

A World of Opportunity for Rutgers: Possibilities for Fund Raising in the Decade Ahead

FINAL REPORT

John M. Cash, Ph.D., Senior Consultant and Managing Director
Lynne LaMarca Heinrich, Senior Consultant and Director

2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In late 2004, Rutgers President Richard L. McCormick asked Marts & Lundy to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the University's internal fund-raising organization. Dr. McCormick was interested specifically in how other major public research universities had mounted major campaigns and what Rutgers would have to do from an organizational and budgetary standpoint to consider a similar-sized campaign.

The 79-year old consulting firm headquartered in Lyndhurst, New Jersey, had been retained in early 2004 by the Rutgers University Foundation initially to conduct a benchmarking study that analyzed Rutgers' fund-raising performance against that of major public research universities. These institutions included Michigan State, Texas A&M, and the universities of Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Texas and Washington.

Significantly, the study concluded that Rutgers' development program is maturing, but has not yet reached its potential.

The initial benchmarking study also found:

- Rutgers has a high level of donor retention, putting it in an excellent position to build its major gifts program.
- Rutgers has not invested in development to the level of its peer institutions.
- The University is not receiving as much money as it should in the form of gifts from its alumni or from non-alumni in New Jersey.
- The benchmark institutions have significantly larger development operations than Rutgers does.
- The current budget for the Rutgers University Foundation is insufficient to support a very large capital campaign.

Following the presentation of these results, the Foundation asked Marts & Lundy in 2005 to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the University's internal fund-raising organization. The president requested this study to assist the university in determining what steps would need to be taken for Rutgers to achieve its true philanthropic potential following the success of its recent fund-raising campaign.

This assessment was carried out over a five-month period. The consultants visited the University on several occasions to conduct interviews and analyze internal planning documents and other materials relevant to the University's fund-raising program. During these visits, they met with a broad cross-section of the Rutgers community in dozens of individual and group interviews. These meetings, conducted on all three campuses, included senior academic and non-academic leadership; development staff members at the Rutgers University Foundation, alumni association staff and volunteer leaders at the Rutgers University Foundation and at Douglass College; financial and operations staff members at the foundation; and major donors and volunteers.

This process resulted in a series of observations and recommendations to the University concerning ways to strengthen the advancement program. Key findings:

- Rutgers has the potential to begin a major capital campaign within the next five years.
- To meet this objective, the University must provide additional resources for the fund-raising operation and determine how to secure those resources in a challenging budgetary climate.
- Rutgers is a complicated and multi-layered institution. A broad institutional vision would guide the planning and execution of a major campaign.
- The organizing of development initiatives around units and programs is confusing to donors and hinders the University's ability to maximize support.
- President McCormick has a strong sense of Rutgers' role in the state and beyond, and is a highly articulate spokesman who engages prospective donors in meaningful dialogue.
- The University needs to be more effective at
 - increasing the level of support from alumni, especially from major alumni prospects.
 - reaching out to potential donors among non-alumni in New Jersey and demonstrating Rutgers' unique role as the region's premier public research institution.
 - mobilizing support from the many major corporations with headquarters in New Jersey that employ large numbers of Rutgers alumni.

The report also provides recommendations on the size of the development staff, the organization of volunteers across the campus, and the special role of the Newark and Camden campuses in a campaign.

In conclusion, John Cash, senior consultant and managing director of Marts & Lundy, commented: "Throughout the process, the firm was greatly assisted by Rutgers University Foundation staff. Everyone at the University and at the Foundation was extraordinarily open and helpful. Marts & Lundy is honored to be a partner with Rutgers University and the Rutgers University Foundation in this important project, and we look to a future of fund-raising success for one of America's great public research institutions."

A World of Opportunity for Rutgers: Possibilities for Fund Raising in the Decade Ahead

FINAL REPORT

Introduction

- Marts & Lundy requested to provide an analysis of the development program at Rutgers University in advance of its next campaign
- Firm worked with RUF on major benchmarking project in 2004
- Special attention to be paid to the Newark and Camden campuses
- Visits in early 2005 by John Cash, Lynne LaMarca Heinrich, and Michael Sinkus
- Counsel was asked to analyze:
 - Fund-raising organization across the institution
 - Budget and funding
 - Volunteer network and structure
 - Engagement of senior leadership in development

