

CREATING FUNDRAISING PROFESSIONALS:  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
CERTIFIED FUND RAISING EXECUTIVE CREDENTIAL

Eva E. Aldrich

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy  
Indiana University

December 2017

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial  
Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee

---

Gregory Witkowski, Ph.D., Chair

---

Dwight Burlingame, Ph.D.

---

Una Osili, Ph.D.

November 9, 2017

---

Eugene Tempel, Ph.D.

## DEDICATION

For Mike, who has been with me every step of the way.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My special thanks go to Greg Witkowski, chair of my doctoral committee, whose help and support has been unwavering throughout my graduate career at the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. Without his scholarly advice, understanding of departmental and institutional processes, and unwavering support, I would never have successfully completed my doctoral degree. Too, I want to acknowledge with thanks the members of my doctoral committee—Dwight Burlingame, Una Osili, and Gene Tempel—from whom I have learned so much over the years, both in class and in professional settings.

I also want to express my appreciation to the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy and the Association of Fundraising Professionals for supporting my doctoral research through the award of the Ernest W. Wood Fellowship, for which I am truly grateful.

Ted Grossnickle also receives my appreciation. It is from him that I learned significant, practical lessons about fundraising, philanthropy, and leadership. My thanks go to Tim Seiler as well for welcoming me to The Fund Raising School a decade ago.

I would be remiss if I did not also acknowledge my family. My father, Robert T. Elsmere, Ed.D.; my mother, Jane Shaffer Elsmere, Ph.D.; my grandfather, Kenneth L. Shaffer; and my grandmother, Margarette D. Shaffer, M.S.Ed., consistently encouraged my academic work and created an environment that strongly supported a love of learning throughout my formative years.

Another key source of support for me during my graduate work was the “aperitivo gang,” my Lilly Family School of Philanthropy compatriots, who met without fail every Friday to talk about the ups and downs of the week. Peter, Sindhu, Liz, Matt, Sarah, and so many more—you made my time as a graduate student a true joy. To each of you, I say

*Prost!* And to Tyrone, who was not part of these Fridays but who was my esteemed colleague and fellow graduate student, thanks for always having a willing ear and good advice.

And last but certainly not least, my husband Mike deserves praise beyond compare for putting up with me all these years and for making me a better person than I otherwise would have been. To him, much love.

Eva E. Aldrich

CREATING FUNDRAISING PROFESSIONALS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
CERTIFIED FUND RAISING EXECUTIVE CREDENTIAL

Credentialing has become an established albeit voluntary—and often debated—part of the fundraising profession. Despite this, scholarly attention to the phenomenon of credentialing for fundraising professionals has been woefully lacking. While the literature has discussed what the benefits of credentialing are to fundraisers and the general public, it has failed to research how particular credentials came to be and why they were created at a particular place and time. This study analyzes the origins of the first fundraising credential, the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) credential, which was first awarded in 1981. While touching briefly on the phenomenon of mass philanthropy that paved the way for the birth of fundraising as a profession in the early twentieth century, the study concentrates on the way in which early practitioner associations such as the American Association of Fundraising Counsel and the National Association of Fund Raising Executives worked to establish fundraising as a legitimate profession. They fended off external threats from government regulation and capitalized on opportunities to give shape to the profession through the development of criteria for determining professional standing, codes and standards of practice and, eventually, the self-regulatory mechanism of voluntary credentialing. The principal results and conclusions of this study are: 1) while the fundraising profession has been witness to major events impacting American philanthropy in the twentieth century, including the reification of philanthropy as an economic “third sector” through the impact of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the

fundraising profession as a whole has been largely disengaged from these events except when they have directly threatened the economic welfare of the profession; and 2) the creation of the CFRE credential was largely spurred by increased calls for self-regulation of fundraising in the late 1970s.

Gregory Witkowski, Ph.D., Chair

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	x
CHAPTER ONE—INTRODUCTION .....	1
Problem Statement .....	3
Study Purpose .....	4
Study Significance .....	4
Research Questions .....	6
Research Design and Methodology .....	8
Archival Sources .....	10
Researcher Bias .....	12
Research Limitations and Delimitations .....	13
Dissertation Overview .....	16
CHAPTER TWO—LITERATURE REVIEW .....	17
Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession .....	18
Perceptions of Fundraising Professionals .....	20
The Philosophical Approach to Fundraising as a Profession .....	27
The Sociological Approach to Fundraising as a Profession .....	30
Credentialing in the Fundraising Profession .....	34
CHAPTER THREE—THE GENESIS OF THE FUNDRAISING PROFESSION (1900-1949) .....	37
A Systemic Theory of Fundraising Develops .....	39
AAFRC Defines Professional Issues and Boundaries .....	42
Contemporary Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession .....	44
Turnover in the Profession .....	46
Professional Boundaries and Community Sanction .....	48
Attempts at Self-Policing .....	54
CHAPTER FOUR—CERTIFICATION AS A RESPONSE TO REGULATION (1950-1959) .....	63
Pennsylvania Solicitation Act of 1951 .....	63
Tompkins Act of 1954 .....	68
CHAPTER FIVE—PRELUDE TO CERTIFICATION (1960-1976) .....	84
Origins of NSFR .....	84
NSFR Ethics Committee .....	88
Professional Education Programs for Fundraisers .....	90
NSFR Education Committee .....	96
A False Start for Certification .....	99
NSFR Institute of Continuing Education (NICE) .....	102



CHAPTER SIX—THE CERTIFIED FUND RAISING EXECUTIVE	
CREDENTIAL (1977-1985) .....	107
Initial Work on the Certification Program .....	108
Early Polling on Certification .....	114
Investigation of Comparable Certification Programs .....	116
White Paper on Certification .....	117
Certification Task Forces .....	125
Funding the CFRE Certification Exam.....	131
Development of the CFRE Exam .....	134
Administration and Promotion of the CFRE Certification Program .....	136
Recertification Requirements.....	139
Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession in the Early 1980s .....	142
CHAPTER SEVEN—SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	144
Summary of Study .....	144
Discussion .....	145
Implications for Future Research.....	148
Closing Comments.....	150
REFERENCES .....	151
CURRICULUM VITAE	

## ACRONYMS

AAFRC	American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel
AFP	Association of Fund Raising Professionals
AFRD	Association of Fund Raising Directors
AHP	Association for Healthcare Philanthropy
CASE	Counsel for the Advancement and Support of Education
CFRE	Certified Fund Raising Executive
CSFRE	Chicago Society of Fund Raising Executives
HBCU	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
NAHD	National Association for Hospital Development
NCCA	National Commission for Certifying Agencies
NICE	NSFR Institute for Continuing Education
NSFR	National Society of Fund Raisers
NSFRE	National Society of Fund Raising Executives
PES	Professional Examination Service

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Formal fundraising efforts have long been a part of American philanthropy.<sup>1</sup> In 1641, clergymen Hugh Peter, Thomas Weld, and William Hibbens left the Massachusetts Bay Colony to travel to England to seek funds to support Harvard College, thus earning a place in history as members of the “first systematic effort to raise money on [the American] continent.”<sup>2</sup> While systematic, this effort was nonetheless ancillary to the participants’ acknowledged profession as clergy. Fundraising would remain an ancillary activity rather than a professional pursuit until the middle of the nineteenth century, when the growing needs of the poor during the Industrial Revolution outstripped the ability of philanthropy to meet these needs face-to-face. These conditions—and the ensuing shift from charity, which focused on alleviation of immediate need, to philanthropy, which had social progress as its aim—created a new need for resource development on a scale never before seen.<sup>3</sup> Only then did fundraising begin to emerge as a distinctive discipline.<sup>4</sup>

Even so, a discipline is not the same as a profession. While major campaigns at the end of the nineteenth century at institutions such as Johns Hopkins University and the University of Chicago (where Baptist clergy Frederick T. Gates and Thomas W. Goodspeed were instrumental to the campaign’s success) demonstrated the way in which

---

<sup>1</sup> Selected content of Chapter One has been adapted from Eva E. Aldrich, “Fundraising as a Profession,” in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2010), 427-433; and Eva E. Aldrich, “Fundraising as a Profession,” in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Fourth Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2017), 503-516.

<sup>2</sup> Scott M. Cutlip, *Fund Raising in the United States: Its Role in America’s Philanthropy* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965), 3.

<sup>3</sup> Olivier Zunz, *Philanthropy in America: A History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 10.

<sup>4</sup> Paul P. Pribbenow, “Public Service: Renewing the Moral Meaning of Professions in America,” Ph.D. diss., (University of Chicago, Divinity School, 1993), 18.

major fundraising efforts required structure, their success nevertheless hinged for the most part on the work of talented individuals who earned their bread in other callings rather than on full-time fundraising professionals armed with science and method.<sup>5</sup>

Fundraising changed fundamentally in the early decades of the twentieth century. Mass philanthropy—“the mass campaign for small donations”—revolutionized fundraising, effectively “democratizing philanthropy.”<sup>6</sup> This paved the way for fundraising to emerge as a profession, as these highly successful, high-volume, small contribution campaigns required full-time, knowledgeable professionals for structuring and execution. Possibly the most famously cited instance of a successful early “mass philanthropy” campaign was that of the American Red Cross, which launched the country’s first nationwide campaign in 1917. This remarkable fundraising effort raised \$114 million in eight days to support the United States’ World War I efforts.<sup>7</sup>

It is the individuals responsible for these early, successful mass philanthropy campaigns—men like Charles S. Ward and Lyman Pierce, who perfected their principles and practices as fundraisers for the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) system—who were the founders of the modern fundraising profession at the start of the twentieth century. In the ensuing years, the fundraising profession has grown and matured even as the philanthropic sector in the United States has grown and matured. However, the understanding of fundraising and its importance to the philanthropic sector still lags, with many organizations unable to instill a culture of philanthropy in otherwise

---

<sup>5</sup> Pribbenow, “Public Service,” 20.

<sup>6</sup> Virginia Hodgkinson, “Individual Volunteering and Giving,” in *The State of the Nonprofit America*, ed. Lester M. Salamon (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 2002), 397.

<sup>7</sup> Cutlip, 110.

highly professionalized and sophisticated charitable enterprises.<sup>8</sup> Despite being a century old, fundraising is still seen as an emerging profession, with further development of research and theory being vital to the profession's future.<sup>9</sup> While fundraising as an aspect of philanthropy is increasingly a focus of scholarly attention, contemporary scholarship on the history of fundraising as a profession is generally limited. This is especially true regarding the history of credentialing for fundraising professionals in general and the history of the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) credential in particular.

### Problem Statement

Credentialing has become an established albeit voluntary—and often debated—part of the fundraising profession. At the center of discussions regarding credentialing for fundraising is the CFRE credential, which is the oldest and most widely acknowledged credential for fundraising professionals. First awarded in 1981, the CFRE credential is a baseline credential for the fundraising profession. To obtain the CFRE credential, candidates must complete a two-part process: 1. an application in which they demonstrate how they meet baseline requirements in the areas of professional practice, performance, and education; and 2. a demonstration of their knowledge of best practices in ethical fundraising as confirmed by achieving a passing score on a 200-question, multiple choice examination.

---

<sup>8</sup> Jeanne Bell and Marla Cornelius, *UnderDeveloped: A National Study of Challenges Facing Nonprofit Organizations* (Oakland: Compasspoint Nonprofit Services, 2013), 18.

