davis who legislated the creation of an alternative, vocationally-based, post-secondary education option besides universities. All twenty-four colleges are provincially legislated by one Act (The Ontario CAAT Charter, 2002) and under-regulated by the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities.

KCI Philanthropy – is a for-profit consulting agency offering the charitable sector advice on fundraising. This includes, but not limited to, recruitment, strategy development, campaign goals and assessment, board leadership. The site contains resources for both

individuals interested in charity as well as those researching charities.

(<http://kciphilanthropy.com/lang/en/>)

Philanthropic Foundations of Canada (PFC) – is a charitable organization made up of over 100 private and public foundations, corporations and charities. The PFC is devoted to membership services, advocacy and resources. (<http://pfc.ca/about-pfc/>)

Professional Association of Volunteer Leaders – Ontario (PAVR-O) – is committed to the professional development of its members through certification, conferences, regional workshops, advocacy and standards of practice and ethics. Our goals are; to provide leadership for professional administrators of volunteer resources; to establish and promote the qualifications, standards and ethics of the profession; to provide professional development in the administration of volunteer resources; to represent the members and to advocate on behalf of the profession; to respect and reflect the diversity of the profession; to promote communication among the membership and beyond for the mutual benefit of the members; to coordinate efforts among organizations with similar objectives. (Professional Association of Volunteer Leaders - Ontario, 2015, n.p.) (<http://www.pavro.on.ca/>)

The Council on Foundations - is a national nonprofit association of more than 2,000 grant making foundations and corporations. (<https://www.cof.org/>)

The Foundation Centre – is a national nonprofit service organization recognized as the nation’s leading authority on organized philanthropy. The Foundation Center was established in 1956 and today is supported by close to 600 foundations. (<http://foundationcenter.org/>)

Chapter One: Introduction

In this research study, I explored whether fundraising is perceived to be an emerging profession, specifically in the context of Ontario's English language Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT). This was an exploratory, descriptive study based on both quantitative and qualitative data collected. I consulted with five participant groups to inform this study. The key informant groups include (1) college knowledge leaders, (2) fundraisers within eight of Ontario's colleges, (3) students enrolled in a full-time fundraising program, (4) teachers or professors who are teaching within a fundraising program at an Ontario college and (5) donors who had made sizable contributions to an Ontario college within the past five to 10 years.

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter One provides an overview of the research, identification of the research questions, and a description of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that ground this research. Chapter Two focuses on the review of the literature that relates to professions and philanthropy; while Chapter Three describes the research design and methodology. Chapter Four presents the research findings, and in Chapter Five, the discussion of the findings, conclusions and implications are presented.

Background of the problem

Ontario colleges are faced with a myriad of fiscal issues. The main sources of income for these colleges are government funding and tuition fees (both from domestic and international students). But with a declining high school student population, provincial net debt of around \$300 billion - the highest since 2006 (Ontario Financing Authority, 2015), and stiff competition for international student enrolment, colleges are forced to take much more sophisticated measures to remain fiscally sustainable and competitive.

During the 1990's, a number of circumstances changed affordability and access to post-secondary education for students. In a November 30, 1995 memo (Appendix L) from the Ministry of Education and Training, Ernie Eves, (Finance Minister at the time) announced the government transfer payments for the 1996-1997 year. The memo started by stating, "The future of Ontario can be strengthened and secured only if the provincial deficit is brought under control". The grant support for post-secondary institutions were reduced by \$400 million; \$280 million for the university sector, and \$120 million to the college sector (proportionate based on each segments operating share). Tuition was increased by 15% and fee deregulation for international students was introduced (with protection of domestic student seats as part of the new policy). Lastly, the memo stated that changes to the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) were being introduced. As a result, people who were supported by social assistance had these benefits terminated while they were in school. Colleges expanded and started to differentiate their programs leading to students commuting to their college of choice, rather than the college in their region which led to the expansion of student residences (another cost factor for students). Colleges were allowed to differentiate tuition based on demand; higher prices for programs that had more job prospects and earning potential. All of these factors combined impacted students ability to pay for a post-secondary education.

Because of these fiscal issues, colleges are implementing ancillary fees and facility rental fees – while attempting to drive higher investment income, and partnership resource contributions. These strategies for turning to sources other than government and tuition fees were first recommended approximately twenty years ago, in the Excellence, Accessibility and Responsibility Report (Smith, Cameron, Gorbet, Henderson, & Stephenson, 1996). One might consider these new sources of funds the low-hanging fruit which can be recognized immediately

but, cannot be increased continuously without raising the ire of both the student population and the general public. However, a more viable, and perhaps more palatable, means of raising additional funds is for colleges to increase income by acquiring private donations and support through fund-raising, thereby entering a landscape already exploited by charitable organizations and university institutions.

Statement of the Problem Situation

As these shifts to external fundraising occur, there is a demand for college fundraisers to demonstrate increased accountability and measurability of their performance to a myriad of affected stakeholders, including college administrators, students, government funders, donors and the general public. Each of these stakeholders has a role to play in influencing the efficacy of fundraising both within and outside each institution. Even though Ontario colleges have been in existence for fifty years as of 2017, they have only been fundraising since 1995 (Snobelen, 1995). With these fundraising departments now taking shape, there is a unique opportunity to shape their operation to meet the accountability, measurability and performance mandates that these critical stakeholders are expecting.

Given the fiduciary, ethical and moral responsibilities of a fundraiser, I was surprised that I could not find any qualifications or requirements for this position in the literature or position postings. I found no consistency in established occupational standards, legislative and/or educational requirements or specific knowledge required for this role. I found one credential - the Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) that is a voluntary credential and not required to obtain any fundraising position.

Purpose of the Research

To meet the demands of the stakeholders (colleges and their administrators, students, government funders, donors and the general public), it was important to explore the current state of college fundraising, particularly as it relates to the occupation and the level of professionalism. My hope for this study is that it will serve to stimulate thoughtful open discussion, related to the essential qualifications of fundraisers, and whether fundraising as an occupation is an emerging profession within the context of Ontario's colleges.

Rational/Significance of the Study

This study is warranted because there are fiduciary responsibilities that fundraisers have to all stakeholders. Fundraisers handle large sums of money on a regular basis. Donors entrust their money to fundraisers and expect that this money will be used in a responsible manner consistent with the direction of their gift. These institutions and charitable organizations expect that reporting and compliance responsibilities to the government, public and beneficiaries are met. The responsibilities of fundraisers reach far beyond a basic job description and encroach on moral and ethical issues and considerations.

In my literature review, I found articles that relate to different aspects of fundraising and professionalization; professionalization of fundraisers (Boland, 2004), credentialing (Chobot, 2004), compensation (Grossnickle & Aldrich, 2004), code of ethics (Kidder, 2004) and training and research (Levy, 2004), but I have not found any research specifically related to the professionalization of fundraising within the Ontario colleges. Moreover, in my literature review, I found the inconsistent use of the terms "fund raising" and "fundraising" signaling there is a lack of a common understanding, consistency and approach to the occupation. In this paper, I

chose to use the term “fundraising” because I found it appeared more frequently in academic literature, compared to “fund raising” in trade literature. The existence of the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) that is an international association dedicated to fundraisers and related organizations with local and international chapters, signals an existing profession, however, this is explored later in the study.

As colleges continue to face fiscal constraints, the findings of this research study may help them understand the role of fundraising within the institution, plan and execute their fundraising strategies, while still addressing the important needs and concerns of other stakeholders within the environment. The findings of this study could provide important information for hiring the right people for these positions and provide a deeper understanding of the needs of the sector, resulting in the ability to raise resource support for the institution.

Personal Rationale

In late 2013, I was appointed to the position of Chief Development Officer at a large urban College located in southern Ontario. I had worked previously at the same College in an academic division with a focus on student experience, employer-college relations, local and international partnerships as well as overall academic operations. This division, the Centre for Hospitality and Culinary Arts, was in the final stages of a five million-dollar, five-year fundraising initiative to renovate the building, classrooms and learning labs.

Prior to my appointment as Chief Development Officer, I had no formal education or experience as a fundraiser. Although I had previously raised funds through partnership and volunteer work, I had no in-depth understanding of the complexities of the position and based on my acquaintance with other fundraisers, this is likely true of others who enter similar positions. As I started my journey in this new position, I began to question whether there were others like

me, who had come into a similar role from the administrative side of the education sector or outside of the sector, with no fundraising background. I sought out resources that might be helpful to me in my new role and found the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) which operates in Canada, United States, Mexico and China. There are over 30,000 members and 200 chapters. Their mission is to advance philanthropy through advocacy, research, education and certification programs (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2016).

During my first year as a Chief Development Officer, I decided to join the AFP and attended the Toronto Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) Congress and the International AFP Conference in San Antonio, Texas in the United States. I also attended Advancement and Alumni sessions offered by Colleges Ontario which focused on sharing information and best practices in fundraising and alumni engagement.

As I reflected on the first year of my position, what I understood about myself was that I did not identify as a member of the fundraising community in AFP, and that my approach to developing resources for the College was very different from that of others. Many of the members that I met were from sectors outside of academia like the environment, health, religion, etc.

Then in 2015, I was appointed President of the College's Foundation. I understood that institutional advancement departments were becoming increasingly important and became very aware of the talent shortage and challenges in this sector. I questioned how individuals identified with the fundraising occupation and how these people were being equipped to deal with donor and stakeholder demands as well as the future fiscal needs of their colleges.

Research Questions

My overall research question was, “Is fundraising perceived to be an emerging profession within Ontario’s English language Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, why or why not?” The specific research questions that drive this study and answer the overall question are discussed in Chapter Three.

Theoretical Framework

Brint (1993) describes trait theory as a set of characteristics or traits that define a profession. I conducted my research through the lens of trait theory firstly, because it provided a starting point for the comparison of the fundraising occupation against the classical defining characteristics of a profession as discussed by Brint and others in the literature (e.g., the medical, legal, nursing and dental hygiene occupations). Secondly, the defining traits provided an appropriate organizing framework for the exploration and description of what exists, resulting in some level of clarity in the measurement as to whether or not fundraising was perceived to be a profession. I acknowledge that the five traits intersect and do not fit neatly into specific trait boxes. Expecting them to do so would set the bar for meeting the criteria too high. However, describing the perceived characteristics in terms of the specific traits adds clarity to the assessment of the extent to which fundraising is currently perceived by important stakeholders to meet these traits.

My research focused on five characteristics of professions as articulated in the literature by Freidson (2001), and further studied by Greenwood (1954), Wilensky (1965), Abbott (1983), Wheelwright (2000), and Boland and Temple (2004). I found approximately 90 years of literature between these theorists on the topic of professionalization of occupations and, consequently decided to focus on the characteristics or traits which remained constant and

common throughout their publications. With respect to Trait Theory, Abbott (2010, p. 178) explained, “(A profession) is any occupation that has a certain set of traits: schools, licenses, exams, ethics codes, etc.” Although trait theory is strongly refuted by Abbott (2010), he recognizes that, “[his theory] does allow that forces internal to professions play a part. But the part they play is determined completely by the ecological conditions” (Abbott, 2010, p. 176). Abbott refutes trait theory because his view is that the focus should be on the work professions do – and not the structural similarities (Abbott, 2010, p. 175). I interpret this to mean that in his view, while trait theory is not the driving force for occupations to become professions (as according to Abbott, it is external forces that do that), he does recognize that professional traits are influenced by these forces. I am, therefore, using this approach for two reasons. Firstly, although there is considerable literature related to professions and professionalization of occupations, I found very little specifically about professionalization of fundraising in Ontario’s colleges. This research may provide a starting point for further study, discussion and spirited debate as to whether fundraising meets the professional criteria relating to trait theory. Hopefully, sector leaders will engage in more research in this area. Secondly, while I acknowledged that professions may be created by external factors, hence including other stakeholders in this study, my focus was to explore how fundraisers specifically in Ontario’s colleges embrace the characteristics of a profession. Their answers may help us understand how their work may or may not be evolving into a profession and why that is or is not important.

My data collection was informed by the following five characteristics of professions as articulated by the previously identified theorists: autonomy, formal course of study, professional associations and code of ethics, state legislation and a unique body of knowledge. I found in my

literature review that these five traits are the most consistent characteristics identified as defining professionalism over the span of the 90 years (Freidson, 2001; Boland and Temple, 2004).

(1) **Autonomy** (Freidson, 2001; Wheelwright, 2000) is the ability of the practitioners to decide and control their own work; where market and institutions have no control over their professional practices. Freidson (2001) calls this the Division of Labour. Another common trait identified by the theorists is the (2) **formal course of study** (Freidson, 2001; Wilensky, 1965; Wheelwright, 2000; Boland and Temple, 2004). To a large extent, each of these theorists also suggests that the study must be completed in a university, where the primary role of the institution is to create new knowledge (Freidson, 2001, p. 86). This contributes to the (3) **unique body of knowledge** within each profession (Freidson, 2001; Greenwood, 1954; Boland and Temple, 2004). The expansion of this knowledge within an occupation is particularly important to achieve professional status, although the advancement and selective dissemination of new knowledge protects the professional status by further stratifying social class (Abbott, 1981).

(4) **Professional associations** with a **formal code of ethics** also play an important role in professionalization (Greenwood, 1954; Wilensky, 1965; Abbott, 1983; Wheelwright 2000; Boland and Temple, 2004). The role of these associations are to promote the interests of their members, confirm credentials and, to a large extent, establish and enforce regulations including a code of ethics. Professional associations are vested with the power to remove the individual's eligibility to practice should the code of ethics be violated. Freidson (2001) remains skeptical about these associations as they are typically self-governed and argues that they are biased when making decisions that compromise the reputation of their professions as a whole. Many of these associations are linked to (5) **state regulations** (Wilensky, 1965) that legislate the profession's

ability to practice. The main objective of state legislation is to protect public interest. States may require professions to register or obtain licensing prior to practicing.

Conceptual framework

My research addressed the characteristics of a profession, as identified in my review of the literature. Figure 1 depicts the conceptual framework of this research, based on the five characteristics identified in the literature.

Scope

Although the discussion in the literature of professions and professionalization as an area of scholarly study spans over the last 90 years, this study will focus on fundraising post 1995, because that was the watershed year within the Ontario college context with respect to fundraising. In 1995, the provincial government cut college funding by 15% - after budgets were previously approved. Through a policy directive (Snobelen, 1995), colleges were summarily notified that budgets were being cut – mid-semester – and a discussion paper was going to be commissioned to review the future of the higher education landscape in Ontario going forward. At that time, colleges needed to respond immediately to the new fiscal reality. Seneca College, for example, undertook sweeping changes after an institutional review recommended organizational restructuring including the re-absorption of both Seneca International and the Seneca Foundation, which were distinctly separate entities, back into the college. Furthermore, the internal review also recommended a net reduction of 141 full-time positions (i.e., 27 administrators, 78 faculty and 36 support staff) (Quinlan, 1997). In retrospect, most of the reductions for Seneca’s full-time administrative and faculty positions took place because of

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework in Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession

natural attrition or buy-outs (not termination) - with only eighteen support staff actually eliminated.

While there are 24 colleges in Ontario, my study focused on eight colleges representing each of the geographical regions and size (Appendix A - Tables 1 and 2). The two Francophone colleges are excluded because of the uniqueness of their institutional culture, the geographical distance from my home and costs associated with translation and interpretation.

Limitations

The findings of this study are not generalizable as the participants were not randomly selected from the total population. I recruited the participants as I believed they would be able to provide meaningful insights that could inform this study. This evaluation is based on my nine years of experience within the higher education sector - five of which had been directly related to fundraising.

Because of the focus of this research, the sample size is relatively small. However, as this was an exploratory descriptive study given the paucity of scholarly data related to the topic, the context requires depth of understanding. Thus, while the participant size may be a limitation of the study, the information gathered through focus group discussions and interviews will add to our overall understanding of the topic that is the focus of this study and issues involved.

The primary donor group that was interviewed were key informants from corporations, foundations and individuals who had given \$100,000 or more to one or more of the twenty-two English language colleges within Ontario within the last five to ten years. Because I work in an urban college, and the donors selected for this study were those in my network, it is likely that the donor-base was from the same area.

As the President of an Ontario College Foundation and having worked in the fundraising sector for over five years, I bring both strengths and potential limitations to this study. My deep understanding of other issues and challenges faced by fundraisers in the Ontario colleges is a strength but at the same time, I was very aware that it might impact the lens through which I collected and analyzed the data. To minimize this potential bias as much as possible the assistance of third-party experts was sought to cross-check the themes I identified in the data from all sources.

Another potential limitation is that my position as President of an urban college foundation could be a deterrent for stakeholders, particularly fundraisers, to openly share their experiences. There could be a perceived competitive threat. For this reason, I created standardized anonymous questionnaires for the fundraiser group. This group was surveyed through an online link or paper surveys with extra care to protect the respondents; anonymity.

Surveys were disseminated at my place of employment through the online survey link and it is likely that some responded. Recognizing the power differential for those who work within the Foundation, the surveys were disseminated by a neutral third-party (i.e., administrative assistant) and the anonymity of all participants was protected.

Methodological Assumptions

The main assumption of this study was that those who participated in this research were knowledgeable about the topic and as honest as possible in their responses since there was no real or perceived power differential relationship with any other participant groups; nor were there any foreseeable advantages or disadvantages to the participants based on the nature of their answers. Where there was a potential for undue influence (e.g., for those who reported to me) this was acknowledged and how this would be managed through neutral third-party engagement

was declared in the Informed Consent forms and is discussed under ethical considerations in Chapter Three.

Summary of Chapter One

This chapter introduced the research topic as well as the background, problem statement, personal significance and limitations. An introduction of the theoretical and conceptual framework that will serve as the foundation for this study was presented. The methodology included the overarching research questions and a description of the different participant groups that inform this study.

In the next chapter, the paper provides a historical context of fundraising in Canada with a focus on law and taxes. The themes found in the literature that relate to fundraising are also explored and discussed. The five characteristics of professions selected for this study and the current state of fiscal restraints at Ontario colleges are examined.

Chapter Three describes the research design and methodology of my study; while Chapter Four presents data collected and their subsequent detailed analysis. In Chapter Five, I discuss the conclusions and implications of the research findings.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

In this chapter, I review the scholarly literature that pertains to the focus and scope of my study. I discuss the history of philanthropy in Canada and how it intersects with state legislation, law and taxes. I then explore the fiscal situation in Ontario's colleges, which is followed by a discussion about professions and the common characteristics that were identified from the literature. Finally, I provide a summary of this chapter.

Scope and Limitations of Literature Reviewed

The literature review includes scholarly writings on professions as early as 1954 and in the fundraising literature after 1990. Because of the 1995 watershed experience for Ontario colleges when the province handed down mid-semester cuts, most of the literature reviewed is from early 1990 and later. From these readings, I identified several themes that will be explored in greater detail – some of which relate directly to fundraising as a career choice / profession, and some of which are outside of the immediate realm of fundraising, but still have some relevance.

I start with a focus on the history of philanthropy in Canada, and a review of the fiscal situation for Ontario's colleges, along with an assessment of several emerging themes including diversification and strategic autonomy. While I found literature related to many aspects of the history of philanthropy, (e.g., in religion), for the purpose of this paper, I explored specifically how the law and taxes have shaped the historical context of Canada's philanthropic landscape. This chapter ends with a discussion of the characteristics of professions and the desire for more trust and accountability in the not-for-profit sector.

The History of Philanthropy in Canada: Law and Taxes

Through my research, there appeared to be an absence of consolidated literature specifically devoted to the history of fundraising in Canada, let alone fundraising in Ontario's colleges. My literature search identified a paper presented at the 2011 Association of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research (ANSER) Conference, entitled, *Rationale for the History of Philanthropy in Canada* (Hardy, 2011). The author explained for Canadian philanthropic studies to advance, the history of philanthropy specifically dedicated to Canada needed to be documented in a rational and holistic manner. Hardy focused her Master's thesis work on consolidating the historical context and has since then, contributed her work to the first chapter of a textbook, *Excellence in Fundraising in Canada* (Mallabone, 2014). The historical context of philanthropy specifically relating to colleges and universities are important for the future of development in Ontario's colleges and so a recount of the historical context of charitable giving is articulated in the next section.

According to Broadbent (1999) and Broder (2001), the legal definition of charity in Canada has been criticized as being irrelevant and unreflective of the modern society. This is largely due to the historical roots of charitable giving from a legal context, which has evolved through common and case law (Broadbent, 1999; Broder 2001). In a 1999 report, *Building on Strength: Improving Governance and Accountability in Canada's Charitable Sector*, also known as the Broadbent report, the author asked, "...why should the courts be deciding, based on law derived from English legislation almost 400 years old, what a democratic nation wants today" (p.52).

The current legal definition of charity is based on the British *Statute of Charitable uses* (1601), (Broder, 2011; Cullity, 2013) also known as the Statute of Elizabeth (Bromely, 2001).

The preamble of the Statute states that charity refers to:

...The relief of the aged, impotent and poor people; the maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners, schools of learning, free schools and scholars in universities; the repair of bridges, ports, havens, causeways, churches, sea-banks and highways; the education and preferment of orphans; the relief, stock or maintenance of houses of correction; the marriages of poor maids, the (support), aid and help of young tradesmen, handicraftsmen and persons decayed; the relief or redemption of prisoners or captives; and the aid or ease of any poor inhabitants concerning payment of fifteens, setting out of soldiers and other taxes. (Bromley, 1999, p. 4)

This preamble was set in 1601 and although relevant to the time, without considering the evolution of how this statute has been applied throughout history, the preamble would do a disservice to the evolution of its relevance today (Broder, 2001). Moreover, the preamble uses a number of terms and phrases that may not be appropriate in the current context (e.g., marriages of poor maids). The following describes a monumental case almost 300 years later, which set the precedent in shaping the legal definition of a charity (Broder, 2001).

The Commissioners for Special Purposes of the Income Tax v. John Frederick Pemsel. The late 1700s was a time of strife and war in England and the government introduced income taxes to fund war efforts. The Income Tax Act was introduced in 1799 and exempted certain organizations from paying taxes (those set up for charitable reasons). In 1803, a modification to the Act required charitable organizations to pay taxes on the interest earned on

investments (i.e., endowments). The legislation at that time allowed for the application of a refund for the taxes remitted, and this is how the Pemsel case started.

John Frederick Pemsel was the Treasurer of the Moravian Church who, in 1888, filed a refund for the taxes remitted to the Commissioners for Special Purposes. This claim was denied and eventually the case made its way to the House of Lords, the highest court in the British legal system. The Lord of Appeals, Lord MacNaughten, ruled in favour of Pemsel shaping the current day legal definition of a charity as relating to taxes. Gousmett (2009, p. 428) states”

...Charity in its legal sense comprises of four principle divisions; trusts for the relief of poverty; trusts for the advancement of education; trusts for the advancement of religion; and trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community, not falling under any of the preceding heads.

The current day criticisms of the lack of clarity in the definition of a charity (Broadbent 1999; Broder 2001; Cullity, 2013; Kitching, 2006), has not only legal implications, but also impacts taxation and registered charitable status.

Under the Income Tax Act 2011, a registered charity is a foundation or organization in Canada that has met the eligibility requirements to be deemed as a registered charity. According to the Income Tax Act (Government of Canada, 2011, para. 1), a charitable foundation means:

...a corporation or trust that is constituted and operated exclusively for charitable purposes, no part of the income of which is payable to, or is otherwise available for, the personal benefit of any proprietor, member, shareholder, trustee or settlor thereof, and that is not a charitable organization. (Government of Canada, 2011, para.1)

The relevance of the legal definition of charities has been questioned both locally and internationally as demonstrated by the number of reviews as discussed below. Starting from the post-war era, there have been a number of reports reviewing the legal definition of charity and charitable purposes as well as the relevance of law, which was established over 400 years ago.

In 1952, England and Wales commissioned a report; *Report of the Committee on the Law and Practice into Charitable Trusts* (Logan, Report of the Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Charitable Trusts , 1953), also known as the Nathan Report. The main purpose of this report was to examine the state of charities and charitable giving with particular emphasis on the definition of charity. While the preamble to the Elizabethan Law (1601) is used as a definition for charities, the language relating to the Pemsel case lacks clarity in the fourth heading of charity. The fourth heading states, “trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community, not falling under any of the preceding heads”. The application has been left to interpretation of lawmakers, and throughout time, has carried a meaning of its own through case law. The report recommended a rewording of the definition “charity” to allow greater flexibility - granting it would be unrealistic to completely rewrite Elizabethan Law (1601) to reflect current day norms (Logan, Report of the committee on the law and practice relating to charitable trusts, 1953).

In 1976, The National Council of Social Service in the UK commissioned a conference attended by individuals and associations related to, and interested in, the voluntary sector. The report of that conference, also known as the Goodman Report, made several recommendations to change the definition of charity to be more relevant to today’s societal needs. Again, the stakeholders criticized the existing Elizabethan Law (1601) for being outdated. In addition to expanding the list of organizations or associations that are deemed to be charitable, the report

also made recommendations to include organizations that operate both abroad and locally for “public benefit” to be considered charitable.

In 1996, the Ontario Law Reform Commission undertook an extensive review of the current local and international definition of charities and operations (Ontario Law Reform Commission, 1996). The report examined the legal definition of a charity; reviewed documents published in the United States, United Kingdom and Australia; investigated tax law relating to charities and then constructed a list of recommendations for the reform of charities and charitable giving. One of the final recommendations of this report was to make *no* changes to the definition of charity as originally established in 1601 and allow case law to continue to evolve the legal terms in which charities are recognized. Nevertheless, the report indicates that in order for a charity to meet the charitable organization “test”, it should consider the three areas; charitable purpose (the good pursued), the practical utility of the act or the project (the effect), and the destination of the benefit (others).

In 1997, Canada’s Panel on Accountability and Governance of the Voluntary Sector authored a report, *Building on Strength: Improving Governance and Accountability in Canada’s Voluntary Sector* (1999), also known as the Broadbent report. The commission was comprised of six volunteer individuals who led this review with several objectives; to conduct research and present draft proposals for discussion about how to promote accountability and governance in the voluntary sector as well as recommendations on a list of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to hold colleges and universities accountable to their Board of Governors; to get feedback from the sector by leading broad consultations; and to present a final report containing specific recommendations (Broadbent, 1999). The report made recommendations to government donors as well as those involved in the voluntary sector in Canada. One of the major criticisms of the

report was its definition of charities and the lack of current day relevance – the committee recommended a review of the legal definition of charity and charitable purposes to adopt language that would reflect today's societal needs.

The Prime Minister of Australia, John Winston Howard, commissioned a Committee to carry out the Inquiry into the Definition of Charities and Related Organizations (Government of Australia, 2000). The purpose of the Committee was to assess the current state of the charitable sector in Australia and to ensure the legislative and administrative frameworks were relevant to the political and economic structures (Government of Australia, 2000). He noted that the modern day charitable sector was informed by statutes developed as far back as 1601 and constructed the Committee for the Purpose of Examining and Reporting on the Charitable Sector in Australia, emphasizing the attributes, purpose and behaviour of such organizations considering then current social expectations and experiences, and those organizations that are wholly or partially charitable religious or community service not-for-profits.

While this report did not specifically recommend a definition for charity, the committee did outline three areas that must be taken into consideration when constructing a new or enhanced law, namely: the purpose of the organization; the nature of the activities undertaken by the organization; and the type of service provided (for example, direct assistance and prevention, advocacy or self-help). This is aligned with a standard charity test as recommended in the 1996 Ontario Law Reform Commission.

The history of charities and charitable giving has long had its roots within the legal context of Canada. As discussed above, there is still much ambiguity in the legal definition of charities, which has been criticized to be outdated and lacking relevance in today's context (Kitching, 2006). With regard to the different reports commissioned by different governments, it

appears that there are some commonalities; the need to further define and clarify the purpose, activities and beneficiaries of charitable organizations. Government, however, still has direct control over charities and charitable giving through two means; the list of eligible registered charities in Canada and the tax benefits related to charitable donations.

Higher Education Financing – Whose Responsibility Is It?

One way we can explain the financing of higher education is through cost sharing. There are two types of costs to consider; the cost of instruction (tuition) and the cost of student maintenance (housing, food, transportation, etc.). The stakeholders sharing the cost of higher education include government, parents, students and donors.

There are differing perspectives on who should pay for higher education. There are those who suggest that the country and society benefits as a whole from citizens who access college and university programs and therefore, the government (or more specifically, taxpayers) should absorb the cost and higher education should be free (Johnstone & Marcucci, 2010). On the other side of the coin, there are those who believe that higher education is a private good and students and parents should pay. Lastly, there are private donors who contribute to higher education, research, access programs, etc. In order for donors to be motivated to give, there needs to be, among other things, a wealthy donor base, established need (students who cannot access higher education due to financial constraints – this would not be the case in a government fully funded system), and a tax system that encourages giving (Johnstone & Marcucci, 2010).

The Changing Higher Education Landscape

The traditional higher education institutions have had to shift their focus from primarily academic inquiry to also adopting business practices characteristic of private enterprises and

become far more result-driven and efficient operation due to neoliberalism (Olssen & Peters Michael, 2005). Classical liberalism is characteristic of a state power that is removed or diminished, while the neoliberal state actively creates and enforces societal conditions that are required for effective operation of market like behaviours in public institutions (Olssen & Peters Michael, 2005). The fundamental belief of neoliberalism is that public institutions will not be responsive to ‘customer’ needs without the discipline of the market. One of the major areas where this is represented is in higher education. These institutions are seen to be important economic drivers for government and society and have been encouraged to develop partnerships and links with community and industry to grow entrepreneurial skills and performance measures (Olssen & Peters Michael, 2005).

This change in the higher education sector has shifted the behaviour of institutions to be more market-focused. Moreover, states are providing incentives for higher education institutes to partner with industry in order to secure funding. For example, the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) founded in 1997 by the Government of Canada matches up to 40% of research infrastructure costs for innovation developments benefiting Canadians and the global community (Canada Foundation for Innovation, 2013). The other 60% must be made up of institutional resources and private funds. Higher educational institutions not only have to focus on traditional inquiry, but they are also looking for government and private partners to fund areas of research in other related projects that are either unfunded or underfunded.

Fiscal Situation in Ontario’s Colleges

Many Canadians continue to contribute to charities spanning many different sectors. The 2012 Statistics Canada survey, *Charitable giving by Canadians* (Turcotte, 2012), noted an increase in statu donations between 2007 and 2010 by Canadians to a number of different

charitable sectors (Table 1). These donations totaled \$10.4 billion 2007 and \$10.6 billion in 2010. In 2010, 40% of Canadian donations went to religion, 22% went to education and research, 15% to health, 8% to international organizations and, interestingly, only 1% to universities and

Table 1: *Donor Rate and Total Amounts Donated by Canadians in 2007 and 2010*

Donor rate and total amounts donated, by type of charitable or non-profit organization, population aged 15 and over, 2007 and 2010						
Type of organization	Donor rate		Total amount donated ¹			
	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007
	percentage	percentage	thousands of dollars	thousands of dollars	percentage distribution	percentage distribution
Total	84	84	10,609,533	10,429,330	100	100
Arts and culture	3	3	107,795 [‡]	105,009	1	1
Sports and recreation	14	14	230,229	236,717	2	2
Education and research	20	14 [‡]	309,091	257,329	3	2
Universities and colleges	1	1	116,783 [‡]	68,190	1	1
Health	53	56 [‡]	1,592,685	1,579,616	15	15
Hospitals	18	18	614,507	603,902	6	6
Social services	42	39 [‡]	1,155,532	956,433 [‡]	11	9
Environment	7	7	274,416	203,752 [‡]	3	2
Development and housing	2	2	104,182	85,706	1	1
Law, advocacy and politics	3	5 [‡]	99,036	136,028	1	1
Grant-making, fundraising and voluntarism promotion	13	10 [‡]	617,339	485,811 [‡]	6	5
International organizations	11	9 [‡]	879,106	647,275	8	6
Religion	33	36 [‡]	4,260,848	4,804,211	40	46
Business and professional associations, labour unions	0 [‡]	0 [‡]	8,085 [‡]	9,974 [‡]	0	0
Other non-classified groups	3	2 [‡]	114,565 [‡]	63,087 [‡]	1	1
Residual amount—different organizations	...	...	125,335	186,290	1	2
Donations toward natural disaster relief	20	..	570,676	..	..	..

[‡] statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) from 2010

1. Excludes donations toward natural disaster relief.

Source: Statistics Canada, Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2007 and 2010.

Source: Charitable giving by Canadians (Turcotte, 2012), Table 5, p. 27).

colleges.

The premise of the legal definition of charity in Canada is based on the Four Heads of Charity (Broder, 2001); relief of poverty, advancement of education, advancement of religion and trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community not falling under any of the preceding

heads. Ironically, colleges and universities, who directly fall under one of these areas, receive 1% of the overall donor's dollar in Canada.

How does the higher education sector gain a larger share of the charitable or private dollar? While this paper does not attempt to answer this question, it is important to keep these statistics in mind in looking at the potential of philanthropy for this sector.