The Benchmarking Study

The Rutgers Benchmarking Study

- Rutgers outpaced the average compound annual growth rate for private giving against the benchmark institution cohort of public universities with major fund-raising campaigns
- While alumni giving is very important to Rutgers, the growth rate was below the benchmark cohort (9.7% versus 12.2% over last ten years)
- While corporations are very important to Rutgers, the level of giving in real dollars was below the rest of the cohort
- While Rutgers secured large campaign gifts from non-alumni friends, the university is still near the bottom of the cohort in raising money from this important source

NOTE: The term “campus” and the term “unit” are used interchangeably in this document to reference schools, colleges, and non-academic entities within Rutgers University

The Rutgers Campaign Experience

- The campaign raised \$615 million in gift and pledge commitments
- Alumni donors were the most important source of funding during the campaign (30%, not including family foundations)
- New Brunswick accounted for 87.3% of all gifts
- Newark and Camden programs were robust, considering size and relative maturity
- Less than 6% of commitments came as bequest expectancies

The Rutgers Campaign: Gift Designations

- Rutgers has one of the highest percentages in the cohort of money raised in the campaign for current restricted purposes
- These are generally programmatic funds that are often raised through faculty relationships
- Current restricted dollars do not always help to build institutional infrastructure
- Unrestricted giving at Rutgers is less important than at other institutions without a health sciences center

Observations on Levels of Giving

- The growing importance of alumni to the development program will require increasing emphasis on the special and major gifts programs (\$10,000-\$1 million)
- Rutgers is in an excellent position to build its major gifts program because of the high level of donor retention
- Donors that give in consecutive years are much more likely to make major gifts as they become able to do so

Observations on Levels of Giving and Development Staffing

- Rutgers has not yet been able to achieve the very top levels of giving that have fueled the largest public university campaigns
- Several of the schools in the benchmark cohort have received multi-year commitments in excess of \$100 million
- Typically, gifts at the top of the pyramid should constitute 15%-20% of the campaign
- The increasing emphasis on major gift work with alumni will require a significant investment in major gift staff
- For a major campaign, the university will need close to 10,000 prospects for its major and leadership gift programs

- The benchmark institutions have significantly larger development operations than Rutgers
- Let the prospect data drive staffing decisions

Historical Overview of the Rutgers Advancement Program and the Rutgers University Foundation

The Advancement Program

- Two successful capital campaigns since the early 1980s
- Last campaign had a broad and highly participatory goal-setting process
- Actual campaign activity, however, was driven principally by the President of the University and the President of the RUF
- All Rutgers campuses came to feel disengaged from the campaign
 - Little regular information distributed to faculty about campaign progress
 - With exceptions, colleges and faculties not actively engaged in development
 - Reporting on campaign progress and gift income did not inspire confidence

The Organization of the RUF

- The Rutgers University Foundation is a highly centralized organization with all fund-raising positions reporting up the administrative hierarchy to the RUF President
- At the same time, the Foundation is set up to mirror the very decentralized university in its structure and in the way it assigns prospects and prospect management
- This decentralized structure is especially apparent in development support for the faculty of arts and sciences in New Brunswick, which is managed centrally but organized around the residential college model, and at the Newark and Camden campuses

A Culture of Philanthropy

- Despite its successful campaigns, Rutgers has done little to develop a true culture of philanthropy on any of its campuses
- Many in the academic leadership do not have confidence in the RUF as an organization, although individual officers are well respected and well liked

- There is considerable competition among the various academic and non-academic units at Rutgers for attention from development
- In general, academic leadership has been unwilling to fund the RUF appropriately, and this reflects a lack of understanding of what development can do for the institution
- Newark and Camden feel that the RUF has not provided their campuses with as much support over time as they have needed; they perceive that there has been little return on investment

A Confusing Model

- All university development programs evolve to reflect the particular culture of their institutions
- The complexity of Rutgers, however, has created an organization that seems to focus on the institution rather than the prospective donor
- Job descriptions for development staff members have evolved to reflect organizational structures rather than reflecting the way that donors actually relate to the University
- Counsel found that some individual staff members have a weak conception of the scope of their responsibilities

The Particular Challenge of Arts and Sciences in New Brunswick/Piscataway

- The University's greatest need for private support is for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Development is organized around college affiliations even when many alumni have little real affiliation to their college experience
- The usual competition for prospects among schools and colleges is greatly complicated at Rutgers by the additional layer of competition based on these residential college experiences
- The RUF is not always able to maximize a prospect's potential relationship to the university due to this cumbersome process