<sup>9</sup> Robert F. Carbone, *Fundraising as a Profession*, (College Park: Clearing House for Research in Fundraising, 1989), 46; Harold G. Bloland and Eugene R. Tempel, "Measuring Professionalism," *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 5; Ian MacQuillan, *Less than My Job's Worth: Is Fundraising a Profession? And Does It Matter if It Isn't?* (Plymouth: Rogare, 2017), 5, [https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/9/9060/Rogare\\_Green\\_Paper\\_-\\_Is\\_Fundraising\\_a\\_Profession.pdf](https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/9/9060/Rogare_Green_Paper_-_Is_Fundraising_a_Profession.pdf).

While research has explored the benefits of credentialing for fundraisers and the general public, it has failed to examine how the CFRE credential came to be and why the development of the CFRE credential marks a significant milestone in the evolution of fundraising as a profession.<sup>10</sup> This lack of research into the development of the CFRE credential is not simply a lacuna in the history of the fundraising profession. It is significant because the void it represents contributes to the fundraising's ongoing self-doubt regarding its right to call itself a profession and under what terms.

### Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to document the development of the CFRE credential within the larger context of the emergence of fundraising as a profession. In particular, the study focuses on the voices and experiences of the practitioners belonging to early fundraising associations such as the American Association of Fund Raising Consultants (AAFRC), which was the first formal association for fundraising professionals; and the National Society of Fundraising Executives (NSFRE), which developed the CFRE credential.<sup>11</sup>

### Study Significance

Recent research has shown some disturbing signs of volatility in the fundraising profession. There is high turnover in leadership positions, inadequate and underdeveloped professional talent, conditions to sustain fundraiser success are minimal, and organizational cultures of philanthropy are lacking.<sup>12</sup> In the face of trying circumstances, fundraising professionals have traditionally relied on their professional

---

<sup>10</sup> Carbone, *Fundraising as a Profession*, 46; Bloland and Tempel, 5; MacQuillan, 5.

<sup>11</sup> Please see the list of acronyms used in this study.

<sup>12</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 5-20.

associations. However, professional associations themselves are now falling behind as members become increasingly less loyal and more value-oriented in the return on investment they expect for their membership dues.<sup>13</sup>

Credentials such as the CFRE serve the interests of professionals by signaling that an individual has attained baseline levels of professional experience, education, performance, and knowledge of best practices. This presumably also assists in building the strength of the talent pool available to the profession, which in turn strengthens the profession as a whole.<sup>14</sup> In addition, a credential tends to elevate both the reputation of the individual practitioner and the reputation of his field of practice. This factor is particularly important for fundraising, which some say “suffers from a bad reputation.”<sup>15</sup>

Credentials also serve the interests of associations. In addition to reinforcing association values, helping to delineate professional knowledge, and promoting ethical conduct, credentials also have the very practical, bottom-line value of generating revenue and increasing member loyalty to associations.<sup>16</sup> In short, credentials create “sticky” members—professionals who maintain long-term membership in the association and who usually go on to form the backbone of leadership for the association and the profession.

Given the contemporary challenges of the fundraising profession and of many of the associations serving it, a deeper understanding of the CFRE credential has the potential to reacquaint the profession not simply with the merits of professional

---

<sup>13</sup> Harrison Coerver and Mary Byers, *Race for Relevance: 5 Radical Changes for Associations* (Washington, DC: The Center for Association Leadership, 2011), Loc. 249.

<sup>14</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 24.

<sup>15</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 23.

<sup>16</sup> Mary Tschirhart, Chongmyoung Lee, and Gary Travinin, *The Benefits of Credentialing Programs to Membership Organizations* (Washington, DC: ASAE Foundation Research Series, 2003), 5, <https://www.asaecenter.org/publications/107675-the-benefits-of-credentialing-programs-to-membership-assns-pdf>.

credentialing but more importantly with how the profession was built, why it is important, and how the CFRE credential serves to support the health and strength of fundraising associations and the fundraising profession.

### Research Questions

This study posits that the CFRE credential is the result of the fundraising profession following patterns typical of the sociological approach to professionalization. The sociological approach to professions is characterized by an emphasis on stipulative criteria that determine the status of an occupation as a profession.<sup>17</sup> While various models for stipulative criteria have been developed, this study uses the criteria of “(1) systematic theory, (2) authority, (3) community sanction, (4) ethical codes, and (5) a culture” as defining features of a profession.<sup>18</sup>

To date the fundraising profession has been successful in establishing systematic theory for fundraising (albeit mostly practice-based theory, not research-based theory, although research-based theory is growing) and ethical codes (as established by professional societies such as the Association of Fundraising Professionals). It has been significantly less successful in terms of establishing authority, community sanction, and a culture with a strong sense of professional identity. As a profession that often elevates practice over research and talent over formal qualifications, fundraising frequently undermines the traditional building blocks of professional authority.<sup>19</sup> Since it is self-policing rather than governmentally regulated, fundraising lacks the hard boundary of licensure that defines traditional professions such as law and medicine. Further,

---

<sup>17</sup> MacQuillan, 4.

<sup>18</sup> Ernest Greenwood, “Attributes of a Profession,” *Social Work* 2, no. 3 (1957): 45.

<sup>19</sup> One school of thought posits that a philosophical approach to defining fundraising as a profession is more apt. See Chapter Two for further discussion.



fundraising still struggles with the concept of a unified culture beyond that offered by ethical codes. Partly this can be attributed to the wide diversity of individuals and organizations engaged in the fundraising profession. Partly it can be attributed to the very real ambivalence that many fundraisers feel about their profession, which is many times neither widely understood nor well supported by charities or by society at large.

The thesis of this study is that the CFRE credential represents an effort by the fundraising profession to grow professional identity through mitigation of deficiencies in professional authority, community sanction, and culture. The CFRE credential's process of voluntary certification acts to enhance professional authority by providing a mechanism for distinguishing those who possess baseline professional knowledge from those who do not; by enabling community sanction through a self-policing function that designates minimal criteria for being acknowledged as a *bona fide* fundraising professional; and by reinforcing fundraising's unique culture to charities and the public through the CFRE credential, which is a visible insignia or emblem available only to those who prove themselves as fundraising professionals by successfully completing an accredited certification process. In creating the CFRE credential, the fundraising profession moved forward in its ongoing professionalization through the consensus created regarding expectations and boundaries for fundraising professionals in terms of knowledge, experience, and ethics. In addition, the creation of the credential fostered the profession's adoption of a view that the fundraising profession was bigger than any particular fundraising association. It also promoted an understanding of certification as a potential gateway to a better and more robust knowledge and research base for fundraising.

Primary research questions include: What were the historic pressures faced by fundraising practitioners that acted as catalysts for professionalization? What role did issues of systematic theory, authority, community sanction, ethical codes, and culture play in the development of professional norms and standards for fundraising? What were necessary preconditions for the development of certification? What key elements helped shape the CFRE credential? What issues faced by the profession did fundraising practitioners seek to address with the creation of the CFRE credential? What role did the development of certification play in the professionalization of fundraising?

### Research Design and Methodology

This study reveals the voices and perceptions of the fundraising practitioners responsible for creating the building blocks of professionalism that culminated in the CFRE credential. The study employed traditional historical methodology and relied mainly on archival research to develop an understanding of the historic environment shaping prior generations of practitioners, including the contemporary circumstances and concerns that led them to prioritize the development of the systemic theory and ethical codes that eventually led to the creation of a professional credential.

Completing this study required a critical reading of records from archival sources of early practitioner associations such as the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel and the National Society of Fund Raising Executives. It also required an examination of records belonging to CFRE International. In examining these sources, the researcher utilized a postmodern framework that understands text as performative

utterances.<sup>20</sup> This framework views text as not simply as a record of reality but as a shaper of reality. Such an approach makes particular sense for this study. Archival sources provide a window for the analysis of the fundraising associations that built the modern fundraising profession as we know it, and the records of these fundraising associations show how the recursive discussions regarding the nature of the fundraising profession that took place over time and in the context of a shifting philanthropic landscape molded practitioner understanding of what the profession was and should be. Notably, it was largely through dialogues internal to the profession—that is, of practitioners engaging with each other about the nature of the profession—that led to the creation of credentialing (itself a performative utterance), with external forces that shaped the ebb and flow of the philanthropic sector as it developed in the twentieth century having minimal impact on decisions regarding credentialing.

The advantage of using traditional historical methodology and relying mainly on archival sources is that this allows for the voices of the practitioners responsible for building the profession to be heard. This provides new insight into how the CFRE credential was constructed, the social context of the fundraising profession at the time when the CFRE credential was being conceptualized and developed, and the tensions and biases extant in professional fundraising associations that impacted the credential's development. The advantage of utilizing a postmodern critical framework is that it aids in understanding how these practitioner voices engaged in a powerful cycle of recursive

---

<sup>20</sup> J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962); John R. Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Jacques Derrida, "Signature, Event, Context," in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 307-330.

dialogue over time to create a collective understanding of what it means to be a part of the fundraising profession. It also allows for credentialing to be understood as a powerful performative utterance that attempts to demarcate profession boundaries within a non-regulated profession. Further, examining the historical development of the fundraising profession allows the study to illustrate the recursive, ever-emerging nature of the profession and the ways in which professionalization has occurred only incrementally.

#### Archival Sources

The study relied extensively on primary sources of information from the following archival sources:

*American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc. Records, 1935-1992.*

Location: Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, University Library, IUPUI, Indianapolis, Indiana. As an association of leading fundraising counsel that pre-dated the establishment of the National Society of Fund Raisers (NSFR), AAFRC (now The Giving Institute) records provided helpful context on trends affecting philanthropy during the period being studied, as well as early efforts to consolidate systematic theory for fundraising practice and to establish a professional code of ethics. Archive contents also included some contemporary reporting on governmental legislation (primarily New York State's Tompkins Committee) affecting the potential regulation of fundraising. Series I: Minutes of Meetings (1935-1987) was examined for the period up to 1965, as after 1965 NSFR became the primary proponent for credentialing. In addition to meeting minutes of the Board of Directors, Series I contained minutes of Executive Committee meetings and records of yearly meetings. In addition, some transcripts of the earliest meetings,

treasurers' reports, committee reports, and speeches and papers presented by association members were also included in Series I.

*Association of Fundraising Professionals Records, 1960-1998.* Location: Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, University Library, IUPUI, Indianapolis, Indiana. The National Society of Fund Raising Executives was the originating organization for the CFRE credential, and its volunteers led the processes that investigated the feasibility of the creation of the CFRE credential and spearheaded the credential's development.<sup>21</sup> Archival materials were examined to identify private and public discussions around the creation of the credential, as well as messaging promoting the credential to NSFRE's membership. Specific materials examined include relevant records of the Board of Directors (1961-1998), including minutes, correspondence, reports, committee records, Division minutes and reports, Executive Committee minutes, and speeches mentioning the NSFRE certification program (which became the CFRE credential); program records (1970-1995), focusing on files of the NSFRE certification program; publication records (1962-1994), focusing on issues of the *NSFRE Journal* and *NSFRE Newsletter* published around the time of the launch of the CFRE credential in 1981; and NSFRE Foundation Board of Directors minutes (1978-1981) and *Sightlines* newsletter (1981) that discuss the CFRE credential or provide insight into the circumstances of the funding of its development. It should be noted that because this study ends just after the establishment of the CFRE credential, NSFRE records post-1985 were not examined for the study.

---

<sup>21</sup> The National Society of Fund Raisers (NSFR) was founded in 1960. It became the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE) in 1977; it was during the NSFRE years that the CFRE credential was developed and first awarded. In 1999, the association changed its name to the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP).