The demand for higher quality of, access to and technological advances in Ontario's colleges (Clark, Moran, Skolnik & Trick, 2009, p. 2), coupled with the heavy constraints on the public budget and the homogeneity of the colleges' funding formulas, has resulted in a compromised fiscal situation for higher education. In addition, globalization has also increased the level of uncertainty related to funding (Clark et. al, 2009, p.19). In order to compete at the global level, the post-secondary system must be seen as more efficient. Programs and courses can be accessed online resulting in a new set of competitors that were not contenders in the past. Additionally, in reconciliation with the public funder, and to fulfil the role of good public governance, governments need to counter the impact of market forces through access policies which may exclude those without the capacity to 'pay' and any tendencies to reduce quality in efforts to improve profits. The tensions in funding between quality and access in post-secondary education presents a unique access challenge for students (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). For example, students who do not have the capacity to fund their education could be at risk of being excluded from the higher education system. Or, students who have special needs may not receive the additional supports that are required for a successful post-secondary experience. A report commissioned by the Ontario government in 2005, known as the Rae Report, states:

The evidence from Europe and elsewhere suggests a growing concern from institutions about the quality they are able to provide with the level of universal

subsidy set aside by governments. Government taps get turned on and off. The institutions have little place else to turn – there is little tuition, philanthropy or private support. The result is lower quality and diminished access. This is not a smart choice for Ontario. (Rae, 2005, p. 24, para. 3)

Although historically, the province's funding formula has been based on per-student count, it is uncertain that the formulas will remain constant with the changing times. Colleges will likely always be faced with funding challenges. However, with this in mind, the next section assumes future calculations based on per-student funding formulas. Figure 2 (p. 27) reviews the per-student funding based on data from the Colleges Ontario Environmental Scan 1996 – 2010, and it appears to contradict the “diminished access” statement in Rae's report. Other than the slight dip in 2002-03 and 2009-10, it appears the trend in per-student funding is increasing, although modestly. If we use the measure of per-student funding as a quality indicator, the numbers do not suggest a decline, however it does raise questions related to replacement costs and increasing funds within the sector. If per-student funding is increasing as the chart suggests, then why is quality and access suffering? This scenario could be related to costs of delivering competitive programs. Technology is changing at a near-daily rate, students are learning from different mobile or technological devices and platforms. Educational institutions cannot keep up with the speed of change, particularly related to capital and technological improvements. Private dollars from donors, corporations and foundations can provide the much-needed resources to help institutions equip their organizations with up-to-date equipment and learning spaces that will create job-ready graduates. While the province's funding formula (per student grant) may cover operating costs (salaries and overhead), colleges must advocate to both government and private donors to expand and build new capital projects (campus).

Why Fundraise in Ontario's Colleges?

Figure 2: Ontario Colleges Total Operating Grant per Full Time Equivalent

Source of Data: Based on Colleges Ontario Environmental Scan (Colleges Ontario, 2015).

© Copyright 2018 Cindy Gouveia

As not-for-profit corporations, up until 1995, colleges were not permitted by the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities (MTCU) to take an aggressive role in acquiring private funds (Ontario, cited in (Smith, Cameron, Gorbet, Henderson, & Stephenson, 1996), p.44). As seen in chapter one (background), on November 30, 1995, the Minister of Education and Training at that time, John C. Snobelen, issued a policy directive to all colleges (Snobelen, 1995).

This statement emphasized concern for the fiscal deficit at that time and handed down mid-semester budget cuts. These budget cuts totaled \$120 million for the college system and

\$280 million for the universities, totaling 15% of overall funding (Gouveia, 2016). The policy directive also promised to commission a discussion paper to inform the “key directions and policies the province might pursue with respect to post-secondary education” (p. 2). The policy statement stayed silent on whether institutions needed to review alternate sources of funding.

In December 1996, a final report was presented to the Minister with recommendations on the future priorities for the post-secondary education sector in Ontario (Smith et al., 1996). This report provided many recommendations including cost sharing, role linkages and meeting future needs. In one paragraph, the report stated, “The recent decision by the Ministry of Education and Training to rescind policies that limited college fundraising efforts reinforces our sense that these institutions have moved to a new stage in their interaction with the private sector” (p. 44).

Although I could not find the specific policies that originally limited colleges from fundraising, it is important to note that, based on widespread anecdotal accounts, there were fundraising restrictions on colleges up until this report – the rescinding of policies that limited college fundraising was the catalyst that opened the gates for colleges to fundraise and seek alternate forms of private support. In addition to the fiscal realities, there are other reasons why institutions seek donations. In the next section, I will briefly discuss some of these areas.

Reasons for Fundraising. The chances of per-student funding increasing exponentially is highly unlikely given the modest increases in the past. While colleges can expect slight increases according to the historical trend, the increases in per-student funding will be surpassed by the costs associated with delivering programs, staffing and capital requirements (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009).

For the colleges to achieve their institutional goals, they must turn to alternate funding sources to sustain current operations. Colleges charge fees to meet their operational expenditures,

for example, parking fees, ancillary fees, alumni and athletic fees provide additional revenue to cover operations. Another source of revenue is fundraising. Although there are many good reasons for institutions to fundraise, including the need for student support, there are other reasons why colleges, or the post-secondary sector for that matter, fundraise. The next section outlines different reasons for colleges to fundraise.

Diversification. Institutions are realizing that there is much risk in relying solely on public funding and tuition to pay for operations. In response to this, institutions are looking to diversify their funding sources to offset some of that risk. Universities have turned to research funding (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009, p. 98) and no different from fund managers who look after your investments, colleges are also looking for creative ways, whether intentionally or out of necessity, to diversify their funding sources. Examples of creative sources of college funding include enhanced recruitment of non-classical learners (e.g., international students), corporate training, rental incomes and fundraising. Colleges are now generating revenue from renting space to food service providers in their cafeterias, purchase agreement incentives, charging community and other organizations for use of space and, in some cases, facilities fees that offset the cleaning and administration costs associated with renting space for events to both internal and external customers.

Strategic Autonomy. Land (2001) states that there is a direct relationship between funding arrangements and the steering effects of colleges. At the provincial level, there are strategic objectives tied with funding arrangements. In other words, for a college to acquire specific funds, it must *do* something that may or may not be relevant to the institution or part of its longer-term planning. Therefore, a college may have strategic objectives that are not entirely supported by the province and would need to secure funding from alternate sources to advance

their autonomy in its local environment. There are also federal funding incentives that promote the national strategy. The Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), a federally funded organization whose mandate is to invest in advanced state-of-the-art facilities and equipment in Canada's research institutions, is an example of this national effort. It is noteworthy that colleges were first invited to participate in applying for this research fund in 2002, as the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act was amended in 2002, allowing colleges to engage in applied research for the first time (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, 2002, S.O. 2002).

Matching. Matching private philanthropic dollars through government or other means (e.g., foundations) is a way to encourage giving towards specific focus areas. The Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) offered matching grants to institutions which were fundraising to support student endowments. These endowments generated scholarships in perpetuity but are restricted to domestic students who enroll in a full-time program who can demonstrate financial need. To access these matching grants, donors had to agree to these minimum criteria and the institution had to comply with the investment policies related to the grant. In recognition of the importance of access for students of lower income families balanced against longer term fiscal provincial constraints, the 2005 Rae Report, Ontario: A Leader in Learning, recommended that the Province make a permanent commitment to the OSOTF. The report encouraged institutions to take advantage of this program, which provided a one-to-one match for private donations restricted to student endowments. For institutions with smaller endowments, (less than \$1,000 per student), the report proposed the matching program be extended for two additional years to allow colleges and universities more time to raise the private portion for the match. This matching program was suspended by the Liberal provincial

government in 2012, and the monies were reallocated to other access programs for post-secondary students, such as the 30% off tuition at that time, and the current “free tuition” program at the time of this study which started in September 2017. There are specific eligibility requirements to access the free tuition program (annual income), and the grant covers a portion of the tuition as it is calculated on an average. The program is a re-packaging of the current access funds. Students and parents can no longer claim tuition on their annual tax filing to offset their income.

The Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) founded in 1997 by the Government of Canada matches up to 40% of research infrastructure costs for innovation developments benefiting Canadians and the global community (Canada Foundation for Innovation, 2013). There are eligibility requirements participating organizations must meet to be able to acquire funding. In general, the fund covers research infrastructure costs related to research and innovation in universities, colleges or research hospitals that are not-for-profit and are not agencies of the province or territory. The CFI’s national goals are to “enhance the capacity of institutions to support economic growth and job creation, as well as health and environmental quality, through innovation” (Canada Foundation for Innovation, 2013). There are three objectives to this program; first, to promote important world-class scientific research and technology development at colleges and universities; second, to “expand research and job opportunities by providing support through research infrastructure for the development of highly qualified personnel and, finally, to promote productive networks and collaboration among Canadian universities, colleges, research hospitals, non-profit research institutions and the private sector” (Canada Foundation for Innovation, 2013; p. 6). Most other provinces in Canada

also have some form research funding, including the Ontario Research Fund (ORF) that funds research operations and infrastructure (Government of Ontario, 2016).

Although not related to institutional fundraising, the Federal Government encourages parents or guardians to save money for their child's education through the Canada Education Savings Grant (CESG) which matches funds contributed to Registered Education Savings Plans (RESP). There are two parts to this grant (Government of Canada, 2013). The first part is the Basic Canada Education Savings Grant which will match up to 20% on every dollar of the first \$2,500 parents save in a child's RESP each year. The second part is the Additional Canada Education Savings Grant through which, depending on net family income, parents may receive an extra 10% or 20% on every dollar of the first \$500 they save in their child's RESP each year. While this was intended to assist low income parents, it quickly became evident that it was the mid-to-high income families who took advantage of this source of funding support; few low-income members of the population participated, either because they did not have the minimum funds required, or they did not have had the financial literacy to access these programs, or due to other factors such as personal values that mitigated against accepting government support (Wiggers, 2013, slides 40 and on).

In addition to government grants, there are also private Foundations that will match donations for specific causes. Matching grants are important to fundraising, and in particular fundraisers as there is an added incentive to create value for donors. For example, the McConnell Foundation will provide up to \$250,000 in matching funds for their project named RECODE, an initiative that fuels social innovation and entrepreneurship in higher education (The McConnell Foundation, 2014). The purpose of these matching grants is to encourage alternative ways of thinking within the higher education sector – RECODE's *raison d'être* is conceived as:

... a call to social innovation—to redesign public institutions from the inside out; to disrupt business as usual; to found and grow new social enterprises; to create partnerships across institutional and sectoral boundaries - in short, to 'recode' our culture's operating systems in order to achieve a more just, sustainable and beautiful world. (J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, 2016)

About 65% of top employers offer matching gifts (Weinger, 2015). Although employers may not be strategically focused on advancing a specific charitable interest, many employers will match funds as a means of encouraging employee engagement.

Overall, there are many examples of relevant matching funds that leverage government, private foundations and business to support selected causes and charitable organizations. As demonstrated by the examples of some matching options available, there is usually a specific area that organizations/governments will match funding to in order to advance a particular area of interest.

Particularism. Within the context of philanthropy, particularism means donors have the option to direct their funds to a specific cause or purpose. Some may argue that particularism has a negative impact on the goals of fundraising as the practice does not provide for the greater universal good, but rather addresses special needs or special interests (Anheier, 2004). Under particularism, there is a direct relationship between tax policy and philanthropy. The government controls *particular* charitable choices through two means; the eligibility list of registered charities that can issue tax receipts and have special tax status, and the tax price. In Canada, there are two levels of tax credits; one at the provincial level, and the other at the federal level. The amount of tax credit you receive is dependent on where you reside, as well as the amount you

donate. To encourage first time donors, the federal government launched an incentive for first time donors in 2013 (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016). Essentially, government allows the taxpayer to share the decision-making process as to where tax dollars are allocated. The Canada Revenue Agency tracks all donations to each of the eligible registered charities (i.e., the not-for-profits that have the ability to issue tax receipts). This provides government with vital signals as to where tax payers are choosing to allocate their funds and to offset a portion of the public cost of providing services (Salamon, 1999).

Local Responsiveness. Colleges were built for the purpose of increasing educational access (Davis, 1967). This is evidenced by the fact that Ontario's colleges were built in communities that enabled students to commute to school, as opposed to incurring additional (and sometimes prohibitive) costs of a residential school. Besides access for students, the Honourable William G. Davis, then the Minister of Education (Davis, 1967), stated "(Colleges).... will be common to all programs: they will be occupation-oriented, for the most part; they will be designed to meet the needs of the local community - and they will be "commuter" colleges (Davis, 1967, p. 12, para. 4).

Regardless of their location, colleges also serve the needs of the local businesses and communities and can leverage this need to acquire funding. Each college community has unique regional socio-economic differences that are specific to their local areas. For example, Niagara College is situated in Ontario's wine region. To leverage the unique aspects of this region, Niagara College's response has been to create an entire learning industry based on this niche. These initiatives require funds to develop, build and maintain. Although innovative and logical, the provincial government's funding formula is homogenous (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009, p. 90) and may restrict funds from serving local needs (e.g., intercollegiate athletics,

capital). In addition to the restriction of funding, there are also the rising costs of research and staffing that stress the system even further. In response to serving the needs of students, business and the community, colleges resort to raising private funds to continue to support their local economies.

What Do We Know?

I found that the literature on the topic of philanthropy is vast and philanthropy-related research is presented in many journals, covering a range of topics including marketing, economics, social psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, biology, and evolutionary psychology (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007). There are many different aspects of philanthropy that have been researched including: helping behaviour (volunteerism), charitable giving, donor motivations and the legal and financial aspects of marketing programs in the third sector, a space occupied between the market and state; also known as the “voluntary” or non-profit” sector (Salamon, 2010, p. 168). While I could not find a singular, clear definition of third sector organizations, for example, United Way and Habitat for Humanity, (Brandsen & Pestoff, 2006), it is generally understood that these organizations lie somewhere on the scale between government and private sector. Third sector organizations are not-for-profit, and typically provide services within healthcare, education, social services, environment and human rights (Mitchell, 1998). While the values of the third sector embrace altruism, cooperation, reciprocity, equality and mutuality (Evans & Shields, 1998), the third sector has also been criticized for the blurring of sectoral lines between the not-for-profit sector mandate, government and the commercialization of services (Salamon, 1998). For example, some not-for-profit organizations charge user or service fees to make up government or private funding gaps. A recent review of a college tuition receipt shows that post-secondary institutions charge ancillary fees to cover

operational and other expenses. The United Way also imposes a processing/administrative fee that is deducted from the donor's contribution when their gift is directed to an alternate charity.

Themes in Fundraising

I identified a number of different themes in the literature that were relevant to fundraising. Although this paper does not address all the themes raised, the following section provides a general overview of what I found in the literature that revealed diversity in fundraising, strategic philanthropy, turnover, fundraising as a profession, and accountability and measuring impact.

Diversity in Fundraising. “Diversity refers to a wide range of social and cultural categories including race, age, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, income level, language and disability” (Mehta & Greenfield, 2014, p. 121). Because of the changes in demographics since the 1980's, together with recruitment challenges and fierce competition for the philanthropic dollar, fundraisers and fundraising organizations are paying particular attention to this topic, both in terms of recruitment of diverse fundraisers and donors (Petty, 2007; Hall, 2010; Bowman, 2010; Joslyn, 2010; Perry, 2012).

One of the challenges identified is the lack of diversity in fundraisers today (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2013), citing only nine percent of fundraisers are people of colour. Bowman (2010) points out that unless something is done to raise the awareness of fundraising as a profession in the non-white communities (e.g., programs and courses related to fundraising in historically black colleges and universities), the younger generation of potential fundraising staff within diverse communities will not choose this sector as a career due to the lack of mentors and personal connections with individuals who are working in the sector.

This is also consistent with The *Chronicle* survey, which reported only seven percent of fundraisers were visible minorities (Joslyn, 2010) and as of the 2016 Association of Fundraising Professionals Benefits and Compensation Study, only nine percent reported being of a different ethnicity than Caucasian. According to Statistics Canada projections, by 2031, 28% of the Canadian population will consist of foreign-born persons and in Toronto, that number will reach up to 50% of people 15 years or older. Diversity in the fundraising sector is a keen topic of interest because these groups provide an additional segment for raising funds as well as fundraising personnel. Organizations are competing to recruit talent with emphasis on strategies to secure diverse fundraisers and development staff (Perry 2012; Zimmer, Krop & Brewer 2003). Some of the research centers on female donors as a diverse/minority group and is largely based on female donor behaviour (e.g., Hall, 2010; Banducci, 2005). The report on Canadian Giving noted that female donors are more likely to give than their male counterparts (Turcotte, 2012). In the United States, there is also interest in attracting and recruiting diverse fundraisers at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) as a strategy to connect with the alumni (Perry, 2012; Bowman 2010). Although the literature points to the importance of diversity of staff and potential donors in fundraising, I did not find in the literature specific conclusions that correlate philanthropic dollars raised with diverse staff and donors.

There are two separate challenges with regard to diversity in fundraising both of which are related to recruitment: recruitment of fundraising staff, and recruitment of diverse donors. While there is “no formula that guarantees a gift from a diverse donor” (Mehta & Greenfield, 2014, p. 122), the general principle is that there are cultural influences that need to be taken into consideration when approaching different groups. The presence of this understanding can be very helpful in securing a gift and the absence of this understanding could frustrate efforts to do so.

Canada's population is changing and an organization's ability to fund raise has much to do with their ability to connect and compel individuals and groups within their local community to support their cause (Hardy, 2014).

Mehta and Greenfield (2014) observe that diversity and inclusion in fundraising starts on the inside and at the top layers of senior leadership. In order to effectively recruit diverse fundraisers and donors, there needs to be a conscientious effort to make diversity and inclusion a priority (Petty, 2007). The demographics of the typical donor is changing and fundraising organizations are noticing they also need to change. This is evidenced by the number of new programs within fundraising associations that are targeting diverse groups. For example, just the AFP alone has established an AFP Diversity and Inclusion Philosophy Statement and has created programming for the African American and Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender (GLBT) diverse community scholarship initiatives and regularly publishes an online journal, Kaleidoscope, which promotes diversity and inclusion in the philanthropic sector (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2009).

While there is much interest in the topic of diversity and inclusion in the fundraising sector, I found no evidence in the literature that correlates diversity and inclusion as a strategy to enhance the productivity or efficacy of fundraising. The question that arises here is whether diversity and inclusion is a general strategy "because it's the right thing to do" or if there is a speculative benefit to increasing donations through the recruitment of diverse employees. Interestingly, when diversity and inclusion are mentioned, authors typically point to the changing demographics of the landscape signaling that there is a potential to raise money from minority communities. If we make the assumption that fundraisers have a better chance of acquiring donors from communities with which they are aligned, then there must be a concerted effort to

embed this into the organization's mission. Currently, the "non-white" top key decision-makers in college and university fundraising is less than one percent (Joslyn, 2010), which may suggest, it is time for change with regard to the racial composition of fundraising organizations.

Strategic Philanthropy. "Philanthropic strategy" and "strategic philanthropy" have been described as leveraging organizational resources to gain a competitive advantage for the organization and create positive social change. They can be described as aligning donations and giving with the firm's business objectives (Porter & Kramer, 2002; Saiia et al, 2003, Foster et al., 2005). Organizational resources can be in the form of gifts-in-kind, employee volunteer time, sharing of resources, monetary donations, etc. (Saiia et al, 2003). Some organizations have gifted patents and technology, however, accepting gifts of this kind should be highly cautioned and well thought out as many times there are expenses associated with these donations (Desruisseaux, 2000). Organizations that are serious about strategic philanthropy usually have a plan to process donations (Post & Waddock, 1995). Although strategic philanthropy is becoming a common platform for many organizations, it appears that they are still largely unintentional about aligning philanthropic giving toward achieving organizational goals (Slack & Campbell, 2008; Foster et al., 2005). For example, Porter and Kramer (2002), described how Cisco's Networking Academy aligned the organization's giving over time, resulting in the achievement of one of its organizational goals of talent recruitment. Cisco donated networking equipment to schools in their local area and realized that the teachers and administrators didn't know how to use the systems after implementation. Cisco employees volunteered their time to teach the academic staff how to use the equipment and eventually created online courses. These courses were also eventually offered to the students. Although the initial intention was not to develop the academy, the result of the process they went through gave birth to the Cisco Networking Academy.

There is a fine line between strategic philanthropy and a charitable donation. There are organizations that want to acquire new markets, recruit top talent, or somehow position their organizations to be better than others based on the willingness and the size of their donations. I have found limited research in this area.

Legal Definition of a Charity in Canada. There are a number of countries that are calling for reform with respect to the legal definition of a charity as evidenced by the numerous reports commissioned by different countries. Although these reports have many recommendations, most share one in common: to review the legal definition of charity and charitable status within the current context. These countries have based their charitable law on the preamble as set out in 1601 (Elizabethan Law) which, it has been argued, does not reflect current realities. The interpretation of the legal definition is further shaped by the Four Heads of Charity as established in the Pemsel case in England (1891). The confusion, as cited by these reports, is in the interpretation of the Fourth Head of Charity – “trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community, not falling under any of the preceding heads” (the advancement of religion, education and relief of poverty). This is largely left up to the interpretation of case law and in the hands of the judges and lawyers to make the arguments and decisions that have shaped our current definition of charity in Canada.

The fact that the definition of charity has been shaped by legal context and the evolution of case law, is precisely the argument the Ontario Law Reform Commission (OLRC) (1996) makes in their stance against making any changes to the current legal definition of charity. The OLRC recommends allowing case law to drive the evolution of the legal definition as the most viable and equitable route. Bromley (1996) argues against “modernizing” the legal definition of

charities as he sees this change as creeping into the independence of the courts, further politicizing the topic of charity. Bromley (1996) states,

I will argue that there are very real protections offered to the sector precisely because the changes implemented by the courts are incremental, in contrast to the sweeping changes which will flow from a radical legislative modernization. In making decisions, the courts are also independent from government. Transferring these decisions directly to Parliament makes the revised definition necessarily political as an articulation of government policy. (p. 22, para. 3)

In the much-cited case, *Vancouver Society of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women v. Minister of National Revenue* (1999), (reported by Bromley, 1996; Kitching, 2006; Broder, 2001; Cullity, 2013) an organization was denied charitable status due to its purpose and the activities in which it engaged. The case eventually made its way to the Supreme Court. The judges were encouraged to review and expand the notion of “public benefit” as it related to charitable status and the fourth head of Pemsel. The majority of the judges conferred that although there may be merit in reviewing the definition of a charity, the re-writing/expansion of the legal context is not feasible. Ironically, in his decision Judge Iacobucci states,

For this court to suddenly adopt a new and more expansive definition of charity, without warning, could have a substantial and serious effect on the taxation system. In my view, especially considering the prominent role played by legislative priorities in the “new approach,” this would be a change better effected by Parliament than by the courts. (Kitching, 2006, para. 22)

Although both sides of the argument - to reform or not to reform - have merit, the interesting part of this statement is not that the courts are looking to government to change the legal definition, it's that the decision would have had taxation implications, which, in Lord McNaughten's original statement in the Pemsel case, decided that the courts should adjudicate *without* influence from other governmental affairs. If, as Bromley (1996) stated, the courts should maintain independent judgment from government, then Judge Iacobucci's consideration of taxation implications could politicize the expansion of the definition of charity.

Accountability and Measurements in the Charitable Sector. Recent events have raised questions related to accountability in the charitable sector. The 2008 firing of Gloria Pace King, a Central Carolina's United Way President due to her "inflated salary" of one point two million dollars (Maley, 2009) and the 2012 Salvation Army scandal involving a total of two million dollars in missing toys (Alamenciak & Mills, 2012) have led to increased public scrutiny of the amount of money used to raise funds that actually go toward the charitable cause. Although accountability will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper, the general outcome is that donors are demanding more measurements and results of their philanthropic dollar. This is one of the reasons why there is a shift from donors strictly seeing themselves as altruistic givers, to social investors that provide "private resources for social or environmental purposes." (Salamon, 2014, p. 16). As a matter of fact, not only are donors raising the *value* proposition and return on their charitable investments, the Canada Revenue Agency has set a thirty-five cent cost per dollar raised benchmark for registered charities. That means that charities in Canada must direct a minimum of 65% of their dollars raised to the causes they serve.

In Salamon's book, *Leverage for Good*, 2014, he takes philanthropy a step further in developing the meaning of private sources for public good. Salamon introduces the "New

Frontiers of Philanthropy and Social Investment”. The author introduces the concept of *actors*, *tools* and *targets* as new terms in philanthropy and giving. Broadly speaking, he takes the concept of classical philanthropy and illustrates how it has changed to a business model. Although the outcomes are the same – social advancement and public good – he provides examples of how these outcomes can be achieved by leveraging classical financial instruments as opposed to simply collecting donations. This new way of thinking can be challenged by the classical, cultural or religious aspects of charitable giving.

Stern, in his 2013 book, *With Charity for All: Why Charities Are Failing and a Better Way to Give*, starts by asking “What are we getting in return, is the investment structured correctly, is the money going to the right places?” (Stern, 2013, p.6).

Interestingly Stern cites examples of the flaws in the charitable sector in the United States and the ease with which many *charitable* organizations gain special tax-exempt status promoting increased occurrences of unethical dealings within the sector. Stern criticizes the ease of gaining a tax-exempt status and calls on government, donors and, to some extent, the general public to lift the veil by ensuring donors know what they are contributing to. Similar to Salamon (1999), the push for accountability and measurements may defeat the core purpose of altruistic philanthropy and move into the commercialization of services. This sometimes makes it difficult to discern the real difference between a charitable and for-profit organization. We see this same concern in academia, where private research dollars push for commercialization and can undermine the core values of academic scholarly research (Clark et al., 2009. p. 72).

A very local and recent example of a call for accountability in the charitable sector was an article in the Ottawa Citizen (Egan, 2014) entitled, “*Six-figure Pay at Charities the Cost of Giving and Getting*”. The article highlights the large six-figure salaries at certain charities,

mostly healthcare related, as reported by Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). Donors may perceive that their dollars are going to large salaries, rather than their intended purpose.

Ultimately, it is about trust; trust between the sectors and the trust of the public. Trust, goodness, honesty and judgment are the primary factors to building good fundraising teams (Stephens, 2004). This may lead to a different discussion relating to the professionalization of the occupation. The main thrust in moving an occupation to a profession is the push from the general public towards some level of professional accountability (Brint, 1993). These forces are all competing for a more transparent level of accountability and measurement.

Turnover in Fundraising. There appears to be a shortage of fundraisers in the sector as indicated by the fact that there are more vacancies than there are people to fill these positions. Many articles that I reviewed focused on the turnover, recruitment, retention and training of staff signaling a significant challenge with people leaving organizations (e.g., Nielsen, 2007; Schwinn, 2014; Smith, 2010). What I did not find in the literature is why people are leaving, and where they are going (Jocelyn, 2014; Seargan, 2010; Bowman, 2010; Croteau, & Wolk, 2010). Are they leaving to go to other fundraising organizations, or are they leaving the sector altogether? One of the articles focused on the turnover rate of fundraisers versus the motivational factors supporting staff retention in institutions (Neilson, 2007). This research was conducted among participants from two associations (predominantly in the US), however, it did not focus specifically on the post-secondary academic sector or Ontario or Canada. And although there are some similarities between the Canadian and American context, there are also many differences in the college sector in Ontario. This leads one to believe there is a gap in the literature that provides an opportunity to explore the human resources aspect of fundraising, specifically in the Ontario advancement sector.

Fundraising as a Profession. Despite the fact that debate continues in the literature as to whether fundraising is a profession, efforts continue to be made to have fundraising recognized as a profession (e.g., Iarrobino, 2006; Boland & Tempel, 2004; Levy, 2004; Stephens, 2004; Chobot, 2004; Kidder, 2004; West, 2014; Sargeant, 2010; Thomas, 2010).

The need for different funding sources is caused by a number of the reasons, some of which have been previously discussed. In addition to staying true to the mandate of Ontario's colleges, the distribution of public funds and escalating costs causes a tense balance between private and public funding today. These emerging themes relate, either directly or indirectly, to the efficacy of fundraising in Ontario's colleges and possibly the post-secondary sector. Given the many different reasons for and segments of fundraising, one must wonder whether there is a need to align specific talent to different areas of development. Do alumni fundraising efforts utilize different skills than efforts geared to raise funds from the general public? Are there specific characteristics that major gift fundraisers require, compared to those who raise corporate funds? Do Ontario's colleges need different types of people for each of these specializations?

History of Philanthropy in Canadian Universities

The earliest Canadian post-secondary educational institution was created in 1635 by the Jesuit religious order in Quebec City. It offered studies in "Lettres" and "Philosophie". In 1663, Bishop Laval started Le Grand Seminaire du Quebec, which later become the University of Montreal in 1919 (University de Montreal, 2015). Along the same vein, English-speaking universities were also founded by different religious orders including Presbyterians, Methodists, Anglicans and Baptists (Kelly, 2009, p. 4). An early example was King's College, founded in 1787 by the Anglicans in Fredericton, New Brunswick, followed by King's Colleges in Windsor,

Nova Scotia and Toronto in 1827. These institutions were largely funded by church donations, private philanthropy, tuition and government grants (Kelly, 2009).

Even after Confederation in 1867, denominational post-secondary institutions still relied on philanthropic donations as a means of survival. For example, in 1883 George Munro Grant, Principal of Queens College in Kingston, petitioned the Government of Ontario that denominational universities receive the same funding as their public counterparts. Munro argued that the University of Toronto had an unfair advantage over the denominational schools as it could access public tax funds. Unfortunately, Munro's effort failed to achieve any meaningful results. Thus, Canadian denominational universities had no choice but to rely on their alumni and interested parties in order to survive. This philanthropic dependence continued until the 1960's, when denominational universities finally succumbed to financial pressures and set aside their religious affiliations in order to receive the same government funding as their secular counterparts (Kelly, 2009).

Despite the financial hardship they faced, one may argue that the requirement for these universities to raise funds during the previous 100 years, enabled them to develop an internal culture of philanthropy and create solid networks from which to raise private support. In fact, the first Canadian alumni funds were introduced in 1949 to instill a culture of giving at Queens University, albeit shortly after Princeton in the US introduced their annual fund.

With a nearly 200-year history of fundraising under their belts, it should be no surprise that Ontario universities are better able to cultivate and secure private and alumni support at a higher rate than their more nascent college counterparts (Gouveia, 2016). Universities have learned to harness their wide-ranging alumni bases and well-developed culture of philanthropy

to create a fundraising juggernaut that has easily raised hundreds of millions of dollars over the years in Canada. This considerable know-how is in stark contrast with the nascent 50-year history of fund raising in Ontario colleges – which have been plagued by anemic alumni support and an underdeveloped culture of philanthropy (Gouveia, 2016). Colleges can learn from their university counterparts about how to enact effective money-raising strategies to secure support for their respective institutions. Major gift fundraisers in Canadian universities assert that they play three key roles in the fundraising process; they are simultaneously - Networker, Negotiator and Knowledge Broker (Nyman, 2018). In addition to these roles, the most commonly cited characteristics of major gift fundraisers are “honesty, reliability, and trustworthiness and above all transparency...” (Nyman, Pilbeam, Baines, & Maklan, 2018. p. 1236), all of which embody some of the characteristics of a profession and are consistent with the “College Fundraising Behaviours Inventory” (Caboni, 2010). All these factors in combination, lend credence to the position that college charitable activities, can advance fundraising to the level of a profession.

Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Funding Trends

When Ontario’s colleges were established, there was no intention for the province to carry the entire cost of education according to Bill 153 (1966), Section (6). However, most of the colleges’ operating expenditures were covered by the province and to a lesser degree, tuition. College funding decreased in the 1970’s (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009) and by the late 1980’s per student funding fell by about one-third (Clark et al., 2009. p. 81). Although these institutions had the opportunity to increase student tuition at that time, administrators and staff did not believe it was the right decision as it may deter students from attending college due to financial hardship. Built in communities that are geographically accessible with regulated tuition

fees, colleges were intentional in attracting students of lower socio-economic status. An increase in tuition would have contradicted the access mission of colleges. Instead, the colleges decided to establish ancillary charges, increase foreign student enrolment, defer capital improvements and take the first tentative steps in securing private support.

However, colleges started seriously considering fundraising as a tactical tool to acquire private monies for scholarships, capital, and/or programming after the 1995 provincial clawback of previously approved funding. Interestingly, college's funding formulas do not account for these private donations, which means donors are assured their contributions are not going to replacement costs (Lang, 2005), unless directed by them. Thus, with no real historical philanthropic context and underlying support structure, colleges have been relatively ineffective in raising private support.

In Europe, recent research suggests that voluntary contributions may actually be impacted by the educational institution's geographical region, and the implementation of the welfare state (Breeze & Gouwenberg, 2011, p. 13). Canada enjoys a liberal welfare state, where many of the social programs are administered and/or funded by the government. This could explain the level of apathy toward charitable giving to colleges. Another layer of complexity is the competitive landscape for the philanthropic dollar, particularly in Ontario. SickKids Hospital, United Way and the Canadian Cancer Society are just a few large-scale charities that share a meaningful cause, established a need-based, top-of-mind awareness and already have an existing base of loyal donors leaving little left in the philanthropic pool over which other, less-established philanthropic organizations compete.

Higher Education Fundraising: An External Perspective

The fundraising sectors for international colleges and universities face similar fiscal realities as Ontario's colleges (Rohayati, Nadji, & Williamson, 2016; More Partnership, 2012). While the focus of my study is centered on fundraising in colleges in Ontario, Canada, it would be beneficial, for the sake of context, to consider how the professionalization of fundraising is perceived in other countries.

I decided to concentrate my international focus on the United States, United Kingdom and Australia due to their similarities to Canada, as they are all developed, western, English-speaking nations. My literature review queries returned no results immediately related to fundraising in colleges or vocational institutions in these regions. I did however find research related to fundraising in universities, or colleges and universities combined, in the United States and the United Kingdom. In the case of Australia, I found a study relating to the need to professionalize fundraisers, but not specifically related to higher education.