Observations

Needs, Constituency, Engines

- All successful capital campaigns rest on three pillars: needs, constituency, and engines

- These elements must be analyzed independently but addressed in a manner that recognizes their fundamental interdependence.
- An analysis of the Rutgers development program through the lens of this “needs, constituency, and engines” model will help to frame a series of recommendations for the future

General Observations

- The Rutgers University development program is maturing but has in no way reached its potential
- The University achieved much during its last campaign, but the campaign’s difficult end and transitions in University and Foundation leadership kept Rutgers from seeing its full benefit
- Rutgers has not yet seen the very large gifts that have fueled the large campaigns at other major public universities
- The absence of an inspiring and well expressed vision that crosses all elements of this large and complex university inhibits the engagement of major philanthropists
- The absence of a strong connection between development priority setting and academic planning has kept the RUF from a close relationship with deans and other academic leaders on all campuses* At the same time, this distance has not served to help the deans to understand how fund raising can assist in shaping their agendas and sustaining their units over time
- This lack of a culture of philanthropy – a true understanding of how fund raising works as a revenue stream and the role of philanthropy in institutional planning – is keeping Rutgers from achieving its private giving potential
- Some feel there was an uneven allocation of resources between, and throughout, the campuses and units and there is tension over this allocation
- Many question the budget for RUF central administration versus the allocation for individual campuses and units
- Throughout the University, alumni affairs programs are not well integrated with the fund-raising programs
- They are under-resourced and sit on an uneven and confusing funding base
- The new organizational structure within the RUF is aimed at significant improvements in the delivery of alumni services and in providing important new performance benchmarks for staff
- Nevertheless, the 19 different and independent alumni associations lead to confusion, inefficiencies, and ineffectiveness
- Alumni programs are not serving overall fund-raising needs of the institution
- There has been little effort to develop an effective web presence for alumni

General Observations: New Brunswick/Piscataway

- The lack of integrated fund-raising plans for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the colleges that provide housing and enrichment programs for their students seriously inhibits the University's overall fund-raising success
- While faculty in engineering and other areas with a more professional orientation are less affected by this division, there are still considerable tensions between college priorities and academic priorities
- Athletics has not reached its potential as a significant driver for development
- The internal culture of the campuses is unnecessarily negative: recent studies show that some faculty and students in New Brunswick/Piscataway have a poor opinion of the quality of the University
- This negativity inevitably seeps into the development function and lowers morale
- The lack of publicity surrounding the success of the last campaign represents a missed opportunity for the campuses to celebrate their achievements
- The campuses in New Brunswick/Piscataway must take the lead position in a new comprehensive capital campaign

General Observations Camden and Newark

- Both campuses feel isolated and under-supported by the RUF
- They are very independent from New Brunswick
 - Separate identities and brand
 - Unique relationships with their communities
 - Different levels of volunteer engagement
- The cities of Camden and Newark are at quite different stages of development and this is reflected in the campuses' position in the community
- The Newark campus is very closely aligned with the city's revitalization effort, and success is seen as intertwined by key volunteers involved with both
- Both Newark and Camden have much less negative internal cultures than the New Brunswick/Piscataway campuses

Observations: University Needs I

- Rutgers is a complicated and multi-layered institution. Defining a broad institutional vision presents a significant challenge in planning for a major campaign in the future
- There is little tradition of engaging the faculty in serious discussion about the future of the University and how private philanthropy could help Rutgers to achieve its objectives
- There is little real sense of urgency for a new Rutgers campaign

- The perception of a lack of visible results for the last campaign weakens the case for a new one
- Cynicism and negative attitudes by New Brunswick faculty members undermine case for support
- Last campaign not seen as really benefiting Newark and Camden

Observations: University Needs II

- President McCormick has a strong sense of the role of Rutgers in New Jersey, nationally, and internationally
- He is praised as a highly articulate spokesman for the campus who engages prospective donors in a meaningful dialogue
- His initiatives to date have received a positive review in the local media and in Trenton
- His efforts to strengthen the undergraduate curriculum and the quality of instruction resonate with the public

Observations: New Brunswick/Piscataway Needs

- The New Brunswick/Piscataway campus's role as a major research university is not well understood or appreciated by alumni and friends and defining that role could provide important structure for the larger case for support
- The campaign priority setting process must build on a larger academic planning process that can help to answer the questions: "Why Rutgers; why now?"
- Capital facilities in the sciences and engineering are of enormous importance to deans in all areas of the sciences and engineering
- Growth in the endowment is a paramount priority of President McCormick
- Capital needs, however, are so great that they have the potential to dominate the coming campaign
- The relationship of state and private funding for these science facilities remains unclear; its resolution could have a significant impact on campaign priority setting