*CFRE International records.* Location: CFRE International, Alexandria, Virginia. CFRE International records include NSFRE documents related to the creation of the CFRE credential. Many of these documents do not exist in the Association of Fundraising Professionals Records, 1960-1998. In addition to minutes of NSFRE Certification Council meetings, the records also contain Certification Council Founding Chair Lyle C. Cook's correspondence related to the creation of the CFRE credential, results of early surveys of NSFRE members regarding certification, and demographic information on early CFREs.

Other archival sources examined included an *American Foundations Oral History Project* interview with Charles Johnson, the Lilly Endowment Inc. executive who approved funding to create the CFRE credential. The interview did not contain information relevant to this study.

A request was also made to Lilly Endowment Inc. to examine its archives on the grant award that funded the development of the CFRE credential. Lilly Endowment Inc. reported that documents related to the grant had been purged as part of standard file maintenance.

### Researcher Bias

The researcher has been a member of the professional fundraising community in varying capacities since 1995, first as a member of the fundraising consulting firm Johnson Grossnickle and Associates; next as Associate Director of The Fund Raising School at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (now the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy); and now as President and CEO of CFRE International, the certification body administering the CFRE credential. The researcher

has been a member of the Association of Fundraising Professionals since 1995 and held the CFRE credential from 2001-2016. The researcher has also experienced fundraising from the perspective of a graduate student in Philanthropic Studies whose research interest is fundraising, a volunteer engaged in fundraising for community organizations, and a donor to a few charities both large and small. The researcher is likewise humbled by having had the honor over the years to meet or work with individuals engaged in the development of the CFRE credential—individuals like Charles Johnson, Jim Greenfield, Bob Pierpont, Don Campbell, and Hank Goldstein. These experiences mean that the researcher cannot make unbiased judgments and observations about fundraising professionals, the fundraising profession, and the CFRE credential, which form the objects of this study.

However, the researcher bias that inevitably comes from having close ties to the objects of research is somewhat mitigated by the researcher having experienced fundraising and fundraising professionals in multiple roles over the years. These multiple roles have made the researcher very aware of the many lenses through which fundraising, fundraising professionals, and certification are viewed as well as the need to triangulate these lenses against each other in order to achieve a balanced perspective when approaching research about the fundraising profession.

#### Research Limitations and Delimitations

A significant limitation of this study is its reliance on archival sources. While providing plentiful data, archival sources are many times selective deposits whose contents depend on what individuals at the time thought to be worthy of keeping. Because of this, there is the potential for archival sources to be incomplete and perhaps

suffer from bias as a result. An example of this encountered during this study were the NSFRE Ad Hoc Committee on Certification documents that were missing from AFP's records but present in CFRE International's records. Without the NSFRE Ad Hoc Committee on Certification documents, the materials in the AFP records provide an incomplete picture of the work that went into the creation of the CFRE credential and the importance and scope of that work. Likewise, CFRE International's records are solely focused on documents related to the creation of the CFRE credential and lack the wider context present in AFP's records.

Another limitation of archival sources is that terms used in the records can take on different meanings over time. This study encountered this issue with the term "fundraiser," which at various times meant a fundraising consultant working for a large firm; a fundraising consultant who either worked for a large firm or who was a sole proprietor; a for-profit professional solicitor of donations; or a paid staff member of a charitable organization. While not an insurmountable limitation, such things require extra care on the part of the researcher.

Delimitations are within the control of the researcher, and there are several important ones pertaining to this study. This study does not pretend to be a history of American philanthropy, nor is it even a fulsome history of the fundraising profession. This study focuses on developments in the fundraising profession that were crucial to the creation of the CFRE credential. Because the first phase of professionalization—the development of a systemic theory of fundraising practice at the beginning of the era of mass philanthropy in the early twentieth century—has already been exhaustively documented by Scott M. Cutlip in *Fundraising in the United States: Its Role in American*



*Philanthropy* (1965), this study does not try to duplicate that work. Instead, this study's in-depth focus begins in 1935 with the founding of the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel and ends in 1985 with the first recertification cycle of the CFRE credential. This timeframe allows the researcher to expand on prior research through analysis of the records of the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel, the Association of Fund Raising Professionals, and CFRE International, which were not available to researchers in Cutlip's era.

In addition, this study focuses on the voices and experiences of the practitioners who shaped the profession as contained in records existing in archival sources. The records from the archival resources on which this study relied showed that in creating the fundraising profession, practitioner discussions were largely insular and surprisingly devoid of great concern for significant external events (for instance, the Filer Commission) that are milestones in American philanthropy. Because of this, the study examines external events only when records show that the events significantly influenced the development of the CFRE credential.

Last, this study does not include oral histories from individuals still alive who participated in the creation of the CFRE credential. Because of time restraints on the part of the researcher and because memory—while valuable—is also notoriously unreliable over time, the researcher chose to focus this study on an analysis of records contained in archival sources. An opportunity for further research is to expand this study to include eyewitness accounts.

## Dissertation Overview

Chapter One introduces the study and provides an overview of the context for the study, the problem to be addressed, the purpose and focus of the work, the thesis and key research questions guiding the work, the research methodology, and archival sources used. It also includes reflections on the theoretical framework for the study, researcher bias, limitations of the study, and an overview of the structure of the study.

Chapter Two reviews the literature informing the study, including research regarding the history of the fundraising profession, theoretical constructions of the profession, and discussions of the role credentialing plays in the profession.

Chapter Three focuses on the twentieth-century origins of standards of practice for fundraising professionals.

Chapter Four focuses on key attempts by state legislatures to regulate fundraising. These cases began the discussion among fundraising professionals about certification as a possible means of self-regulation.

Chapter Five focuses on efforts in the realm of ethics and professional education that were precursors to the development of the CFRE certification program.

Chapter Six focuses on the creating of the CFRE credential and how the credential constituted an effort of fundraising practitioners to address issues of insufficient professional authority, community sanction, and culture.

Chapter Seven summarizes the study and identifies implications for future research.

## CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

The search for professional sustainability and respect has long been a driving factor for practitioners seeking to build fundraising as a profession.<sup>1</sup> This chapter reviews literature relevant to the development of professionalism in fundraising and fundraising credentialing. Sections include perceptions of the fundraising profession; perceptions of fundraising professionals; the philosophical approach to defining fundraising as a profession; the sociological approach to defining fundraising as a profession; and credentialing in the profession.

For purposes of this study, “fundraising” is defined narrowly as an activity that generates monetary support for charitable organizations. “Fundraising professional” is defined as an individual who is employed by a charitable organization and whose occupation is the generation of monetary support for that organization. “Fundraising consultant” is defined as an individual who is employed by a for-profit company and whose occupation is providing advice and counsel on fundraising to charitable organizations. “Professional solicitor” is defined as an individual who is employed by a for-profit company and whose occupation is soliciting donations on behalf of a charitable organization. These distinctions did not always exist within the fundraising profession, and indeed grew only as divisions of labor entered the field. Even today, these various terms are not always well understood or used consistently by the public and by those

---

<sup>1</sup> Selected content in Chapter Two has been adapted from Eva E. Aldrich, “Fundraising as a Profession,” in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2010), 427-433; and Eva E. Aldrich, “Fundraising as a Profession,” in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Fourth Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2017), 503-516.

within fundraising. Still, they provide a valuable means of distinguishing various functions and relations within the fundraising profession.

### Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession

Evidence suggests that many donors find nonprofit personnel to be trustworthy because they seek their advice when making philanthropic gifts, and professional training for fundraisers asserts that fundraising is about “pride” not “apology.”<sup>2</sup> However, an ongoing challenge for those in the fundraising profession is that deservedly or not, “fundraising suffers from a bad reputation.”<sup>3</sup> Periodic “charity racketeering” scandals and sensationalist stories in the press asserting donors are being disrespected and even harmed by overly aggressive or overly frequent charitable solicitations mean that the profession of fundraising tends to suffer from low-esteem issues both in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of its own practitioners.<sup>4</sup>

Much of this problem is due to perceived tensions between the task of fundraising and the interests of those being solicited. One researcher suggests a key problem with fundraising is the inherent conflict that exists between the interests of the donor and the interests of the fundraiser, noting,

Without questioning the general good intentions of fundraising or the authentic generosity of givers, there is certainly a tension between the giver’s empathy for others, on the one hand, and the calculating rationality of the fundraiser, on the other, in his or her effort of marketing or persuading a potential donor.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Una Osili *et al*, *The 2016 U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy* (Indianapolis: IUPUI Scholarworks, 2016), 34, <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/11234>; The Fund Raising School, *Principles and Techniques of Fundraising* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 2013), iv.

<sup>3</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 23.

<sup>4</sup> Cutlip, 441-475; “Poppy Seller Who Killed Herself Got 3,000 Charity Requests for Donations a Year,” *The Guardian*, 20 January 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jan/20/poppy-seller-who-killed-herself-got-up-to-3000-charity-mailings-a-year>.

<sup>5</sup> Per-Anders Forstorp, “Fundraising Discourse and the Commodification of the Other,” *Business Ethics: A European Review* 16, no. 3 (July 2007): 286.

The use of the term “tension” to describe the tenor of the donor/fundraiser relationship and “calculating rationality” as applied to the fundraiser certainly suggests that the author finds the donor/fundraiser relationship to be suspiciously stacked in favor of the fundraiser.

Another researcher offers a stronger opinion regarding the ability of fundraisers to serve the interests of the donor, from which it may be inferred that asymmetrical information and contract failure may be a cause for a lack of trust between the donor and the fundraiser:<sup>6</sup>

Even assuming the fundraiser is fully honest and forthcoming, the fundraiser remains an agent of the nonprofit, with a duty to that organization to the exclusion of the interests of the donor. A conflict with the donor’s interests is permissible; a conflict with employing organization is not. Knowing this, the donor cannot rely on the fundraiser as his or her own agent.<sup>7</sup>

Here, the researcher takes the stance that agency is necessarily a one-way street. The fundraiser must seek to benefit the employing organization to the detriment of the donor’s best interests.

As if a bad reputation, perceived conflicts of interest, and issues of contract failure are not bad enough, fundraising historically has been a source of ambivalence even among fundraisers. Some fundraisers dislike the word itself, while a significant portion of fundraisers feel distinctly uncomfortable asking for money.”<sup>8</sup> Even fundraising luminaries such as Charles S. Ward, one of the seminal personae in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Richard Steinberg, “Theories of Nonprofit Organizations,” in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Second Edition, eds. Richard Steinberg and Walter W. Powell (New Haven: Yale University Press), 121.

<sup>7</sup> Scott Sibary, “Counseling Philanthropic Donors,” *Ethics & Behavior* 16, no. 3 (2006): 185.

<sup>8</sup> Margaret A. Duronio and Eugene R. Tempel, *Fundraisers: Their Careers, Stories, Concerns, and Accomplishments* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 192-19.

development of early mass donation campaigns for the YMCA system that led to the emergence of the modern fundraising profession, admitted that he perfected the structure for short duration, high intensity campaigns because he did not really like fundraising and was irritated that fundraising took him away from his programmatic responsibilities.<sup>9</sup>

### Perceptions of Fundraising Professionals

One result of this ambivalence toward the fundraising profession is an effort by fundraising professionals to present themselves and their work in a way that mitigates these anxieties. For the most part, this is done by downplaying claims to extensive specialized knowledge and highlighting fundraising as a function of servant-leadership.