United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, a 2014 report entitled, *An Emerging Profession: The Higher Education Philanthropy Workforce* (More Partnership, 2012), commissioned by the Higher Education Fundraising Council for England (HEFCE) explored the occupation of fundraising and whether it meets the criteria of a profession. This report was built upon a previous study, *The Pearce Report* (More Partnership and Richmond Associates, 2014) that identified a direct correlation between fundraising efficacy and fundraising staff. That study concluded “(fundraising) is increasingly professional, but not yet quite a profession” (p. 24). The new 2014 report examined the professionalization of fundraisers in the university context in England. Over 750 informants participated through interviews, surveys, written submissions, document analysis as well as site visits to advancement offices in the United States and Canada

for comparisons. The 2014 report concludes, “.... educational fundraising is not yet a profession. But it is on the way to becoming so.” (p. 18). Reasons cited for this view include, but are not limited to, a narrow fundraising knowledge base, drawing upon other disciplines such as psychology and law, a small body of published work and a concern that licensure to practice would create an additional barrier to entry in an already high-demand field.

United States. In the absence of formal regulation (control mechanisms relating to the behaviour and practice of fundraising), Caboni (2010) examines fundraising in colleges and universities in the United States based on normative behaviours as a form of self regulation. The study informants were drawn from the Council for Advancement in Education (CASE) made up of college and university fundraising practitioners whose primary job responsibility was to raise money for their institutions. Of the possible 10,183 members, a total of 803 (7.7%) informants participated through a mailed questionnaire. The study used the “College Fundraising Behaviours Inventory” (Cabone, 2010), an inventory of behaviours and characteristics which could represent normative behaviours in the sector. Behaviours included “honesty, integrity, promise-keeping, fidelity/loyalty, fairness, caring for others, respect for others, responsible citizenship, pursuit of excellence, accountability, safeguarding the public trust and duty.” (p. 345). While the study recognizes that there is a challenge in the lack of formal inquiry (unique body of knowledge) the study concludes that fundraising is a maturing profession as practitioners have the autonomy to deploy strategies to raise support for their institutions and moral boundaries exist as a means of self-regulation and restricting undesirable behaviours that could potentially harm donors.

Australia. The 2005 national Australian study, Giving Australia, collected data from over 10,000 respondents through household phone surveys (6,209 residents), business community

surveys (2,705 respondents), non-profit sector surveys (481 participants), focus groups, in-depth interviews and panels that highlighted a misalignment between charities and the mistrust of the sector by the general public. The report asserted that one way to gain public trust is through the professionalization of fundraisers.

Building upon this work, Scaife and Madden (2006) highlight some of the challenges associated with the professionalization of fundraisers in Australia. Through a literature review and the distillation of Giving Australia's (2005) interview themes, the authors make observations and recommendations which may be useful for the charitable sector to grow and thrive. Identified themes were the ability to transfer knowledge, generating more awareness of fundraising as a career option, education and training (formal course of study), professional associations (code of ethics), public trust and transparency (professional oversight) and research (unique body of knowledge) – all of which point toward the direction of professionalization to enhance and improve the sector's image to gain more support for charities.

Professions

I found a vast body of knowledge defining professions. Although there are other discussions arising from the topic of professions perpetuating class structure or the creation of knowledge monopolies (Freidson, 1973), this section will provide a brief history of professions, focus only on the definitions of a profession and provide a general account of the five characteristics that this study is grounded upon.

One of the first instances of the division of labour is in Adam Smith's monumental book, *The Book of Nations* (Smith, 1776). Smith studied the specialization of tasks through an economic lens. Although one may argue there were earlier examples of the division of labour through an historic lens, where younger men in tribes would hunt food while others would stay

behind and gather food such as small game, and plants and perform other tasks, commonly older men, women and children. Smith believed that for society to prosper, there would need to be a division of tasks to increase the efficiency and efficacy of products and services. Smith used the example of pin makers. He compared the efficiency of one individual, who focused on straightening the wire, putting the head on the wire and sharpening the pin, against people who were specialized only in each of those tasks. He posited that not only would the second option be more efficient, but the pin would likely turn out a better quality as each of those tasks would be mastered. In the same vein, Durkheim, almost a century later, studied how societies were bound together in different relations of solidarity. Through a functionalist lens, he posited that societies during the pre-modern era were kept together through their commonalities, similarities and experiences, or relations of mechanical solidarity (Durkheim, 1893). Among other things, they generally shared the same experiences, values, characteristics and each individual's role within a community (labour) were like the others. There was little choice or room for individualism. Durkheim (1893) argued that modern society was focused on individualism and choice, or relations of organic solidarity (Durkheim, 1893). People would specialize in tasks and counterintuitively, the dissimilarities and inter-dependence on each other was what kept communities and society together. He used the example of the vital organs of the body. All of the body's organs serve their own purpose but cannot function independently. One of the main differences between organic and mechanic solidarity is the division of labour. In pre-modern society, the individuals within the group generally did the same job, whereas in post-modern era people had highly specialized jobs.

In one of the later publications, *Professionalism, The Third Logic: On the Practice of Knowledge*, Freidson (2001) notes that professions are characterized by the locus of control in

the market. He describes the market conditions under which labour is controlled by the *market* (consumers) the first logic, where consumer demand drives what the market produces. The *institution* (management), the second logic where the administration and management of organizations drives what services and products will be sold. And the third being *occupation* (individuals) referring to professions. Freidson discusses professionalism (which he calls the Third Logic). The main sections of this book addressed characteristics of professions.

Freidson is in support of professionalization, despite Abbott's (1986) claim that professions, in particular with response to market, can be rigid and unable to expand to meet demographic demands (p. 196). Abbott points out that professions are a combination of external factors and actors which propel an occupation to become a profession; the public, state and co-workers. He refutes trait theory (Abbott, 2010). His view is that professions are socially constructed, rather than functionally created. Abbott (2005) points out that these actors, are all part of ecologies, each including "its set of actors, its set of locations, and the relation that involves between these..." (p. 1). He explains that the actors, within each of these ecologies are hinged or connected in some way, and through these connections new alliances and relationships are formed. The purpose of these relationships typically provide benefits to each of these individual actors and ecologies. It is his belief that these linked ecologies are the social fuel that moves an occupation towards a profession.

Forsythe (1985) describes a profession as "...a fundamental social process embedded in the relationship between society and those who practice certain expert occupations." One of the earlier definitions of a profession was coined by Greenwood (1954). He described a profession as having a basis in systematic theory-authority recognized by clientele, broader community

sanction and approval of that authority, an ethical code regulating relations with clients and colleagues and a professional culture sustained by professional associations.

Building upon Greenwood's (1954) theory, Wilensky (1965) identified five "stages" or characteristics of professionalization, recognizing that there was a *scale* of professionalism. The language and discussion that Wilensky raises also suggests that occupations progress through a process to becoming a profession. He identifies the five stages of professionalization as a full-time commitment from practitioners to a task that needs doing, the founding of a professional association to promote the interests of the occupation, the development of a formal course of study with an academic institution, the adoption of the occupation by the state as requiring formal protections (credentialing, registration, licensing), and a formal code of ethics to regulate the behaviour of practitioners.

While the context may have been different in the early stages of defining professions, the current literature on this topic takes on largely the same form. An article written by Wheelwright (2000), defines a profession as having certain characteristics. These characteristics include social values - charitable and pro-bono work to reciprocate the monopolistic benefits of a "profession"; theory and intellectual technique, that is to say the specialized training and sound body of knowledge; autonomy, such as clients acting on professional advice without question (e.g., a doctor prescribing medication); sense of community and commitment, largely based on common interest or common respect (may take the form of a "club"); ethics, specifically the promise of proper behaviour or conduct on the part of the professional; standards, in particular the demonstration of a set of required criteria, prior to practicing in the profession; and professional association, where professional standards are set, credentials are confirmed, and code of ethics are written where members are occasionally disciplined by peers (e.g., Medical Association).

History of Other Professions

Two of the professions that merit mention are nursing and dental hygiene. Both are relatively new in their professional development and most people have had experiences and can relate to these professions. Moreover, both of these programs are taught at colleges, albeit baccalaureate nursing is taught in collaboration with universities. Nursing was a profession that was delegated to females because of their ability to provide care for their younger ones. There was no formal education required and most nursing practice knowledge was transferred through oral tradition. Those who were known to have better skills in nursing were asked to take care of others (Roux & Halstead, 2009). The gender and social dynamics of the nursing profession had been prevalent since the inception of the occupation as women who were tasked with taking care of others were often of lower societal class, or not able to marry.

One of the major contributors to the nursing profession in the 19th century was Florence Nightingale, who was born to a wealthy British family, and contrary to her parents' wishes, decided to pursue nursing even though it was misaligned with her social class. In 1854, Nightingale went to serve as a military nurse in the Crimean war. She was appalled by the soldiers' death rates which she believed to be directly related to the poor hygiene and conditions of the hospitals. During that time, she improved the wounded soldier's conditions resulting in greater survival rates. She documented her experiences which served as a foundational contribution to the body of knowledge in nursing and later founded the Nightingale School of Nursing at St. Thomas Hospital (Roux & Halstead, 2009) starting the first formal education institution for nursing. People from around the world wrote to the Nightingale school asking for their graduates to work for them.

Since then, an emergence of nursing schools opened with the first nursing North American association founded in 1896, the Nurses Associated Alumnae of the United States and Canada, known today as the American Nurses Association (ANA). The association sets standards of practice, a code of ethics, educational requirements and, as the public's concern grew for qualified nursing professionals in the United States, started to legislate the registration of nurses.

In 1911, Canada formed its first national nurses' association, which was previously provincially based and grew into a national organization, the Canadian Nurses Association of Trained Nurses. The group changed its name to the Canadian Nurses Association (CNA) with nine participating provinces (Canadian Nursing Association, 2017). Today, the CNA has almost 140,000 members and represents the nursing profession as well as the provincial associations, independent registered nurses (Ontario and Quebec), retired nurses, Canadian nursing students' associations and the Canadian Network of Nursing Specialties (Canadian Nurses Association, 2017).

Another profession worth mentioning is dental hygiene. As early as the 1880s there were documented cases of "dental nurses" who were usually female and practiced under a male dentist's direction (Adams, 2003). In 1906, an American dentist, Alfred C. Fones, coined the term, "dental hygienist" after training his apprentice to help with cleaning and polishing teeth. After that, Fones trained just under one-hundred dental hygienists after the closure of a local dental hygiene training school (Milling, 2010).

In Canada, in 1963, a number of alumnae of the University of Toronto Dental Hygiene School organized a nation-wide association for dental hygienists, and the Canadian Dental Hygienists Association (CDHA) was created. As of 2013, the CDHA had a membership base of over 15,000 practitioners and is the country's leading voice for dental hygiene. The association's

mission is public policy environment, public recognition, professional practice, professional knowledge and leadership (Canadian Dental Hygienists Association, n.d.).

In 1991, the Regulated Health Professions Act Ontario, was introduced by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, 1991). Its core mandate is to set out the framework for healthcare practitioners in the province, which includes both nursing and dental hygiene. Both professions have met a number of criteria or characteristics that make the occupations, “professions.”

Gender Dynamics in Professions

The vast literature related to gender and professionalization includes topics like power, gender dynamics and the characteristics of male and female “roles” (Adams, 2003; McLaughlin, Muldoon, & Moutray, 2009; Zalek & Phillips, 2003). Gender dynamics have been a part of professions since the beginning of time with the division of labour historically determined by gender roles. Gender in the sociological literature has shaped both male and female professions (Adams, 2003). The professions that have been most successful at defining themselves have been predominantly male professions such as medicine and dentists (Adams, 2003).

One of the reasons why the nursing and dental hygiene professions exist is because predominantly male doctors and dentists needed to outsource some of their less lucrative services in order to spend more of their time doing expert tasks (Adams, 2003). They needed support to deliver services that were seen to be of less value, hence they trained assistants, who were usually female. Interestingly, one of the admission requirements at the first dental hygiene school at University of Toronto in the 1950s, was that you had to be a female. This was changed in 1968 to welcome applicants of both genders (Adams, 2003). This, in itself, created a gender power imbalance in the professional relationship. However, as the number of female doctors and

dentists increased, the gender roles continued to create an unbalanced dynamic. Due to this power dynamic, female nurses tended to be more willing to defer to a male doctor and see female doctors as equals (Zalek & Phillips, 2003). Whether these circumstances impact the future of equality in professions, the interesting insight here is that gender appears to be the primary driver of the professional relationship (Zalek & Phillips, 2003).

Women have traditionally been seen as more caring, consultative and collaborative, whereas male characteristics are related to assertiveness, rationality and independence (Adams, 2003). As the number of women gaining prominence in traditionally male professions increases, men have been experiencing difficulty making gains in traditionally female professions. Men typically avoid pursuing traditionally female professions like nursing (McLaughlin, Muldoon, & Moutray, 2009). Male nursing students have reported feeling lonely, isolated and discriminated against at nursing school, which was amplified by the assumption that nurses are females - particularly during lectures (McLaughlin, Muldoon, & Moutray, 2009). In the workplace, male nurses were seen as effeminate and sometimes had their sexuality questioned (McLaughlin, Muldoon, & Moutray, 2009). As women continue to face challenges in gaining equal professional status, men are also experiencing some of the same issues, at a lesser degree when choosing a traditionally “female” profession. Men also don’t usually choose female-dominated professionals due to the association of those occupations with femininity and lower wages.

Characteristics of a Profession

Based on the literature I found on the nature of professions, there is a general discourse about what makes up a profession. Early theorists suggested that there are certain characteristics that differentiate a profession from other occupations called trait theory. And other theorists propose the functionalist theory, that is, “...that groups and intuitions exist because they are

functional for society” (Ackroyd, 2016). Ackroyd (p. 16) claims that trait theory is “too often assumed that these traits must be the cause of professional effectiveness, but how and why was unanalyzed”. One of the current day discourses relating to professions is the potential erosion of the profession and how state, market and other forces are changing the classical definition of professions. This is illustrated in *The Professoriate and Professionalism in the Academy* (Muzzin & Martimianakis, 2016) where the authors explore the professoriate as a profession and outlines three possible futures for the profession. Firstly, elite professors will survive and maintain their professional identities. Secondly, that knowledge and knowledge production will not strictly be produced by the academic profession. Muzzin and Martimianakis observe

An alternative conclusion could be that the great experiment of the internet, Google and Wikileaks, promises a true emancipation of knowledge historically produced in the silos of dons’ jurisdictions, disciplines or colonial enclaves that is as significant as the industrial revolution. (2016, p. 325)

Furthermore, these authors state that “visionary third-world” scholars will push the boundaries and redefine what knowledge and knowledge creation is and means.

I chose to use trait theory because it was important for me to understand which, if any, of these characteristics are common in fundraising work in Ontario’s colleges. This thesis serves as a starting point for other researchers to dive deeper into fundraising in Ontario’s colleges.

I isolated five characteristics that are common among different theorists and were consistently mentioned over the course of the literature review. The following section explains each of these characteristics, which formed the basis of this paper. The five characteristics are: autonomy, unique body of knowledge, formal course of study, state legislation and professional association with code of ethics.

Autonomy. Freidson (2001) described the market conditions by which work is controlled in terms of three logics: the first logic is the market (consumers), the second logic is the institution (management) and the third logic is the occupation (individuals). The third logic that Freidson referred to is professional status of an occupation where the practitioners control their own work.

Forsythe (1985), while reviewing characteristics of a profession in fundraising, notes that fundraising is not autonomous based on the general public's viewpoint, signaling as well that autonomy is a requirement of a profession.

Unique Body of Knowledge. Boland and Temple (2004) attempted to measure the professional characteristics of fundraising to other, established, professions such as law and medicine. They defined a profession as follows;

A body of applicable expert knowledge with a theoretical base, acquired through a lengthy period of training (preferably in a university), a demonstrated devotion to service, an active professional association, a code of ethics, and a high level of control over credentialing and application of the work. Other characteristics often cited are full-time work, a long-term commitment to the profession, and a strong sense of community within the profession. (Boland, 2004, p. 6, para. 2)

They argued that a profession is a journey and it is always changing and evolving, but there are other characteristics that remain consistent, such as trust. Patients trust their doctors, clients trust their lawyers, and, to a certain extent, donors trust their solicitors (fundraisers). They noted that because there is a strong emphasis on the measurable bottom line in fundraising (money raised), one sometimes disregards the important skills and characteristics of a profession.

Contrary to Boland and Temple (2004), fundraising does not appear to meet all the criteria of a profession.

Formal Course of Study. Flexner (1930) briefly discussed the differences between professions and vocations and drew a clear distinction between what should be taught in universities and what should not. His belief was that the professions had a higher calling and aimed to solve problems at the societal level. He questioned whether law or medicine should be taught in universities in the absence of the ideals of pure inquiry of the comprehension of problems (e.g., disease) to better society at large. In Flexner's mind, there was a clear and distinct demarcation between a profession (with a higher calling) and a vocation (the use of the knowledge discovered).

In reviewing the established professions, there is a requirement to complete a course of study and successfully pass some form of examination prior to practicing. In some cases, there are further registration or legislative requirements to practice in Ontario or Canada. For example, in the medical profession, in addition to completing the required course of study and a set of exams, the individual must undergo a registration process with the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons to start practicing. This is true for the nursing and several other health professions. In the legal profession, an individual must complete a required course of study, articling (work placement) as well as the pass the "bar" exam to acquire the Juris Doctor (JD) or a Bachelor of Laws (LLB) to practice. In the accounting profession, individuals must complete the required academic program at a university, gain experience at specific firms (work placement), as well as successfully pass the Uniform Evaluation – an examination all individuals must pass to gain the Certified Public Accountant (CPA) designation. All of these professions require a formal education at the university level or higher, *prior* to practicing. Although there are a number of

fundraising programs offered at different levels (college, undergraduate and post-graduate) as well as credentials - Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) and the Advanced Certified Fundraising Executive (ACRFE) - there is no formal requirement to complete a program or a credential prior to obtaining a position as a fundraiser within the fundraising sector.

State Legislation. Recognized professions have regulatory bodies that establish the standards of practice for individuals within the profession. Many of these regulating bodies are tied to legislation of the state, province, or country. Of the many mandates of these organizations (i.e., establish code of ethics, credentialing, etc.), one of these is to protect the general interest of the public. These bodies have the authority to regulate, discipline, or in the most extreme cases, remove the individuals from practice. For example, in the legal profession in Canada, the Law Society of Upper Canada (LSUC) is the self-governing body for lawyers and paralegals. One of the main goals of LSUC is to protect the public's interest and provide the general public with a conduit by which they can file a formal complaint. The College of Physicians and Surgeons (legislated by the Ontario legislature), regulates the academic requirements, standards, codes of ethics and behaviour of doctors and surgeons. They serve the public interest through a complaint and investigation process. The regulating body has the responsibility to investigate and resolve complaints from the public, again having the authority to discipline or remove doctors from practice. This is true also for the rest of the health professions.

Within the fundraising sector, there are a number of associations that will be discussed in the next section, however, there is no *regulating* body in Ontario or Canada that has been granted the authority, through legislation, to regulate this occupation. For the most part, fundraising associations have an established a code of ethics to which members must adhere, however, membership in these associations is not a requirement to secure a position and they are largely

voluntary. These associations do not have the authority to discipline or remove individuals from their positions, however, in the case of the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), they have the right to revoke an individual's membership in the Association and go to the extent of publishing the individual's offense (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). The Council for Advancement in Support of Education (CASE) has a number of policies relating to the professional practice of fundraisers and institutions - the CASE Statement of Ethics, Principles of Practices for Fundraising Professionals at Educational Institutions and other CASE adopted principles of practice¹. While this association has a whistleblower process for the general public and other practitioners to report violations, which *may* lead to disciplinary action, the association encourages members to adhere to the established guidelines. The absence of a legislated regulatory body and a formal process to protect public interests, would limit fundraising from meeting this defined criterion of a profession.

Professional Associations with Codes of Ethics. There are many associations in the fundraising sector – varied by region and sub-sector - and are all funded by membership fees. Members of these organizations benefit from the organization's resources, shared knowledge, best practices and networking opportunities. There are a variety of associations serving different areas of fundraising. There are associations relating to healthcare, education and research. There are also resources for donors, gift planners (e.g., financial services representatives) and foundations. This may mean that there could be differences in the ways each sub-sector would raise funds in support of their cause, for example educational institutions look for ways to expand alumni giving (Harrison, 1995; Pollack, 1998; Cardillo, 2000), however, the alumni group may not bear any significance to raising funds in the healthcare sector as hospitals and

medical facilities may not have alumni. This suggests that there are different skill sets that are unique to each of the fundraising sub-sectors.

Associations are generally voluntary and act as a knowledge base for the people or stakeholders involved in fundraising. Abbott (1983) pointed out that the code of ethics within an association has five basic properties that relate to obligations to the public and colleagues. These are: universal distribution, correlation with intra-professional status, enforcement depending on visibility, individualism and emphasis on colleague obligations (p. 855). Belonging to a professional association is a characteristic for defining a profession (Greenwood, 1954; Wilensky, 1964; Wheelwright, 2000) however, the question raised is whether the association is voluntary and how the code of ethics is enforced if it is violated. I question how one can expect mandatory membership of fundraisers to belong to an association prior to it being recognized as a profession? The fact that these organizations are voluntary suggests that fundraising is an occupation at this point, as opposed to a profession.

Discussion

There appear to be a number of areas in which fundraising does not meet the criteria of a profession as discussed above and the occupation is in the early stages of becoming one as defined by Wilensky's (1965) process of professionalization. Within the higher education sector, there are many different terms reflecting fundraising as being part of the department or an individual's position. For example, many higher education institutions refer to their fundraising departments as *advancement*, *development*, *partnerships*, or *community/external relations*. While these departments may serve other areas (e.g., alumni relations, corporate partnerships, etc.), the fundraising function is associated with this language and, as evidenced by the different sub-sector associations, there appears to be a degree of specialization in each of these spaces. There

are also other positions or job titles within an institution that may not work with or report to the advancement department, but there is an expressed expectation that these roles play a critical part in fundraising. For example, Deans, Associate Deans, Vice President - Community Development, Alumni Relations and, in many cases, the President. Lashler (1996) points out that there are many varied terms relating to the function of fundraising and while in some cases they are very straightforward, in other circumstances these terms do not reflect their function at all, for example the title “Academic Chief Executives”.

Forsythe (1985) may have considered fundraising a “*mimic*” profession – “...mimic professions may have a code of ethics and other trappings of a profession, but they have no power...” (p. 64). A recent report was published by a UK Consulting firm, More Richmond Associates, titled; “An Emerging Profession: The Higher Education Philanthropy Workforce” (2014). The report title acknowledges that, while the fundraising occupation is not a profession as compared to medicine or law, it possesses characteristics similar to that of a recognized profession, or emerging profession.

Although fundraising may not meet the criteria of a *bona fide* profession, for the purpose of this paper, I will refer to fundraising, as an “emerging profession”. Based on the literature I found related to professions, there are five characteristics of professions that are consistently identified in the literature. These five characteristics are autonomy (Freidson, 2001; Wheelwright, 2000), formal course of study (Freidson, 2001; Wilensky, 1965; Wheelwright, 2000; Boland & Temple, 2004), professional association with a formal code of ethics (Greenwood, 1954; Wilensky, 1965; Abbott, 1983; Wheelwright 2000; Boland and Temple, 2004), state legislation (Wilensky, 1965) and unique body of knowledge (Freidson, 2001; Greenwood, 1954; Boland and Temple, 2004). This emerging profession will become

increasingly important as colleges look at longer-term strategies to support their strategic and fiscal priorities.

Summary of Chapter Two

In this chapter, I discussed the history of philanthropy in Canada, Ontario College's fiscal situation and emerging themes both in fundraising and philanthropy. This is followed by a discussion on the characteristics of professions. The next Chapter outlines the research methodology followed by Chapter four, where I report the findings and data analysis related to the research questions that drive this study. In Chapter five, I discuss the findings' implications for my study.

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology

In this chapter, I discuss the research design and methodology, data collection and recording, establishment of credibility, data analysis, methodological assumptions and ethical considerations of my inquiry.

As fiscal constraints on Ontario's colleges become more pronounced due to changes in funding, and cost of instruction exceeding the cost of inflation (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, & Trick, 2009, p.110), these institutions have begun to look for alternative ways to develop resources. Whether through ancillary fees, rental, alternative income, or fundraising, the measurability of outcomes as well as performance and accountability become important to ensure sustainable income models. This study is focused on fundraising in Ontario's colleges as an emerging profession using the selected five characteristics of professionalization as identified in the literature discussed in chapter two. These characteristics are autonomy, formal course of study, professional association with a formal code of ethics, state legislation, and unique body of knowledge.

My overall research explored whether fundraising is perceived to be an emerging profession within Ontario's English language Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, why or why not? The specific research questions that drove this study were:

Research Question #1. How do fundraisers in participating Ontario colleges decide upon their area of work (division of labour)? Who decides the fundraising strategies, areas of focus and annual plans? (Autonomy Criterion)

Research Question #2. What fundraising-related programs or courses have fundraisers in these Ontario colleges studied as part of their formal course of studies? (Formal Course of Study Criterion)

Research Question #3. What are the legislative requirements that the participating Ontario college fundraisers must operate within? What are the repercussions to the individual or organization should they not follow these requirements? (State Legislation Criterion)

Research Question #4. What professional associations are participants aware of/or required to be a part of, to fundraise? (Professional Association with Code of Ethics Criterion)

Research Question #5. What do participants perceive to be the unique knowledge established for fundraising? How do they access this information? (Unique Body of Knowledge Criterion)

Research Design

I used an exploratory/descriptive research design which is appropriate for this study because exploratory/descriptive research design is most effectively used when the topic is new, and the research lays the groundwork for future study. Exploratory research has been defined by Newman (2000, p. 510) as "Research into an area that has not been studied and in which a researcher wants to develop initial ideas and a more focused research question." And, Newman defines descriptive research as "Research in which one 'paints a picture' with words or numbers, presents a profile, outlines stages, or classifies types (p.510)." The topic of my thesis research is new, and I found a gap in the literature related specifically to fundraising in colleges in Ontario. According to Sue and Ritter (2012), "the goal of exploratory research is to formulate problems, clarify concepts, and form hypotheses" (p. 2) and "exploratory research typically seeks to create hypotheses rather than test them" (p. 2). For these reasons, the exploratory/descriptive research

design was appropriate for this study as the findings raise questions and provide new insights for further study.

Research Methodology

I used a mixed-methods methodology by collecting both quantitative and qualitative data in that I collected numeric data as well as the perceptions of informants. According to Creswell (2009) the benefits of using both strategies is that they could “neutralize or cancel the biases” of a single method (p.14). Moreover, the use of both methods may connect the data and results can be used to “reinforce” each other (Creswell, 2009, p.14). The use of both methods allows for broad numeric trends coupled with detailed views of participants. Therefore, the strength of the study is greater than if one method were used (Creswell, 2009, p. 4).

According to Creswell (2009), using mixed methods provides the researcher with “multiple forms of data, drawing on all possibilities” and allows the researcher to ask, “both open- and closed-ended questions” (p.15). Because I found very little research on the topic that is the focus of this study, the mixed method design allowed me to gather qualitative and quantitative data and explore emerging themes.

Site Selection. This study included eight colleges (Table 2) to access several different participant groups. The Fundraisers who were invited to participate in this study were employed at one of eight selected English language colleges in Ontario. I selected the colleges based on location as well as size. The sample of two large urban, one small urban, three medium urban, one small rural and one small urban distributed in the west, central, north and east representing approximately half of the Ontario college system student population. Appendix A, Tables 1 and 2, depict the classifications of Ontario colleges from which I selected the eight representative sites for inclusion in this study.

Table 2: *The Eight Ontario Colleges Selected for this Study*

College	Size (Student Population-full and part-time)	Location	Classification	Region
Algonquin College	54,000	Ottawa	Large Urban	Eastern
Cambrian College	12,000	Sudbury	Small Urban	Northern
Centennial College	40,000	Scarborough	Medium Urban	Central
Georgian College	39,000	Barrie	Medium Urban	Central
George Brown College	65,400	Toronto	Medium Urban	Central
Humber College	83,500	Toronto	Large Urban	Central
Niagara College	24,000	Welland	Small Rural	Western
St. Clair College	20,500	Windsor	Small Urban	Western

Source: Cindy Gouveia based on Gheewala (2016). © Copyright 2018 Cindy Gouveia.

There are twenty-four colleges in Ontario, and this study focused on eight English language colleges. Two French speaking, and 14 English speaking colleges were excluded. The French language colleges were excluded because the costs of translation are prohibitive to my study. The remaining 14 colleges were excluded because the sample of eight colleges were chosen as representative of both geographic and size distribution of the college system. Each of the eight colleges selected had either formal or informal administrative offices that are designated to raise funds.

Participant Selection. The five stakeholder groups purposefully invited to participate in this study were: Knowledge Leaders, Fundraisers, Donors, Students, and Teachers/professors in two fundraising programs. I selected participants from all five stakeholder groups as they were key informants on the topic that was the focus of my study. Each group was selected because of its direct involvement in the fundraising sector, or in the case of the students, their intention to

join the sector. Based on publicly accessible data, Humber College (located in southern Ontario), and Georgian College (located in central Ontario) are the only two Ontario colleges that offer full-time fundraising programs. I invited students enrolled in the full-time fundraising programs in these two colleges to participate in focus group discussions

Knowledge leaders. The first participant group was the knowledge leaders in college fundraising departments – these are individuals who have strategic oversight of the fundraising (advancement) departments and/or involved in the recruitment of fundraising talent within an Ontario college. I chose this group because they would have insights on the level of professionalism that currently exists and to some extent, what the future holds for this area. I recruited these participants through publicly available sources (i.e., website directories). Examples of job titles of this group included, but were not limited to, President, Vice President Advancement, Vice President External Relations and Vice President Human Resources. My goal was to recruit and interview a minimum of five, and maximum of ten knowledge experts in the Ontario College system. Appendix B is the invitation to participate for this group which was sent to all knowledge leaders in the 22 English language colleges. A total of seven knowledge leaders, from seven institutions, participated in this study.

Fundraisers. The second participant group was fundraisers within the eight participating colleges who worked in fundraising departments. These were individuals who were employed in a fundraising capacity at a participating Ontario college and allocated a minimum of twenty-five percent of their time on making direct asks, in other words, they are directly involved in soliciting gifts / donations. I chose this group because they were the people who are employed in this sector and could provide insights into the current state of professionalism within this sector. These were people who typically held job titles such as, Major Gift Officer, Director of

Development, Chief Development Officer, and Alumni Giving Officer. I recruited these individuals through publicly available sources (e.g., website directories) and my professional network. I emailed or mailed (as appropriate) the invitation to participate (Appendices C & Ci). My goal was to survey a minimum of eight, and a maximum of twenty individuals, with the hope that at least two people from each participating institution would respond. However, because these participants were not identifiable in the survey they completed, I do not know who the individual respondents were or which college they were from. A total of forty-seven individuals participated from this group.

Donors. The third participant group was donors. These were individuals, foundations, or corporations who had made a minimum donation of \$100,000 to an Ontario college within the past five to 10 years. They were all from Ontario, but their sites of operation varied. Participating donors operated out of their homes, offices, foundations or corporations. This group was able to provide insights into their perceptions of the level of professionalism of fundraising individuals with whom they had had interactions. A request to participate and an informed consent form (Appendix D) was sent to each of these individuals. I recruited this group through publicly available sources and my professional network. A total of six participants were from this group.

Students. The fourth group was comprised of students who were enrolled in a full-time fundraising program. I chose this group based on the assumption that they intended to enter the fundraising sector and might inform the study by providing insights into their knowledge and perceptions of fundraising as an emerging profession. The two colleges that I approached were Humber and Georgian since they are the only colleges (based on my initial research of public sources) that offer these full-time programs. I approached the Program Coordinator of each of these programs and asked that they distribute, on my behalf, an invitation to their students

inviting them to participate in a focus group discussion (Appendix E). After the Program Coordinators distributed the invitation to participate to the students, only three responded. This did not allow me to move forward with the focus group as planned, so instead, I interviewed the one student at Humber, and sent the questions to two other students at Georgian for response. All the questions that were asked were the same as the intended focus group questions.

Teachers. The fifth group of informants were full-time or part-time teachers within the fundraising programs at the two colleges from which the students were invited, that is Georgian and Humber. I chose this group because they were teaching those individuals who would be entering the fundraising field. A keen understanding of the teachers' backgrounds as well as how they self-identified would provide valuable insights into the topic that is the focus of this study. I recruited this group through publicly available sources, namely the staff directories at Georgian, George Brown and Humber. My goal was to recruit between four to eight full/part-time teachers to interview. A total of fourteen individuals from this group participated in my study.

Data Collection and Recording

In this section, I describe the data collection tools, data collection process and recording of the findings.

Instrumentation. I designed all the data collection instruments (Appendices Bi, Ci, Di, Ei, and Fi) based on the themes I identified in my review of the literature, and my more than 10 years' professional experience in the college sector, of which more than five years revolved around fundraising.

I used a number of different instruments to inform this study (see Figure 1, col.3). Each of the questions within the tools directly related to one of the key characteristics of a profession.

Therefore, the data were categorized under each of the research questions related to the following traits: autonomy, formal course of study, professional association with a formal code of ethics, legislation and a unique body of knowledge. The data sources that informed the research questions that drove this study are identified in Table 3. The information gathered in all tools related to the five research questions that provided insights to the overall study.

Data Collection and Recording. Data collection and recording was completed in five phases. Although each of these phases added pertinent information to the previous phase, some phases were conducted done concurrently.