Observations: Camden and Newark Needs

- Camden feels that it is treated as a second class citizen despite its clear sense of itself and a strong image as an institution that cares deeply about its students
- The day-to-day needs at Camden are so pressing that an overarching campus vision is not being articulated
- As with Camden, Newark has a strong self-image but does not feel it is fully respected by New Brunswick

- The campus is intimately tied to the Newark revitalization effort and its leadership
- This is reflected in the language of the Provost – “Connecting Universities and Cities”
- Newark sees the larger institution that is Rutgers as “three institutions...big and diffuse with no single message”
- There is no real overarching clarity about why Rutgers merits private support; no strong message coming from the University

Observations: Constituency I

- Rutgers has not undertaken a major wealth screening of its alumni/development database in ten years
- While the excellent research operation in the RUF has worked hard to keep pace with prospect generation, without screening they have been unable to manage the major gift constituency as a whole
- New Jersey has areas of great wealth and non-alumni friends should be a source of significant gifts
- The absence of a hospital and of a strong and highly visible athletics program somewhat limits the University’s ability to reach out to the larger community
- President McCormick has set the building of a strong core of friends as a major objective of his presidency
- There are many opportunities on all of the campuses to build support from this constituency

Observations: Constituency II

- Success in a future campaign will depend on the careful identification and cultivation of principal gift prospects
- It is essential that the President be focused on those individuals who can make transformational contributions to the University
- President McCormick has made a significant effort to reach out to prospective corporate donors in New Jersey
- Nevertheless, the University has been far too dependent on a small number of corporate prospects
- There has been little concerted effort to work with faculty members and unit fund-raising staff members to capitalize on research relationships and enhance overall corporate support

Observations: Constituency, New Brunswick/Piscataway

- RUF staff members have not made a consistent effort to identify new prospects using faculty and members of the academic administration

- The complex organizational structure of these campuses and the tensions between college and faculty prospects in arts and sciences has hindered prospect identification and development
- Some units are anxious about sharing information with others for fear of losing prospects
- Counsel did not find any units where the volunteer structures were designed to identify and engage potential major donor prospects

Observations: Constituency, Camden

- As with New Brunswick, the campus has insufficient and ineffective volunteer structures for engaging key volunteers and major donors
- There is no high level Provost's Council for top prospects
- Alumni are heavily first generation college attendees, and the depth of their wealth is unknown
- Alumni programming is nascent and is not yet serving as an effective mechanism to identify key prospects
- The alumni base is young
- There is limited significant potential among local corporations
- The campus feels there is potential for foundation support but, they must compete with other campuses for access to key foundations

Observations: Constituency, Newark

- Newark has a number of strong volunteer structures established to engage key volunteers; Business, Arts & Sciences, Law, campus/provost have advisory groups of one sort or another with varying degrees of strength and understanding of roles
- The key city leadership is deeply engaged with the campus
- Newark has a growing tradition of gift support
- There are leadership level prospects under cultivation by the provost and key deans

General Observations: Engines

- The Rutgers University Foundation was without a strong, permanent leader for many months
- It is critically important that the new RUF President be accepted as a senior member of the University President's cabinet
- The RUF Board has not historically been deeply engaged in raising major and leadership gifts for the University; the institution has lacked a volunteer structure that is able to provide the President with access to the wealth in New Jersey

- The staff of the RUF are generally experienced development professionals who work hard and are committed to the institution
- It is important, given the University's limited resources, that the Foundation operation be as efficient and lean as possible

Observations: Major Gifts

- There are not enough major gift staff to cover the existing prospect base
- Wealth screening and the redesign of the prospect pool will require additional staff if the University is to reach its philanthropic potential
- Prospect portfolios for the major gift staff, both centrally and in units are not well defined or managed
- As a result, performance benchmarks for staff are not uniformly applied and the major gift program does not exhibit best practices
- Overall, there is not a smooth transition from annual giving to special gifts to major gifts to planned giving
- The existing reporting structure does not effectively promote communication between the various units within the RUF