For the most part, despite the growing number of academic and continuing education programs available to fundraisers, successful fundraising professionals continue to be described in ways that de-emphasize the need for an understanding of systemic theory for fundraising and that sometimes go further to suggest a rejection at some level of the notion that formal qualifications are needed to be successful as a fundraiser. As an example, requirements for successful major gifts fundraisers have typically been described as including possession of a solid liberal arts education and excellence in listening, negotiation, and communication—qualities that are unlikely to distinguish major gifts fundraisers from other fundraisers, or other professionals, for that matter.<sup>10</sup> Other research notes that as reflected in advertisements for management positions in fundraising, key trade publications such as *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* and *The Nonprofit Times* seek individuals possessing qualities such as

---

<sup>9</sup> Cutlip, 41.

<sup>10</sup> Ernest W. Wood, “Profiling Major Gifts Fundraisers: What Qualifies Them for Success?” *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 15 (1997): 5-15.

verbal and written fluency and competence; attention to detail; ability to conceptualize; negotiating skills; ability to coordinate and manage; innovation; the capacity of seeing something new, different, and better; analytical skills; mentoring, supervising, and teaching ability; understanding of budget; and ability to plan.<sup>11</sup>

Only two qualities that might be considered more specialized in nature, “volunteer management” and “technical expertise,” are included in this list. This preference for non-technical skills may also be indicative of organizations that lack a strong culture of philanthropy and therefore may not be entirely aware of exactly what to seek in a skilled, successful fundraising professional.

So why is it beneficial for the skills required for fundraising to be portrayed in such a generic fashion, with an emphasis on the qualities possessed by many competent individuals regardless of profession? While it is true that it is generally accepted that the basis for success in fundraising is the ability to grow relationships with donors, and this work may indeed depend on more generic skills such as superior communication abilities, it behooves the fundraising profession to portray itself in this way because of the potential for informational asymmetries between fundraisers (who as professionals seemingly ought to be privy to a set of special skills or knowledge that might give them an unfair advantage in securing gifts from potential donors) and donors (who, not being privy to these special skills and information, might therefore be gullible and vulnerable to fundraisers’ professional wiles and skills).

Thus, the portrayal of fundraisers as individuals who possess general competence but who do not necessarily possess specialized knowledge or skills has a dual positive impact on the positioning of the profession. On the one hand, it emphasizes that

---

<sup>11</sup> Lilya Wagner, *Careers in Fundraising* (New York: Wiley, 2003), 57.

fundraisers are competent individuals, and the public trusts their competence. On the other hand, the lack of emphasis on specialized knowledge or skills suggests that fundraisers do not have an unfair advantage over the donor, which again emphasizes the trustworthiness of the fundraiser because of an implication of lack of professional guile on his part. Because of this, the fundraiser can be perceived as free of the problems inherent in contract failure, where the relationship between the producer and the consumer is eroded because of differences in knowledge which produce a lack of trust.<sup>12</sup>

The assertion of the liberal arts as appropriate preparation for fundraising does something more: it also positions fundraising as a profession in the classical style. The current state of the profession of fundraising is often described as an emerging profession at best and, many could argue, may be more akin to a trade. While the availability of academic training for fundraisers has emerged over time, researchers continue to note that fundraising is still infrequently taught in academic settings, whereas academic training is common for other recognized professions such as law and medicine.<sup>13</sup> Instead, most fundraisers still do their learning on the job—something more like the apprenticeship system common in trades. The assertion that the liberal arts constitute perfect preparation for a career in fundraising suggests through association that fundraising could rightly be placed in the same league of respected and established professions such as law and the clergy, where the liberal arts have traditionally provided undergraduate preparation. This association provides fundraising with a tenuous but

---

<sup>12</sup> Steinberg, 121.

<sup>13</sup> Wood, 5-15; Sarah K. Nathan and Eugene R. Tempel, “Fundraisers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century,” Indianapolis: IUPUI Scholarworks, 2017, 2, [https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20\\_%20white%20paper%20\\_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yhttps://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20\\_%20white%20paper%20\\_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20_%20white%20paper%20_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yhttps://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20_%20white%20paper%20_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).



nonetheless real connection to other professions, thus helping fundraising—and fundraisers—position themselves as more than simply tradesmen.

No doubt this positioning is important because some of the most effective asking relationships occur between peers.<sup>14</sup> Without the advantage of association with other professions through the portrayal of the importance and viability of the liberal arts as a source for fundraising excellence, fundraisers might be awkwardly positioned as belonging to a lesser occupation, with this power inequality potentially having an impact on the ability of the fundraiser to ask for and to be successful in securing gifts from donors who consider themselves as belonging to a higher professional rank.

Another recurrent theme within the fundraising profession is the suggestion that fundraising is equal (if not superior) to other professions because the fundraising profession leads through serving others. One of the clearest assertions of this appears in the frequently awkward position of fundraisers within charitable organizations.<sup>15</sup> On the one hand, fundraisers are rarely the ultimate institutional decision makers, instead having to carry out directives regarding fundraising and institutional advancement. On the other hand, institutions are rarely successful unless fundraisers have a true seat at the leadership table, being able to influence policy and grow an understanding of philanthropy as an institution-wide concern.<sup>16</sup> To navigate these difficult waters, fundraisers frequently adopt the position of “servant-leaders.”

---

<sup>14</sup> The Fund Raising School, *Principles and Techniques of Fundraising*, VII.10.

<sup>15</sup> Lilya Wagner, *Leading Up: Transformational Leadership for Fundraisers* (New York: Wiley, 2005), 30.

<sup>16</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 18.

A concept popularized by the work of Robert Greenleaf, servant-leaders are “affirmative builders of a better society.”<sup>17</sup> Servant-leadership “involves others in decision making, is ethical behavior, demonstrates caring, and fosters individual growth within the context of organizational life.”<sup>18</sup> Those possessing the characteristics of servant-leadership exhibit behaviors or attitudes that include “listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community”—most of which echo the characteristics of successful fundraisers enumerated earlier.<sup>19</sup>

The idyllic depiction of the fundraiser as servant-leader is a consistent theme when fundraising professionals write about fundraising. One such published account relates an incident from a fundraising professional’s youth, when he and his father, a clergyman, spent an afternoon of service going from farm to farm near his rural home to pick up bales of grain being donated for purposes of feeding the hungry overseas. This story (and others like it) weaves a narrative which takes on mythic proportions in which the role of the grain gatherer is likened to the role of the fundraiser, providing a vital and noble yet humble link between those who produce the grain (the donor) and those who need the grain (the people served).<sup>20</sup>

Those who adopt the trope of fundraiser as servant-leader likely do so not only because of the reputational boost that may accrue to the profession. While depictions of the fundraiser as servant-leader and as someone who is dedicated to not just professional

---

<sup>17</sup> Wagner, *Leading Up*, 30.

<sup>18</sup> Wagner, *Leading Up*, 30.

<sup>19</sup> Wagner, *Leading Up*, 98.

<sup>20</sup> Paul P. Pribbenow, “Public Character: Philanthropic Fundraising and the Claims of Accountability,” *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 47 (2005): 13-27.

excellence but to a better society do much to portray the fundraiser in a positive light, the trope of servant-leadership may also play strategic importance in positioning the fundraiser to work well with donors, particularly major donors capable of giving institutionally significant gifts. Six key characteristics that influence the giving of major gifts donors are hyperagency, identification, association, tax aversion, death, and gratitude.<sup>21</sup> While the last five are fairly common impulses (after all, even those giving small donations may be motivated by identifying with the situations of others, peer groups, the desire for the positive impact of donations on taxable income, the wish to leave a legacy that lives on, and a sense of being blessed and wishing to share those blessings with others through charitable donations), the concept of hyperagency deserves special consideration. Hyperagency is defined as

the enhanced capacity of wealthy individuals to establish or substantially control the conditions under which they and others will live. For most individuals, agency is limited to choosing among and acting within the constraints of those situations in which they find themselves. As monarchs of agency, the wealthy can transcend such constraints and, for good or ill, create for themselves a world of their own design.<sup>22</sup>

A “monarch of agency” who wishes to find efficacy in the world of philanthropy requires a loyal servant. Through their positioning as servant-leaders, fundraisers can act as leaders or guides to the wealthy in their forays into philanthropy. Simultaneously, they can act as servants to the wealthy in the fulfillment of impulses fueled by hyperagency, allowing the wealthy to watch as their philanthropy creates, if not an entire world totally of the wealthy individual’s own design, then certainly an institution that is made substantially different through the donor’s generosity. In this way, the question of who

---

<sup>21</sup> Paul G. Schervish, “The Spiritual Horizons of Philanthropy: New Directions for Money and Motives,” *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 29 (2000): 17-32.

<sup>22</sup> Schervish. “The Spiritual Horizons of Philanthropy,” 24.

has ultimate power in the philanthropic relationship—the donor or the fundraiser—is ultimately answered in favor of the donor while yet allowing the fundraiser to retain a position that, while focused on service, is not subservient.

This positioning of the fundraiser is crucial for the fundraising dynamic and deserves further study and attention, as “the social relation that is philanthropy [is] an interaction between what appears to be only two actors: donors and recipients.”<sup>23</sup> It goes further:

The general tendency is for donors to occupy positions that give them substantially more active choice than recipients about how to define the philanthropic transaction and how to take part in it. Recipients also can and do make choices that affect what happens to themselves and to donors and shape the way philanthropy is organized.<sup>24</sup>

While it can be argued that the greater power of the donor is not a danger in terms of the distortion of the philanthropic relationship with recipients or of fulfillment of institutional mission, a reasonable counterpoint is that the superior power afforded the donor by the philanthropic relationship does indeed put philanthropy at risk by placing the donor’s interests above that of the institution’s mission and those the institution serves.<sup>25</sup> Such considerations point out the advantage of the servant-leader trope for the fundraiser because the trope emphasizes the fundraiser as a champion of institutional mission in the face of possible corruption or distortion of the mission by donors who may be tempted to put their own visions or interests first.

---

<sup>23</sup> Susan A. Ostrander and Paul G. Schervish, “Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation,” in *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*, ed. Jon Van Til (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), 68.

<sup>24</sup> Ostrander and Schervish, 70.

<sup>25</sup> Schervish, “Is Today’s Philanthropy Failing Beneficiaries? Always a Risk, But Not for the Most Part,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (2007): 373-379; Susan A. Ostrander, “The Growth of Donor Control: Revisiting the Social Relations of Philanthropy,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (2007): 356-372.

One further feature deserving attention in the perception of fundraising professionals is the terminology employed by the profession in talking about giving. This distinction is particularly evident in the realm of major gifts, where major gifts are commonly described as “transformational gifts” and the act of giving is called a “values exchange” between the donor and the institution.<sup>26</sup> Such terms are important in positioning the fundraising professional, as the very use of this elevated language is a performative utterance that quite clearly changes fundraising from an act of resource procurement for institutions into one of vision fulfillment for donors. The advantage that such an approach gives to fundraisers in the practical art of securing gifts is hard to deny, as it removes the “taint” of money from the philanthropic equation and instead emphasizes the spiritual benefits accruing to the donor from successful fundraising. Using language that places emphasis on the change that the donor wants to see happen in the world in a very real way “ups the emotional ante” of giving, leading the way potentially not only to larger gifts but to a heightened sense of trust in the fundraiser, whose use of terms like “transformation” and “values exchange” elevates his role not to the status of spiritual adviser, but certainly to that of someone who is more interested in the donor’s satisfaction and sense of fulfillment than in merely securing support for institutional projects.

### The Philosophical Approach to Fundraising as a Profession

Ambivalent perceptions of the fundraising profession create a context in which fundraising professionals have reason to downplay their specialized professional knowledge and embrace the mantle of servant-leadership. This helps explain the

---

<sup>26</sup> The Fund Raising School, *Principles and Techniques of Fundraising*, II.5.

continuing strength of the argument that a philosophical approach is the best way for defining fundraising as a profession.