Phase one. The first phase was a detailed document analysis through which I gathered information on formal courses of study in all Ontario Colleges (see Appendix H, Hi), legislation and professional associations. This document analysis investigated the number and types of full-time and part-time fundraising programs that were available in Ontario colleges (including the course syllabi), the legislation that fundraisers are required to abide by, and the professional associations and whether they had a formal code of ethics. I gathered the information from my review of publicly available documents. I coded the relevant themes that I identified in my analysis of these documents.

Phase two. The second phase consisted of the distribution of **questionnaire surveys** (Appendices C, and Ci) to the fundraisers employed or contracted at each of the eight English language Ontario colleges that participated in this study. I developed the survey questions based on my review of the literature and my experiential knowledge of fundraising within the college sector. I chose to use surveys for two reasons. First, because fundraisers' schedules can be demanding, the survey provides them with the opportunity to respond at a time convenient to

them, and second, because it provided the fundraiser with at least some level of anonymity, an important element given the competitive nature of the sector.

The surveys were distributed in two ways, online through email addresses that were listed in publicly available sources from the colleges and by regular postal mail. That is, the surveys were distributed online directly to people employed in the fundraising departments using email addresses as listed in the college websites, or by regular mail sent to their colleges for to those who did not list their emails.

Phase three. Phase three was intended to consist of **focus group discussions** with students enrolled in a fundraising program at the two Ontario colleges that offered these programs, that is Georgian and Humber. I contacted the Program Coordinators and asked that they distribute to Students enrolled in the program, on my behalf, an invitation to participate in a focus group discussion (Appendix E). Both Program Coordinators agreed to distribute my invitation to their students. One Program Coordinator sent an email and the other posted the invitation on an online communication portal that students accessed during their course. In the invitation, the students were asked to reply directly to me and I would facilitate a focus group meeting. Pizza was to be provided as a form of compensation. A total of three students replied - one student from Humber College and two students from Georgian College - which did not meet the minimum criteria for a focus group. I then contacted the student from Humber and arranged for a phone interview, and for the two students from Georgian, I created an online survey because their program was entirely online, and the two students were located outside of my immediate geographic area.

Table 3: *Data Sources that Answer the Research Questions*

To what extent is fund raising an emerging profession within the higher education context, specifically in Ontario's English speaking Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology?		
Research Questions	Sources of Data	Q #
RQ 1 - How do the fund raisers decide upon their area of work (division of labour)? Who decides the fund raising strategies, areas of focus and annual plans? (AUTONOMY)	Interviews with decision Makers / knowledge experts Fund raiser survey Interview with teacher within a fund raising program	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9
RQ 2 - What fund raising related programs or courses have fund raisers in Ontario's colleges studied as part of their formal course of studies? (FORMAL COURSE OF STUDY)	Interviews with decision Makers / knowledge experts Fund raiser survey Interview with teacher within a fund raising program Focus Group with students Document Analysis - web research on fund raising programs in Ontario's post-secondary schools	10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20, 21,22
RQ 3 - What professional associations are key informants aware of / or required to be a part of, in order to fund raise? (PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION WITH CODE OF ETHICS)	Interviews with decision Makers / knowledge experts Fund raiser survey Focus Group with students Interview with donors Document Analysis - web research for fund raising associations	23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34
RQ 4 - What are the legislative requirements that Ontario college fund raisers required to operate within? What are the repercussions to individual or organization should they not follow these requirements? (STATE LEGISLATION)	Interviews with decision Makers / knowledge experts Fund raiser survey Interview with teacher within a fund raising program Interview with donors Document Analysis - web research on legislation impacting fund raising in Ontario	35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42
RQ 5 - What do key informants perceive the unique knowledge established for fund raising? How do they access this information? (UNIQUE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE)	Interviews with decision Makers / knowledge experts Fund raiser survey Interview with teacher within a fund raising program Focus Group with students Interview with donors	43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51

Phase four. This phase consisted of in-depth **interviews** with full and part-time teachers in the fundraising programs at Georgian and Humber. They were identified through publicly available sources (i.e., college website) and were invited to participate through an informed consent letter (Appendix F) by email, in the case where the email address was listed, and by regular mail to them at their College where I did not find their email address. It was important to gain an understanding of their backgrounds, how they self-identified (i.e., as fundraisers, teachers or other), the scope of their teaching assignments and how their experiences aligned with the five professional characteristics in this study (Appendix Fi). Of the eight teachers who participated, seven were teaching part-time and one was a Program Coordinator who had unique perspectives to contribute. The part-time teachers provided interesting insights, since they straddled both the not-for-profit charitable sector and teaching simultaneously. I selected this group since they were teaching the next generation of individuals who would be entering the charitable sector and it was reasonable to assume that their self-image and backgrounds influenced what they shared in the classrooms.

Phase five. This phase consisted of in-depth **interviews** with the decision-makers/ knowledge experts (Appendix Bi) within the sector, and with donors (Appendix Di) who had made a minimum donation of \$100,000 to an Ontario college over the past five to 10 years. I identified these individuals through publicly available sources (college websites, donation announcements in the news). These individuals were invited to participate by email or phone, and meetings were negotiated for the interviews which took between 30 and 60 minutes.

Establishing Credibility

To ensure content/construct validity, I asked two content experts, who did not participate

in this study, to review the relevance of the questions based on the Lawshe's Content Validity Checklist (Lawshe, A Qualitative Approach to Content Validity, 1975) (Appendix G) and Lalonde's checklist. I asked these content/construct experts to review all the instruments I had created focusing on the relevance and importance of the questions in relation to the research questions. Based on the advice and feedback of these content experts, I made minor changes to each of the instruments.

After I made these changes, I pilot-tested the questionnaire surveys for face validity with two individuals who are involved in the fundraising sector but did not participate in this study. The pilot tests confirmed the length of time required to complete the instruments, identified questions that were unclear or leading in the wording or in the order of the questions.

Interview transcripts were validated by all interview participants. After I transcribed the interviews I sent them to each participant and asked them to let me know within two weeks if they wished to make any changes. All changes requested were minor and were made prior to analyzing the data.

Data Analysis

I analyzed the quantitative responses from the fundraiser surveys and calculated numbers and percent of responses to the questionnaire items. I identified themes based on counts of frequency of similar responses and presented the data with charts and graphs.

Qualitative data enhance the understanding of the participants' perceptions (Creswell, 2009, p.4). I used Creswell's six steps for data analysis in qualitative research (Creswell, 2009, p. 185) and identified themes in the data. In the first step, I took all the information gathered from interviews and transcribed them into electronic documents for ease of use and reference. In step two, I read through all the information and gathered a general sense of what the participants said.

This step provided me with a broad sense of the meaning of the documents. In the third step, I reviewed the data at a deeper, more detailed level and started coding the information. In addition to having the five professional traits as predetermined codes, I also identified other emerging themes and coded them. I developed a qualitative codebook (Creswell, 2009, p. 187) that included the five characteristics, but also had the flexibility to add or “change the information learned during the data analysis process” (Creswell, 2009, p. 188). In step four, I used the coding from the previous step and described the setting, people and events. I then further analyzed the data and identified any other themes that I could reference between individual informants, or informant groups, including the quantitative data gathered from the fundraiser survey. In step five, I presented the information through a narrative of the themes as well as how the responses were related to each of the five characteristics of professionalization. In step six, I interpreted the data based on the identified themes in the literature and provided a narrative of the meaning of the results.

Methodological Assumptions

As there was no real or perceived power differential in my relationship with any participants from the colleges or students, and there was nothing for the participants to lose or gain, it was reasonable to assume that the participants were honest in reporting their perceptions and responses to questions asked, including any that may have required recall.

Participants in the donor group who contributed more than \$100,000 to an Ontario college were predominantly from my network and some of these donors had contributed to my home College as well as other colleges in the past. Although, some of these donors may have been more likely to participate in my study, because I may have been a trusted and known source to them, I was not in any position of power over them. For this reason, it is reasonable to assume

that my relationship with any of the donors did not exert undue influence on them, and that their responses were an accurate reflection of their perceptions.

Limitations

The study findings are not generalizable beyond the participating Ontario colleges since the sites and respondents were purposefully selected and were not a random sample. However, generalizability is not the intent of this exploratory descriptive study, but rather to gain a deep understanding of the issues related to the professionalization of this specific occupational group. For these reasons, the findings of my study may be of interest to other groups who are seeking professional status and my findings could be used as a basis to inform further studies on the focus of this study.

The document analysis included only the selected Ontario colleges, and did not include any universities, since fundraising in these colleges was the specific focus of my study.

Ethical Issues/Considerations

All participants were informed in their Invitation/Information Letters (Appendix D) that participation in this study was completely voluntary and that they would not be identifiable in any reporting of the findings in this thesis, or publications and presentations at professional meetings and conferences. They were also informed that they had the right to decline to answer any question(s) they did not wish to answer and withdraw from the study without explanation or penalty of any kind. No physical or psychological harm was anticipated beyond what is encountered in daily activities.

The Humber student was provided the Informed Consent Form (Appendix E) by email prior to the phone interview and the consent form was reviewed and signed by the student at the

beginning of the interview. The two students from Georgian College had to indicate explicit consent (Appendix E) prior to being able to access the online survey link. All Students were asked the exact same questions as the intended focus group discussion guide (Appendix E).

The online survey participants were informed that if they wished to withdraw they could do so by not submitting their responses, in which case none of the information provided would be included in the study findings. However, if they wished to withdraw after they submitted their responses it would not have been possible to delete any information provided by them because the survey questionnaire was anonymous.

Interviewees were informed by the Informed Consent (Appendix D, Di, E, Ei, Eii, F, Fi) attached to the recruitment email. With those who agreed to be interviewed, the Consent was reviewed before the interview began; I answered any questions, and if they then agreed, they were asked to sign the Informed Consent Form before I asked any questions.

Interviewees were informed that no value judgments would be placed on their responses. They were told the length of time anticipated (15 minutes) for the interview and asked to provide explicit consent to have the discussions audio-recorded. I would have taken notes during the interviews if any participants had not provided consent to audio-record the discussion, however all consented. All reporting of the findings included only non-identifiable participant codes for all interview participants. Because audio-recordings render participants vulnerable to identification, the audio-recordings were erased as soon as the interviews were transcribed.

The interview participants were also informed that they could decline to answer any questions or withdraw from the program anytime by simply terminating the interview without explanation or consequences, or informing me by any means (e.g., email, phone or in person). If they withdrew before the data were aggregated for analysis their data would have been deleted

and not included in the study, however, none of the participants withdrew. All of the interviewees consented to audio-recording of the interviews and received a copy of the interview transcript for the review and revision if they wished; one donor and one knowledge leader asked for revisions of their transcripts.

For analysis purposes transcripts were coded, identifiable only by the group that the respondent was a member of. For example, donors were coded as D1, D2, etc., and knowledge experts/leaders were coded as KL1, KL2, etc. As soon as I had coded the transcripts, I erased the audio-recordings and kept a list linking codes to actual names of those interviewed.

The data collected were kept confidential and securely stored on my password protected computer or, in the case of hard copies, in locked drawers in my office that only my Thesis Supervisor and I had access to. All identifiable information in digital format was encrypted consistent with the University of Toronto policy.

I contacted the colleges and potential participants only after I had received the approval of the Research Ethics Boards at the University of Toronto, Algonquin College, Cambrian College, Centennial College, Georgian College, George Brown College, Humber College, St. Clair College, and Niagara College. These were the eight colleges that reflected the different college sizes, and geographic location, and provided a reasonably representative sample of the colleges in Ontario.

There were several other ethical considerations unique to this study. Most immediately, I surveyed fundraisers from my place of work, and because I am their Supervisor, there was a power differential. To mitigate these concerns, I asked a third-party (i.e., administrative assistant who had no line relationship with any of the respondents) to send out, on my behalf, the invitation to participate (Appendix C) and the URL to the web-based survey. The survey did not

include any questions that were perceived to be proprietary information and the responses could not identify the participants. There was no way that I was able to identify who participated and who didn't. The web-based survey was administered online on the secure OISE server.

Another potential ethical issue was that fundraisers who completed the survey questionnaire could potentially have perceived my role within the fundraising sector (as the President of a college foundation) as competition to their interests, because many organizations share the same prospective donor databases. For this reason, the fundraiser survey was anonymous. Moreover, questions asked in the survey were not related to specific donors or other proprietary information.

Because the Ontario college fundraising sector and the sample size were relatively small, there was a small chance that others who were familiar with this context might be able to identify respondents. For these reasons, I informed potential participants (donors, fundraisers, teachers) of this possibility in the Informed Consent before they signed the consent forms. Furthermore, if it were warranted and with the participants' consent, I would have altered the descriptions of settings and events in a non-consequential manner to disguise the respondents. However, this was not necessary for any of the participants.

Summary of Chapter Three

In this chapter, I presented the research design and methodology to answer my overall question of whether fundraising is perceived to be an emerging profession, or not, as informed by the participants in my study and assessed against the criteria of what constitutes a profession as identified in the literature reviewed. This overall question was grounded in the five research questions that I developed relating to the characteristics of professions. I described the participants, data collection and analysis as well as the methodological assumptions, limitations

and ethical considerations that informed my study. Chapter four presents the findings based on the data collected. Conclusions and implications are offered in Chapter five.

Chapter Four: Research Findings and Analysis

The focus of this study was the exploration of fundraising as an emerging profession in participating Ontario's College of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT), based on five classical professional characteristics as identified in my review of the literature.

In this chapter, I present my research findings and analysis, organized by the five research questions relating to each of the professional characteristics identified: autonomy, formal course of study, professional associations and code of ethics, state legislation and a unique body of knowledge. Answers to these questions are further categorized based on sources of data: document analysis, interview data and survey data. Interview data included responses from donors, full or part-time teachers in a fundraising program, students and knowledge leaders, while concise survey data are drawn from fundraisers across participating Ontario colleges. I provide conclusions at the end of each of the research questions - with an overall end-of-chapter summary that integrates all the data presented in this chapter.

Description of Sites/Context

My research included eight of the twenty-two English language colleges in Ontario. I purposefully selected colleges based on the geographic location and size to provide a broad range of representative characteristics of the college system (Figure 3). The study sites included four colleges from the Central Region; Centennial, George Brown, Georgian and Humber, and one college each from the Northern; Cambrian, two colleges from the Western; Niagara and St. Clair, and one from the Eastern Region, Algonquin.

Figure 3: Map of Ontario Colleges

Source: Colleges Ontario, 2016

The full and part-time student populations of each of the participating colleges range from a small, rural college located in the Northern Region with 12,000 students to a large, urban college in Central Ontario with 83,500 students (Gheewala, 2016). Of the eight participating colleges, two institutions (i.e., Algonquin and Humber) were large urban, one was small urban (i.e., Cambrian), three colleges were medium urban (i.e., Centennial, Georgian and George

Brown), one was small rural (i.e., Niagara) and one was small urban (i.e., St. Clair). The combined full and part-time population of the eight participating colleges was 338,400 students, of the 736,640 in total, which was 46% of the total student population of all Ontario colleges at the time of this study (Gheewala, 2016).

Organizational Context and Naming. During the data collection process, I discovered seven of eight Teachers (who taught part-time in the fundraising programs) were also employed in some form of fundraising capacity, which added an unanticipated richness to the findings.

Organizational structures differed among the colleges. The fundraiser survey revealed that the individuals were either employed by the college directly, or by the college foundation. In the cases where individuals were employed by the college, they reported into departments like marketing, finance or even the office of the President. This lack of consistency signaled that unlike other departments, the fundraising department did not have its own separate identity, but rather, was seen as a spin-off of other pre-established areas.

The naming of the college areas responsible for fund-raising that was used by participants during the interviews also signaled a diversity of alternate names for the fundraising activity. Terms such as advancement, development, partnership and/or resource development and alumni engagement were used; all in the context of fundraising. There appeared to be a hesitancy to refer to the activity specifically as “fundraising”. Moreover, there appeared to be a disconnect between the fundraising department and the college. For instance, KL1 stated,

In most of our colleges, the fundraising offices are not seen to be part of the college machine. We aren't really looked at as part of the larger machine. It's not only our college, but I speak to most of the advancement leaders and there's a shared sense of this.

KL5 also commented on the lack of connectedness the advancement department has with its college. I noticed KL5 used and interchanged the terms development, advancement and philanthropy in reference to fundraising. KL5 explained:

In particular, within this specific sector (college advancement) and given that this area is relatively new compared to universities and hospitals, I think it's critical to develop a culture of philanthropy at the institution. This is something that I am challenged with often. I feel that the fundraising function is adjunct, and philanthropy is not part of the strategic priorities of the institution... The institution's leadership doesn't understand the fundraising area well. And it is challenging to communicate the importance of and the process for this across the institution in order to build a culture of philanthropy. There is a lack of donor centric philosophy, even within the development department and across the college.

In addition to the different terms used in describing the fundraising departments at the colleges, the teacher participants also explained that they did not self-identify as fundraisers depending on the circumstance. They described themselves as communications specialists, mentors, coaches, or employed in the non-profit sector. Unlike other professions, teacher respondents used different job titles and descriptions under varying circumstances. The fundraisers and their institutions preferred to characterize their charitable activities in a manner that was perceived to be more broadly acceptable (advancement, partnership development, etc.). Fundraiser respondents, particularly in the part-time teacher group, appeared to go to great lengths to disguise their fundraising identity. When asked what he/she did for a living, one

teacher/fundraiser replied that he/she struggled to admit that he/she had a role in fundraising. T3 commented:

This is interesting because it really depends on what audience I am speaking to. I am a part-time instructor at an Ontario College which means I also need to make a living elsewhere. I have a degree in journalism and have been in journalism for over 25 years. Typically, I tell people that I am a communications specialist because I do have a communications company that I operate as well. That's where my experience with non-profits and charities comes into play. Typically, the short answer would be that I am a communications specialist, I also say that I am an instructor at a College and depending on whom I am talking to, I also identify as a journalist.

The Gendered Nature of the Profession

As discussed in chapter two, much of the literature that I reviewed on gender and professionalization included topics like power, gender dynamics, and the characteristics of male and female “roles” (e.g., Adams, 2003; McLaughlin, Muldoon, & Moutray, 2009; Zalek & Phillips, 2003). Gender and professionalization is a historic phenomenon as the division of labour was originally based on gender.

The literature suggests that gender plays a predominant role in professions with typically male professions subordinating female occupations (e.g., the relationship of dentists and dental hygienists, doctors and nurses). Fundraising is an occupation that requires one to be patient, collaborative and communicative (Adams, 2003) – these are seen as predominantly female characteristics and could impact on areas such as

recruitment, retention and other areas that would impact the sector. Freeley, Upsall, Watt and Williams (2006) claim that 80% of the fundraisers in Canada and the United States are female.

Based on my own professional experience/relationships over the years, I have found that over 50% of the fundraisers I know are female. However, it is not possible to determine the exact gender profile of fundraiser participants in my study for several reasons. Firstly, in the Fundraiser Survey, the forty-seven respondents were not asked to report on their gender or any other demographic information that may reveal their identity, largely because I initially thought that this variable was not necessary to inform the core purpose of my research. In retrospect, it might be useful to explore this relationship in future studies. Secondly, those who were interviewed were likewise not asked by which gender they would self-identify. However, according to the 2016 Compensation and Benefits Study U. S. and Canada, 80% of the respondents in both the US and Canada reported to be female of the AFP membership which is made up of individuals who are working in the fundraising sector.

I will now report the findings as they informed the specific research questions that drove this study. Table 3 in Chapter Three identifies the sources of data collected that pertained specifically to each of the research questions.

Research Question # 1 asked: “How do the participating fundraisers decide upon their area of work? Who decides the fundraising strategies, areas of focus and annual plans?”
(Autonomy Criterion)

Knowledge leaders, teachers and fundraisers were the key informants of whom I asked this question. The primary objective for this question was to determine the level of autonomy and decision-making authority individual college fundraisers had over crucial areas relating to setting strategic goals, executing operational plans, and the daily use of their time. This perspective aligns with the autonomy criterion of a profession described as the ability of the practitioners to decide and control their own work (Freidson, 2001; Wheelwright, 2000); where market and institutions have no control over their professional practices. Freidson (2001) calls this the Division of Labour.

Interview Data

I interviewed seven knowledge leaders who were key informants as employees of six of the participating colleges (Cambrian, Georgian, Humber, Niagara, St. Clair and Centennial), and eight teachers from three colleges (Humber, Georgian and George Brown) who taught either full or part-time in courses in a fundraising-related program.

Knowledge Leaders in the Colleges. Based on the seven knowledge leaders’ responses, the colleges had differing methods in approaching their strategic fundraising/campaign planning and most were highly influenced by their College’s overall strategic objectives or longer-term decisions. Some respondents reported that the development of their long-term strategic or annual fundraising plans included input from leaders from academic areas identifying their funding needs, while other institutions did not include this step. Several respondents (n= 3) indicated that their college had already decided the areas and amount of the “need”, and the college’s

development department's job was to simply execute the strategic plan actions and find the required funds.

In all cases, none of the knowledge leaders themselves, had unilateral power to draft or reject these decisions – but rather, they acted to inform or influence the direction of these longer-term goals through collaborative institutional processes involving other stakeholders including Deans, Directors and others at the Vice-President level. In my discussions with knowledge leaders, I heard a recurring theme of the participants trying to promote fundraising, or a culture of philanthropy, within the institution, as well as influencing academic leaders to support fundraising efforts.

All the knowledge leader respondents concluded that there was normally a higher-level body of authority that decided these larger objectives. Some of these approving bodies included their College's Board of Governors, an advancement/fundraising committee of this Board or, in the case of a college Foundation, the Foundation Board. However, when asked about the signatory requirements on gift agreements, two (29%) of the knowledge leader respondents indicated that they had the full authority to sign off, binding their Colleges to the agreement, along with any deliverables that needed to be fulfilled (e.g., naming rights, recognition activities, etc.). The other five knowledge leaders (71%) indicated that they were the signatories along with another person in a senior position within the institution (e.g., Vice President or President). Two of these respondents (KL2, KL5) indicated that if the gifts were large enough (above a certain dollar amount), or if there were special circumstances, then the President of the College would be the final signatory on the agreement. From an annual planning perspective, knowledge leaders and their fundraising staff had full authority to plan and execute activities that would realize the broader fundraising goals of the college.

Interestingly, the knowledge leaders referred to their fundraising departments with different names. Names reported were: Office of Institutional Advancement, Development Office or Foundation where appropriate. The lack of consistency may also imply that the colleges have varying perspectives on fundraising in general.

Teachers. From the perspective of the eight teachers interviewed who taught courses related to fundraising, all but one participant (n=7; 88%) interviewed were also involved in some form of fundraising capacity, outside of their teaching role. Most (n=7; 88%) of these respondents were teaching part-time and one stated explicitly that he/she needed to subsidize his/her income with other revenue. The participation of part-time faculty added an unanticipated dynamic to the richness of the feedback from this respondent group, as their answers not only reflected their roles as teachers, but also as individuals operating in the not-for-profit sector. When asked, only one of the respondents (12%) admitted to being a “Fundraiser”. The other seven respondents (88%) decided *not* to call themselves “Fundraisers” and instead, came up with various other descriptions of their roles – particularly in the contexts of prospecting activities - such as, a networking event, cocktail party, or corporate gathering. One of the respondents explained,

I don’t get into being a fundraiser because many people don’t really understand what that means. Some people have a perception of what Fundraisers do (i.e., stopping you on the street and asking for a gift, or knocking on your door asking for a donation), and the general public doesn’t realize that the best that Fundraisers do is build relationships and support donors in achieving their philanthropic goals. Fundraisers don’t twist anyone’s arm, nor do the best Fundraisers in Canada or the world. (T5)

These teacher respondents seemed to have a high degree of autonomy when it came to reaching out to potential donors within their fundraising role. It appeared that they had much autonomy over their fundraising schedules, while they had limited authority over their teaching schedules. However, they had much more freedom to develop resources and tools to use in the classroom. Those who engaged in consulting, tended to focus on a small base of clients - either directly fundraising on their client's behalf or setting the strategic and tactical plans around fundraising for them.

Survey Data

Of the 47 Fundraiser Survey respondents, when asked about the structure of the fundraising department, 33% (n=15) reported that the fundraising department was part of their College; 22% (n=10) reported that they worked for a separately registered charity (foundation) that supported their College; 4% (n=2) reported that they worked in a hybrid model (i.e., for both a college *and* a registered charity); 2% (n=1) answered I don't know; 2% (n=1) reported 'other'; none of them reported to be a contracted service provider, and 37% (n=17) left this question blank. The Fundraisers were not asked to identify which institution they were from; therefore, the responses could not be attributed to specific colleges. However, surveys were only sent to the eight colleges that agreed to participate through the Ethics Review Approvals.

When asked about their employment relationship with the organization, 28% (n=13) indicated that they were employees of their College, while 17% (n=8) were members of the College's foundation; 2% (n=1) indicated they were volunteers, another 2% (n=1) answered other, and 50% (n=23) left this question blank. None of the respondents were independent contractors.

Figure 4: Fundraiser Survey: Q4 - Is the college's advancement/development department

Not surprisingly, only 20% (n=9) of respondents stated that they or their department were involved in institutional decisions that set tuition, ancillary fees or other student related financial decisions as traditionally, fundraising departments do not make decisions related to student fees and such. However, 20% (n=9) of the respondents indicated that they had a role in these areas. Further exploration found that three (6%) of these respondents reported that they were part of the President's Office and four (9%) reported that they were a part of the Finance Department, which could explain these results as fundraising is considered a form of revenue, hence, some colleges may have the department report into Finance. Moreover, one (2%) of these individuals reported into their institution's Marketing / Communications department. However, most respondents left this answer blank (n=31; 68%) and 15% (n=7) reported "other" as their reporting line without

any further explanations. One of the explanations relating to why a majority of the individuals left this question blank may be the nature of the employment relationship that they have with the institution. There may be a possibility that these individuals are consultants or private contractors who have been brought into the organization for a specific fundraising campaign or project.

Conclusion

I identified a number of themes in the data described above. First, neither knowledge leaders nor teacher participants appeared to have an unequivocal level of autonomy. In the case of the knowledge leaders, they were not the final decision-makers in setting strategic priorities for the institution, however, they did have the power to sign off on gift/donor/partnership agreements that in many cases committed college resources or deliverables on behalf of the institution.

Teachers had much autonomy with respect to the resources and topics taught within the classrooms, however, this had implications for the standards and consistency of programming. Because 88% of the Teachers (n=7) were also employed in the charitable sector, this group's responses were also informed by their "day-job" knowledge in answering questions related to their autonomy within their fundraiser roles. However, 63% of the teachers (n=5) indicated that they had a very high level of autonomy when fundraising. As one part-time teacher put it,

My goal is to get money in the door, so my schedule revolves around getting money in the door. So, whatever I need to do to move projects and the donor prospects along that continuum – that's what I do. For example, right now I have been tasked with producing a number of requests to corporations and foundations. So that's what I have been doing for the last few weeks – just spending all my

days finding prospects and putting together proposals to send to them. I have a very high degree of autonomy in my work. (T2)

Teachers, in their fundraising roles, could set their own schedules, determine which projects to pitch (based on research of potential prospects), and negotiate gift agreements. Yet, the campaigns or projects that they would fundraise for, had already been determined. This means they had limited, or no involvement in setting the strategic objectives of their organization. Most interesting about the teacher group, is that all but one avoided declaring that they were fundraisers. A theory that could explain this desire to obfuscate their true function is found in the Social Identity Theory (Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979). This theory states that individuals who share similar characteristics cluster in “ingroups” where individuals of the group go to any extent of helping each other, and anyone who does not share the same characteristics are in the “outgroup”. This dynamic is clearly at play – each, may be considered as their own unique “ingroup”. Within these ingroups, members can exert a high degree of suasion which influences the actions of other members – and it is this influence whether overt or subtle, that is of key importance to the fundraiser.

Based on the interview data, it appeared that there was a negative perception of admitting that they were fundraisers. This may be related to the social construct of what a “fundraiser” is. I have personally experienced this within my role as President of a College Foundation for the past four years. There have been circumstances where potential donors have outright stated that they are committed to other charities, before an “ask” is made. Upon reflection, there have been far fewer callbacks from people and organizations while I have been in this position, compared to others that I have held in the past – both college and private sector – when I was not as clearly identified as a “fundraiser”.

Based on these findings, fundraising partially meets the criterion of autonomy in tactical duties but not to the full extent of autonomy related to the broader institutional goals.

Freidson's (2001) research described market conditions by which work is controlled in terms of three logics: the first logic is the market (consumers), the second logic is the institution (management) and the third logic is the occupation (individuals). The third logic that Freidson referred relates to the professional status of an occupation is where the practitioners control their own work. While there are some areas where fundraisers control their own work, my findings that fundraising practitioners are not fully autonomous are consistent with both Freidson's (2001) and Forsythe's (1984) theory.

Research Question #2 asked: "What fundraising related programs or courses have fundraisers in Ontario's colleges studied as part of their formal course of studies?" (Formal Course of Study Criterion)

Document Analysis

I completed a website search of each the twenty-two English speaking colleges in Ontario, using keyword searches that included fundraising, fund raising, and fundraiser and found there were a total of sixteen fundraising/not-for-profit programs identified at fourteen institutions (Appendix I). Programs had different course delivery methods: one was a part-time on-campus program, eight were distance education programs, including a hybrid of on-campus and online, part-time online, three full-time on-campus and four part-time online programs. The programs ranged in length from three to twenty courses; the modal length was nine courses. A summary of course information and themes available online is mapped in Table 4 below.

Table 4: *Summary of Course Information in Ontario's College of Applied Arts and Technology*

	No. of Courses	Elective	Marketing for Non-Profit Organizations	Advocacy - Government and Stakeholder relations	Finance	Human Resources	Introduction to NFP Management	Strategic Planning and Decision Making	Leadership	Partnerships	Program Evaluation	Introduction to Fundraising	Operations of Fundraising	Donor Centered Fundraising / Relationships	Fundraising Campaigns	Entrepreneurial Fundraising	Major Gifts, Estates	Annual Giving Programs	Special Events	Capstone - Final Application of curriculum	Digital Strategies of Fundraising (ePhilanthropy)	Grant / Proposal Writing	Professionalism - Ethical and Moral	Volunteer Management	Prospect Research	Technology - software for fundraising	Team Building and Relationships	Career Development-resume	Direct Marketing and Merchandise	Stewardship	Planned Giving	Endowments	Legal	
Name of Institution																																		
Algonquin College	6		x									x		x	x				x	x														
Centennial College	7		x									x		x	x	x			x	x														
Conestoga College	3																																	
Confederation College	6		x									x		x	x				x	x														
Fanshawe College	6	x	x									x		x	x				x	x														
Flemming College	6	x	x									x		x	x				x	x														
George Brown College	6		x									x		x			x		x		x													
George Brown College	6	2	x	x	x	x	x					x																						
Georgian College	13	2	x									x		x	x			x		x		x	x	x	x	x								
Humber College	20		x	x	x								x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Lambton College	6		x				x							x	x				x	x														
Loyalist College			x		x		x						x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	
Seneca College	12		x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x							x				x	x		x								
Seneca College	6		x											x	x				x	x														
Sheridan College	3		x									x							x															
St. Lawrence College	6		x									x		x	x				x	x														
Total	4	15	2	4	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	12	2	11	11	1	3	3	12	11	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	1	1	1	3	2	2	

Source: Cindy Gouveia. © Copyright 2017 Cindy Gouveia

Programs Offered. A range of credentials could be earned through successful completion of these programs. Ten programs led to Certificates, four led to Ontario Graduate Certificates, and two led to a Recognition of Achievements. One of the institutions had a broken link on the website and when I contacted the Program Coordinator, I was told that the program had been suspended due to lack of enrolment.

In terms of content, the majority (more than ten) of the programs had six courses in common; marketing for non-profits, introduction to fundraising, special events (as a means of generating income), donor-centered fundraising, fundraising campaigns and a capstone project.

However, there were some common courses which suggests there is a core common body of knowledge. The most common courses within programs were Marketing (15 programs), Introduction to Fundraising (12 programs), Special Events (12 programs), Donor Centered Fundraising (11 programs), Fundraising Campaigns (11 programs) and a Capstone Project (11 programs). The presence of these courses in the programs suggests that these are key areas of fundraising. One of the donor respondents (D2) suggested that a charitable organization is not a business and should not be operated as such. However, based on my personal experience, although a charity is a not-for-profit operation, there are definite parallels to viable business operations. For example, knowledge of finance is a very important part of a charity's sustainability even though a course focused specifically on finance was offered in only four of the sixteen programs. Other examples include Human Resources Management (found in two programs), Introduction to Not-For-Profit Management (four programs), Technology Software (four programs), Endowments (found in two programs).

Certification as Fundraisers. Within the fundraising sector in Ontario, there is a voluntary certification that Fundraisers can achieve - the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE). This is a program that is delivered by “an independent nonprofit organization whose sole mission is dedicated to setting standards in philanthropy through a valid and reliable certification process for fundraising professionals” (CFRE, 2016). The CFRE is devoted to advancing the professionalism and education of fundraisers. The minimum requirements necessary to apply for the credential are: three years of fundraising experience, fundraising-specific education (e.g., Continuing Education, authoring, academic degrees, service learning) and Professional Performance (i.e., actual funds raised, communications projects, management

projects). There are 5,451 members worldwide who have been certified as of 2014 (Certified Fund Raising Executive, 2014).

The CFRE is a trade-based certification that requires individuals to achieve a designated number of points for education, professional practice, and professional performance, and successful completion of an exam. Ongoing continuing education and recertification are required to maintain this designation.

Interview Data

I interviewed six donors, eight teachers and seven knowledge leaders to answer Research Question Two.