Observations: Planned Giving

- The RUF has built up a solid planned giving program at Rutgers
- The program, however, is understaffed for the size of the constituency and has not been able to take full advantage of the rise in overall wealth in New Jersey
- Marketing for the program is comparatively small and staff members are limited in their reach into the prospect base
- The planned giving program could be better integrated into the major gifts program
- However, until there is additional staffing, it would be challenging for existing officers to absorb much additional activity

Observations: Annual Giving

- The RUF annual giving program has been very effective overall
- The policy of multiple solicitations honors the complex organization of the institution while maintaining best practices
- Donor retention at Rutgers is among the highest among public universities
- It is difficult to imagine that the annual giving can significantly increase its overall totals through its direct mail and phone programs
- Nevertheless, more attention to the independent identities of Newark and Camden in segmentation may result in stronger giving to those units

- Personal solicitation and a special gifts program is the next natural step in developing increased unrestricted support

Observations: Development Communications

- Materials produced during the last campaign were of high quality but, it will be very important in the upcoming campaign to have flawless communication between the fundraisers and the development communications team
- The integration of communications, proposal writing, stewardship, and development publications should be much smoother
- Units need access to a central communications resource for their fund-raising materials

Observations: Development Operations, Finance and Stewardship

- Many of the positions in gift administration and systems are part time, a situation that will not be workable in a larger campaign
- The RUF accounting system is outdated
- Gift acknowledgements and recording are made efficiently but, there has not been any serious attempt to increase staffing in response to the growth in annual giving
- The RUF does not have an easy time accessing University information and is often treated as a separate rather than an integral member of the larger Rutgers family
- Donors are also generally well stewarded though there could be a stronger integration between stewardship and major gifts
- In general, donors seem to be “passed” to stewardship and then largely left alone by their former managers

Observations: Alumni Relations

- The organizational model for alumni relations at Rutgers University does not support a strong, well integrated, alumni development program
- The fierce independence of so many small associations, perpetuated by a small group of volunteers who are not representative of the alumni body as a whole does the University a disservice
- Rutgers has a responsibility to its alumni across the country to provide alumni services
- Until it fulfills this responsibility well, the University will not achieve its potential in terms of alumni engagement including private giving
- While consolidation of the associations would be politically challenging and upset a cadre of volunteers, the current organization is thoroughly dysfunctional

Observations: New Brunswick/Piscataway

- The existing organizational structure and prospect assignments within the faculty of arts and sciences do not maximize staff effectiveness with donors
- The scope of FAS is so broad and the potential so deep for the University that it requires a strong and well supported development program
- The allocation of resources is not evenly applied on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campuses
- Support for the RUF by the deans would be stronger if the allocation of resources was more appropriately targeted
- This may mean that some units will lose some of their development coverage in order to keep within budgetary limits

Observations: Camden

- The Camden deans are new to fund raising and they need stronger support and training
- In general, day to day concerns distract academic leadership from important fund-raising tasks
- Until recently, the provost has not had staff to support a major gifts effort for campus-wide priorities
- There are varying levels of staff experience and strength
- As a result, major gifts work is sporadic and portfolios are too large for effective staffing
- Enthusiastic staff and volunteer support for President McCormick: strong vision, charismatic

Observations: Newark

- The provost & deans have made time for fund raising; they have an assigned portfolio of major prospects/donors, and are adept at conveying institutional vision
- The provost is very prominent in the Newark business community
- He needs to have a portfolio of assignment of campus wide prospects and the staffing to support his efforts
- Counsel found enthusiastic staff and volunteer support for President McCormick: vision, warm, articulate, and passionate about Rutgers

Recommendations

General Recommendations I

- Counsel recommends that Rutgers University and the Rutgers University Foundation begin formal preparations for a new comprehensive capital campaign
- The tentative campaign goal should be significantly larger than the previous campaign
- In the time period before the campaign begins, Rutgers should allow a limited number of fund-raising initiatives to proceed
- We recommend that President McCormick appoint a Comprehensive Campaign Task Force
- The Comprehensive Campaign Task Force should represent the larger University. It should be chaired by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

General Recommendations II

- We recommend that the RUF President maintain regular communication with academic leadership by attending meetings of the dean's council and by calling on individual deans on a regular basis
- We recommend that the University consider establishing a Faculty Advancement Council to advocate for development, assist in campaign and fund-raising events, and represent the RUF to the larger academic community
- We recommend that the RUF build up some of its centralized services in order to provide more effective support to the institution
- We also believe that the RUF should establish a strong regional major gifts program to complement unit based activities