The philosophical approach to defining a profession “tries to determine, through argument, whether an occupation ought to be considered a profession.”<sup>27</sup> Under such an approach, “a profession is a number of individuals in the same occupation voluntarily organized to earn a living by openly serving a moral ideal in a morally permissible way, beyond what law, market, morality, and public opinion would require.”<sup>28</sup> Rather than relying on stipulative criteria to separate professions from non-professions, the philosophical approach relies on individuals in the occupation to engage in “reiterated conversation” and “Socratic definition” to establish the parameters of the profession.<sup>29</sup>

In some ways, the philosophical approach to defining fundraising as a profession is both nostalgic yet entirely modern, as its precepts harken back to the pre-mass philanthropy era of fundraising, when fundraising was largely an occupation of clergymen and talented amateurs. In setting up the argument for what is at heart an endorsement of a philosophical approach to fundraising as a profession, one researcher begins by noting that the fundraising profession tends to suffer from expected problems such as the taint of the fact that “the currency of our work is currency.”<sup>30</sup> The argument goes on to assert that the key to the establishment of a strong professional base for the fundraising profession—and, by extension, for the ethos of professionals in the field—is a return to an earlier construction of the concept of professionalism.<sup>31</sup> This earlier

---

<sup>27</sup> MacQuillan, 4.

<sup>28</sup> MacQuillan, 15.

<sup>29</sup> MacQuillan, 15.

<sup>30</sup> Paul P. Pribbenow, “Love and Work: Rethinking Our Models of Professions,” *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 26 (1999): 49.

<sup>31</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 49-68.

construction goes beyond sociological conceptions of the professional, which defines professions by criteria such as possession of exclusive access to specialized bodies of knowledge, and instead emphasizes the idea of professions as holding responsibilities of social trusteeship. In other words, the philosophical approach would charge lawyers with fighting for justice and not simply with knowing how to navigate the law.<sup>32</sup> Likewise, under the philosophical approach, fundraisers are charged not simply with raising dollars but with being stewards of the greater good. It is a balance between “love and work,” a counterpoint that the researcher borrows from the writings of Wendell Berry. “Love” can be defined as “the realm of the amateur” and its realm “literally, [that of] the lover, one who participates for love.” “Work” is defined by “efficiency, the realm of the professional.”<sup>33</sup> To rightly practice fundraising—and to rightly understand it—this argument asserts that love must transform work and in so doing create a world in which

professions and professionals become teachers in a society that needs to understand how its highest moral aspirations are served in very concrete ways in our common work to build a better society. [The work of professionals] will be transformed...by virtue of the public goods they seek to enhance and preserve.<sup>34</sup>

This view of professionalism clearly sees the fundraising professional as primarily as an educator who helps donors understand their role in philanthropy and who helps institutions create a culture of philanthropy. By placing an emphasis on the creation of public goods, the role of the fundraising professional in securing actual funding for institutions is downplayed, thus suggesting that the actual getting of money is potentially a task that deflects the fundraiser from the major thrust of the fundraiser’s calling.

---

<sup>32</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 49-68.

<sup>33</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 36.

<sup>34</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 42.

According to this argument, fundraising as a profession “suffers for its attempts to ground its knowledge-base in a contractual understanding of human relationships” and instead must be grounded in an ethic of service.<sup>35</sup> The typical fundraiser’s understanding of the profession as a set of techniques and skills to be mastered “is important only if it is understood as part of the promotion of healthy relationships between institutions and their various friends and constituencies.”<sup>36</sup> The “disconnection between knowledge and service” is claimed as a key problem of the fundraising profession, and this disconnection explains why recent efforts to professionalize fundraising solely through the creation of stipulative criteria are “wrong-headed.”<sup>37</sup> The next step in the evolution of fundraising as a profession within the philosophical approach is not to oppose the impulses of the amateur (whose pursuits are driven by love) and the professional (whose pursuits are driven by work), but rather to adopt a model whereby “love transforms work.” In this way, the fundraiser’s love of humankind and ethic of service to the community transforms the work of fundraising from a set of techniques into a powerful calling. This rightly “define[s] the profession of philanthropic fundraising in terms of its philanthropic dimension.”<sup>38</sup>

### The Sociological Approach to Fundraising as a Profession

The sociological approach to defining a profession “assesses the prospective profession against qualifying criteria, such as whether it has a code of conduct or a professional body.”<sup>39</sup> The sociological approach has dominated most recent research on

---

<sup>35</sup> Pribbenow, “Public Service,” 221.

<sup>36</sup> Pribbenow, “Public Service,” 222.

<sup>37</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 34.

<sup>38</sup> Pribbenow, “Love and Work,” 42.

<sup>39</sup> MacQuillan, 4.



fundraising as a profession, which is understandable given that the sociological approach measures the developmental stage of a profession based on stipulative criteria that became relevant to fundraising only after the emergence of mass philanthropy and the systemic theory of fundraising that developed in its wake.

While most researchers conclude that fundraising falls short on many stipulative criteria and therefore is rightly assessed as an emerging profession, researchers using the sociological approach nevertheless provide important insights into the ways in which fundraising has worked diligently to build the values, norms, and symbols that are typical of an established profession.<sup>40</sup> They observe that “fund raisers aspire to what professions and occupations generally seek: effectiveness and efficiency in the work, control over work and work jurisdiction, and recognition of the legitimacy of the work and those who perform it.”<sup>41</sup> Some go further, asserting there are three distinct phases with discernible steps within the sociological approach to professions. First is the process phase, in which the profession is first designated as a full-time endeavor, followed by the establishment of specialized educational and training programs and an acknowledged professional association. Next is the power approach, in which the profession establishes market control through convincing the public that the services it performs are vital and not

---

<sup>40</sup> Carbone, *Fundraising as a Profession*; Harold G. Bloland and Rita Bornstein, “Fundraising in Transition: The Professionalization of an Administrative Occupation,” in *Taking Fund Raising Seriously: Papers Prepared for the Third Annual Symposium, Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, University Place Conference Center, Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis, June 6-8, 1990* (Indianapolis: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 1990); Pribbenow, “Public Service”; Duronio and Tempel, *Fundraisers*; Bloland and Tempel, “Measuring Professionalism”; Jamie Levy, “The Growth of Fundraising: Framing the Impact of Research and Literature on Education and Training,” *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 21-30; Richard B. Chobot, “Fundraising Credentialing,” *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 31-50; and Lilya Wagner, “A Crossroads on the Path of Professionalism in Fundraising,” *On Philanthropy*, September 17, 2007.

<sup>41</sup> Bloland and Tempel, 69.

readily learned by a large number of people. Last is the structural-functional approach, which demands a base of theoretical and applied knowledge; professional autonomy in decision making; service to others; the acknowledgment of professional authority; the development of a distinctive professional culture; and societal recognition of the legitimacy of the profession.<sup>42</sup>

Some researchers suggest a shorter list of commonly accepted characteristics of professions under the sociological approach, including “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.”<sup>43</sup> However, they note that measuring the degree to which fundraising fulfills these traits as a profession can be challenging, as an examination of each of these areas demonstrates.

Another criterion common to models of professions within the sociological approach is the development of systemic theory. As some researchers note, “for a busy and successful fundraising professional, theory may seem obscure and hard to connect with practice. Yet theory that is generated through research is so significant that it is a major means for marking the difference between professions and nonprofessions [sic].”<sup>44</sup> Despite this, the fundraising profession and fundraisers in general seem to value the development of skills over the development and utilization of theoretical or research-

---

<sup>42</sup> Robert F. Carbone, “Licensure and Credentialing as Professionalizing Elements,” *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 15 (1989): 83-96.

<sup>43</sup> Boland and Tempel, 6.

<sup>44</sup> Boland and Tempel, 11-12.

based knowledge.<sup>45</sup> In part, this is due to the way in which fundraisers have traditionally been trained.<sup>46</sup> In one study, 74 percent of respondents cited learning on the job as the way in which they learned fundraising; 43 percent cited non-degree professional development training; and less than 10 percent listed formal education.<sup>47</sup> While formal education programs are on the rise—and in fact are seen as currently trailing demand—many experienced fundraisers continue to depend on a philosophical definition of the profession, maintaining that the primary qualifications for the profession are personal qualities, including good skills in listening, negotiation, and communication.<sup>48</sup> However, by having a solely skills-based conception of the profession, these individuals overlook the consideration that “although the work of fundraising is shared with amateurs, with a theory and research base in the hands of professionals, the distinctions between profession and amateur can be more sharply drawn, and fund raising could have a greater ability to define and defend its work boundaries.”<sup>49</sup> Just as technical competence alone is insufficient as a claim to professionalism, so is a reliance on a purely philosophical approach that downplays the need for technical proficiency.

Perhaps the area in which fundraising has gained the most maturity as a profession is in the development of active professional associations and codes of ethics. The fundraising profession possesses numerous professional associations, with the largest in North America being the Association of Fundraising Professionals, whose members are all bound by the AFP’s *Code of Ethics and Standards of Professional Practice*. This

---

<sup>45</sup> Boland and Bornstein, 82.

<sup>46</sup> Beth Breeze, *The New Fundraisers* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2017), 71-74.

<sup>47</sup> Duronio and Tempel, 134.

<sup>48</sup> T. Cohen, “Nonprofit Training Seen Trailing Demand,” *Philanthropy Journal*, May 29, 2007, 1; Wood, 5-15.

<sup>49</sup> Boland and Bornstein, 82.

Code constitutes “an important effort to bridge the gap between fundraising as a business (represented by the professional fundraising firms of earlier generations) and fundraising as a mission (in service of particular charitable organizations).”<sup>50</sup> The Code has expanded to include articles aimed specifically at fundraising consultants and other businesses serving the fundraising profession.<sup>51</sup>

While having a code of ethics is one trait of professionalism, codes of ethics can be problematic because “codes of ethics can be badly or well written. They may be too general or too specific, too stringent or too lax. They may miss the most significant measures of ethical behavior.”<sup>52</sup> More importantly in terms of enforcement, the fundraising profession has not made it clear how ethics and standards should be monitored beyond the associational level, and what sanctions might be applied or how they might be enforced for violations happening outside of association membership.<sup>53</sup>

### Credentialing in the Fundraising Profession

A primary reason for the development of fundraising certification programs was a “justification of fundraising as a profession.”<sup>54</sup> While credentialing is not necessary to practice the profession, and fundraisers have been known to debate among themselves the value of credentialing, credentials have nonetheless become a standard part of the fundraising profession. A discussion of the comparative virtues of licensing, certification, certificates, and accreditation points out that credentialing programs make the case that credentials such as the CFRE have a distinctive return on investment. They

---

<sup>50</sup> Pribbenow, “Public Service,” 214.

<sup>51</sup> Holly Hall, “Evaluating How Well a Fund Raiser Does in Luring Big Gifts,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 1, 2017, 1.

<sup>52</sup> Boland and Tempel, 10-11.

<sup>53</sup> Duronio and Tempel, 196.