Donors. Donors reported that they did not perceive of a fundraiser's education as an important factor in their donation evaluation. They seemed more interested in the actual charitable cause, the integrity and reputation of both the charitable foundation, and in some cases, the fundraiser. Donors were interested in the fundraisers' ability to coherently make their case for the donation. However, half of the donors (n=3) suggested that the individual fundraiser's behaviour and professionalism could be seen as an outcome of their formal education or experience.

I think it does come through in how the persons present themselves. Education does help, it gives them more experience, knowledge to approach someone with more confidence and more professionalism. It's not always essential, I know of some people who are more senior in the sector who are highly effective and don't have a high level of education. (D6)

Two Donors (33%) did not see education as important and stated that the education of the fundraisers would not impact their giving decision. The fundraiser's level of education, in and of

itself, appeared to have no bearing on the donors' giving decisions. On the other hand, donors mentioned that the fundraisers' ability to read social cues was very important – the ability to make a connection and use discretion. One donor put it this way when describing an off-putting situation:

Someone (a fundraiser) was particularly persistent or had a tendency to make you feel guilty, or take things out of context, or jump ahead of your (the donor's) intent, maybe by telling other people that you're making a gift and you haven't actually decided. (D5)

This donor further commented that this type of behaviour would likely result in a complaint to the charitable organization where the fundraiser was employed. When asked whether education was an important factor in their giving decision, a private donor stated:

Not really....We always felt that we always wanted to fund mainly education. My main focus is for young people. My funding decisions are targeted toward young people who otherwise wouldn't have the means...We look more at the organization that's raising the money – not really the person who's doing the fundraising. We look at the college or the institution, what they're doing. What they are recommending to fund. (D3)

And, another donor put it this way:

I can't say that it's a formal education is that important, like if someone told me they're a graduate from a particular school and that they have a degree in this or that. It's more about the qualities of the fundraiser that are enhanced by a proper education. For example, their ability to understand the social situation, or the ability to understand the corporate / public sector. The ability to understand their

own clients and the sensitivity to matching their needs with funding / donation options. You could argue that someone could have these skills without necessarily (having) the formal education. (D5)

Teachers. All teacher respondents had some form of initial post-secondary education with either a Bachelor's degree or College Diploma - but none had initially started their professional career in a fundraising program. All eight of the respondents then took some type of post-graduate study such as a certificate/degree in philanthropy including courses, or workshops and four (50%) had achieved the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE) designation. When asked, a teacher respondent stated,

I have an undergrad (degree) from a Canadian University, started with medical studies and ended up with a degree in history and philosophy. I entered fundraising in the late 80s. There was no 'preparation' for fundraising back then. In many cases, there still isn't. The majority of the fundraisers out there are not educated to be fundraisers – this is a fairly recent phenomenon. (T7)

Another teacher respondent shared,

I have a degree in communications. And then, when I decided to pursue fundraising, I dove in head first. I have taken dozens of webinars and seminars and any educational opportunities that revolved around fundraising. I have the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE) designation and I did two study groups to prepare for that. (T2)

Knowledge Leaders. Knowledge leaders identified the most important criteria for hiring fundraisers were: previous experience, a track record in fundraising with the ability to build relationships and close prospects, and the ability to raise money immediately. "We really need

people who are going to come and work with us and start to raise money virtually immediately”, said one of the participants (KL6). Formal education or training in fundraising was relatively unimportant compared to fundraising experience. However, based on institutional hiring policy, some of the respondents did indicate that the minimum educational requirement for any candidate would be an undergraduate degree or a three-year college diploma (preferably in business or communications) depending on the position – but these educational pre-requisites were not directly related to fundraising. One of the respondents (14%) cited the CFRE or near completion of the CFRE was required; the remaining knowledge leaders (86%) stated that the CFRE was not a requirement for a position at their institutions. One respondent stated,

...writing skills are critical. Strong people, communication and interpersonal skills. (Having) obtained or near completion of the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE) credential. We do have staff who don't have the CFRE, however, when hiring new staff, this credential is mandatory. (KL5)

That response is contrasted with that of another knowledge leader's response.

I look at two things. Background – what they have done, some form of marketing and communications is preferred, and either a university degree or diploma. Experience is very important as we do not have large offices in colleges and we need people who are coming with the experience and contacts. This is not a place where we can have people spending a lot of time learning on the job. (KL6)

Survey Data

Students. Only 11% (n=2) of students responded to the online questionnaire, and I conducted a face-to-face interview with one other student. These students indicated that they were taking the program as they felt it would increase their chances of getting a

position in the not-for-profit sector. One student indicated that he/she chose the program because of its co-operative education component, real-life assignments as well as the increased opportunity for employment in the sector. “The program teaches you all the basic concepts and the assignments all relate to real life job tasks. The internship at the end allows you to gain real world experience fundraising, which should make me more employable” (S1). Another student mentioned that in researching the fundraising programs, he/she noticed that more and more, entry level job postings for the not-for-profit sector require a college-level diploma as a minimum requirement. “I noticed that employers were looking for a fundraising college diploma or in some cases communications - it was becoming increasingly obvious that the sector is looking for a minimum of a college education even for entry level positions” (S3).

Fundraisers. Most fundraisers had a university degree - undergraduate (n=13; 28%), or master's (n= 9; 20%) degrees - while 11% (n=5) had college diplomas. Four percent (n=2) of fundraiser respondents had only a high school diploma and 7% (n=3) had some form of college certificate. When asked if their educational program was related to their positions in fundraising, only 24% (n=11) reported yes, another 24% (n=11) reported no, and 15% (n=7) of fundraisers reported their education related to fundraising only somewhat.

I also asked fundraisers whether they had the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE) credential. Thirteen percent (n=6) responded yes; 38% (n=18) replied no, and another 13% (n=6) stated they intend to get the designation at some point in the future. However, 15% (n=7) of fundraisers reported that they had no intention of pursuing this certification (but provided no further explanation), and 11% (n=5) were unsure.

Figure 5: Fundraiser Survey Q8 - What is your educational background?

Discussion

The data that answer Research Question Two relate to two themes: identification of relevant programs to prepare fundraisers, and whether or not fundraisers have taken a fundraising program as a part of their formal course of studies. I will now discuss these two themes.

Fundraising Programs in Ontario Colleges. Based on my personal experience of five years managing a charitable foundation and in my document analysis, there are a number of key foundational elements in fundraising that are not consistently included as core curricula of fundraising programs. Specifically, these topics are: finance, legislation/charity law, board management, governance, sales management, customer (donor) service and not-for-profit leadership. This was evident in my review of program courses. Each of these topics is important and relevant due to the nature of the structure of a charitable organization.

Finance, including preparation and disclosure of financial statements, the ability to forecast and budget and endowment investments and reporting are just a few abilities and skills that are paramount to the fiscal sustainability of the organization. Having an intimate understanding of charity law, including provincial and federal legislation is critical to maintaining the organization's charitable status. For example, topics like receipting, fundraising tenants, protection of donor privacy, structuring gift agreements, the area of sponsorship or lotteries – all of these are part of charity law and how the organization must operationalize these requirements. Sales management, or in fundraising terms, the cycle of philanthropy, is important in securing financial support from donors. The cycle includes identification, cultivation, solicitation, stewardship and renewals. There are activities and processes associated with each phase of this cycle and an intimate understanding of these is important in raising money for the organization. Customer service and donor-centered service can be described as the behaviour and attitudes that are necessary to secure and keep donors. As D5 put it:

Certainly personality, someone who can make people feel relaxed and more sympathetic, you never want people who are too pushy. Some of them could be effective, but later on down the road, there could be resistance to them because of their pushy style.

Not-for-profit leadership is a broad topic that includes setting the vision for the organization, inspiring staff and volunteers to get behind the cause, understanding the philanthropic landscape and navigating through the competitive environment. All of these topics are of critical importance and even if a student is taking a course to prepare for an entry-level position, at minimum, these topics should be introduced in the curriculum as it will give

graduates a better understanding of how the work they are doing is related to a broader and bigger picture.

Education Required for Fundraisers. Although donors explicitly stated that education was unimportant, their implicit comments reflect a different reality. Donors specified certain skills and behaviour that were important to their decision to hire fundraisers. For example, they cited the fundraiser's ability to make the case for support. One donor suggested,

The top two characteristics that I would want in a fundraiser is the general knowledge to clearly present the case for the client, and the social sensitivity to assess the willingness of the funder to get on board – and then the skill to be able to marry the two together. (D5)

This may suggest that fundraisers would benefit, or be more effective in their role, if a Sales, Communications and/or Presentation course were part of programming (e.g., prospecting, proposal or sales pitch, overcoming obstacles, closing the sale, customer retention). Other behaviours explicitly mentioned were the ability to connect and understand social cues, which suggests that a Customer Service or an Emotional Intelligence related course may be necessary to improve efficacy in securing donations. One donor who acknowledged the importance of education added:

(My) opinion... is, Education is extremely important, in every sector. However, experience in industry is really important to me. So, people who know how to use funds ethically and who have good stewardship is the most important to me.

Whether they have a Masters, or a PhD isn't as important. (D2)

Knowledge leaders were more interested in the individual fundraiser's experience and track record, than fundraising-related education. Notably, fundraising education was not

identified as a requirement, but when they were asked about their hiring decisions, several of the knowledge leaders stated that it was preferred, but not a requirement. As one knowledge leader stated,

I have a different view of this than most people in fundraising. I know that a lot of people in fundraising/hiring positions, they want them to have their fundraising certification and I am not so big on that. I find that you can teach them the “nuts and bolts” of the fundraising, how you work with CRA and all of those items. You can have them take courses in that. They must have some background, preferably in business and sales oriented. Because I find fundraising very much like sales – you have to be able to close. (KL1)

Some teachers had achieved or were attempting to achieve the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE). As T3 noted,

I don’t have my CFRE designation, but many of our other instructors have their designation. Again, our students are not required to have that accreditation at this time as one of the minimum requirements is a certain number of years’ experience in the field before you can even start the process. The students are encouraged to strive for their CFRE, but that’s not something that you can simply apply for like a membership.

While teachers were most interested in the sector’s CFRE designation, which requires the individual to have a minimum of three years of experience, fundraising-specific education (Continuing Education, Authoring, Academic Degrees, Service Learning) and Professional Performance (Actual funds raised, Communications Projects, Management Projects), the credential did not appear to hold the same value for donors or knowledge leaders. In contrast,

donors indicated that education wasn't something that would impact their giving decisions. As D5 indicated,

I can't say that it's a formal education that is important, like if someone told me they're a graduate from a particular school and that they have a degree in this or that. It's more about the qualities of the fundraiser that are enhanced by a proper education.

Conclusion

There appeared to be some level of interest for a more structured approach to fundraising education, however, there is no formal requirement or strong reason to demand a post-secondary educational background in fundraising as a prerequisite to practice in this area in the participating Ontario colleges. This is evident in the varying levels of education reported by the fundraisers who were surveyed, as well as the comments from participating knowledge leaders and those currently employed in the sector.

In summary, fundraising as an occupation does not currently meet the criterion of having a formal course of study as a requirement for the classification as a profession.

Interestingly, the data identified numerous curriculum themes that would be uniquely useful in the training of fundraisers. These findings are aligned with Flexner's (1930) suggestion that there is a requirement for professions to obtain a formal course of study within or outside a university. In addition, recognized professions like medicine, accounting and law require a formal course of university study, a practicum requirement and the successful completion of a standardized exam. Based on my findings, fundraising does not fully meet these professional characteristics.

Research Question #3 asked: “What professional associations are key informants aware of/or required to be a part of, in order to fundraise?” (Professional Association with Code of Ethics Criterion)

Document Analysis

I identified professional associations in my document analysis through web searches using key word search terms such as “fundraising association” and “fund raising association” and included them in the Terms and Definitions section. Although there were others, I selected the results that were pertinent to fundraising and education in Ontario. A number of the associations were also cited by informants of this study; either as being member or having knowledge of the association.

These associations appear to focus on different sub-sectors or specific geographic locations. For example, there are associations dedicated specifically to healthcare philanthropy or educational support. Membership in these associations is strictly voluntary and practitioners do not have to be a member to obtain employment in the sector.

The general function of these associations is to share knowledge, professional development and networking opportunities. Other benefits of membership may include access to industry reports, access to job postings, advocacy for the charitable sector and capacity-building for increased support from different donor segments (e.g., alumni giving).

The Council for Advancement in Education appeared to be the largest association, founded in 1974, it currently has nearly 81,000 advancement professionals on the staff of member institutions. However, the most cited (and wide-spread) association mentioned in my interviews and online surveys was the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP). The Association has a broad mandate of “fostering development and growth of fundraising

professionals and promoting high ethical standards in the fundraising profession (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2016)."

Almost three-quarters (n=7; 70%) of these associations have a Code of Ethics, either adopted from the Association of Fundraising Professionals, or specific to the association. None of these associations' websites cited a right to remove individuals from employment/practice if they had contravened any or all parts of their Code of Ethics. However, the AFP and Imagine Canada do provide some level of suasion as the AFP can de-register and expel individuals from the association for breach of ethical standards and also bar their use of the CFRE designation. And, the Imagine Canada, Standards Program can remove a charitable organization from their qualified list if the charity fails to uphold the program's ongoing acceptance criteria.

To further understand the knowledge gap between the fundraisers and the donors, I reviewed the websites of all twenty-two English speaking colleges to verify whether there was any mention of a Donor Bill of Rights (Appendix L) or Code of Ethics (Appendix (M)). Of the twenty-two colleges, none had posted a Code of Ethics, and only three (14%) had posted the Donor Bill of Rights on their websites. Although one of the colleges did not have these documents posted, there were two links for donor resources - links to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) and Imagine Canada. It is possible that the Code of Ethics would be an internal document for the individuals working within the department and hence, there might be no reason to post it to a public domain. However, I would have anticipated that most, if not all, of the colleges would have posted the Donor Bill of Rights as a public declaration of the individual's or institution's commitment to the donor.

Interview Data

Donors, teachers and knowledge leaders were asked about their awareness and perceptions of fundraising associations, specifically relating to ethical codes. These participants provided insights into their perspectives on these associations.

Donors. In general, donors seemed unaware of any associations related to fundraising. Two of the donors (33%) interviewed were able to identify the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) as these donors' foundations or associations were members of this organization. These two donors were also able to identify the AFP's Code of Ethics and the Donor's Bill of Rights. Yet, when I probed further, they were only able to provide some general information about the Ethics Code or the Rights - no specific details were provided. Donors did not see an association as a vehicle for expressing concerns about a charity. All donors (n=6) indicated that if there were issues with the fundraiser they were dealing with, they would go through the channels within the organization or simply stop donating; they would not consider seeking an external course of action or arbitrator unless the actions of the organization were criminal (e.g., embezzlement).

I am not aware of any professional associations for fundraisers, in a precise sense...I assume that there are as there are associations for everything, like exchange in knowledge and information exchanges. I know there are a lot of conferences around for fundraising people and they likely share tips and approaches. I am not aware of who they are and to me, it's not a concern, and it's of little interest to me as a donor to know that the fundraiser is involved in an association. (D5)

Knowledge Leaders. Participating knowledge leaders indicated that being part of AFP and having the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) credential is very important to building knowledge and contact/networking databases. However, the associations' membership costs and location of professional development workshops and opportunities could limit or dissuade the institution from being fully engaged with any association. Some knowledge leaders cited that the location of the conferences required them to travel and incur additional expenses above and beyond their budgetary allocation. As one knowledge leader stated,

We belonged to an association in the past, and the location of where these conferences and other opportunities were, weren't really accessible to us because of travel and accommodation costs. It's not easy for us to get there. We didn't receive value for it. (KL1)

Knowledge leaders seemed divided on the subject; two (29%) had a deep appreciation for being a part of the AFP – having achieved the CFRE designation. “It's very important to have this membership particularly for learning, knowledge and currency. Also, to maintain a network”, said KL5. However, two others (29%) clearly did not see the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) or Council for Advancement in Support of Education (CASE) of considerable value. The remaining respondents (42%) had lukewarm or varied feelings about the subject, citing cost as a factor as well as their own internal ability to transfer knowledge to staff. “...We don't have the financial resources to be sending staff to tens of thousands of dollars' worth of professional development seminars. The partnerships that we have are informal, and I leverage these contacts for information sharing”, responded KL6.

When asked if there was specific training for onboarding new staff, all organizations provided some form of institutional or departmental orientation; only three (42%) cited that they

would send staff to some form of fundraising related training/workshops (e.g., AFP Congress, online webinars, etc.). Only one (14%) of these knowledge leaders mentioned a formal review of the Code of Ethics from the Association of Fundraising Professionals as part of their orientation for any new staff in the advancement area. Furthermore, this individual stated she/he has the AFP Code of Ethics on their office wall next to the Donor Bill of Rights. KL2 stated, “We post the AFP Code of Ethics and the Donor Bill of Rights in our office at the foyer, so when Donors come in, they see it”.

Teachers. Although the teachers thought that memberships in professional associations were important, because membership was voluntary, teachers only recommended that students become part of the AFP association, but did not strongly encourage or require their students to join. One teacher (T7) noted, “These associations are important because you have to be current in the sector, particularly in planned-giving. For example, when there are changes in tax laws that has an impact on planned-giving and what I teach in the classroom”.

Another teacher shared that although students are not required to join the AFP, they are required to volunteer during AFP’s annual conference in Toronto. T8 stated:

At one of the colleges I teach at, the students are required to attend and volunteer for the annual AFP Congress. The students from the other college (I teach at) are not required, but they are encouraged to attend – they (the students) are also provided a special rate.

It appeared that teachers held AFP as the most esteemed organization followed by Canadian Association of Gift Planners (CAGP), Council for Advancement and Support in Education (CASE) and Association of Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP). As T1 said, “At the place where I work, we feel so strongly about belonging to the association, that the organization pays

for the staffs' AFP membership". And T4 stated, "I belong to AFP, and it's the only association I belong to right now. AFP was a better investment for my needs as a professional." However, one Teacher felt very strongly about the lack of value provided by the AFP.

I am a member of AFP. Would I recommend that organization? Not particularly, but that's the only one out there right now. I don't think they provide value. You pay \$250 per year and you get next to nothing for it. What you do get is a discounted price on some webinars and conferences and that's it. So, I don't think there's value for the money you pay. But, if you're going to be a professional fundraiser, you may as well do it. (T2)

All eight teachers interviewed were members of the AFP, and three (38%) teachers belonged to other fundraising associations as well. Two (25%) of the respondents were former volunteer members of the AFP.

Survey Data

Survey data were collected from two students and 47 fundraisers. One student agreed to be interviewed by phone, and the questions asked were exactly the same as those on the survey.

Students. Two (66%) of the students were aware of the AFP as well as their Code of Ethics. Both Students who responded to the survey reported that they were not full members of AFP, however, the one student I interviewed had purchased a "Young Professionals" membership. The Young Professionals membership provides the same value as a full member, but at a discounted rate. To qualify, the individual must be under 30 years old, hold some degree of responsibility directly for fundraising, work within the U.S. or Canada and be compensated for their services, must subscribe to the AFP Code of Ethical Principles and Standards and its bylaws and promote the Donor Bill of Rights and be employed, or have been employed by an

organization that provides benefits to the society (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2009). When I asked the one Student I interviewed, he/she couldn't recall whether it was something that she/he had looked up independently, or if membership in AFP was introduced in class. Since the student had not received any information from the AFP after his/her initial enrolment, the student was not aware of the next steps required to realize the full benefits of the membership, such as industry reports and events, once he/she was gainfully employed in the industry.

Fundraisers. Interestingly, 15% (n=7) of the fundraising respondents indicated erroneously that the AFP had the authority to stop them from fundraising if they had contravened the code, while 33% (n=15) indicated that the Association did not have the authority to remove them from practice, and the rest of the respondents left this question blank. Furthermore, only 4% (n=2) of the fundraiser respondents indicated that membership in an association was a requirement of their jobs, whereas 54% (n=25) of the fundraisers indicated that membership in a fundraising association was not an employment requirement.

Upon my deeper review of AFP's Code of Ethical Behaviour and the Donor Bill of Rights, I found nothing in the documents mandating, or suggesting that fundraisers, or member organizations should share or publicly post this information.

Conclusion

Scholars have long held that a Code of Ethics binding any profession together is a mandatory requirement for an occupational group to be recognized as a *bona fide* profession (e.g., Greenwood, 1954; Wilensky, 1965; Wheelwright, 2000). Ontario college fundraisers and the charitable associations or foundations in which they work are not bound by any Code of Ethics - neither by law, nor by their own moral imperative. Adherence to a Code of Ethics

unique to fundraising was perceived by the participants as strictly voluntary. However, college-based informants - fundraisers and knowledge leaders - seemed to have a broad awareness of these fundraising associations and their associated Codes of Ethics and Donor Bill of Rights. Surprisingly, their donors had no knowledge of these fundraising associations, nor their ethical codes or the Donor Bill of Rights. What was perhaps even more surprising was that the donors did not seem to be very interested in such documents.

In summary, with respect to the Code of Ethics criterion essential for designation as a profession, fundraising as an occupation in Ontario's colleges does not meet this condition. Abbott (1983) pointed out that the code of ethics within an association has five basic properties and are a requirement of a profession. Greenwood (1954), Wilensky (1964) and Wheelwright (2000) also agree that an enforceable and mandatory Code of Ethics is a requirement of a profession. In the case of my findings with Ontario college fundraisers, the professional association and code of ethics are neither mandatory nor enforceable to the extent that practitioners are removed from positions.

Research Question #4 asked: "What are the legislative requirements that Ontario college Fundraisers are required to operate within? What are the repercussions to individuals or organizations should they not follow these requirements?" (State Legislation Criterion)

Document Analysis

There is direct and indirect Federal and Provincial legislation that impacts how Canadian charities operate and their relationship with their donors. Although this list is not exhaustive, at the federal level, there is the Charities Directorate, housed within the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), is responsible for,

.... all program activities related to the provisions of the Income Tax Act regarding registered charities, Registered Canadian Amateur Athletic Associations

(RCAAs), Registered National Arts Service Organizations (RNASOs) and federal political parties (contributions to registered political parties or to a candidate at a federal election). (Canada Revenue Agency, 2011)

The Charities Directorate determines activities considered charitable and those that are not. Ironically, the act of fundraising is not in itself considered a charitable activity. However, the act of donating to some fundraising activities *is* considered a charitable activity and must meet specific eligibility criteria to be eligible for a charitable tax receipt. The Directorate governs, monitors and enforces activities including, but not limited to, the registration of charities and not-for-profit organizations, issuance of tax receipts, the acceptable ratio between funds raised and operational expenses, how fundraisers can be compensated, and monitors compliance. Canada Revenue Agency publishes the Report on Charities Program (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016) on an annual basis. This report provides information to charities and the general public. In 2015-2016 alone, the Charities Directorate audited almost 1% of Canada's 86,000 charities. They performed 726 audits and noted the most common concerns were incorrectly issued donation receipts, annual (tax) return errors, inadequate books and records, non-charitable purposes and/or activities and non-filing of T4/T4A slips (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016, p.15). Moreover, the CRA revoked the registration of 1,429 charities during that year, most of which were at the request of the charity and only 1.5% were because of an audit (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016, p.16).

Examples of other indirect federal legislation that charities must abide by is the Canadian Anti-Spam Legislation (CASL) (Government of Canada, 2016), which regulates certain electronic business activity relating to the handling of personal information in the Canadian economy. In addition, the Privacy Act (Government of Canada, 2016), which protects the

privacy of an individual's information from government and organizations as well as the right to access that information, must also be adhered to by charities, particularly with respect to donor information. The Income Tax Act also has legislation relating to the special tax-exempt status of charitable organizations.

At the Provincial level, there are a number of legislative requirements that charities are required to adhere to as well. These requirements are largely administered through the Office of Public Guardian and Trustee "who plays a role in protecting the public interest in charitable property" (Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee (OPGT), 2015). A list of these legislations is included on the Imagine Canada website (2012);

1. Charities Accounting Act – Requires charities to register and report annually and provides for various sanctions and remedies in the event that charities misuse or misappropriate charitable property.
2. Charitable Gifts Act – This Act was repealed in 2009. The Act limited charities' ownership of business interests and required most charities to divest any interest in a business that was greater than 10%. Although the legislation no longer includes specific limits, there are requirements as to how investment income may be spent (for charitable purposes only).
3. Donation of Food Act – Charities that distribute donated food in Ontario should review this Act, as it addresses the liability of their directors, agents and employees in respect to donated food.
4. Gaming Control Act – Charities that wish to conduct charitable gaming in Ontario (bingos, raffles, etc.) should consult this Act, as it may be necessary to be licensed under this Act.

5. Ministry of Community and Social Services Act – Empowers the Minister of Community and Social Services to operate and manage charities in Ontario.
6. Religious Organizations’ Lands Act - Regulates the ownership of land by unincorporated religious organizations.
7. Trustee Act – Regulates various trust law aspects of charities in Ontario, including the investment standards to which charities will be held.

The Ontario Human Rights Commission also has a policy dealing with scholarships that are provided on an “exclusionary” basis (Ontario Human Rights Tribunal, 1997). This policy allows for donors to direct their scholarships to groups or individuals who are identified through grounds set out by the Code. These grounds include, but are not limited to, race, sex, colour, religion, etc. In other words, this policy allows for certain individuals/groups as identified in the Code, to be awarded scholarships that others (who do not share the same characteristics) would not be eligible to receive.

In addition to the general Provincial legislative requirements, there are also a number of other Ministry Policy Frameworks to which Ontario Colleges must adhere. One example is the Minister’s Binding Policy on Banking, Investment and Borrowing (Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, 2009). This policy provides the framework governing how Ontario Colleges must utilize various financial instruments to invest their charitable and provincial matching funds. One section of this policy dictates how endowment funds must be invested, particularly for the Ontario Trust for Student Support (OTSS) matching funds.

In my document analysis, I was not able to find any legislation that related specifically to individual fundraisers, instead, all the legislation seemed to be focused on the organizations in which they are employed. The only specific reference to fundraisers within the CRA

requirements, was that fundraisers *cannot* be compensated through commission payments. The issue is that this type of compensation structure may lead to unethical behaviour. The concern is that commission payments may encourage fundraisers to put their own personal gain, ahead of the organization's or a client's best interests. Moreover, registered charities have a heightened responsibility to the general public because of their tax-exempt status – commission payments, particularly when they are applied for large gifts, could result in lack of public trust and confidence. Another concern is that the more commission you pay the fundraiser, the less of those donation dollars go to the cause. This becomes a very sensitive issue especially with the new trend towards mega gifts (i.e., eight-figure and greater gifts). However, the administration of this statute would still fall on the charitable organization; thus, it cannot be considered as a specific legislative requirement governing the actions of an individual fundraiser. Table 5 depicts these relevant legislations.

Knowledge Leaders. All seven knowledge leader respondents were familiar with CRA's oversight on charities, specifically related to tax receipting but did not provide much detail. One knowledge leader stated,

...Canada Revenue Agency for sure, and then having to participate and complete our charitable return as part of the College. We go through quite a process to complete that piece and that's the legislation that really guides how we are tax receipting. (KL2)

Table 5: *Summary of Legislative Requirements for a Canadian Charity*

Level of Governance	Legislation	Impact
Federal Canada	Canada Revenue Agency	Registers, monitors and enforces compliance for Registered Charities. Requires charities to register and report annually, and provides for various sanctions and remedies in the event that charities misuse or misappropriate charitable property.
Provincial Ontario	Charitable Gifts Act	This Act was repealed in 2009. (The Act limited charities' ownership of business interests and required most charities to divest any interest in a business that was greater than 10%.)
Provincial Ontario	Donation of Food Act	Charities that distribute donated food in Ontario should review this Act, as it addresses the liability of their directors, agents and employees in respect of the donated food.
Provincial Ontario	Gaming Control Act	Charities that wish to conduct charitable gaming in Ontario (bingos, raffles, etc.) should consult this Act, as it may be necessary to be licensed under this Act.
Provincial Ontario	Ministry of Community and Social Services Act	Empowers the Minister of Community and Social Services to operate and manage charities in Ontario.
Provincial Ontario	Religious Organizations' Lands Act	Regulates the ownership of land by unincorporated religious organizations.
Provincial Ontario	Trustee Act	Regulates various trust law aspects of charities in Ontario, including the investment standards to which charities will be held.
Provincial Ontario	The Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee (OPGT)" in Ontario	Protecting mentally incapable people, the public's interest in charities, searching for heirs for estates which the OPGT administers, investing perpetual care funds, dealing with dissolved corporations
Provincial Ontario	Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act	The purposes of this Act are to provide a right of access to information under the control of institutions in accordance with the principles that, (i) information should be available to the public, (ii) necessary exemptions from the right of access should be limited and specific, and (iii) decisions on the disclosure of government information should be reviewed independently of government; and AND (b) to protect the privacy of individuals with respect to personal information about themselves held by institutions and to provide individuals with a right of access to that information.
Federal Canada	Privacy Act	The purpose of this Act is to extend the present laws of Canada that protect the privacy of individuals with respect to personal information about themselves held by a government institution and that provide individuals with a right of access to that information.
Federal Canada	Canada's Anti-Spam Legislation (CASL)	The law will help to protect Canadians while ensuring that businesses can continue to compete in the global marketplace. Sections of the Act related to the unsolicited installation of computer programs or software came into force.

Source Cindy Gouveia. Copyright Cindy Gouveia 2016.

Interview Data

Next, I discuss the responses of knowledge leaders, teachers, donors interviewed as well as the fundraiser and student survey data related to this research question.

Several (n=4; 57%) knowledge leaders were aware of ethical policies related to the Association of Fundraising Professionals' Donor Bill of Rights (Appendix L) and the fundraising Code of Ethics (Appendix M) and recognized that these were voluntary standards, as opposed to legislation. One knowledge leader explained,

I know the theoretical side of it. I was trying to look up whether there was federal or provincial legislation that is enforced. There's the Ministry of Training in Colleges and Universities (MTCU) Investment policies for the endowment fund, Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) guidelines for taxes and Donors, we use the AFP Bill of Rights (even though it's not legislation, it's what we are bound by as professional fundraisers).

And then I look at Imagine Canada's standards as something that we'd like to hold ourselves to. Again, with Imagine Canada not being legislation, it is an ethical handbook that we stay within. (KL7)

The knowledge leaders who *voluntarily* joined fundraising associations and adopted ethical codes suggested that these professionals recognize a need to self-regulate and that the move to professionalism is stronger than originally anticipated. Moreover, this voluntary action is contradictory to the *requirement* of having a professional association with a formal code of ethics in established professions (Greenwood, 1954; Wilensky, 1964; Wheelwright, 2000).

Teachers. All the participating teachers (n=8) recognized the requirements to meet mandatory CRA tax guidelines and reporting. They all also indicated that they voluntarily abide

by the AFP Donor Bill of Rights/Code of Ethics in their conduct. This response is commendable based on their willingness to adhere to external, non-binding standards. This finding suggests that there is a strong intention to move toward professionalization related to this characteristic based on the teachers' voluntary adherence to these ethical codes.

Donors. Interestingly, participating donors did not name any legislation related to fundraising or charitable governance. Donors typically used the charity's internal "chain of command" (from immediate supervisors of the fundraisers, to the boards – if they existed) to voice a concern. One donor explained,

I would go to the head of the charity or department. Not all organizations asking for money have a foundation, so then you would go to the head of the organization itself. And I think I would probably stop there. (D5)

When Donors were asked whether they referred to an external source to deal with the concerns, most (n=4; 66%) indicated that they would pursue an external route, if there were one, in addition to suspending their donations to the college if their issues were not met with an amicable resolution.

A recent example reported in The Toronto Star (Hudes, 2016), in October of 2016 is the \$1M Faas Foundation donation to the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH). The Foundation alleged that CAMH was not able to carry out the Foundation's direction of the donation and questioned whether the funds were even spent. Not only did the Faas Foundation rescind the remainder of two-thirds of the \$1M pledge, they also demanded CAMH return the first \$330,000 payment to the Foundation. Perhaps the Faas Foundation was not aware that there were external agencies, such as the Charities Directorate of the CRA and the Charities

Accounting Act or voluntary associations like the Association of Fundraising Professionals with whom they could file a complaint, prior to taking the story to the court of public opinion.

One of the donors interviewed was surprised that there might be an external agency that they could go to with a complaint, and asked,

There's a third-party regulating fundraising activities? Oh, definitely, I would use that third-party to file a complaint. Then that would answer my question. It would save me the research or consulting different areas of expertise, rather than nowhere to go. So, yes, if you do have this organization, I would then (go there to file a complaint), actually, particularly if it was major enough. (D1)

One of the donors who participated in this study suggested that if the receiving charity was responsible for any serious wrongdoing that they would go through legislative channels. When asked, the donor stated, "...absolutely. If it was serious enough, if there was evidence of fraudulent activity, or misrepresentation of facts – that would be media worthy, or that would be definitely something I would go through legislation" (D4). In another interview, a donor also mentioned that AFP and Imagine Canada standards were available; but recognized that these were not mandatory in nature. Donor D2 explained,

Just based on the information I know, I would talk to Imagine Canada, but I would also talk to CRA (Canada Revenue Agency) because to me, they (CRA) are the charity watchdog. And it would hold more weight with CRA and their guidelines because there is no wiggle room. Although there is the Code of Ethics and Donor Bill of Rights...I would say that CRA is the bigger watchdog when it comes to (fundraising) guidelines. (D2)

Survey Data

Survey data were provided by fundraisers and students.