Recommendations: Presidential Vision

- We recommend that President McCormick develop a clear set of core themes for Rutgers University that will form the basis for a campaign priority setting process
- These themes should be visionary and should position Rutgers for the next 15-20 years
- The Vision Statement should be short and inclusive and have relevance to all of the University's many constituencies

- Once articulated, this Presidential Vision Statement should be reworked in the form of a position paper that can be distributed to the University community as well as to alumni, friends, and the media

Recommendations: Campaign Priority Setting

- The campaign priority setting process should be initiated in the spring of 2006 and be completed by December of 2006
- We recommend that it be a highly inclusive process that will engage faculty and members of the University community on all campuses.
- The RUF should establish a formal program of internal communications in partnership with the University's academic leadership to ensure that the priority setting process is transparent and that faculty members who wish to engage in fund raising are kept well informed on decision making
- We recommend that the Presidential Vision Statement provide the guiding principles for the campaign and that proposed fund-raising priorities be graded against its core themes

Recommendations: Communications

- As the University's prospect pool is more clearly defined through wealth screening and research, we recommend that President McCormick begin a series of specialized communications to prepare current and potential donors for the campaign to come
- The first position paper should introduce the Presidential Vision Statement for Rutgers and announce that it will be one in a series of communications designed to discuss the future of the University
- Subsequent early position papers might highlight the College Avenue project as an example of the institution's new direction or discuss the special fund-raising initiatives in Newark or Camden commensurate with their own particular identities
- The position papers should invite conversation and engagement and open the door for approaches by RUF staff members
- As the campaign priorities are developed through 2006-07, the position papers should be used to introduce the themes of the campaign and to discuss major university initiatives

Recommendations: Presidential Events

- The position papers should be reinforced by a series of focused events around New Jersey and in other areas where the University has a significant prospect population

- These events should be in the form of a Presidential “Listening Tour” where President McCormick outlines his plans for Rutgers and invites engagement and comment
- The central event should be the Leadership Dinner, a small dinner hosted by a volunteer in a private home with invitations limited to Rutgers top prospects
- These dinners should begin in the fall of 2005; staff should aim to hold an average of one Leadership Dinner every month through 2007
- President McCormick should also speak at larger regional events and at some alumni functions to set forth his vision for the institution and to engage in a dialogue with the Rutgers constituency

Recommendations: Wealth Screening

- Counsel recommends that the Rutgers University Foundation immediately begin the process of screening its entire alumni/development database for philanthropic capacity
- Once completed, the Vice President for Individual Gifts should work with research and with outside counsel to assess the capacity of the prospect population and to design a new model for major gift portfolio management
- The screening data should be used as the key indicator for staffing and funding of the RUF: let the prospect numbers drive the funding decisions

Recommendation: Engaging the Faculty and Volunteers in Prospect Development

- We recommend that development staff members make a concerted effort throughout the University to engage faculty members in prospect development
- Staff should interview faculty and review lists of prospects identified through electronic wealth screening and through rating and screening interviews to expand and refine the constituent base
- Individual members of the RUF board, the alumni boards, and members of college and unit advisory boards should also be interviewed as part of this larger prospect development process

Recommendation: Major Gift Portfolios

- Once the prospect screening process has been completed, we recommend that an entirely new major gift portfolio system be put in place
- Existing portfolios should be dissolved with each fundraiser allowed to keep no more than 25-30 prospects
- New portfolios consisting of no more than 150 prospects should be established for every major gift officer in the central RUF and in units across the university

- Portfolios should be replenished with prospects from the larger pool created through screening as individuals make gifts, decline solicitation, or are deemed not to have significant philanthropic capacity

Recommendation: Arts and Sciences in New Brunswick/Piscataway

- We recommend that major gift fund raising for the New Brunswick/Piscataway campuses in the arts and sciences abandon college affiliation as a determinant for prospect allocation
- Arts and Sciences major gift officers should be assigned broad-based portfolios that correspond to the traditional disciplinary areas of the faculty: physical sciences, biological sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences
- These divisions should not be rigid, however, and regional considerations should also be included in the establishment of arts and sciences portfolios
- Arts & Sciences fundraisers should also take responsibility for securing undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships in their disciplinary areas