<sup>54</sup> Chobot, 31.

provide the certificant with the benefits of professional acknowledgment, donor confidence, employment advantages, higher compensation, and a profession that is overall stronger.<sup>55</sup>

However, such benefits can be as much or more perceptual than actual. Research supporting such claims is minimal to non-existent, and while it would appear that certification would suggest a certain level of competence, what it documents in actuality is a minimal level of experience and knowledge—two things that may be allied but that are not equivalent.<sup>56</sup> In fact, the most documentable correlation between the CFRE and professionalism is the fact that reported salaries for holders of the CFRE are significantly higher than those of non-credentialed professionals.<sup>57</sup> Overall, credentialing programs for fundraisers are important to the profession because of the way they have evolved to be “exemplars of good fundraising practice” that have gained acceptance across the globe.<sup>58</sup>

This voluntary adoption of credentialing is particularly important when considering the issue of the relationship of professional autonomy to licensure. The licensing of professionals “is in some ways the enemy of autonomy since it is a mandate promulgated by civil authority, normally state governments.”<sup>59</sup> Not only is licensure an enemy of autonomy. Licensure of fundraisers by government has other serious issues attached. Because fundraisers must have the public’s trust, they must go beyond

---

<sup>55</sup> Chobot, 31-50.

<sup>56</sup> Chobot, 31-50.

<sup>57</sup> Association of Fundraising Professionals, *The 2017 Compensation and Benefits Report* (Arlington: Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2017), 22-23.

<sup>58</sup> Chobot, 31-50.

<sup>59</sup> Carbone, “Licensure and Credentialing as Professionalizing Elements,” 89.

licensing, which is based on “meeting a minimal standard of competence.”<sup>60</sup> Further, the “mutual relationship between the public and the voluntary sector is on a higher level of expectation; the public good requires public trust, and trust is a mutual relationship.”<sup>61</sup> Certification, it can be argued, is a way for the fundraising profession to meet a higher standard voluntarily through practitioner attainment of a baseline level of professional experience and knowledge.

---

<sup>60</sup> Chobot, 31-50.

<sup>61</sup> Pribbenow, “Public Service,” 229.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### THE GENESIS OF THE FUNDRAISING PROFESSION (1900-1949)

The early twentieth century is cited as the beginning of the era of mass philanthropy, a time when a “people’s philanthropy” characterized by a popular mobilization to support the common good through small gifts collected on a massive scale became ensconced as one of the nation’s democratic values.<sup>1</sup> During this era, mass philanthropy thrived alongside the Progressive spirit, which expressed that “the defects of their [American] economic, social, and political institutions could be remedied by the application of scientific principles, compassion, and expertise.”<sup>2</sup> Americans came to see giving as an alternative form of thrift, with giving portrayed as a sort of “self-taxing” that served as “an investment in a safety net for all that was well worth the momentary sacrifice.”<sup>3</sup> The associative state, which “envisioned a society self-governed by dense networks of associations working in partnership with government to advance public welfare” took hold, with giving playing a necessary role.<sup>4</sup> New, innovative vehicles for giving by middle- and working-class Americans were created, including the Community Chest and community foundation models.<sup>5</sup> Demonstrations of the power of multitudes of small gifts were seen in successful campaigns such as the first ever Christmas seal campaign in the United States, the structured fundraising methods of the YMCAs, and the astonishing effort by the American Red Cross that raised in excess of \$100,000,000 in

---

<sup>1</sup> Zunz, 44.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Dobkin Hall, “A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000,” in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Second Edition, eds. Richard Steinberg and Walter W. Powell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 45.

<sup>3</sup> Zunz, 72.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Dobkin Hall, 49.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Dobkin Hall, 49.

the space of the week of 18-25 June 1917 on the eve of the United States' entry into World War I.<sup>6</sup>

It is within the changing philanthropic landscape of America in the early twentieth century that fundraising first emerged as a profession. While the activity of fundraising had been a significant part of the American landscape since colonial times, the massive scope of small-donation mega-campaigns was required in order to provide the conditions for fundraising to emerge as a viable, full-time profession.<sup>7</sup> These mega-campaigns required men (for fundraising was nearly exclusively a male profession at the time) capable of organizing and executing fundraising efforts conducted with the precision and speed of military operations. The perfection of the strategy, tactics, and execution of such campaigns changed philanthropy from a realm where only the likes of Carnegie and Rockefeller could achieve true impact to one where average citizens learned about the power of collective philanthropy to influence the world.

These were exciting times in which to be a fundraiser. But as is often the case, those living in exciting times often do not realize the enormity of the change in the environment in which they are operating. From the records of the American Association of Fund Raising Council (AAFRC), this certainly seems to be the case. AAFRC was founded by “nine of the major, long-established fund-raising consulting firms” in 1935.<sup>8</sup> Even these major firms were small by today's standards. As an example, one founding firm of AAFRC, John Price Jones, Inc., started out with 6 staff and 5,200 square feet of office space—presumably to allow for future expansion.<sup>9</sup> AAFRC's records—and what

---

<sup>6</sup> Zunz, 46-58.

<sup>7</sup> Cutlip, 3.

<sup>8</sup> Cutlip, 340.

<sup>9</sup> Cutlip, 175.



they illumine of the early days of the fundraising profession—provide insight into the cares and concerns of those who were actively shaping fundraising as a true profession, complete with codes of conduct, standards of practice, and advocacy for those earning their living through the practice of the new science of fundraising. Often the pressing concerns of the day were mundane and focused on addressing criticism of this new profession and protecting “what had become a lucrative business.”<sup>10</sup> While the larger picture of the growth of mass philanthropy as a twentieth-century game changer is certainly important, it has been expertly discussed elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> What has not been thoroughly examined—and what is the focus of this study—is the growth of the fundraising profession from the perspective of those early practitioners’ own words, and how many of the issues that drove early associations of fundraising professionals echo through the decades and led to the need to create a certification for fundraising professionals, the Certified Fund Raising Executive credential.

### A Systemic Theory of Fundraising Develops

Prior to the early twentieth century, fundraising was largely a passion, not a profession. From the first fundraising campaign for Harvard University (then Harvard College) in 1641 to Reverend Frederick T. Gates’ service to John D. Rockefeller Sr. in the late 1890s that helped significantly shape Rockefeller’s philanthropic priorities, fundraising existed as an ancillary activity (not a paid, full-time profession) that was focused on soliciting the aid of a few donors of substance.<sup>12</sup> But by the early 1900s these donors of substance and the new philanthropic vehicle they created, the charitable

---

<sup>10</sup> Cutlip, 342.

<sup>11</sup> Cutlip, 29-63; Zunz, 44-75.

<sup>12</sup> Cutlip, 3, 34.

foundation, were not enough to address the increasing challenges and needs of urban America.<sup>13</sup> True to the American ethos of the value of associationalism, citizens took action in the early 1900s by forming new, large associations to undertake projects to address public problems. Large organizations (many of which still figure prominently in the United States) were formed during this time with such foci as youth (Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts), disease eradication (American Cancer Society), and civil rights (National Association for Advancement of Colored People). Each of these organizations had the need to raise significant sums of money to fulfill their ambitious missions.<sup>14</sup> However, when it came to serving as a key player in the evolution of the fundraising profession, one organization stands out: the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA).

Charles Sumner Ward and Lyman L. Pierce, who started their careers as YMCA administrators, are widely acknowledged to be the “builders” of the short-term, intensive fundraising campaign that distinguishes modern fundraising. While they were not originators of the system (similar efforts had existed within the YMCA system as far back as 1884), they perfected it.<sup>15</sup> And unlike today's fundraising professionals who are apt to speak with a passion about their calling, their success was the result of quite the opposite instinct: in particular, Ward found fundraising irritating because it took him away from the YMCA's programs. In fact, Ward's methods evolved from the desire for

getting the fundraising chore done all at once, and done quickly. He asked his directors to agree to close down their desks a part of each day for a short period of time and give wholehearted support to an intensive, organized effort to raise the Y's budget at the beginning of the year. In return Ward promised these men that they would not be called upon for begging chores the remainder of the year.... He later explained candidly,

---

<sup>13</sup> Cutlip, 38.

<sup>14</sup> Cutlip, 38.

<sup>15</sup> Cutlip, 39.

‘To get the agony over with quickly was the main idea which prompted this movement.’<sup>16</sup>

It is ironic that those fundraisers today who feel qualms about their profession likely have much more in common with a founder of modern fundraising than do their more enthusiastic colleagues.

Both Ward and Pierce (Ward’s future fundraising colleague at the Washington, D.C., YMCA and later his business rival) based their fundraising campaign model on principles that are familiar to fundraisers today: “careful organization, picked volunteers spurred on by team competition, prestige leaders, powerful publicity, a large gift to be matched by the public’s donations, careful records, report meetings, and a definite time line.”<sup>17</sup> It is YMCA fundraising campaign techniques that provided the foundation of fundraising science during the era of mass philanthropy, and it was the men who came out of the YMCA system—namely Charles Sumner Ward and Lyman L. Pierce and their compatriots—who are widely acknowledged to be “the builders of the model of today’s fund drive.”<sup>18</sup> Their first collaboration in 1905, which raised \$80,000 in 27 days for the YMCA of Washington, D.C., was a triumph of the “whirlwind campaign.” Their subsequent collaborations—and those of their colleagues—escalated goals, strategies, and techniques for mass philanthropy campaigns, which were soon capable of raising millions of dollars.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Cutlip, 41.

<sup>17</sup> Cutlip, 44.

<sup>18</sup> Cutlip, 39; Zunz, 62.

<sup>19</sup> Cutlip, 397-440.

## AAFRC Defines Professional Issues and Boundaries

Ward, Pierce, and their proteges formed the core founders of the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel (AAFRC).<sup>20</sup> The founding of AAFRC is another important marker of the emergence of modern fundraising. With the founding of AAFRC, the fundraising profession began to assert itself as a united entity with a common cause. The profession acknowledged a common set of interests, including the need to exchange ideas regarding professional practice, set standards, and deflect criticism. The profession also started to set its boundaries in terms of who was considered to be a member of the fundraising profession, and who was not.<sup>21</sup>

On May 13, 1935, the American Association of Fund Raising Council (AAFRC) held its first formal meeting at the Advertising Club in New York, New York.<sup>22</sup> On the agenda for the meeting was the adoption of bylaws for the fledging organization and the approval of the charter list of member organizations. These consisted of many of the iconic firms from the early days of the fundraising profession, including American City Bureau; John Price Jones, Inc.; Ketchum, Inc.; MacArt & Campbell; Marts & Lundy; Pierce & Hedrick; Leo Redding; Tamblyn & Brown; Tamblyn & Tamblyn; Ward, Wells & Dreshman; and Will, Folsom & Smith.<sup>23</sup> Officers elected at this time were Cornelius Smith, President; Bayard M. Hedrick, Vice President; and J. Nate, Secretary-Treasurer.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Cutlip, 340-341.

<sup>21</sup> Cutlip, 342.

<sup>22</sup> Minutes of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc. (AAFRC Minutes), 13 May 1935, 1, Series I, Roll 1: Minutes of Meetings, 1935-1987 (Series I), American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc., Records, 1935-1992 (AAFRC Records), Ruth Lilly Archives and Special Collections, University Library, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (hereafter cited as RLASC).

<sup>23</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 13 May 1935, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>24</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 13 May 1935, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Cornelius Smith was particularly singled out for praise for “his tireless effort in connection with the formation of the Association and the efficient manner in which he coordinated the work of the various committees in their respective endeavors.”<sup>25</sup> Smith in turn gave thanks to others in the AAFRC for “the splendid cooperation they had afforded him.”<sup>26</sup> In addition to taking care of business related to the formation of the AAFRC, the meeting also featured a program on “Trends in Giving” by Mr. Street, which was followed by a discussion of the topic among AAFRC members. Trends in giving was to be a consistent interest of AAFRC over the years and eventually led to the publication of the first *Giving USA* report in 1956.