Fundraisers. The Fundraiser Survey responses revealed that 30% of respondents (n=14) were aware of some form of legislation relating to fundraising or charitable guidelines. Another 20% (n=9) did not know about any legislation and 9% (n=4) were unsure; the rest of the respondents (n=19; 41%) left this question blank. When asked to list relevant legislation, ten of the eleven respondents (90%) stated CRA tax regulations. One respondent also cited the Not-for-Profit Act, and another identified the Privacy Act. Figure 6 depicts these findings.

Students. The two students who answered the survey were not able to identify any legislation related to charity or fundraising. One of the survey respondents cited the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) Code of Ethics, however, this is not legislation. The student I interviewed identified CRA as the primary enforcement arm for charity legislation.

Conclusion

The most powerful legislative enforcement body regulating charitable operations in Canada is the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). Its mission is to ensure compliance with the income tax legislation and regulations through a balanced level of education, information sharing and governance. The CRA is also the body that registers or deregisters charities in Canada. For example, in 2015/2016 alone, the CRA revoked 1,429 charities. The report states that 701 organizations requested for their charity to be revoked, while another 703 were revoked because of failure to file their tax returns (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016). The remaining 20 were revoked after audit for a variety of infractions.

Figure 6: Fundraiser Survey: Q17 - Are you aware of any provincial/federal/municipal legislation by which fundraisers must operate within?

While the actions of an individual fundraiser can compromise the organization's ability to operate effectively, most, if not all, of the onus falls upon the registered charity to ensure its policies and practices are in alignment to CRA guidelines. The necessity for Canadian charities to adhere to these governmental requirements does not seem to be consistent with other recognized professions (e.g., medical, accounting, engineering) whose governing bodies provide their own licenses to practice, establish their own operational standards and may in addition to government sanctions, impose their own penalties for non-compliance. With the Imagine Canada

standards program, it appears that fundraising is moving in this direction, however, membership in the organization is still voluntary.

While teachers and knowledge leaders appeared to have some awareness of CRA guidelines, specifically related to tax receipting, it was surprising that donors did not seem to know of any legislation related to charitable giving, including CRA guidelines and other provincial requirements. Moreover, most donors indicated that they would simply stop giving if there was an issue with the receiving charity. Section 6 (1) of the Charities Accounting Act states,

Any person may complain as to the manner in which a person or organization has solicited or procured funds by way of contribution or gift from the public for any purpose, or as to the manner in which any such funds have been dealt with or disposed of. (R.S.O. 1990, c. C.10, s. 6 (1).

This provides donors with the option to approach an external legislative body to register a complaint, however, the donors interviewed were not aware of this right and I found that teachers, fundraisers and knowledge leaders did not specifically mention this legislation either.

Donors seemed more interested in the impact of their donation and as one donor stated, "...giving is very personal to us..." (D3). As far as that donor was concerned, charitable organizations are fulfilling their basic legislative requirements by issuing tax receipts as required by the CRA. Other than a concern with the generation of a tax receipt, it appears that the donors would not use legislative rights as a method of enforcement or remediation. One donor stated, "...unless it was really rude, egregious and fraudulent, I would never bother. I would just stop giving money" (D6).

While there are ethical responsibilities of fundraisers and professional codes with which they voluntarily abide, the responses to Research Question #4, suggest that there does not appear to be any legislation that specifically governs the behaviour and activity of individual fundraisers but instead, legislation concentrates on the responsibilities of the charitable *organization* to comply, mainly with tax regulations. While donors do have a little-known avenue to register a complaint about how funds are collected through the Charities Accounting Act, most of the information points at the charitable organization having to self-regulate its employees' professional conduct and behaviour.

In summary, the literature reviewed states that recognized professions have regulatory bodies that establish standards of practice for professions that are tied to federal, provincial or local legislation. Wilensky (1965) maintains that this is a necessary requirement to be a recognized profession. The main function of these regulatory bodies is to protect the general interest of the public and among other rights, have the authority to remove the individual from practice. Based on my research findings, with respect to the criterion of governance of state legislation, Fundraisers do *not* meet this requirement of practicing professions.

Research Question #5 asked, “What do key informants perceive to be the unique knowledge established for fundraising? How do they access this information?” (Unique Body of Knowledge Criterion)

Interview Data

Donors, knowledge leaders and teachers were asked about the specific resources they would go to if they were to research topics related to fundraising. Most (n=5; 83%) of the donors

stated they would use friends or business/industry contacts to research or gather information about the charity or a specific fundraiser. When asked, one donor responded,

Why would I want to do that? Historically, I have found Imagine Canada a useful reference point. I know they still exist. I would talk to peers in other corporations or even in non-profit organizations in the field that I am interested in. If I wanted to find out more about standards and practices in the healthcare field, I would reach out to the senior leaders whom I know in that sector. (D5)

Two of these respondents (33%) (one from a foundation the other from an association), referred to third-party organizations (like Imagine Canada, AFP, etc.) as independent entities that they might approach for information. For instance, respondent D2 commented:

Imagine Canada, Charity Intelligence, Network for Good and AFP. I think they are good resources to learn about what you should and shouldn't be doing, guidelines, and questions, and I use my charitable lawyer a lot. He's an industry expert when it comes to charitable law – what's right and what's wrong. He knows it.

One respondent did not have any idea where to start looking for information;

I wouldn't know where to go and research this information. People don't know that there would be a place to look. This is not something that has come up for me – and I have been exposed to fundraising for 30 years. I would be curious to know if there's any legislation. (D6)

Knowledge Leaders. There were a variety of answers to Research Question Five from the knowledge leaders, who referred either to internal organizational sources (e.g., library), AFP or LinkedIn to gather fundraising information. Six (86%) respondents in this group indicated that

they would go to someone they knew, either within the organization or sector. “We are fortunate that we have seasoned and high caliber professionals working in the institution and my first option is to go to these people (KL3)”. This group was also the most vocal about not having a readily available source of information. KL2 put it this way:

There probably aren’t a lot for fundraising professionals to draw from or access (the sector), whereas other sectors or other professions have potentially more to draw on. And maybe that’s a need in the sector. I think that if I was to gather information that I needed for our department, I would be looking at institutions and organizations that do it really well and draw on that history and success.

Teachers. Teachers of fundraising courses were asked about the teaching resources that they would use in their classes. Surprisingly, no two teachers identified the same instructional resources or cited any resource standards to which they were expected to adhere.

I use a few books that are at my discretion. I use a book called ‘Emotional Intelligence’. I think that’s really important in fundraising, but that’s not a required book. I also use the book ‘Persuasion’, which is by Arleen Dickenson. And that’s more for the networking part. And for the fundraising, I basically use the resources that we actually use at my place of work, which include templates like our donor agreements. (T1)

Most (n=6; 75%) teachers indicated that they were using resources that they put together themselves through web searches, industry reports, best practices, industry guest speakers and personal experiences. For instance, T5 explained,

I developed the lessons and assignments. There were gaps in the market for a textbook that speaks to e-Philanthropy and social media. There was also nothing

that was completely relevant to the Canadian landscape (i.e., Canadian Anti-Spam Legislation, Tax receipting, etc.). I have done a pretty thorough literature review of what's out there – and I cobbled together what's out there and sourced the authors accordingly. There haven't been any new textbooks published since 2010, but I still use some best practices from those books.

Two of the respondents (25%) indicated that there were specific booklists for some of the courses in the program, and general resources within other courses. T4 explained,

There are 20 courses within the program and they each have a resource list in the course outlines. Twelve or so, have specific booklists – not all the courses have required resources, but include online resources, links to different associations.

The association libraries are resources that we use within the program. There are a series of books that are required. There aren't a great number of "textbooks" in our field, but there is a lot of writing in book form.

With no set standards, textbooks or curricula shared between fundraising teachers, this raises the question of the standards of graduates entering the workforce, especially given the wide-ranging variance in instructional approaches and length of programs.

Moreover, when asked which school their fundraising programs belonged to within the institution, there was a wide-range of answers depending on the college. Some programs were embedded in the Business School, Media and Technology; while yet others were found in Human Services and Community Safety School, Hospitality and Tourism School or Continuing Education.

Survey Data

Fundraisers. Fundraisers were asked to identify where they could go to seek information specifically related to fundraising. Nineteen (41%) of survey respondents answered this question. Most (n=12; 63%) of the respondents cited AFP as their source for information. Five (26%) cited colleagues in the industry, another five (26%) cited CRA, four (21%) would go to the library, of which one (5%) specifically named a university library. And only one (5%) specifically mentioned “scholarly” work. While there could be many reasons why more fundraisers didn’t answer this question, there are two reasons that come to mind; the way the question was constructed may have been confusing, or they did not know the answer.

Students. The two student survey respondents did not provide any answers to this open-ended question either. The one other student that I interviewed cited CRA as a main source to find resources related to fundraising.

Conclusion

Boland (2004) states that a ‘profession’ has a body of applicable expert knowledge with a theoretical base, acquired through a lengthy period of training (preferably in a university), a demonstrated devotion to service, an active professional association, a code of ethics, and a high level of control over credentialing and application of the work (p. 6, para. 2). There appears to be no unique body of knowledge, or recognized discipline for fundraising that is housed or taught in a university setting (Boland, 2004). Ontario college fundraising teachers appear to have much freedom to select trade, association, academic and organizational resources to use within the curriculum. This myriad of styles and approaches may lead to inconsistency with industry’s

expectation of graduates from different fundraising programs across the province. These approaches will undoubtedly lead to a patchwork of practices and procedures with potentially uncertain standards and knowledge gaps among students. Many of the teachers indicated that there was a lack of specific Canadian textbooks and resources which could hinder any standardization, compared with the myriad of information available within the United States context. The Canadian charity sector does have some unique tax and legislative aspects, but much of the basic fundraising groundwork is similar between the United States and Canada. This should not limit the teachers' ability to institute common best practices - even if the resources are from the United States. As one teacher put it, "There are far more resources from the United States than we have specifically in Canada - some of my teaching resources are drawn from US sources" (T7).

In summary, based on the information gathered from the interviews, surveys and document analysis, fundraising, to some extent, appears to have a unique body of knowledge. However, it is not consolidated or recognized as a separate discipline in any manner that supports its growth in academic research and new knowledge generation within the Ontario college landscape. Therefore, fundraising does *not* meet this criterion a profession with respect to the criterion of it containing a unique body of knowledge.

Summary of Chapter Four

In this chapter, I presented the description of the participants, findings and a discussion answering each of the research questions. I provided quantitative and qualitative data from the different sources of data - document analysis, interviews and surveys. I presented my analysis of the data and a discussion at the end of each of the research questions that inform the answer to the overall question of whether fundraising is an emerging profession in Ontario's colleges and

how the specific findings relate to the theoretical frameworks that ground this study. The next chapter will focus on a broader discussion of the findings and implications for policy/practice and further research.

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Implications of the Findings

In this chapter, I discuss the conclusions based on my interpretation of the research data with respect to the theoretical framework that grounds this study, and relevant literature reviewed. I begin with some insights related to the context of the profession and then discuss the findings with respect to the defining criteria of a profession and how well the findings of this study met those criteria. Finally, I discuss the implications of the findings for policy, practice and further research.

Alignment of Findings with the Defining Criteria of a Profession

This thesis has explored whether fundraising in participating Ontario's colleges is an emerging profession. The research is based on five characteristics - traits of professionals as classically identified in the scholarly literature: autonomy, formal course of study, association with code of ethics, legislation, and unique body of knowledge, as depicted in Figure 1, Conceptual Framework.

In the next section, I discuss my interpretation of findings in relation to the theoretical framework and the literature.

Autonomy of Practitioners. Autonomy in this context is defined as the extent to which the individual practitioners have the freedom to provide expert advice and independently make practice decisions. In this study, the questions revolved around the individual respondents' ability to determine both strategic charity goals and the subsequent tactical efforts required in attracting those very gifts.

Both knowledge leaders and fundraisers provided insights related to the criterion of autonomy. I found that neither knowledge leaders nor fundraisers reported that they had the unilateral autonomy to decide the overarching strategic fundraising goals of the institution. Knowledge leaders provided insights on institutional approaches to making these higher-level decisions, however, they were not fully autonomous in determining the broader goals.

Some strategic planning for fund-raising included consultations with academic leaders. Some colleges had a fundraising committee at the Board of Governor's level. Or, in the case where there was no fundraising committee, the Board would make the decisions. Ultimately, the fundraising plans were driven by the institutional goals, regardless of whether the college had its own fundraising department or if it had a foundation.

Autonomy of a profession relates to the ability of the practitioner to decide and control their own work (Freidson, 2001; Wheelwright, 2000); and where market and institutions have no control over their professional practices - Freidson (2001) calls this the Division of Labour. Based on the informants' responses to Research Question Number One (RQ1) by knowledge leaders and teachers as fundraisers, the respondents did exhibit varying degrees of autonomy; however, none of the positions described by participants had full autonomy with respect to their fundraising roles and independence at their institutions. The institution's higher organizational levels generally drove strategic decision-making and controlled the strategic-level activities performed by the fundraisers (i.e., the specific target areas for fundraising). With respect to RQ1, while it appears that the fundraisers are moving towards greater autonomy, with greater flexibility in managing schedules and the operational tactics they employ to approach fundraising

– individual fundraisers still lacked the ultimate level of autonomy as characteristic of established professions. As one knowledge leader put it,

I collected all the (divisional fundraising) information with my team, we then went forward to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and had dialogue discussion, did some priority setting, and so on. And after that, we went to the Advancement Committee of our Board of Governors (BoG). So, our BoG owns the fundraising process and endorsed what our priorities would be for the campaign. (KL2)

This lack of full autonomy is not unlike the nursing or the dental hygiene professions. Both professions have a great deal of autonomy within the scope of their practice and standards, however, both nurses and dental hygienists do not have complete autonomy over their work. In the case of nursing, some of their patient care is subject to orders and prescriptions of medical doctors, while dental hygienists' can perform procedures under their own initiative (provided that they are part of their scope of practice) or if ordered by a member of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons (Ontario Laws, 2009).

Fundraisers in Ontario's colleges *do not* fully meet the criterion of professional autonomy; however, their practice is somewhat like a profession in that fundraisers, just like nurses and dental hygienists, do have the autonomy to carry out some of their work independently, without supervision.

Formal Course of Study

Theorists (e.g., Wilensky, 1965; Freidson, 2001; Wheelwright, 2000; Boland and Temple, 2004; Sargeant, 2010) suggest that a formal course of study is required in order to be deemed a

profession. Greenwood (1954) and Wilensky (1965) also identified five stages of a profession – one of which is a formal course of study with an academic institution. Flexner (1930) briefly discussed the differences between professions and vocations and draws a clear distinction between what should be taught in universities and what should not. His belief was that the professions had a higher calling and aimed to solve problems at the societal level. For this paper, I did not review programs offered by universities; but instead concentrated on Ontario college fundraising programs / curricula since this sector was the focus for my research.

Table 6: *Comparison of the Curricula of Two Ontario College Fundraising Programs*

	No. of Courses	Elective	Marketing for Non-Profit Organizations	Advocacy - Government and Stakeholder relations	Finance	Human Resources	Introduction to NFP Management	Strategic Planning and Decision Making	Leadership	Partnerships	Program Evaluation	Introduction to Fundraising	Operations of Fundraising	Donor Centered Fundraising / Relationships	Fundraising Campaigns	Entrepreneurial Fundraising	Major Gifts, Estates	Annual Giving Programs	Special Events	Capstone - Final Application of curriculum	Digital Strategies of Fundraising (ePhilanthropy)	Grant / Proposal Writing	Professionalism - Ethical and Moral	Volunteer Management	Prospect Research	Technology - software for fundraising	Team Building and Relationships	Career Development-resume	Direct Marketing and Merchandise	Stewardship	Planned Giving	Endowments	Legal
Name of Institution																																	
Georgian College	13	2	x									x		x	x			x		x		x	x	x	x	x							
Humber College	20		x	x	x								x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

Source Cindy Gouveia. © Copyright 2018 Cindy Gouveia

An analysis of the Fundraising programs at both Georgian and Humber Colleges revealed some interesting gaps in the curricula. The above chart compares both curricula against over 30

key subject matter areas, identified in the course descriptions and through themes extracted from knowledge leader's interviews – critical to the fundraising sector.

On the surface, it does appear that the Humber 2-year program offers a more comprehensive curriculum with over 20 courses – while the Georgian course requirements over the same 2-year period covers only 15 different subjects. The main difference between the two colleges lies in Humber's greater emphasis on several operational areas including finance, stewardship, planned giving, endowments, direct marketing and relationship building. All-important facets in helping fundraiser's in their day-to-day tasks.

However, upon further review of both curricula, each program is devoid of the more strategic courses - that may help graduates better plan and understand the charitable foundation framework. The Humber program is a full time, in-class method of delivery, whereas the Georgian program is entirely online. This may be one factor that could impact the course outcomes. Both colleges should mandate courses in Strategic Planning, Executive Leadership, Strategic Partnerships, Human Resources, Legal and Entrepreneurial Fundraising. If we are to create future fundraising leaders, then the curriculum in both programs must prepare graduates to become better executives and decision makers with courses that build these crucial skills. Perhaps this may mean partnering with their respective business schools and introducing some business courses into each program for the students, to facilitate their exposure and practice of these critical strategic skills.

A formal course of study in fundraising is not a requirement to obtain a position as an Ontario college fundraiser. From the Fundraisers' survey results, only 24% (n=11) of the respondents had an education related to fundraising, while another 24% (n=11) did not.

Interestingly, only 13% (n=6) of the informants had the highest possible educational designation in the fundraising sector - the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE). These survey results clearly demonstrate that specific fundraising related education of credential is not required to practice as a Fundraiser in an Ontario college.

Moreover, when knowledge leaders were interviewed, only one (14%) suggested that the CFRE is a mandatory requirement to obtain a position within the college's fundraising department. The rest of the knowledge leaders were more concerned about fundraising experience, established partner relationships and a post-secondary credential. Thus, to obtain a college fundraising position, it appears that work experience vastly trumps fundraising-related education.

Donors also suggested that they looked for specific relationship-building skill sets, rather than any specific-fundraising education. Ability to clearly articulate needs, sensitivity to donors' emotional cues and experience appeared to be the most common themes.

With respect to an established profession like nursing, there are formal requirements of educational programs and their graduates that must meet Standards of Practice as established by the profession's governing body. For example, the College of Nurses of Ontario (Standards and Learning, 2017) has a set of practice standards that all nurses must adhere to, within their job descriptions. These practice standards are an absolute requirement, regardless of employer or employment circumstances. Furthermore, the nursing education programs must meet the requirements of a rigorous professional accreditation process to be "approved". In addition, graduates of accredited nursing education programs must successfully complete a standardized national exam – the NCLEX-RN - before they are allowed entry to practice in the profession (College of Nurses of Ontario, 2016).

Similarly, dental hygienists must also successfully complete an accredited full-time program, and all must successfully complete an exam set by the National Dental Hygiene Certification Board (NDHCB) (College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario, 2017) for entry to their practice.

A formal course of study in fundraising within Ontario's colleges is not a requirement to practice. Based on the data that answered this question, Fundraisers in Ontario colleges *do not* meet the unique course of study criterion of a profession.

Association with a Code of Ethics

Some of the participating fundraisers voluntarily became members in the AFP or other fund-raising associations and indicated that they personally abided by the associations established Code of Ethics and Donor Bill of Rights. However, the AFP has no enforcement or regulatory capability to mandate compliance with either the Ethics Code or Donor Rights - thus adherence to these codes is strictly optional and honour-based. In this sense, fundraising *does not* meet the criterion of a profession which requires a code of ethics be not only mandatory, but also clearly enforceable. The fact that even a few of the participants did recognize the importance of these codes of ethics suggests that fundraising as an occupation may be at the very early stage of moving towards professional status. However, the evidence for that assumption is very weak in the findings of this study.

These findings present an interesting dilemma for the fundraising sector – established professions adopt, adhere and enforce a Code of Ethics largely to protect the public interest. Within the fundraising realm, it is possible that donors may be vulnerable to less-than-ethical activities. For example, legacy or bequest gifts are becoming increasingly popular with seniors or individuals who are in their later years. There are a number of ethical checkpoints that should be

considered when meeting with these potential legacy donors. Is the donor of clear mind? Is the fundraiser qualified to determine that they are or are not? Are other family members or the executor present when these discussions occur? Can the donor be assured that they are protected during these types of very personal and sensitive conversations?

In 2016, a 92-year old British “prolific poppy-seller”, Olive Cooke, committed suicide apparently due to the number of requests she had received from charities (Morris, 2016). The report noted that she had received over 3,000 requests per year, leaving her overwhelmed. This article raised concerns about how some charities sold Cooke’s and other donor information, to external charitable organizations resulting in Olive Cooke receiving an overwhelming number of solicitations. These are only a few concerns that an enforceable Code of Ethics could potentially address.

Other established professions have their own Colleges to regulate entry and continued eligibility to practice. For example, the nursing profession has the College of Nurses of Ontario (CNO) which is the governing body for nurses in Ontario. The CNO has a Code of Ethical Behaviour that all Registered Nurses must adhere to (College of Nurses of Ontario, 2017). If nurses are found to have contravened the Code of Ethics, their registration to practice can be revoked, which would disable them from finding employment as nurse.

In addition, Registered Nurses may voluntarily join the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario (RNAO), whose mandate is to advocate for the profession and “healthy public policy, promote excellence in nursing practice, increased nurses’ contribution to shaping the health-care system, and influenced decisions that affect nurses and the public they serve” (Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, 2017, paragraph 1)

In the case of dental hygienists, they too have the College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario (CDHO) which

regulates the dental hygiene profession by setting the requirements to be registered as a dental hygienist and establish practice standards for safe, ethical care for all Ontarians through: Rigorous certification; Ongoing knowledge building; Quality assurance activities; Articulating and promoting practice standards; Establishing requirements for entry to practice; and Enforcing practice standards and professional conduct. (College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario, 2017, paragraph 2)

The College has a Code of Ethics that all dental hygienists must adhere to, and if they do not, the individual can be barred from practice.

There is also a Code of Ethics for fundraisers who belong to the Association of Fundraising Professionals. However, adherence to this code and the association, is strictly voluntary and the association does not have the authority to remove practitioners from practice if they are found to contravene the code. In this way, fundraising *is not* quite like other established professions.

Legislation

Trait theory indicates that there are legislative requirements for an occupation to become a profession. Wilensky (1965) notes that the legislation of a profession usually occurs toward the end of the professionalization process. The findings suggest that there are no specific legislative requirements in Ontario related to how individual fundraisers operate; however, there are legislative requirements of the charitable organizations in which fundraisers are employed. One specific example is that charities cannot use commission-based compensation for their fundraisers. This commission restriction may be an attempt to ensure that the fundraisers put the

financial interests of the charity, donor and beneficiaries first – rather than their own personal gain. If commissions or other forms of “sales incentives” were implemented, there could be undue pressure placed on both the individual fundraiser and donor to close deals. Commissioned fundraisers could also erode the public’s trust in charities and philanthropic gift giving, as Donors would think that their money could be going to unscrupulous fundraiser sales bonuses and not to those in need, research or events/activities the donor wishes to support.

Charitable organizations are also considered tax-exempt by law - which means there is an obligation to ensure the highest level of financial compliance, transparency, reporting and that they operate with tax-payers’ interests also in mind. Essentially, through this special tax exemption, the public purse is helping to subsidize the charity’s daily operations.

Charities or not-for-profit organizations such as academic institutions are vulnerable to the actions of the fundraisers they employ. For instance, a fundraiser could potentially embezzle funds, steal (taking donations of tangible items like equipment, food or clothes) or redirect other goods for personal benefit. These unscrupulous acts would not only compromise the individual’s employment and have criminal consequences - but, they could also have broader implications like compromising the brand and registration of the institutions or charity. The Canada Revenue Agency, the Federal governing body of charities, could de-register a charity for these criminal actions.

The legislation of healthcare professionals in Ontario was created to protect the public from healthcare practitioners in that they have the potential to “do harm” to their clients. In the early 1980’s, the Ontario government engaged in the Health Professions Legislative Review, which in 1991, led to the Regulated Health Professions Act (RHPA) (Adams, 2003). This act is responsible for overseeing the regulatory colleges that govern healthcare professions with a core

focus on public interest. The professional colleges have the authority to set standards, investigate complaints and discipline members who have contravened the standards as set out by these colleges (Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, 2017).

There are currently twenty-six regulated healthcare professions that include nursing and dental hygiene. Each of these professions have their own act to legislate the activities that they can perform under their scope of practice and the terms under which they can practice. Topics such as terms, definitions and scope of practice are outlined in the code. For example, the Dental Hygiene Act, 1991, S.O. 1991, c. 22, specifically states that dental hygienists can “scale teeth and root planning including curetting surrounding tissue, perform orthodontic and restorative procedures, and prescribing, dispensing, compounding or selling a drug designated in the regulations”. In this case, the activities of a dental hygienist, is determined by law.

What sets these healthcare professions apart from fundraising is that nursing and dental hygiene have sets of enforceable standards of practice and regulation. There are specific educational, standards of practice, code of ethics, and ongoing practitioner licensure requirements for nurses and dental hygienists to practice. The legislation of healthcare practitioners and the standards of practice requirements lead to a level of uniformity and standard professional practice requirements.

Similarly, with respect to state legislation, Ontario college fundraising does have some limited aspects of legislative control required in establishing a profession. Compensation restrictions, tax exemption and potential criminal enforcement – keep charities and individual fundraisers in compliance.

There is no legislation that determines the entry requirements and standards of practice for fundraisers in Ontario colleges, therefore, fundraising *is not* like other established professions with respect to legislation.

Unique Body of Knowledge

A unique body of knowledge is one of the professional traits that define a profession (Wilensky, 1965; Boland, 2004). Based on the data collected, there is, to some extent, a body of knowledge that exists in the Ontario colleges' fundraising sector. There are industry / trade related resources, conferences (local and international) as well as journals that are dedicated to fundraising. However, the bulk of the informants cited knowledge and practices derived from the United States – in particular the AFP. One must admit that there are commonalities in fundraising between the two nations. Yet there are specific differences impacting the Canadian sector including differing donor motivation, tax implications, solicitation strategies and funding priorities – not to mention how government intersects with the charitable sector.

However, in my literature review (e.g. Gaudiani, 2005; Glickler, 2005; Hardy, 2011), I found an absence of any discussion of specific required knowledge explicitly related to Ontario college fundraising. In fact, the absence of a unique body of knowledge is consistent with the findings from an international context (Cabone, 2010; More Partnership, 2014). This absence of any specific research or knowledge means there is a lack of awareness of Ontario's college's private funding needs – specifically around donor perception and provincial government legislation funding, both by college institutions and its students. Without common industry-specific knowledge, Ontario college fundraisers are ill-prepared to fully understand impending demographic trends, respond to potential tax changes and intelligently counter any controversial

funding or operational restrictions imposed on the college-sector generally, or to fundraising specifically, by the various levels of government.

Similarly, healthcare professions, like nursing and dental hygienists for example, do not have a unique body of knowledge. Their practice is based on the application of a number of other disciplines and fields such as psychology, sociology, chemistry, and physics, for instance. However, Nursing does have elements of a unique body of knowledge based on praxis theories specifically relating to nursing praxis.

While there are resources related to fundraising, along with programs and the Certified Fundraising Executive credential, to suggest that there is a unique body of knowledge that is as rigorous and robust as other established professions would be a stretch. Therefore, fundraising in relationship to the unique body of knowledge criterion is *not* like a recognized profession.

Conclusion

While the findings of this study are not generalizable, my interpretation of the findings suggests a number of conclusions and implications that may be of interest to colleges beyond those who participated in this study, as well as other higher education organizations that depend on private funding support. In addition, the findings may be of interest to other vocational groups that may seek to move to professional status.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Based on this research and my interpretation of findings, the next section outlines some implications for policy and practice that may be helpful to the college fundraising sector in becoming more effective in fundraising in Ontario's colleges and what the future may hold for this growing area of interest.

Canadian-Specific Resources for Students in Fundraising Programs. The findings identified a lack of Canadian specific fundraising resources for Teachers and Students in college fundraising programs in Ontario. The research findings suggest that although there are general resources available, there are none that are Canadian specific and consolidated into a holistic textbook, let alone fundraising in Ontario colleges. Moreover, in the absence of a consolidated textbooks, how can colleges assure industry that there is some level of consistency among and between graduates of the program entering the workforce? It is important to all the stakeholders; donors, employers, fundraisers and the charitable sector at large that the general public understand what to expect and the standards of practice in fundraising activities. The creation and adoption of Canadian-specific resources can provide some assurances to the not-for-profit employers as to what competencies and knowledge graduates will have upon graduation.

Impact of New Funding Formula for Ontario Colleges on Fundraising. At the time of writing this paper, the Ontario government announced a shift in the funding formulas for colleges. To summarize, the funding will change from a per-student formula, to block and outcomes-based funding. While these changes will not be implemented until the 2020-2021 academic year, there may be significant impact to how fundraising may change for the college sector in Ontario (Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development, 2016).

In the current funding model, the incentive is always to grow due to the per-student funding model. In essence, the more students a college enrolls, the more funding it would receive. Hence, much of the fundraising efforts were aligned with student access (i.e. scholarships and awards) and capital (i.e., buildings to house as many students as a college could enroll). Under the new model, a college would receive a pre-determined amount of funding based on X students (like universities) and the incentive to grow is greatly reduced. What will

the future of college fundraising look like? What impact does the change in funding formula have on college fundraising stakeholders? These questions need to be explored with respect to the implications for fundraising as they will be an important resource for the Ontario colleges. Based on my own considerable experience in the college sector and my interpretation of the new funding formula I anticipate a shift in the focus of raising funds to augment operational expenses such as program delivery (supplant versus supplement) and labour (endowed positions).

Creation of Provincial Legislation for Fundraisers. The success and sustainability of a charitable organization is based on a number of factors including marketing, the internal capacity and talent, the cause it represents and most importantly, its reputation and public trust. A number of recent events and news stories have severely compromised the public confidence in charities. There are signals that more and more charities realize this and are looking for ways to increase the level of public trust. These signals include charities adopting and adhering to Imagine Canada standards, voluntary membership to an association and adherence to the ethical codes, as well as Fundraisers themselves investing in their individual professional development in acquiring the Certified Fund-Raising Executive (CFRE). Donors are asking for more accountability through active participation of drafting gift and donation agreements, measurable outcomes and cancellation clauses if the donation is not impacting the cause in which the Donors wished to invest.

One way of providing the public assurances is to create a provincial legislation for fundraisers covering the requirements of how fundraisers practice. The proposed legislation could include the definition of fundraiser, which surprisingly, even the Canada Revenue Agency does not define. It could include a cooling off period for substantial amounts (to be determined) consistent with consumer protection act. Bequest-giving should include independent legal advice

from an attorney. A formal complaint process and mechanism within the statute are needed to ensure there is protection for Donors. A code of ethical conduct which requires the individual to behave in certain ways is essential. Other areas of this legislation may include regulation of bonds, insurance, anti-harassment of donors, and trust accounts. In my web search, I found one comprehensive resource of the Fundraising Institute Australia that addresses Principles of Fundraising Practice (code of conduct, definitions, etc.), Standards of Fundraising Practice (standards that cover solicitation programs), Complaints Process (formal process by which individuals can file a complaint), and Enforcement (repercussions to those individuals or organizations that contravene the standards). While this association is comprised of voluntary membership, the principles and scope of these “rules” can be used as a starting point to create legislation in Ontario. The Fundraising Institute of Australia (Fundraising Institute of Australia, 2017) has developed a standard that could be modified to be adopted as legislation for Ontario fundraisers. During the course of my research, I consulted with a retired provincial judge, the Honourable Justice Marvin Zuker, (permission to name granted) who reviewed and modified the guidelines of the Fundraising Institute of Australia to reflect the current provincial context. Judge Zuker’s mock legislation includes all the tenants as mentioned above and changed to reflect Ontario’s provincial legislation.

The creation of appropriate legislation may lead to future licensure and a possible devoted governing body in Ontario whose sole purpose is to regulate the activities that Fundraisers perform, and to ensure public trust does not erode to the point where Donors just simply stop giving.

Implications for Further Research

During my literature review, I found very little research literature related to Ontario college fundraising. This may be because colleges are relatively young (created in 1967), compared to other sub-sectors such as religious, university or social service fundraising institutions. Moreover, even discussion of any fundraising within the Canadian landscape seemed sparse compared to our US counterparts. Moving beyond the geographical and sector borders, the scarcity and absence of unique scholarly bodies of knowledge related to fundraising is consistent in the US and the UK (Cabone, 2010; More Partnership, 2014). Research topics could include, but not be limited to, whether fundraisers are motivated to make fundraising a profession or whether there are gaps between fundraising program outcomes and employment/employer demands.

Due to the gap in Canadian-centric fundraising literature, there is a significant opportunity for future researchers who are interested in this topic to make an impactful contribution to this area. The increase of academic literature related to fundraising across Canada would level set and increase the knowledge required to improve and grow the charitable sector.

Conclusion

In Canada, there are 86,000 charities of which 46,000 are in Ontario. Provincial college charities are a small fraction of that number; however, they perform critical activities - supporting the realization of the colleges' missions and assisting students in meeting their educational goals. Furthermore, the work performed by college fundraisers generates measurable economic activity and strengthens our social fabric; helping others succeed and become upstanding contributing members of our society.

The research question in this study asked, “Is fundraising in Ontario’s colleges perceived to be an emerging profession?” Based on the findings of my study, I conclude that fundraising in the Ontario college system is *not yet* a profession - even though one might see some embryonic signals suggesting a slow evolution towards professionalization on several fronts - consistent with the findings in the UK which concluded that “(fundraising) is increasingly professional, but not yet quite a profession” (More Partnership and Richmond Associates, 2014, *p. 24*).