Recommendations: Stewardship

- We recommend that a stewardship task force be established to review the complete stewardship program of the RUF
- We recommend that this task force be constituted as soon as possible and that it present a report to the President of the RUF and the academic leadership on all campuses no later than December 1, 2005
- The task force should be chaired by the Vice President for External Programs and include
 - Unit development officers
 - Stewardship staff members
 - Representation from the RUF board
 - Representation from academic leadership

Recommendation: Alumni Relations

- Counsel recommends that President McCormick establish a Special Committee on Alumni Relations to examine the structure of the Rutgers University alumni relations program and to make recommendations to the University on the proper form of organization
- This Special Committee should be charged with producing a report to the President and the RUF board
- We recommend that the Special Committee be staffed by the Associate Vice President for Alumni Relations and include the following:
 - Representatives from selected associations

- Representatives from the RUF board
- Representatives from academic leadership from across the university

Recommendation: University and Unit Volunteer Structures

- We recommend that every volunteer board at Rutgers University have a formal volunteer position description
- The process should be managed by the development directors in each unit and coordinated by the Vice President for Major Gift Programs
- We recommend that all University volunteer organizations have position descriptions by the spring of 2006
- The position descriptions should cover the following:
 - Scope of responsibilities
 - Responsibility of the provost/dean/director to the volunteers
 - Gift expectations
 - Fund-raising responsibility (if any)
 - Size of the board and terms of office

Recommendation: Campaign Leadership

- President McCormick should use his "listening tour" over the next two years to identify and cultivate potential leadership for the upcoming campaign
- Beginning in the winter of 2007, the President should host a series of breakfasts in his home to engage a small number of key volunteers who he and the RUF believe will form the nucleus of a campaign cabinet
- Both Newark and Camden must have their own distinct role in the campaign cabinet
- The RUF President and the Vice President for Major Gift Programs should identify the individuals who should be included in these campaign recruitment events no later than the fall of 2006
- This campaign cabinet should be recruited and in place by the start of the campaign

Recommendation: Funding for Development

- We recommend that the RUF continue to pursue a policy of complete openness with the University concerning their gift recording policies
- We recommend that the University formally commit to funding the campaign at levels comparable to other major public research universities within the AAU
- We recommend that the President of the RUF report at least yearly to the provosts, deans and others in the academic leadership on the costs of development and the use of campaign funds

- We suggest that the recommendations of the committee examining funding for development be well publicized within Rutgers University so that the University community can fully appreciate the costs of private philanthropy

Conclusion

Building for the Future

- Rutgers is a superb university, a critical resource for the people of New Jersey and a national resource of real significance
- Private philanthropy is essential to the university's future and is the only option for providing the margin of excellence that will move Rutgers into the front rank of American research universities
- A major capital campaign can be a catalyst for a dramatic increase in the level of private support for the University
- Significant changes need to take place at Rutgers and at the Rutgers University Foundation to make this campaign possible; we must begin now

Unnecessary Confusion

- The organizational structure of Rutgers is unique among major public universities in America
- It is also a very confusing organizational structure.
- The RUF has an opportunity to bypass this confusion and establish a model that will optimize private giving to the University
- The period between campaigns is a good time to implement change and to maximize efficiency on behalf of the larger institution
- The cultural default at the RUF seems to be: "when in doubt, make it more complicated"

Funding

- The University needs to assume funding responsibility for the RUF commensurate with the capacity of the prospect base and the ability of the Foundation to reach that base
- At the same time, the RUF has to be more open with its gift accounting and instill trust on the part of the larger institution that the money invested is money well spent
- It is a clear sign of institutional maturity to accept the responsibility of funding development appropriately

An Inspiring Vision

- President McCormick has already proven himself to be an effective communicator and visionary leader for Rutgers
- The University has the time to refine his vision and to build institution-wide consensus in the period leading up to a new comprehensive campaign
- By allowing momentum to build slowly and collectively across the institution, the University will be in a much better position to establish a sense of real urgency when the campaign begins
- Rutgers must avoid being mired in procedure and process and reach for a new paradigm that will move in the institution to the front ranks of American universities

Why Rutgers; Why Now?

- In order to make the jump to a new level of private philanthropy and to reengage generations of disaffected alumni, President McCormick and his team must be able to answer both parts of this question
- It is not enough to say that Rutgers needs the money; every university needs money
- The agenda has to provide a view of a powerful and positive future for Rutgers that clearly shows its potential contributions to New Jersey, the nation, and the world
- The campaign must give thousands of new prospective donors the opportunity to touch that future and to make a difference for the institution and for their community