The first official meeting of the AAFRC established key foundational features that continue to define the organization (now known as The Giving Institute) to the present day. The restriction of membership to fundraising firms rather than individual fundraising professionals; the focus on mutual cooperation; and early attempts to approach the topic of giving from a more or less scientific perspective were all factors by which the AAFRC made an early attempt to define broad parameters for fundraising as a profession and address three key issues: the public’s lack of understanding of the fundraising profession; the need for self-regulation of the profession, both for the good of the public and for the profit of *bona fide* fundraising professionals; and the development of a basic body of knowledge regarding the theory and practice of fundraising and related issues such as giving.

---

<sup>25</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 13 May 1935, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>26</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 13 May 1935, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

## Contemporary Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession

Then as now, fundraising was a profession that was little understood by those outside its realm of practice. And from the early days, a key focus of the AAFRC was an educational effort to uplift the image of fundraising—an effort that was driven not only by the perceived need for respect of the profession but also by the practical consideration of driving more business to member firms, which were self-styled as the only true fundraising professionals around. This focus can be seen in an early AAFRC memorandum, which states the organization's purpose was:

1. To advance the standards of the fund raising profession;
2. To stimulate more effective service to the clients of the member organizations;
3. To provide a forum for exchange of opinion and ideas on matters related to the profession;
4. To enlarge a friendly spirit of cooperation between member organizations rendering services in similar fields.<sup>27</sup>

But this concern about the image of the profession went beyond the bylaws and was a more or less permanent theme within AAFRC over the years, commencing early on. Partly this may have been due to the fact that at the time, there was a particularly tight relationship between the fundraising profession and the public relations profession, as many individuals such as John Price Jones were former journalists who had drifted into public relations and then into fundraising.<sup>28</sup> The idea that the fundraising profession was a victim of bad press had to be particularly galling to them. At the May 18, 1936, meeting of the AAFRC, the comments of Robert F. Duncan of John Price Jones, Inc., reflected this perspective:

There is an opportunity somewhere to say something about us as a profession. He [Duncan] is being constantly reminded that we are not

---

<sup>27</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Memorandum, n.d., Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>28</sup> Cutlip, 175-176.

very well understood and he would like to see a written statement concerning the profession; what it does and does not do; the type of men who are in it; its ideals. He pointed out that we do not have the professional standing of lawyers or doctors. He said it would help were we to get a definite statement put out by the Association, defining what we do. Many clients and potential clients would welcome such a statement. Anything we do to elevate our profession would be very helpful to all.<sup>29</sup>

The notion that releasing a statement was to be a key element to address the problem no doubt reflects Duncan's familiarity with journalism and press releases.

President Bayard M. Hedrick of Pierce & Hedrick, who was trained in the YMCA system, noted similar issues.<sup>30</sup> He said with great seriousness at the May 17, 1937 meeting of the AAFRC,

We have some real problems to deal with within the Association. For instance, just how important is it for us, who are in this business, that this business shall attain a status that gives it first-class business recognition, or recognition as a profession? We must give real time, attention and thought to this matter.

What direction shall we take? Shall we attempt to apply rigid controls or the process of cooperation in which we share our ambitions for this profession of ours and work together trying to produce better conditions within our organizations and better service to our clients, thereby lifting the whole program....

In laying down the real objectives of our Association...we should bear in mind the lifting of the standards of our profession.<sup>31</sup>

Bayard's emphasis on the need to cooperate, improve service to clients, and lift standards no doubt was influenced by the service and religious ethic of the YMCA system with which he was familiar. More importantly, though, his words show the way in which the fundraising profession was starting to build consciousness of the need for more than a simple association of individuals engaged in similar work. While professional

---

<sup>29</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 May 1936, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>30</sup> Cutlip, 161.

<sup>31</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 17 May 1937, 1-2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

cooperation was important, the mention of the potential for “rigid controls” was a foreshadowing of AAFRC’s work to create formal standards of practice to serve as community sanction for entry into the profession. Both Duncan’s and Hedrick’s perspectives led to one common approach: the way AAFRC decided to lift the standards of the profession was to create standards for regulating membership in AAFRC.

#### Turnover in the Profession

AAFRC firms themselves wrestled with another issue that is a challenge within the fundraising profession yet today: staff turnover. In fact, this was such an important consideration that “personnel” was the single topic of discussion at the AAFRC meeting on January 18, 1937. Key discussion questions were listed as:

How to attract the best type of man and woman.  
How to keep them after we get them.  
Employment arrangements and particularly some general discussion as to retirement plans, profit-sharing plans, etc.<sup>32</sup>

These questions point to a common concern of those in attendance: the tie between the stature of fundraising as a lesser profession and the issue of staff turnover. Dwight Folsom, Sr., of Will, Folsom & Smith said that fundraising “has publicity of a type that is negative, which as a result does not lead me with a burning desire to get into it.”<sup>33</sup>

George Tamblyn, Jr. of Tamblyn & Tamblyn noted a particular challenge of the firms was “to lay plans whereby men could be attracted with a view to permanently engaging in our work.”<sup>34</sup>

The collective wisdom of the assembled firms suggested that the best way to get the right people into the profession was to hire young individuals and train them on the

---

<sup>32</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>33</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>34</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.



job rather than to look for experienced fundraisers. Folsom probably best summarized the general consensus when he noted that the practice at Will, Folsom & Smith was to “find a man” and

first put him through a course of training so that he may acquire the knowledge and experience to fit him for the work. Seldom do they [Will, Folsom & Smith] find that people claiming to have campaign experience prove to be of very great value. He [Folsom] felt that we are all faced with the problem of developing a method whereby we can train people for the work.<sup>35</sup>

Without reliable training available, AAFRC members were left to their own resources to train their new recruits. Because of the high stakes and highly structured nature of the campaigns these firms undertook, trusting that a recruit had been properly taught the basics of campaigning in their prior engagements was not an option. Firms like Will, Folsom & Smith took the precaution of training each recruit according to the firm’s particular methods and standards. Other than being trainable and unmarred by having learned bad or ineffective practice elsewhere (which likely was why those with prior campaign experience were not necessarily sought after), little else was required. Folsom noted that a real problem in the profession is that he did not believe that fundraising had found

any reliable source from which to enlist personnel. The main difficulty from his [Folsom’s] point of view was the lack of a definition of essential qualifications.... No particular educational or business record has been found to provide the essential background fulfilling the necessary qualifications.<sup>36</sup>

John Crosby Brown of Tamblyn & Brown was the sole person to touch on the topic of women in the fundraising profession during this discussion of personnel. He

---

<sup>35</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>36</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

said, “The question of women has not been mentioned. The difficulty of getting men is grave and will continue. It is somewhat less difficult to get women of ability.... They [Tamblyn & Brown] have one woman who is regarded as the equal of anyone....”<sup>37</sup> At the time, Tamblyn & Brown had three women conducting campaigns. Brown noted that his firm would not have been able to cope with the volume of work without the female consultants, most of whom worked on campaigns for women’s organizations such as the YWCA.<sup>38</sup> Despite the presence of several female consultants, most women in fundraising were generally limited to support roles or to working with women’s organizations.<sup>39</sup>

### Professional Boundaries and Community Sanction

While lifting the standards of the fundraising profession was certainly a clear aim of the AAFRC, so was advancing the business interests of AAFRC member firms. As the business of fundraising grew, so did the number of practitioners, many of whom AAFRC saw either as compromising the profession or posing unfair competition to the legitimate firms represented by AAFRC’s members. These questionable elements included fundraisers who accepted percentage-based compensation, freelancers, and amateurs.

From the beginning, AAFRC members sought to distance themselves from fundraisers who were compensated on a basis of a percentage of funds raised. In fact, this prohibition is one of the few early tenets of AAFRC that still appears in contemporary codes of ethics for fundraising professionals. At the AAFRC meeting held

---

<sup>37</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>38</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>39</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 18 January 1937, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

on December 16, 1935, at the Advertising Club of New York, the guest speaker, Mr. Markel, Sunday Editor of the *New York Times*, noted that it was his opinion that when publicity notices for charity fundraising campaigns were composed, the name of the fundraising firm engaged as counsel should appear. He noted, “Failure to make this clear raises some distrust and suspicion in the minds of the men working in the editorial room [because] there is a general impression among newspaper men that firms, such as the principal firms of the Association, do their work on a commission basis.”<sup>40</sup> He also shared the insider information that placing undue pressure on the City Editor to publish a charity fundraising announcement was counterproductive, as that makes him “sore as hell.”<sup>41</sup>

While it is unknown whether AAFRC members modified their approaches to the City Editor in the wake of Mr. Markel’s address, they certainly took to heart the need to elevate the status of the fundraising profession in the eyes of the press and the public. To that end, the AAFRC Publicity Committee proposed to draft a communication to go to newspaper publishers and city editors that would “set forth briefly the nature of the Association, the ideals which govern its members, the basis of compensation for our services, etc.” The result of this effort was a piece providing the first overview of the AAFRC. It included the date of the AAFRC’s founding, member organizations, and officers; the principles of the AAFRC; and qualifications for membership. What is perhaps most striking about this document is the amount of space devoted to the qualifications for membership, which occupies the entire second page. These qualifications are:

---

<sup>40</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 16 December 1936, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>41</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 16 December 1936, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

1. The active executive head of the member organization shall have had a continuous experience of at least ten years as professional counsel in the fund-raising field.
2. The members must have a record of consistently successful work, and of repeated calls to serve the same clients or others involving the same constituency.
3. They must show satisfactory references, both from clients and from one or more banks or trust companies.
4. They must conform to the minimum standard of assigning as executive-in-charge only those members of their staffs who have served as associates on six or more campaigns, or who have been continuously employed as staff members or a period of at least one year.
5. Membership in this Association shall be confined to those organizations which do business on a fee basis only, and which make no profit, directly or indirectly, from disbursements for account of clients.<sup>42</sup>

The criteria for admission to AAFRC can be boiled down to two key factors: experience and good character. By requiring applicant firms to demonstrate longevity in their leadership and management personnel, AAFRC effectively was requiring a minimum level of experience. Further, while “successful work” was a criterion for admission to AAFRC, quantifiable standards by which to measure success were not defined. Instead, it can be inferred that AAFRC equated “success” to repeat business, suggesting that what AAFRC was really trying to determine with this criterion was the experience and good character of the applicant firm—that clients thought the firms knowledgeable enough and professional enough to ask for repeat engagements. The emphasis on references also underscores the importance of good character as a criterion for admission to AAFRC, as does the insistence on working on a fee basis only, which was a factor that distinguished AAFRC firms from others, as AAFRC saw percentage-based compensation as “harmful to the prestige” of the fundraising profession.<sup>43</sup> While experience and good character provided something of a measuring stick by which to judge those seeking admission to

---

<sup>42</sup> AAFRC Minutes, “Not for Publication”, n.d., 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>43</sup> Cutlip, 342.

AAFRC, specific criteria for judging each were generally lacking. This left much discretion to those charged with reviewing an applicant firm's petition. Perhaps the most telling statement, however, regarding what AAFRC hoped to do by instituting these qualifications lies in the last sentence of the document, which states, "The relationship of members of the Association to clients is more analogous to that of the lawyer than it is to that of the advertising man"—a very clear effort to elevate fundraising out of the arena of public relations and sales, both occupations for which there were no prerequisites, and into the realm of a *bona fide* profession with barriers for entry.<sup>44</sup>

It is important to consider this list of qualifications because it marks a significant point of growth in professional maturity, as it is a first formal effort by the fundraising profession to set community sanction—that is, minimum criteria to determine who is accepted as a professional. Given the profession's lack of a formal path of study to distinguish qualified practitioners from lay people—and, in fact, the lack of any sort of professional education except on-the-job training—limiting AAFRC membership to firms which possessed sufficiently experienced staff, a record of successful client work, a good reputation, and fee-based compensation provided a set of professional parameters that put boundaries around the profession to a certain extent.