When I tested the professional criteria - autonomy, formal course of study, state legislation, professional association with code of ethics and unique body of knowledge, fundraising *did not* fully meet the requirements of any of these criteria. However, fundraising can be considered a para-profession, or semi-profession, that is somewhere in between a profession and an occupation (Volti, 2012, *p. 154*). This is specifically evident in the common courses of the programs (body of knowledge) as well as the level of autonomy that the fundraisers have in generating their own strategy on how to garner support.

My overall perception after having completed this study is that the best word that describes the current status of fundraising in Ontario colleges is a state of “status quo”. There was little or no questioning by the participants as to whether practices can or should be improved or whether there was a need for ethics standards codified in law and enforced. There appeared to be little or no sharing of best practices among Ontario’s Colleges – from an academic perspective for those in fundraising programs – and also among college foundations and advancement departments themselves. I question how the drive for professionalism can ever be achieved when I found that Fundraisers and their leaders tended to publicly hide the fact that they are fundraisers – there seemed to be a lack of pride in declaring this. And finally – without those very donors and government actors showing some interest and pushing to better codify

charitable regulations, standard and ethics – it will be exceptionally difficult for Ontario college fundraisers to become considered a full profession any time soon.

Fundraising and the charitable sector is based on public trust. Fundraisers, and the organizations in which they are employed have a moral, ethical and fiduciary duty to carry out the work to help those who are in need. How donor's dollars are handled, reported on, invested and spent is critical to the continued trust that will grow the charitable sector and continue to serve beneficiaries – the Ontario colleges in this study. Fundraising should continue to move along the continuum to professionalization due to these reasons. This is particularly urgent in the adherence to the ethics trait. Moreover, as a recognized profession, it would provide protection for the donors and the public at large – ensuring that Canada continues to grow and thrive where the charitable sector serves the neediest and improves society as a whole.

References

- Abbott, A. (1981, January). Status and Status Strain in the Professions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(4), 819-835.
- Abbott, A. (2010, April 20). Varieties of Ignorance. *American Sociology*(41), 174–189.
doi:10.1007/s12108-010-9094-x
- Ackroyd, S. (2016). Sociological and organizational theories of professions and professionalism. In M. Dent, I. Bourgeault, J.-L. Denis, & E. Kuhlmann, *The Routledge Companion to the Professions and Professionalism* (pp. 15-30). New York, USA: Routledge. Retrieved August 29, 2017
- Adams, T. I. (2003, August). Professionalization, Gender and Female-dominated Professions: Dental Hygiene in Ontario. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 40(3), 267-289. Retrieved June 4, 2017
- Alamenciak, T., & Mills, C. (2012, November 24). *Salvation Army: Man at centre of missing toys scandal a former teacher with a love of motorcycles*. Retrieved from The Toronto Star:
http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2012/11/24/salvation_army_man_at_centre_of_missing_toys_scandal_a_former_teacher_with_a_love_of_motorcycles.html
- Association of Fundraising Professionals. (2009). *AFP: The Social Network for Young Fundraising Professionals*. Retrieved February 25, 2016, from Association of Fundraising Professionals: <http://www.afpnet.org/Join/content.cfm?ItemNumber=9496>
- Association of Fundraising Professionals. (2009). *Diversity in Fundraising*. Retrieved from Association of Fundraising Professionals:
<http://www.afpnet.org/About/content.cfm?ItemNumber=3120>

- Association of Fundraising Professionals. (2016, February 20). *About*. Retrieved from Association of Fundraising Professionals: <http://afptoronto.org/about/>
- Banducci, B. (Winter 2005, Issue 50). Women's philanthropic leadership: How is it different? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, p39-53.
- Boland, H. G. (2004). Measuring Professionalism. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43) 5-20.
- Breeze, B. &. (2011). *Giving In Evidence - Fundraising From Philanthropy in European Universities*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Brint, S. (1993). Elliot Freidson's Contribution to Sociology of Professions. *Work and Occupations*, 20(3), 259-287.
- Broadbent, E. (1999). *Building on Strength: Improving Governance and Accountability in Canada's Charitable Sector*. Toronto: J. W. McConnell Family Foundation.
- Broder, P. (2001). *The Legal Definition of Charity and Canada Customs and Revenue Agency's Charitable Registration Process*. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.
- Bromely, B. (2001). 1601 Preamble: The State's Agenda for Charity. *Charity Law at the Pacific Rim Conference*, (p. 28). Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved September 7, 2015, from <http://beneficgroup.com/pdf/The%20State's%20Agenda%20for%20Charity.pdf>
- Cabone, T. (2010). The Normative Structure of University Fundraising Behaviours. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 3(81), 339-365. Retrieved July 27, 2018
- Canada Foundation for Innovation. (2013, May). *Policy and Program Guide*. Retrieved from Canada Foundation for Innovation: http://www.innovation.ca/sites/default/files/essential_documents/Policy_and_program_guide_en.pdf

Canada Revenue Agency. (2011, 6 1). *Charities Directorate*. Retrieved from Canada Revenue Agency: http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/chrts/bt/mssn_vsn-eng.html

Canada Revenue Agency. (2016, January 27). *How do I calculate my charitable tax credits?* Retrieved from Canada Revenue Agency: <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/dnrs/svngs/clmng1-eng.html>

Canada Revenue Agency. (2016, December 29). *Report on the Charities Program*. Retrieved February 25, 2017, from Canada Revenue Agency: <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/chrts/bt/nnlrprt/menu-eng.html>

Canadian Association of Gift Planners. (2015). *About Gift Planning*. Retrieved from Canadian Association of Gift Planners: <https://www.cagp-acpdp.org/en/about-gift-planning>

Canadian Dental Hygienists Association. (n.d.). *About CDHA*. Retrieved from Canadian Dental Hygienists Association: http://www.cdha.ca/cdha/About_folder/About_CDHA/CDHA/About/About_CDHA.aspx?hkey=6cb6ef64-534e-40c4-9521-bd273dbd075e

Canadian Dental Hygienists Association. (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved from Canadian Dental Hygienists Association: http://www.cdha.ca/cdha/About_folder/History_folder/CDHA/About/History.aspx?hkey=065b136f-72d3-4a84-a7aa-51cc7b519cd5

Canadian Nurses Association. (2017). *About CNA*. Canadian Nurses Association. Retrieved June 4, 2017, from <https://www.cna-aiic.ca/en/about-cna>

Canadian Nursing Association. (2017). *History*. Canadian Nursing Association. Retrieved June 4, 2017, from <https://www.cna-aiic.ca/en/about-cna/history>

Certified Fund Raising Executive. (2014). *2014 CFRE Annual Report*. Alexandria, VA : CFRE.

CFRE. (2016). *About*. Retrieved from Certified Fund Raising Executive:

<http://www.cfre.org/about/>

Chobot, R. B. (2004). Fundraising Credentialing. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43), 31-49.

Clark, I., Moran, G., Skolnik, M., & Trick, D. (2009). *Academic Transformation; The Forces Shaping Higher Education in Ontario*. Montreal and Kingston: Queen's Policies Studies Series, McGill-Queen's University Press.

College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario. (2017). *About the College*. Retrieved from College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario: <http://www.cdho.org/about-the-college/about/what-we-do>

College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario. (2017). *Requirements*. Retrieved from College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario: <http://www.cdho.org/my-cdho/registration/requirements>

College of Nurses of Ontario. (2016, March 9). *Nurse Educators and Schools*. Retrieved August 13, 2017, from College of Nurses of Ontario: <http://www.cno.org/en/become-a-nurse/entry-to-practice-examinations/nclex-rn/nurse-educators-and-schools/>

College of Nurses of Ontario. (2017). *Ethics*. Retrieved from College of Nurses of Ontario: <http://www.cno.org/fr/exercice-de-la-profession/educational-tools/learning-modules/ethics/>

Colleges Ontario. (2015). *Research*. Retrieved from Colleges Ontario:

http://www.collegesontario.org/research/2013-environmental_scan.html

Council for Advancement and Support in Education. (2016). *About CASE*. Retrieved from Council for Advancement and Support in Education:

http://www.case.org/About_CASE.html

- Council for Advancement and Support of Education. (2013). *North American Compensation Survey*. New York: CASE.
- Cullity, M. (2013). *Charity and Politics in Canada - A Legal Analysis*. Edmonton: The Pemsel Case Foundation.
- Durkheim, E. (1893). *The Division of Labour in Society* .
- Egan, K. (2014, June 18). *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ottawacitizen.com/news:>
<http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/six-figure-pay-at-charities-this-aint-a-lemonade-stand>
- E-Laws Ontario. (1991). Nursing Act 1991. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Queens Printer for Ontario 2012-2017. Retrieved from <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/91n32>
- Éric Caron Malenfant, A. L. (2010). *Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population*. Statistics Canada.
- Forsyth, P. B., & Danisiewicz, T. J. (1985). Toward a Theory of Professionalization. *Work and Occupations*, 12(1), 59-76.
- Foster, M., Meinhard, A., Berger, I., & Wright, P. (2005). From Philanthropic Strategy to Strategic Philanthropy: Selected Canadian Case Studies. *Centre for Voluntary Sector Studies - Ryerson University*.
- Foster, M., Meinhard, A., Berger, I., & Wright, P. (2005). From Philanthropic Strategy to Strategic Philanthropy: Selected Canadian Case Studies. *Centre for Voluntary Sector Studies, Ryerson University*.
- Freidson, E. (1984). The Changing Nature of Professional Control. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 1-20. Retrieved March 29, 2015

- Freidson, E. (1999). Theory of Professionalism: Method and Substance. *International Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 117-129. Retrieved March 20, 2015
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, The Third Logic, On the Practice of Knowledge*. Great Britain: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved March 28, 2015
- Fundraising Institute of Australia. (2017). *Code*. Retrieved from Fundraising Institute of Australia: <https://www.fia.org.au/pages/fia-code.html>
- Gaudiani, C. L. (2005). Thinking about the why of giving. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (47), 5-11.
- George Brown College. (2012, October 25). *George Brown College*. Retrieved from George Brown College Launches Success at Work – Largest Fundraising Campaign in Its History: http://www.georgebrown.ca/releases/success_at_work.aspx
- Getting Fund-Raiser Certification*. (2011, March 20). Retrieved from Academic OneFile: [http%3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA252116775%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D25e11cd51665e061c4d8535a096a12e9](http://www.galegroup.com/ps/doi/3DGALE%257CA252116775%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D25e11cd51665e061c4d8535a096a12e9)
- Gheewala. (2016). *Thesis Proposal*.
- Glickler, J. (2005). Advancing in advancement: A self-efficacy study of development practitioners in higher education. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Gousmett, M. J. (2009). *University of Canterbury Research Repository*. Retrieved from University of Canterbury: <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/3448>
- Gouveia, C. O. (2016). Resource Development in Ontario's Colleges – What's the Future? *College Quarterly*, 19(1). Retrieved August 1, 2018, from <http://collegequarterly.ca/2016-vol19-num01-winter/resource-development-in-ontarios-colleges-whats-the-future.html>

- Government of Australia. (2000, August 23). *Chapter 14: The Preamble to the Statute of Elizabeth*. Retrieved from Charities Definition Inquiry: Government of Australia: http://www.cdi.gov.au/report/cdi_chap14.htm
- Government of Australia. (2000, 08 30). *Inquiry into the Definition of Charities and Related Organizations*. Commonwealth of Australia 2000. Retrieved from Inquiry into the Definition of Charities and Related Organizations: <http://www.cdi.gov.au/html/terms.htm>
- Government of Canada. (2011, December 14). Retrieved September 7, 2015, from Justice Laws Website: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-3.3/section-149.1-20101215.html>
- Government of Canada. (2013, July 29). *Canada Education Savings Grant (CESG)*. Retrieved from Service Canada: <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/goc/cesg.shtml>
- Government of Canada. (2016, December 16). *Justice Laws Website*. Retrieved from Canadian Anti-Spam Legislation: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/E-1.6/index.html>
- Government of Canada. (2016, December 16). *Justice Laws Website*. Retrieved from Justice Laws Website: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-21/page-1.html#h-1>
- Government of Ontario. (2016). *Ontario Research Fund*. Retrieved from Government of Ontario: <https://www.ontario.ca/search/ontario-research-fund>
- Greenlee, J. S., & Gordon, T. P. (1998). The Impact of Professional Solicitors on Fund-Raising in Charitable Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(3), 277-299.
- Grossnickle, T. R., & Aldrich, E. E. (2004). Compensation: The Intersection of Valuation and Accountability. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43) 51-62.
- Hall, H. (2004). Gender Differences in Giving: Going, Going, Gone? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43) 71-81.

Hall, H. (2010, April 4). *People Skills No Longer Sufficient for Fund Raisers; Globalization, and Changes in Demographics and Technology, Will Transform the Profession*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile:

http://go.galegroup.com/ps/2Fi.do?3Fid%3DGALE%257CA225864232%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D741d130dc07905a79c4f7d27b3029c20

Hardy, P. (2011). Research Results for a History of Philanthropy in Canada: Extended Abstract.

Nonprofits and Charities in a Changing World (pp. 1-19). Association of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research. Retrieved from Association for Nonprofit and Social

Economy Research: <http://www.anser-ares.ca/files/conf11/papers/Hardy%20paper.pdf>

Hardy, P. (2014). A History of Philanthropy in Canada. In G. Mallabone, & G. Mallabone (Ed.),

Excellence in Fundraising in Canada (Vol. 2, pp. 13-26). Toronto: Civil Sector Press, a Division of Hillborn Group Ltd.

Hardy, P. (2014, 08 30). *Links & Resources*. Retrieved from The Tunnelwood Group:

<http://tunnelwood.com/links.html>

Harrison, W. B. (1995). College relations and fund-raising expenditures: Influencing the

probability of alumni giving to higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(1), 73-84.

Holmes, K. (2016). *Thesis Proposal*.

How Best to Deal With the Shortage of Top Fund Raisers. (2007, October 4). Retrieved from

Chronicle of Philanthropy:

<http://go.galegroup.com/ps/2Fi.do?3Fid%3DGALE%257CA16942686>

7%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26
 asid%3D891570703fb1b410a68bb1b29218c8a8

Hudes, S. (2016, October 16). *Philanthropist 'questioned the credibility' of CAMH before rescinding donation*. Retrieved January 7, 2017, from The Toronto Star:

<https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2016/10/01/philanthropist-questioned-the-credibility-of-camh-before-rescinding-donation.html>

Iarrobino, J. D. (2006). Turnover in the advancement profession. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(2), 141-169.

J.W. McConnell Family Foundation. (2016). *RECODE*. Retrieved from RECODE:

<http://www.re-code.ca/about>

Jasper, C. R. (2005). Women Executives and Business Owners: A New Philanthropy. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (50) 55-68.

Johnstone, B. D., & Marcucci, P. N. (2010). Johnstone, Bruce D.; Marcucci, Pamela N. In B. D. Johnstone, & P. N. Marcucci, *Johnstone, Bruce D.; Marcucci, Pamela N.* (p. 317).

Baltimore, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved March 24, 2018

Joslyn, H. (2010, September 6). *Women and Minorities Lag in Getting Top Fund-Raising Jobs*.

Retrieved from Academic OneFile:

http://3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA237071159%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D5c8398ad353f523cea4157ee8647c863

Kelly, S. G. (2009, February). Private Money for the Public Good: Higher Education

Philanthropy in Canada and the United States. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 1(2).

- Kidder, R. M. (2004). Foundation codes of ethics: Why do they matter, what are they, and how are they relevant to philanthropy? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (45) 75-83.
- Kitching, A. (2006, February 28). *Charitable Purpose, Advocacy and the Income Tax Act*. Retrieved from Parliamentary Information and Research Service:
<http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/prb0590-e.htm>
- Klegon, D. (1978). The sociology of professions. *Work and Occupations*, 5(3), 259-283.
- Lalonde, A. (2015). *Impact of Embedded Remediation in Literacy Skills for First Semester Practical Nursing Students in one Ontario College Program*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Lang, D. (2001). *Financing Higher Education in Canada*. Toronto: Higher Education Group, OISE/UT, Technical Report.
- Lang, D. (2005). Formulaic Approaches to the Funding of Colleges and Universities. *International Handbook of Educational Policy*, 1-21.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A Qualitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personal Lsychology*, 563-575.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personal Psychology*, 28, pp. 563-575.
- Levy, J. D. (2004). The growth of fundraising: Framing the impact of research and literature on education and training. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43) 21-30.
- Logan, D. W. (1953). Report of the committee on the law and practice relating to charitable trusts. *The Modern Law Review*, 16(3), 343-358.

Logan, D. W. (1953). Report of the Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Charitable Trusts . *The Modern Law Review*, 343-358.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992). Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13, 103-123.

Maley, F. (2009, April). *They Gave At The Office*. Retrieved from Business North Carolina:
<http://www.businessnc.com/articles/2009-04/they-gave-at-the-office-category/>

Mallabone, G. (2014). *Excellence in Fundraising in Canada* (Vol. 2). (G. Mallabone, Ed.)
Toronto: Civil Sector Press, a Division of the Hillborn Group.

McLaughlin, K., Muldoon, O. T., & Moutray, M. (2009, August 10). Gender, gender roles and completion of nursing education: A longitudinal study. *Nursing Education Today*, pp. 303-307.

McMaster University. (2006). *Inspiring Innovation: The Campaign for McMaster University*.
Retrieved May 20, 2015, from McMaster University:
<http://www.mcmaster.ca/mcmastercampaign/default.html>

Mehta, K., & Greenfield, D. (2014). Diversity in Fundraising. In G. Mallabone, *Excellence in Fundraising in Canada* (Vol. 2, pp. 121-132). Toronto: Civil Sector Press, a Division of The Hillborn Group Ltd.

Milling, L. A. (2010, July 30). A Grand History. *RDH*, 30(7). Retrieved from RDH:
<http://www.rdhmag.com/articles/print/volume-30/issue-7/features/a-grand-history.html>

Minister of Justice. (2014, June 27 2014). Consolidation Income Tax Act. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

- Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development. (2016, April 29). *College Funding Model Consultation Paper*. Retrieved from Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development: <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/Audiences/colleges/cff/fundingreform.html>
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. (1991). Health Workforce Planning and Regulatory Affairs Division. *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*. Ontario, Canada: Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Retrieved June 4, 2017, from <http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/hhrs/about/rhpa.aspx>
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. (2017, 05 26). *Regulated Health Professions*. Retrieved from Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care: http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/hhrs/about/regulated_professions.aspx
- Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. (2009, May). *Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Policy Framework*. Retrieved from 2.0 Finance and Administration, Banking, Borrowing and Investment, Operating Procedure: <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/documents/BankingandInvestmentOpProc.pdf>
- Moore, C. J. (2005, October 13). *Wanted: a Little Respect*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile: http%3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA146949331%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3Def00470020092cc4cb2639d94af42fd5
- More Partnership. (2012). *Review of Philanthropy in UK Higher Education: 2012 status report and challenges for the next decade*. England: Higher Education Fundraising Council of England (HEFCE). Retrieved July 27, 2018

- More Partnership and Richmond Associates. (2014). *An emerging profession: The Higher Education Philanthropy Workforce*. England: Higher Education Fundraising Council of England (HEFCE). Retrieved July 27, 2018
- Morris, S. (2016, January 20). *Poppy seller who killed herself got 3,000 charity requests for donations a year*. Retrieved from The Guardian:
<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jan/20/poppy-seller-who-killed-herself-got-up-to-3000-charity-mailings-a-year>
- Muzzin, L., & Martimianakis, M. A. (2016). The professoriate and professionalism in the academy. In M. Dent, I. L. Bourgeault, J.-L. Denis, & E. Kuhlmann, *The Routledge Companion to the Professions and Professionalism* (pp. 317-328). New York: Routledge. Retrieved August 29, 2017
- Nichols, J. E. (2003). Repositioning Fundraising in the 21st Century. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(2), 163-171.
- Nicholson, W. (2007). Leading Where it Counts: An Investigation of the Leadership Styles and Behaviors that Define College and University Presidents as Successful fund raisers. *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 7(4), 256-270.
- Nilsen, M. (2007). Fund raisers More Committed To Causes Than Organizations? *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 7(3), 249-251.
- Norrie, K. &. (2011). Tuition Fee Policy Options for Ontario. Toronto. *Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario-An Agency of the Government of Canada*.
- Norrie, K., & Lennon, M. C. (2011). *Tuition Fee Policy Options for Ontario*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario-An Agency of the Government of Canada.

- Nyman, J. P. (2018). Identifying the Roles of University Fundraisers in Securing Transformational Gifts: Lessons from Canada. *Studies in Higher Education*, 7(43), 1227-1240. Retrieved July 31, 2018
- Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee (OPGT). (2015, December 8). *Charities*. Retrieved from Ministry of the Attorney General:
<https://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/family/pgt/charities/>
- Olssen, M., & Peters Michael, A. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: from the free market to market capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-145.
- Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, 2002. (S.O. 2002). Ontario, Canada.
- Ontario Financing Authority. (2015, September 30). *Province's Consolidated Debt Portfolio*. Retrieved February 20, 2016, from Ontario Financing Authority:
http://www.ofina.on.ca/borrowing_debt/debt.htm
- Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. (1997, July 8). Policy on Scholarships and Awards. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Human Rights Commission.
- Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. (n.d.). Policy on Scholarships and Awards. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Human Rights Commission.
- Ontario Law Reform Commission. (1996). *Report on the Law of Charities*. Toronto: Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- Ontario Laws. (2009, December 15). *Dental Hygiene Act, 1991, S.O. 1991, c. 22*. Retrieved August 13, 2017, from Ontario: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/91d22>

- Perry, S. L. (2012). Diversity, donations, and disadvantage: The implications of personal fundraising for racial diversity in evangelical outreach ministries. *Review of Religious Research*, 53(4), 397-418.
- Petty, J. G. (2007). Introduction: Union gives strength--diversity and fundraising. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(3), 171-175.
- Picarda, H. (1999). The Law and Practice Relating to Charities. In H. Picarda, *The Law and Practice Relating to Charities* (p. 9). London: Butterworths.
- Polizotto, S. (2000). A Steady Ascent: How Institutions Can Avoid the Peaks and Valleys of Fundraising. *Currents*.
- Pollack, R. (2003). Beyond Philanthropy. *Currents*.
- Pollack, R. (May 1998). Divide and Conquer. *Currents*.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 56-68.
- Professional Association of Volunteer Leaders - Ontario. (2015). *Vision Values*. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from Professional Association of Volunteer Leaders - Ontario:
<http://www.pavro.on.ca/vision-values>
- Quinlan, S. (1997). Transforming Your College To Meet The New Financial Realities: The Seneca Experience. *6th International Conference For Community & Technical College Chairs, Deans and Other Organizational Leaders* (p. 11). Reno, Nevada: Academy.
- Rae, B. (2005). *Ontario: A Leader in Learning*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Registered Nurses Association of Ontario. (2017). *About RNAO*. Retrieved from Registered Nurses Association of Ontario: <http://rnao.ca/about>

- Registering to Practise Medicine in Ontario*. (2014, August 22). Retrieved from The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario: <http://www.cpsso.on.ca>
- Richard, L. C. (2005). The New Philanthropists . *Education Next*, 5(4).
- Rohanyati, M. N. (2016). Philanthropic Fundraising of Higher Education Institutions: A Review of the Malaysian and Australian Perspectives. *Sustainability*, 8(20). Retrieved July 26, 2018
- Roux, G., & Halstead, J. A. (2009). *Issues and Trends in Nursing: Essential Knowledge for Today and Tomorrow*. Joe & Bartlett Learning. Retrieved June 4, 2017
- Ryan, G., & Palmer, J. (2005). Leading the Fundraising Effort. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 132, 43-48.
- Ryan, L. (2006). Behavioral Characteristics of Higher Education Fund-raisers. *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 6(4), 282-288.
- Ryerson University. (2015). *Supporting Ryerson*. Retrieved from Make Your Mark: <http://www.ryerson.ca/supporting/makeyourmark/>
- Saiia, D. H., Carroll, A. B., & Buchholtz, A. K. (2003). Philanthropy as strategy when corporate charity "begins at home". *Business and Society*, 42(2), 169.
- Salamon, L. M. (1999). The Nonprofit Sector at a Crossroads: The Case of America. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 5-23.
- Salamon, L. M. (2010). Putting the Civil Society Sector on the Economic Map of the World. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 81(2), pp. 167-210.
- Salamon, L. M. (2014). *Leverage for Good - An Introduction to the New Frontiers of Philanthropy and Social Investment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sargeant, A. (2010, April 4). *Making Fund Raising a Real Profession: Next Steps*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile:

[http%3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA225864216%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D21f43ea49da231cf0a7a0fdb030652db](http://go.galegroup.com/Fps/Fi.do?Fid=3DGALE%257CA225864216%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D21f43ea49da231cf0a7a0fdb030652db)

Satterwhite, C., & Cedja, B. (2005). Higher Education Fund Raising: What is the President to Do? *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 5(4), 333-342.

Scaife, W. &. (2006). Change Agents or Counting the Change: Insights Into the role of Fundraisers in Australia Society and Issues Facing Their Professionalization. *Social Change in the 21st Century*, 1-12. Retrieved July 28, 2018, from <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/5986/>

Schwinn, E. (2001, June 28). *Tips for Hiring Fund Raisers From Outside the Nonprofit World*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile:

[tp%3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA147060456%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D498edd9ae79b144b346d396ca5a7ed74](http://go.galegroup.com/Fps/Fi.do?Fid=3DGALE%257CA147060456%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D498edd9ae79b144b346d396ca5a7ed74)

Schwinn, E., & Sommerfeld, M. (2002, April 18). *Revolving-Door Dilemma*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile:

[http%3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA147005528%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D18ac373e68d47330fe18cc35a31bda30](http://go.galegroup.com/Fps/Fi.do?Fid=3DGALE%257CA147005528%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D18ac373e68d47330fe18cc35a31bda30)

Sidel, M. (2003). The Struggle for Hershey: Community Accountability and the Law in Modern American Philanthropy. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 1-61.

- Slack, R., & Campbell, D. (2008). Corporate "philanthropy strategy" and "strategic philanthropy". *Business and Society*, 47(2), 187-212.
- Smith, A. (1776, May 29). *An Inquiry In To The Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Vol. 2). (S. M. Soares, Ed.) MetaLibri Digital Library. Retrieved from https://www.ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA_WealthNations_p.pdf
- Smith, D. C., Cameron, D. M., Gorbet, F., Henderson, C., & Stephenson, B. M. (1996). *Excellence Accessibility Responsibility*. Report of the Advisory Panel on Future Directions for Postsecondary Education, Ministry of Education and Training, Toronto. Retrieved January 11, 2015, from <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/futuree.html>
- Smith, Z. (2010). Assessing Educational Fund Raisers for Competence and Fit Rather Than Experience: A challenge to Conventional Hiring Practices. *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 10(2), 87-97.
- Snobelen, J. C. (1995, November 30). Operatng Support 1996-97. *Policy Directive - Ministry of Education and Training*, 2. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ministry of Education and Training. Retrieved January 11, 2015
- Standards and Learning*. (2017). Retrieved from College of Nurses of Ontario: <http://www.cno.org/en/learn-about-standards-guidelines/>
- Stephens, C. R. (2004). Building the Fundraising Team. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43), 83-94.
- Stern, K. (2013). *With Charity For All: Why Charities are Failing and a Better Way to Give*. New York: Random House of Canada Limited.

Stern, K. (2013). *With Charity For All: Why Charities Are Failing And A Better Way To Give*. In

K. Stern, *With Charity For All: Why Charities Are Failing And A Better Way To Give* (p. 3). New York: Random House of Canada Limited.

The Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2013). *Annual Report*. Cambridge, MA.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario. (2014, 08 22). Retrieved from Registering to Practise Medicine in Ontario: <http://www.cpsso.on.ca>

The McConnell Foundation. (2014, 08 30). *Recode Information Guide and Request for Proposals*. Retrieved from The McConnell Family Foundation: http://mcconnellfoundation.ca/assets/PDFs/RECODE%20_INFO_GUIDE_ENG_FINAL.pdf

Thomas, C. (2010). Retaining Educational Fund Raisers: Reducing turnover by investing in human capital management. *International Journal Of Educational Advancement*, 10(2), 99-107.

Turcotte, M. (2012). *Charitable giving by Canadians*. Toronto: Statistics Canada.

Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social Comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 187-204.

University de Montreal. (2015). *Brief History*. Retrieved from University de Montreal: http://www.umontreal.ca/english/overview/brief_history.html

University of Toronto. (2014, November 20). *University of Toronto*. Retrieved from Campaign Updates: <http://boundless.utoronto.ca/campaign-updates/innovation-and-entrepreneurship-panel/>

Vancouver Society of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women v. M.N.R., 1 S.C.R. 10 (Supreme Court of Canada February 23, 1999).

- Volti, R. (2012). *An Introduction to the Sociology of Work and Occupations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California, USA: Sage. Retrieved May 20, 2018
- Wagner, L., & Ryan, J. P. (2004). Achieving diversity among fundraising professionals. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (43), 63-70.
- Warnett, R. (2004). Canadian Fundraising. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, (46), 37-52.
- Waters, R. D., & Kelly, K. S. (2012). Organizational roles enacted by healthcare fund raisers: A national study testing theory and assessing gender differences. *Journal of Communication Management*, 16(3), 244-263.
- Watras, J. (2005). Philanthropy and educational reform during the great depression. *American Educational History Journal*, 32(2), 116-121.
- Weinger, A. (2015, April 15). *Corporate matching gift programs: Understanding the essentials*. Retrieved from Charity Village:
https://charityvillage.com/Content.aspx?topic=Corporate_matching_gift_programs_Understanding_the_essentials#.Vtrh143SmOU
- West, M. (2011, March 20). *Fund Raisers and Recruiters Weigh Value of Certification*. Retrieved from Academic OneFile:
http://3A%2F%2Fgo.galegroup.com%2Fps%2Fi.do%3Fid%3DGALE%257CA252116774%26v%3D2.1%26u%3Dutoronto_main%26it%3Dr%26p%3DAONE%26sw%3Dw%26asid%3D24f5a5817133839536fb51a5deb794b6
- (2014). *What Donors Value: How Community Foundations Can Increase Donor Satisfaction, Referrals, and Future Giving*. Cambridge, MA : The Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Wheelwright, V. (2000). A profession in the future? *Futures*, 32(9-10), 913-918.

- Wiggers, R. (2013, October 18). PUBLIC POLICY TO PROMOTE ACCESS, EQUITY AND SUCCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION. *PUBLIC POLICY TO PROMOTE ACCESS, EQUITY AND SUCCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Power Point Presentation to class in LHA1803, Recurring Issues in Postsecondary Education.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1965, September). The Professionalization of Everyone? *The American Journal of Sociology*, 70, 137-158. Retrieved March 14, 2015
- Zalek, B., & Phillips, S. P. (2003, February 11). Gender and power: Nurses and doctors in Canada. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, pp. 1-5.
- Zimmer, R., Krop, C., & Brewer, D. (2003, March 20). Private Resources in Public Schools: Eivdence from a Pilot Study. *Journal of Education Finance*, Vol 28, 485-522. Retrieved from Chronicle of Philanthropy.

Appendices

Appendix A – Classification of Ontario Colleges

Table 1 *Ontario's 24 Colleges and their designation, total student population (full time and part time), size, regional descriptor and city population*

College name and location	Designation CAAT/ ITAL	TOTAL student population (includes full-time and part-time students)	Size: Based on number of fulltime students and the region	Regional descriptor: Urban/Rural (where any municipality with a population of less than 100,000 is also considered rural)	Stats Can 2011 data on Population
Southern					
1) Barrie: Georgian College	CAAT	39,000	Medium	Urban	166,634
2) Belleville: Loyalist College	CAAT	unavailable	Small	Rural	63,985
3) Hamilton: Mohawk College	CAAT	52,000	Medium	Urban	670,580
4) Kingston: St. Lawrence College	CAAT	26,000	Small	Urban	117,787
5) Kitchener: Conestoga College	ITAL	48,300	Medium	Urban	444,681
6) London: Fanshawe College	CAAT	55,000	Medium	Urban	366,191
7) Oakville: Sheridan College	ITAL	52,000	Large	Urban	182,520
8) Oshawa: Durham College	CAAT	10,000+	Medium	Urban	290,937
9) Ottawa: Algonquin College	CAAT	54,000	Large	Urban	933,596

10) Ottawa: La Cité collégiale (fr)	CAAT	5,800	Small	Urban	933,596
11) Peterborough : Fleming College	CAAT	16,000	Small	Rural	80,660
12) Sarnia: Lambton College	CAAT	9,700	Small	Rural	79,526
13) Toronto: Centennial College	CAAT	40,000	Medium- Large	Urban	5.1 million
14) Toronto: George Brown College	ITAL	65,400	Medium- Large	Urban	5.1 million
15) Toronto: Humber College	ITAL	83,500	Large	Urban	5.1 million
16) Toronto: Seneca College	ITAL	94,000	Large	Urban	5.1 million
17) Welland: Niagara College	CAAT	24,000	Small	Rural	50,631
18) Windsor: St. Clair College	CAAT	20,500	Small	Urban	276,165
Northern					
19) North Bay: Canadore College	CAAT	8,300	Small	Rural	53,515
20) Sault Ste. Marie: Sault College	CAAT	6,900	Small	Rural	67,646
21) Sudbury: Cambrian College	CAAT	12,000	Small	Urban	106,840
22) Sudbury: Collège Boréal (fr)	CAAT	1,600	Small	Urban	106,840

23) Thunder Bay: Confederation College	CAAT	11,800	Small	Urban	108,359
24) Timmins: Northern College	CAAT	10,840	Small	Rural	43,165

Source: (Gheewala, 2016)

Table 2. *Classification of the 22 English language colleges in Ontario based on geographic location, regional population, college size and type of programming offered*

	Small Rural	Small Urban	Medium Urban	Large Urban
Western	Lambton Niagara	St. Clair	Conestoga* Fanshawe Mohawk	
Central			Centennial Georgian George Brown*	Humber* Seneca* Sheridan*
Eastern	Fleming Loyalist	St. Lawrence	Durham	Algonquin
Northern	Canadore Sault Northern	Cambrian Confederation		

Legend: * Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (ITAL)

Source: (Holmes, 2016, p.78)

**Appendix B - Knowledge Experts' Invitation to Participate
in an Interview and Informed Consent**

OISE
ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Knowledge Experts' Invitation to Participate in an Interview and Informed Consent

First Name, Last Name

Title

Institution

Address

City, Prov Postal Code

Title of Study: *"Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?"*

Date

Dear XXX

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My thesis supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of Knowledge Leaders in the advancement / development / fundraising area. For this reason, I am inviting you to participate in an interview related to **College Fundraising and Resource Development**. The interview is anticipated to take approximately one hour and will be held at a time and place that are agreeable to you. There are no known risks to your participating in this discussion. While there will be no direct benefits to you, your insights will contribute to a deeper understanding of important issues related to fundraising in Ontario colleges.

Because this is a non-funded research project I will not be able to provide any compensation for your participation. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary;

you are free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from the study without explanation or penalty of any kind, by letting me know by any means. If you withdraw any time before the data are aggregated, your information will be deleted and not included in the study. With your consent, the discussion will be audio-recorded, and you will receive a copy of the transcript of the interview for your review and revision as you see fit, before your data will be included in the study. Neither you nor your institution will be identifiable in any reporting of the findings in appropriate professional publications or presentations – only non-identifiable pseudonyms will be used. Attached is an outline of the questions we will be discussing.

The information you share will remain confidential, kept in a locked and secured location. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. The audio-recordings will be encrypted and will be destroyed immediately after transcription of the discussion. If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

If you are willing to participate in this study, please send me an email at [REDACTED] with your name and contact information by [insert date]. I will contact you to negotiate a time and place for the interview. The information provided above will be reviewed before we begin the interview and you will then be asked to sign a consent to participate form.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Informed Consent for Knowledge Experts to Participate in Interviews

Re Thesis Research Study titled **“Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”**

By [REDACTED]

By signing this form, I confirm that I understand the information in the Invitation to Participate in the above study; that all my questions (if any) have been answered, and that I agree to participate in an interview related to **College Fundraising and Resource Development**.

I agree to the audio-recording of the interview. ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date: _____

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records.

Appendix Bi - Knowledge Experts' Interview Questions

Script: Review the information in the Informed Consent Appendix B before the interview begins *Ensure you have the consent form signed by the interviewee*

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.

Interview Questions:

1. How are your strategic fundraising plans established? What is the process?
2. Who are the key decision makers in formulating annual and strategic goals?
3. Who is usually the signatory on the donor agreements? (bindable) (i.e. college signatory job title)?
4. What do you think are the mandatory educational requirements when hiring fundraisers? (Individuals who are required to fund raise a minimum of 50% of the time)
5. Please describe any specific training / development programs that you provide to new staff in the fundraising department / area.
6. How important is membership in a professional fundraising association for performing the job of a fundraiser? Why or why not?
7. Is belonging to a fundraising association a requirement of the position? Why / Why not? How well is this membership supported by the organization?
8. What legislative requirements are you aware of that Ontario college fundraisers must operate within? Please identify those you know of.
9. What are the resources that are available to you if you were to research topics specifically on fundraising? Are they trade, academic, or other?
10. What, if any, topics do you think are critical/specific to fundraising?

Please feel free to share any additional thoughts that may be helpful to this study.

Appendix C - Invitation to Fundraisers and Informed Consent (Web Based)

OISE

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Date

First Name, Last Name

Title

Institution

Address

City, Prov, Postal Code

Title of Study: *“Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”*

Dear XXX

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My Thesis Supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

As part of my study I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of Fundraisers, such as yourself, who are employed in the advancement / development / fundraising area in an English-speaking Ontario college. For this reason, I am inviting you to participate in this study by completing an anonymous survey questionnaire located on a secure University of Toronto server. The questionnaire is anticipated to take about 15 minutes of your time to complete.

There are no known risks for your participation in this study greater than you would encounter in your daily activities. While there are also no direct benefits to you, your insights will provide valuable insights into issues related to fundraising in Ontario colleges. Because this is a non-funded research project I am not able to provide any compensation for your participation,

When you click on the link below, there will be two Informed Consent “Check Box” options. One stating “I agree”, which will take to you the survey, and the other stating “I do not

Fundraiser Questionnaire Survey - Web based survey

Research Study titled: "Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession"

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you are free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer. You are also free to withdraw from the study any time BEFORE you submit this questionnaire. If you wish to withdraw, simply close the survey WITHOUT tapping "Submit", and none of the data you have entered before that will be included in the study. Please indicate below if you are willing to participate in this study or not. Thank-you.

I agree ☐ (this links the participant to the following questionnaire)

I do not agree ☐ (this closes the survey form without access to the questionnaire)

Do you work in a department that raises support (i.e. money) in an Ontario college or affiliate (i.e. Ontario College Foundation)?

Yes

No

1. What percentage of your time is devoted to direct fundraising-"*making the ask*" (choose the closest answer):
 - a. 25%
 - b. 50%
 - c. 75%
 - d. 100%
2. Is the college's advancement / development department?
 - a. Part of the college
 - b. Separately registered charity
 - c. A contracted service provider
 - d. I don't know
 - e. Other (open field)
3. IF the answer is A, part of the college, which department do you report into?
 - a. Office of the President
 - b. Marketing and Communications
 - c. Finance
 - d. Other_____
4. Are you a(n):
 - a. employee of the college,

- b. employee of the Foundation or a separately registered charity,
 - c. independent contractor,
 - d. other (open field)
- 5. Do you, or an individual from your department participate in meetings or decisions that set tuition, ancillary fees, or other student tuition / financial related decisions?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 6. Please select – highest level of education completed.
 - a. college certificate
 - b. college degree
 - c. undergraduate degree
 - d. master's degree
 - e. doctorate
 - f. Other: _____
- 7. Was your program related to your current job?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 8. IF Yes – please state the name of program _____ AND the institution (open field)
- 9. Do you have the Certified Fundraising Executive credential?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No –
- 10. IF not, do you intend to get the Certified Fundraising Executive credential?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 11. Do you belong to any fundraising associations? If so, please list them.
 - a. Open field
- 12. Does the association have a Code of Ethics?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

13. Does the association or membership have the authority to stop you from fundraising if you are found to have contravened the Code of Ethics?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

14. Is membership to these associations a requirement for your job?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

15. Are you aware of any provincial / federal legislation by which fundraisers must operate within?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

16. If Yes, list them:
 - a. Open Field

17. What resources are available to you if were to find out more about a specific topic related to fundraising? Please list them:
 - a. Open Field

Demographic – OPTIONAL Please feel free to decline to answer any questions you are not comfortable responding to

1. Please check all the areas that your position is involved:
 - a. Cultivation
 - b. Research
 - c. Alumni
 - d. Stewardship
 - e. Events
 - f. Major gifts
 - g. Annual giving programs
 - h. Planned giving
 - i. Marketing
 - j. Human resources
 - k. IT - database
 - l. Finance
 - m. Other: _____

2. Male / female (Check box)
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
3. Age range?
 - a. 18-24 years old
 - b. 25-34 years old
 - c. 35-44 years old
 - d. 45-54 years old
 - e. 55-64 years old
 - f. 65-74 years old
 - g. 75 years or older
4. How long have you been employed in the advancement / development department of your college?
 - a. Less than one year
 - b. 1-2 years
 - c. 3-4 years
 - d. 5-6 years
 - e. More than 6 years
 - f. Don't know/Not sure
5. How long have you been employed at your college (all areas including advancement/development)?
 - a. Less than one year
 - b. 1-2 years
 - c. 3-4 years
 - d. 5-6 years
 - e. 7-8 years
 - f. More than 9 years
 - g. Don't know/Not sure
6. How long have you been working in the fundraising sector (overall)?
 - a. Less than one year
 - b. 1-2 years
 - c. 3-4 years
 - d. 5-6 years
 - e. 7-8 years
 - f. More than 9 years

- g. Don't know/Not sure
7. How long have you been working in the educational sector (including your current position in the advancement / development position)?
- a. Less than one year
 - b. 1-2 years
 - c. 3-4 years
 - d. 5-6 years
 - e. 7-8 years
 - f. More than 9 years
 - g. Don't know/Not sure
8. What is your job title?
- a. Open Field
9. What is your salary range?
- a. Less than \$25,000
 - b. \$25,000 to \$34,999
 - c. \$35,000 to \$49,999
 - d. \$50,000 to \$74,999
 - e. \$75,000 to \$99,999
 - f. \$100,000 to \$149,999
 - g.** \$150,000 or more

Appendix Ci - Invitation to Fundraisers and Informed Consent (Paper Based Survey)

OISE
ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Date

First Name, Last Name

Title

Institution

Address

City, Prov, Postal Code

Title of Study: “*Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?*”

Dear XXX

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My Thesis Supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

As part of my study I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of Fundraisers, such as yourself, who are employed in the advancement / development / fundraising area in an English-speaking Ontario college. For this reason, I am inviting you to participate in this study by completing an anonymous survey questionnaire by completing enclosed questionnaire and depositing it into the envelope provided. The questionnaire is anticipated to take about 15 minutes of your time to complete.

There are no known risks for your participation in this study greater than you would encounter in your daily activities. While there are also no direct benefits to you, your insights will provide valuable insights into issues related to fundraising in Ontario colleges. Because this is a non-funded research project I am not able to provide any compensation for your participation,

You will be free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from the study anytime. You will be free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from the study anytime by simply by NOT depositing the forms in the envelope provided and sending your questionnaire back. Because the survey is anonymous, it will not be possible for you to withdraw from the study after you have submitted your responses.

Transcripts will be encrypted as required by the University of Toronto and kept confidential and secure in a locked drawer. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. If you are willing to participate in this study, please deposit the completed survey into the envelope provided and send the completed form back.

If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Fundraiser Questionnaire Survey - Paper based survey

Exactly the same as the survey distributed online (see Appendix C) was distributed in paper-based form with the following introduction.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you are free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer. You are also free to withdraw from the study any time BEFORE you complete this questionnaire. If you wish to withdraw, simply DO NOT deposit the questionnaire in the envelope provided or indicate Withdrawn on the form if you have started to complete it.

Appendix D - Donor Invitation and Informed Consent

OISE

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Date

Re: Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

Donor to an Ontario Community College:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My thesis supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of organizations / individuals who have supported College **Fundraising and Resource Development**. You are being invited to participate in an interview for my study since your organization has made a donation that has been recognized in publicly available sources. (Provide specific example / link to announcement here). The interview is anticipated to take approximately one hour and will be held at a time and place that are agreeable to you. There are no known risks to your participating in this discussion and you will remain anonymous through the use of a pseudonym. In the case that the answers potentially identify you, I will alter the descriptions of settings and events in a non-consequential manner to disguise the you. While there are no direct benefits to you either, your valuable insights will contribute to a deeper understanding of issues related to Fundraising in Ontario colleges.

Because this is a non-funded research project I will not be able to provide any compensation for your participation. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you are free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from

the study by letting me know by any means and without explanation. If you withdraw any time before the data are aggregated, your information will be deleted and not included in the study.

With your consent, the discussion will be audio-recorded, and you will receive a copy of the transcript of the interview for your review and revision as you see fit before your data will be included in the study. Neither you nor your organization will be identifiable in any reporting of the findings in appropriate professional publications or presentations – only non-identifiable pseudonyms will be used. Attached is an outline of the questions we will be discussing.

The transcript of the discussion will be encrypted as required by the University of Toronto and kept confidential and secure on a password-protected computer. The audio-recordings will be destroyed immediately after transcription. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

If you are willing to participate in this study, please send me an email at [REDACTED] with your name and contact information by [insert date]. I will contact you to negotiate a time and place for the interview. The information provided above will be reviewed before we begin the interview and you will then be asked to sign a consent to participate form.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Informed Consent for Donors Willing to Participate in Interviews

Re Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

By [REDACTED]

By signing this form, I confirm that I understand the information in the Invitation to Participate in the above study; that all my questions (if any) have been answered and I agree to participate in an interview related to **College Fundraising and Resource Development**.

I agree to the audio-recording of the focus group discussion ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date: _____

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records

Appendix Di - Donor Interview Questions

Script: Review the information in the Informed Consent Appendix D before the interview begins *Ensure you have the consent form signed by the interviewee*

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.

Fundraising in the college sector – 45 minutes

1. How important is the educational background of the fundraiser you work with? Does this factor play a role in funding decisions? Please elaborate.
2. What professional associations for fundraising / fundraisers are you aware of? How important is this in your decision to donate?
3. Are you aware of a professional code of ethics for fundraising? Does the adoption of one impact your giving decision?
4. If you had a complaint about a fundraiser, where would you go? And if you were satisfied with that, where would you go to next?
5. Are you aware of any legislative requirements that Ontario college fundraisers must operate within? Or fundraisers in general? (i.e. lawyers are required to abide by the requirements of the Law Society of Upper Canada - protecting interests of their clients). Do you think it's necessary? Why or why not?
6. If you wanted to find out more about fundraising / philanthropy in Ontario's colleges, what resources would you go to? Or if you were to research fundraising in general, what resources would you go to?

Exit Question – 10 minutes

- Is there anything that you would like to add?

Appendix E - Student Focus Group Invitations and Informed Consent

OISE

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

(This letter is for the program coordinator / faculty member to distribute to students if direct access to students cannot be granted)

Date

Re: Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

Dear Student in a Post Graduate Certificate program for Fundraising Management:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My thesis supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of students, such as yourself, who are engaged in a college program that focuses on **College Fundraising and Resource Development**. For this reason, I am inviting you to participate in a focus group discussion. The focus group discussion is anticipated to take approximately one hour (focus group) or 30 minutes (for online survey) and will be held on your college campus. There are no known risks to your participating in this discussion. While there will be no direct benefit to you either, your insights will provide valuable insights into issues related to fundraising in Ontario colleges.

Because this is a non-funded research project I will not be able to provide any compensation for your participation. Your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary; neither participation nor non-participation will have any impact your progress in your program.

You will be free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from the study by leaving the group (without explanation or penalty of any kind) any time before the end of the session. Because this will be a group discussion it will not be possible to delete any information you have provided before leaving the group.

The focus group discussion will be audio-recorded. All members of the focus group will be asked to commit to not discussing any of the information shared in the discussion with anyone outside of the group. Furthermore, only non-identifiable participant codes will be used in the discussion and in any reporting of the findings in appropriate professional publications or presentations. Attached is an outline of the questions we will be discussing.

The information shared in the focus group discussion will remain confidential and secure. The transcript of the focus group discussion will be encrypted as required by the University of Toronto and kept confidential and secure on a password protected computer. The audio-recordings will be destroyed immediately after transcription. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

If you would like to participate in this study, please send me an email at [REDACTED] with your name and contact information by [insert date]. I will contact you with the date and time of the focus group discussion. The terms of your participation in the focus group will be reviewed at the beginning of the scheduled discussion and if you still agree to participate, you will be asked to sign the following consent form consistent with the information provided above.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Informed Consent to Participate in the Focus Group Discussion

Re Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

By [REDACTED]

By signing this form, I confirm that I understand the information in the Invitation to Participate in the above study; that all my questions (if any) have been answered and I agree to participate in the student focus group discussion as described.

I agree to the audio-recording of the focus group discussion ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date: _____

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records

Appendix Ei - Invitation to Student Survey and Informed Consent

Invitation to Student Survey and Informed Consent Sent to Program Coordinator of the Georgian Fundraising Program

Dear Student,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My Thesis Supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

As part of my study I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of Students, such as yourself, who are taking a fundraising program. For this reason, I am inviting you to participate in this study by completing an anonymous survey questionnaire located on a secure University of Toronto server. The questionnaire is anticipated to take about 15 minutes of your time to complete.

There are no known risks for your participation in this study greater than you would encounter in your daily activities. While there are also no direct benefits to you, your insights will provide valuable insights into issues related to fundraising in Ontario colleges. Because this is a non-funded research project I am not able to provide any compensation for your participation,

When you click on the link below, there will be two Informed Consent “Check Box” options. One stating “I agree”, which will take to you the survey, and the other stating “I do not agree” which will exit you from the survey. In order to proceed to the survey, you will have to click on “I agree”. Alternatively, if you do not wish to participate, you can simply exit the browser.

You will be free to decline to answer any question(s) by clicking “ok” on the pop-up box that appears between questions. You may withdraw from the study anytime by simply closing the survey site *before submitting* your responses and all responses previously entered will be deleted.

Because the survey is anonymous, it will not be possible for you to withdraw from the study after you have submitted your responses.

Transcripts will be encrypted as required by the University of Toronto and kept confidential and secure on a password protected computer. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. If you are willing to participate in this study, please go to the following site:

<https://surveys.oise.utoronto.ca/surveyviewer2/index.php?surveyID=XKLDG&inst=1>

If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at

[REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

-
1. What were the reasons you chose to take this fundraising program?
 2. How will this program help you to obtain a position within fundraising?
 3. Prior to taking this program, did you research any other programs related to fundraising?
What were they?
 4. What led you choose to this one?
 5. What legislative requirements are you aware of that Ontario college fundraisers must operate within? Please identify those you know of.
 6. Which fundraising associations are you aware of? Do you belong to any of them?

7. Are you aware of a formal code of ethics within the association? If so, which one(s)?
8. What resources are available to you if wanted to find out more about a specific topic related to fundraising?
9. Is there anything that you would like to add?

Appendix Eii - Student Focus Group Discussion Questions

Re: Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

Script:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this focus group. I will review the information you received in the Invitation to Participate and answer any questions you may have. If you still agree to participate, please sign the Informed Consent form and return it to me before we start our discussion today.

(Only those Students who give me their signed consent form that includes permission to audio-record will be invited to stay for the discussion).

I am providing you with blank name cards, so you can choose a pseudonym to maintain your anonymity throughout this discussion and any reporting of the findings.

I will Explain the context of the research – and distribute Figure X that shows how the focus group discussion fits within the study framework

Questions with non-leading probes (e.g., Tell me more about that....) will be used as needed

Professionalism in fundraising – 40 minutes

1. What were the reasons you chose to take this fundraising program?
2. How will this program help you to obtain a position within fundraising?
3. Prior to taking this program, did you research any other programs related to fundraising?
What were they?
4. What led you choose to this one?
5. What legislative requirements are you aware of that Ontario college fundraisers must operate within? Please identify those you know of.
6. Which fundraising associations are you aware of? Do you belong to any of them?
7. Are you aware of a formal code of ethics within the association? If so, which one(s)?
8. What resources are available to you if wanted to find out more about a specific topic related to fundraising?

Exit Question – 12 minutes

- Is there anything that you would like to add?

Appendix F - Teacher/Professor Invitation and Informed Consent

OISE

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Date

Re: Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

Teacher/Professor in a fundraising program at an Ontario Community College:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and in the process of completing a dissertation to fulfill the partial requirements for the PhD degree in Higher Education. My thesis supervisor is Dr. [REDACTED] in the Leadership, Higher and Adult Education Department.

I am interested in exploring the perceptions and experiences of individuals who have or are teaching within a Fundraising program to explore **College Fundraising and Resource Development**. You are being invited to participate in an interview for my study because you teach within a fundraising program and your contact information is in publicly available sources. The interview is anticipated to take approximately one hour and will be held at a time and place that are agreeable to you. There are no known risks to your participating in this discussion and your identity will remain anonymous through the use of a pseudonym. In the case that the answers potentially identify participants, I will alter the descriptions of settings and events in a non-consequential manner to disguise the respondents. While there are no direct benefits to you either, your valuable insights will contribute to a deeper understanding of issues related to Fundraising in Ontario colleges.

Because this is a non-funded research project I will not be able to provide any compensation for your participation. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you are free to decline to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer and withdraw from the study by letting me know by any means and without explanation. If you withdraw any time before the data are aggregated, your information will be deleted and not included in the study.

With your consent, the discussion will be audio-recorded, and you will receive a copy of the transcript of the interview for your review and revision as you see fit before your data will be included in the study. Neither you nor your organization will be identifiable in any reporting of the findings in appropriate professional publications or presentations – only non-identifiable pseudonyms will be used. Attached is an outline of the questions we will be discussing.

The transcript of the discussion will be encrypted as required by the University of Toronto and kept confidential and secure on a password-protected computer. The audio-recordings will be destroyed immediately after transcription. Only my Thesis Supervisor and I will have access to any of the data. If you would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this study, please send me a separate email request.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]; Phone: [REDACTED], or my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]; Phone [REDACTED]. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research study, please call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or Phone 416-946-3273, or the REB at your college at (insert contact info for the appropriate college).

If you are willing to participate in this study, please send me an email at [REDACTED] with your name and contact information by [insert date]. I will contact you to negotiate a time and place for the interview. The information provided above will be reviewed before we begin the interview and you will then be asked to sign a consent to participate form.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

Dr. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Informed Consent for Teachers/Professors Willing to Participate in Interviews

Re: Thesis Research Study titled “Fundraising in Ontario Colleges: An Emerging Profession?”

By [REDACTED]

By signing this form, I confirm that I understand the information in the Invitation to Participate in the above study; that all my questions (if any) have been answered and I agree to participate in an interview related to **College Fundraising and Resource Development**.

I agree to the audio-recording of the focus group discussion ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date: _____

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records

Appendix Fi - Teacher / Professor Interview Questions

Script: Review the information in the Informed Consent Appendix F before the interview begins *Ensure you have the consent form signed by the interviewee*

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.

Fundraising in the college sector – 45 minutes

1. When someone asks you, what do you do for a living, what do you tell them?
 2. How is your work distributed? How do you decide what your schedule is?
 3. What is your educational background? What courses / programs have you taken that are related to fundraising?
 4. What fundraising organizations do you belong to, if any? Which ones would you recommend? Are students in the fundraising program required to be in any of these associations?
 5. Which legislations are you aware of that governs fundraisers, or fundraising locally, provincially, or federally?
 6. What resources are you using to teach within the program? What are the specific learning resources that are required within the program?
 7. What School (within the college or university) does the fundraising program belong to?
 8. What are the other programs that you teach in? What are the courses that you teach?
- Is there anything that you would like to add?

Appendix G - Lawshe's Content Validity Checklist

Review the background and language questionnaire and then complete the following content Validity Index (CVI). The CVI was developed by Lawshe (1975) for the purpose of validating the reliability of a research instrument among subject matter expert raters (SMEs) to determine whether each survey question is relevant to the research question being investigated.

This tool was further developed by Andrea Lalonde (Lalonde, 2015) to include a checklist.

Research Question: Is fundraising perceived as an emerging profession within Ontario's English language Applied Arts and Technology Colleges, and why that is important or not? The following questions are asked of all 50 questions in the survey tool (Appendix C)

1. Is the knowledge measured by this item _____ to the research question?

☐ essential ☐ useful but not essential ☐ not necessary

2. Is the knowledge measured by this item _____ to the research question?

☐ essential ☐ useful but not essential ☐ not necessary

3. Is the knowledge measured by this item _____ to the research question?

☐ essential ☐ useful but not essential ☐ not necessary

4. Is the knowledge measured by this item _____ to the research question?

☐ essential ☐ useful but not essential ☐ not necessary

5. Is the knowledge measured by this item _____ to the research question?

-----The form continues with the same assessment for all 50 of the questions in the survey tool (Appendix C) and ends with the following:

Additional Comments: _____

Subject Matter Expert Rater Information

Name: _____ Signature: _____

Department: _____ Job Title: _____

Place of Employment: _____

Appendix H - Fundraising Programs in Ontario Colleges

Name of Institution	Program Name	Designation	Course Delivery	Full / Part time
Algonquin College	Fundraising Management	Certificate	Distance Education (Online)	Part Time
Centennial College	Fundraising	Certificate	Distance Education (Online)	Part Time
Conestoga College	Fundraising Practioner	Certificate	Distance Education (Online and In Class)	Part Time
Confederation College	Fundraising Management	Recognition of Achievement	Part-time Online Learning Studies	Part Time
Fanshawe College	Fundraising	Certificate	Distance Education (Online)	Part Time
Flemming College	Fundraising Management Certificate	Certificate	Distance Education (Online)	Part Time
George Brown College	Fundraising Certificate	Certificate	Part-time In Person	Part Time
George Brown College	Not-for-Profit Management Certificate (CONED)	Certificate	Distance Education (Online and In Class)	Part Time
Georgian College	Fundraising and Resource Development	Ontario College Graduate Cert.	Distance Education (Online) + externship	Full Time - 3 Semesters
Humber College	Fundraising Management - Program Code 10991	Ontario Graduate Certificate	In person	Full Time - 3 Semesters
Lambton College	Fundraising Leadership	Certificate	Distance Education (Online)	Part Time
Loyalist College	Program Suspended	Ontario College Graduate Cert.	In-person	Full Time - 2 Semesters
Seneca College	Nonprofit Leadership and Management	Ontario College Graduate Cert.	In person	Full Time - 2 Semesters
Seneca College	Fundraising Management Certificate	Certificate	Part-time Online Learning Studies	Part Time
Sheridan College	Fundraising - Recognition of Achievement	Recognition of Achievement	Part-time Online Learning Studies	Part Time
St. Lawrence College	Fundraising Management	Certificate	Part-time Online Learning Studies	Part Time

Appendix I - College Websites with Code of Ethics and/or Donor Bill of Rights

Ontario Colleges that post the Fundraising Code of Ethics and Donor Bill of Rights on Website						
College	Code of Ethics	Donor Bill of Rights	Link	Donate Button on Home page?	Foundation	Notes
Algonquin College	N	N	http://www.algonquincollege.com/foundation/ways/	Y	Foundation	
Cambrian College	N	N	http://cambriancollege.ca/donate/	Y		
Canadore College	N	N	http://www.canadorecollege.ca/	N		
Centennial College	N	N	https://www.centennialcollege.ca/student-life/alumni-development/	N		
Conestoga College	N	N	http://www.conestogac.on.ca/giving/	Y		
Confederation College	N	N	http://www.confederationcollege.ca/advancement	Y		
Durham College	N	N	http://www.durhamcollege.ca/info-for/alumni/giving-to-dc	Y		
Fanshawe College	N	Y	https://www.fanshawec.ca/foundation	Y	Foundation	
Flemming College	N	N	https://flemmingcollege.ca/giving-to-flemming	Y		
George Brown College	N	Y	http://www.georgebrown.ca/giving/about/donor_bill_of_rights/	Y	Foundation	
Georgian College	N	N	http://www.georgiancollege.ca/community-alumni/giving/	N		
Humber College	N	N	http://humber.ca/advancementandalumni/	N		
Lambton College	N	N	https://lambtoncollege.ca/About_Us/Foundation/Give_Now/	Y		
Loyalist College	N	N	http://www.loyalistcollege.com/alumni/give-back/	Y		
Mohawk College	N	N	http://www.mohawkcollege.ca/donors-and-supporters	N	Foundation	
Niagara College	N	N	http://donate.niagaracollege.ca/	Y	Foundation	
Northern College	N	N	http://www.northernc.on.ca/foundation/	N	Foundation	Has a link to CRA and Imagine Canada
Sault College	N	Y	http://www.saultcollege.ca/services/Giving/PDF/DonorBillofRights.pdf	Y		
Seneca College	N	N	http://www.senecacollege.ca/support/about.html	Y		
Sheridan College	N	N	https://www.sheridancollege.ca/giving-to-sheridan.aspx	Y		
St. Clair College	N	N	http://www.stclaircollege.ca/advancement/	N		
St. Lawrence College	N	N	http://www.stlawrencecollege.ca/give/alumni-friends/foundation/	Y	Foundation	

Appendix J - Donor Bill of Rights

A DONOR BILL OF RIGHTS

DEVELOPED BY:

Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)

Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP)

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)

Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Non-Profits

PHILANTHROPY is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To assure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

I

To be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes.

II

To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization's governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgment in its stewardship responsibilities.

III

To have access to the organization's most recent financial statements.

IV

To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.

V

To receive appropriate acknowledgement and recognition.

VI

To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.

VII

To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.

VIII

To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors.

IX

To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.

X

To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers.

Appendix K - Code of Ethical Standard

CODE OF ETHICAL STANDARDS

ETHICAL STANDARDS (Adopted 1964; amended Oct 2014)

The Association of Fundraising Professionals believes that ethical behavior fosters the development and growth of fundraising professionals and the fundraising profession and enhances philanthropy and volunteerism. AFP Members recognize their responsibility to ethically generate or support ethical generation of philanthropic support. Violation of the standards may subject the member to disciplinary sanctions as provided in the AFP Ethics Enforcement Procedures. AFP members, both individual and business, agree to abide (and ensure, to the best of their ability, that all members of their staff abide) by the AFP standards.

PUBLIC TRUST, TRANSPARENCY & CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Members shall:

- 1 not engage in activities that harm the members' organizations, clients or profession or knowingly bring the profession into disrepute.
- 2 not engage in activities that conflict with their fiduciary, ethical and legal obligations to their organizations, clients or profession.
- 3 effectively disclose all potential and actual conflicts of interest; such disclosure does not preclude or imply ethical impropriety.
- 4 not exploit any relationship with a donor, prospect, volunteer, client or employee for the benefit of the members or the members' organizations.
- 5 comply with all applicable local, state, provincial and federal civil and criminal laws.
- 6 recognize their individual boundaries of professional competence.
- 7 present and supply products and/or services honestly and without misrepresentation.
- 8 establish the nature and purpose of any contractual relationship at the outset and be responsive and available to parties before, during and after any sale of materials and/or services.
- 9 never knowingly infringe the intellectual property rights of other parties.
- 10 protect the confidentiality of all privileged information relating to the provider/client relationships.
- 11 never disparage competitors untruthfully.

SOLICITATION & STEWARDSHIP OF PHILANTHROPIC FUNDS

Members shall:

- 12 ensure that all solicitation and communication materials are accurate and correctly reflect their organization's mission and use of solicited funds.
- 13 ensure that donors receive informed, accurate and ethical advice about the value and tax implications of contributions.

- 14 ensure that contributions are used in accordance with donors' intentions.
- 15 ensure proper stewardship of all revenue sources, including timely reports on the use and management of such funds.
- 16 obtain explicit consent by donors before altering the conditions of financial transactions.

TREATMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

Members shall:

- 17 not disclose privileged or confidential information to unauthorized parties.
- 18 adhere to the principle that all donor and prospect information created by, or on behalf of, an organization or a client is the property of that organization or client.
- 19 give donors and clients the opportunity to have their names removed from lists that are sold to, rented to or exchanged with other organizations.
- 20 when stating fundraising results, use accurate and consistent accounting methods that conform to the relevant guidelines adopted by the appropriate authority.

COMPENSATION, BONUSES & FINDER'S FEES

Members shall:

- 21 not accept compensation or enter into a contract that is based on a percentage of contributions; nor shall members accept finder's fees or contingent fees.
- 22 be permitted to accept performance-based compensation, such as bonuses, only if such bonuses are in accord with prevailing practices within the members' own organizations and are not based on a percentage of contributions.
- 23 neither offer nor accept payments or special considerations for the purpose of influencing the selection of products or services.
- 24 not pay finder's fees, commissions or percentage compensation based on contributions.
- 25 meet the legal requirements for the disbursement of funds if they receive funds on behalf of a donor or client.

Appendix L - Memo PSE Cutbacks Nov 1995

Ministry
of Education
and Training

Ministère
de l'Éducation
et de la Formation

Mount Block
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2
Telephone (416) 325-2600
Facsimile (416) 325-2608

Edison House
Queen's Park
Toronto (Ontario)
M7A 1L2
Telephone (416) 325-2600
Telecopier (416) 325-2608

Minister

Ministre

MEMORANDUM TO:

Chairs, Board of Governors
Colleges of Applied Arts and
Technology

Information copies to: Presidents,
Colleges of Applied Arts and
Technology, ACAAAC, AEC, EPETC, COC,
COCSPA, OPSEU, OCASA, CFS-TO

FROM:

The Honourable John C. Snobelen

DATE:

November 30, 1995

SUBJECT:

Operating Support, 1996-97

*Budget
Division*

The Honourable Ernie Eves, Finance Minister, announced government transfer payments for 1996-97 in the House yesterday. I am attaching copies of his statement, for your information.

The future of Ontario can be strengthened and secured only if the provincial deficit is brought under control. We cannot afford to continue spending at current levels. If we do not act now to address the deficit, today's students will be faced with even more serious fiscal problems in the future and a reduced range of public services from what we now enjoy.

As indicated in Mr. Eves' statement, the government is reducing grant support for postsecondary education by \$400 million in 1996-97. This reduction will be apportioned according to each sector's current share of operating support, i.e., 70% or \$280 million for the university sector and 30% or \$120 million for the college sector.

The transfer payment allocation for colleges in 1996-97 will be \$688.8 million. This allocation includes \$3.3 million for pay equity funding. Information on grant allocations to individual colleges will be provided to you by Ministry staff over the next several weeks.

For 1996-97, the standard tuition fee level will be \$1,275, an increase of 15% over the 1995-96 level of \$1,109. Colleges are to designate 10% of this increase for local institutional student aid. Additional information will be provided to you under separate cover by Ministry staff.