While AAFRC had a list of qualifications for membership, the organization did not have a formal list of items that would disqualify a candidate from membership. However, there was an informal vetting process in place at AAFRC for determining who was eligible for membership in AAFRC and who was not. The case of the firm of Dwight Folsom provides an illustration of the vetting process in

---

<sup>44</sup> AAFRC Minutes, "Not for Publication", n.d., 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

action. Dwight Folsom, Jr., the firm's principal, had formerly been associated with AAFRC member firm Will, Folsom & Smith. (He was, in fact, Folsom Sr.'s son.) In putting forward Dwight Folsom, Jr.'s request for membership, Cornelius Smith (who was a partner in Will, Folsom & Smith and thus a colleague of Dwight Folsom, Jr.'s father) noted that the younger man's "training and experience were technically adequate" but that his firm's fees for service were too low.<sup>45</sup> The meeting minutes say that Smith had

very definite evidence that Mr. Folsom offers his services for fees which are a small fraction of that which members of the Association regard as necessary, if competent service is to be rendered in behalf of clients. This would seem to be corroborated by statements made by Mr. Folsom to Mr. Smith personally, to the effect that he regarded fees charged by member organizations in capital campaigns as excessive and unwarranted. Consequently, it appears he offers his services at rates which would not conform to those we [the Association] consider essential in order to render the right type of service.<sup>46</sup>

Had this discussion of fees been made public, it is likely that AAFRC would have found itself in hot water for potential violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, whereby it is unlawful for associations to exclude otherwise qualified members due to "unpopular business or professional views or practices of applicants (e.g., price discounting)."<sup>47</sup> As it is, it points out an interesting question in terms of AAFRC's position on fees: Were AAFRC's policies primarily meant to safeguard clients by admitting member firms whose resources guaranteed they would provide superior service? Or were AAFRC's policies primarily meant to safeguard member firms' profitability by giving community sanction only to those firms who promised to uphold a specific pricing structure? There

---

<sup>45</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 8 May 1939, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>46</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 8 May 1939, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>47</sup> Jerald A. Jacobs, *Association Law Handbook: A Practical Guide for Associations, Societies, and Charities*, Fifth Edition (Washington, DC: ASAE Association Management Press, 2012), 307.

are arguments to be made on both sides, with the realistic answer probably lying somewhere in the middle.

Conveniently, a rotation in the composition of the AAFRC Membership Committee was on the horizon, so the question of what to do with Dwight Folsom, Jr.'s application for membership became the new Membership Committee's problem. They took up the question again at the meeting of October 16, 1939, where Harold Seymour as Chair of the Membership Committee moved for approval of Dwight Folsom, Jr.'s application. The minutes reflect that

In the discussion which followed, it became very evident that *there was a need for establishing a definite code of ethics* [emphasis mine] and procedure as a basis for investigation of any applicant for membership. In view of the fact that this was the first time the Membership Committee had been called upon to function in a matter of this kind, it was considered an opportune moment—in fairness to ourselves and future members—to draw up a definite mode of procedure which could be applied in the present and all future instances. In this connection, it was suggested that where an applicant had previously been associated with a member of the Association, it might be desirable for the applicant either to be nominated or seconded by such member. It was also suggested that an applicant might be considered elected if not more than one negative vote was cast by members present at one of the regular meetings of the Association.<sup>48</sup>

Seymour's statement is of interest because it marks the first time in AAFRC records that there is a direct call made for creating a formal code of ethics for the profession. While the fundraising profession—and AAFRC itself—was still very young, it suggests that the profession had grown beyond the point where its qualified practitioners were in agreement on all points regarding the informal understanding of professional ethics under which they had theretofore operated. However, AAFRC was not yet ready to fully dispense with the criterion of good character, and in fact this importance was reinforced

---

<sup>48</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 16 October 1939, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

by the suggestion that applicant firms be recommended by current members, who still held the upper hand about who was admitted.

While it was a notable day for the profession, it was another frustrating day for Dwight Folsom, Jr. Once again, the membership of his firm was deferred as the Membership Committee was tasked with reviewing AAFRC by-laws "as they relate to conditions of membership, and bring in any suggestions, as regards qualifications of membership and procedure to be followed, at the next meeting."<sup>49</sup> Subsequently, in the January 15, 1940 meeting, Harold Seymour presented a new member application form (called a "questionnaire" in the minutes) for approval by AAFRC.<sup>50</sup> The application form was then passed unanimously at the 13 February 1940 meeting.<sup>51</sup>

#### Attempts at Self-Policing

Subsequent events make clear that AAFRC took the statement of qualifications and the effort to elevate the fundraising profession seriously. They also took seriously the protectionist stance they had adopted toward their members. Typically, the qualification standards themselves eliminated the key type of fundraiser that AAFRC wished to keep out of the profession: individual practitioners, which at various times AAFRC members referred to as "amateurs" or "freelancers."

The most fulsome discussions of the vexations caused to fundraising firms by the competition posed by individual practitioners began at the AAFRC meeting held on August 5, 1940. Noting that fundraising firms were already hard-pressed due to the war in Europe, a still-depressed economy, and "the long term trend of this [fundraising]

---

<sup>49</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 16 October 1939, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>50</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 January 1940, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>51</sup> A copy of the questionnaire is not included in AAFRC records.



business, which he thought was on the negative side,” Harold J. Seymour had a lot to say.<sup>52</sup> Seymour was among the first to articulate an evolution in the field of professional fundraising that would result in a bifurcation of fundraising professionals into two distinct pools—those that were direct employees of nonprofit organizations and those that were fundraising consultants. This trend was certainly of concern to AAFRC members, who generally saw the movement of larger institutions to build in-house fundraising functions as bad for business. Seymour’s comments at the AAFRC meeting on August 5, 1940, provide historical perspective on the way in which those active in fundraising from the earlier days of mass philanthropy saw this development. As the minutes reflect,

Fifteen or twenty years ago, when he [Seymour] first came into the business, there were not many people who knew much about fund-raising. Nearly all Community Chest campaigns were run by professional organizations [i.e., fundraising consulting firms]. The Social Agencies seldom had campaigns. When they did, they engaged professional assistance. We are now up against an entirely different situation. There are a lot of fellows who have worked for our firms, or as Chest Executives, or with clients, who have raised money. To-day [sic], Cornell, Yale, and other educational institutions—164 in all—have money-raising assistants.<sup>53</sup>

Seymour went on to share yet more instances of the same trend in social agencies and healthcare institutions, which in Seymour’s view tended to poach both qualified and unqualified fundraisers as long as they could show experience with a respected fundraising consulting firm. The profession was still young enough that fundraising consulting firms felt that institutional fundraising expertise would potentially cancel the need for AAFRC member firms’ services, when in fact history has shown the opposite

---

<sup>52</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 August 1940, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>53</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 August 1940, 6, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

trend: the more organizations there are that are trying to raise money, the more their fundraising staff has need of fundraising counsel.

Seymour's advice to his fellow AAFRC members regarding this situation consisted of two points:

His first point was that he thought one of the things we [AAFRC] have got to be a little more hard-boiled about is helping those institutions [i.e., nonprofit organizations] to set themselves up so perfectly. He found he had been helping a lot of people to get some fine jobs at their [his fundraising consulting firm's] expense.... His second point was that we have got to be smarter than the free lancers, and that we have to sell people on the fact that we can produce more. These free lancers are not dumb people...and a few others are very smart and they are doing a good job. We, therefore, have to hold up our standard of performance, as well as the standards of our personnel, and the standards of our fees also. If we take business by cutting fees to the point where we cannot provide the right kind of personnel and supervisory service, we will be defeated.<sup>54</sup>

Seymour's tone was clearly protectionist, suggesting that AAFRC members might need to keep their hard-won professional knowledge closer to the chest and further emphasize quality of service. The tone of the meeting continued to be somber after this, with many of those in attendance sharing stories of employees who were enticed to full-time fundraising positions at nonprofit organizations, organizations such as Community Chests and Councils who had embraced the in-house fundraising model, and other allied conditions that are "eating things from under us," as Seymour put it.<sup>55</sup> As the meeting drew to a close, however, C. H. Dreshman of Ward, Wells, and Dreshman was true to the sunny outlook of a fundraiser. As the minutes reflect, he

suggested we close the meeting on a note of optimism, and observed that we have all been in business for a great many years and that it would be well for us to take a little word out of Henry Ford's book, to the effect that

---

<sup>54</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 August 1940, 6, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>55</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 August 1940, 8, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

we forget politics and get down to business. We ought to be high-minded among ourselves and with the client, and do a high quality of work.<sup>56</sup>

Dreshman's comments served as a welcome corrective, reminding those in attendance that a focus on self-preservation was likely unneeded and did not reflect the higher ideals to which AAFRC member firms aspired.

Nevertheless, the concerns about competition expressed at the meeting on August 5, 1940, continued to haunt AAFRC member firms. The discussion continued on November 18, 1940, at the Harvard Club in New York City, when John Crosby Brown of Tamblyn & Brown, Inc., presided over a meeting on the topic of "Convincing the Client of the Full Value of the Services of a Campaign Firm."<sup>57</sup> While a few firms saw little reason to devote significant resources to "fighting the amateur," the vast majority of those participating in the discussion saw distinctive threats coming from freelance fundraisers, who regularly undercut AAFRC member firms on the basis of pricing.<sup>58</sup> James E. Almond of American City Bureau was one of those who was not overly worried about the competition posed by individual consultants. Nonetheless, his own firm had experience of what AAFRC members generally saw as unfair competition from this quarter, as the meeting minutes indicate:

For instance, he [Almond] was in August, Ga., meeting with a client having under consideration the raising of \$250,000 for an advertising campaign. There he met independent competition which he could not get around because the independent used to be on the A.C.B. [American City Bureau] staff. The independent simply stated that he had been a member of the A.C.B. organization, knew their procedure, thoroughly appreciated the fact that all he knew was learned from Mr. Almond, but that Mr. Almond had nothing to offer that he could not offer personally—and

---

<sup>56</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 August 1940, 9, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>57</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>58</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

climaxed this presentation by stating, 'I will do the job for \$1,500 less than the fee quoted by Mr. Almond.'<sup>59</sup>

Even more than being undercut on pricing, AAFRC member firms were likely more worried about what was a gradually changing environment for their businesses: new players with different, nimbler business models were entering fundraising consulting.

The other source of competition from individuals resulted in what was a fairly recent phenomenon—organizations adding staff positions for full-time, paid fundraisers. George Tamblyn, Jr., of Tamblyn & Tamblyn noted that “this question is becoming more acute because some of our organizations are leaving the regular campaign field and going into long-range service that requires only one man.”<sup>60</sup> Almond agreed, saying, “There are 134 colleges which to-day [sic] have men who do nothing other than raise money for the colleges.”<sup>61</sup> It was generally agreed, however, that ultimately such institutions would still require the assistance of fundraising firms. George Tamblyn noted that “where a man employed by the institution is entrusted with a campaign, he cannot be as effective as where an independent firm assumes that responsibility. Where a firm is employed, their representative’s position is of greater importance and has more prestige with the institution, as well as with the Board of Trustees.”<sup>62</sup> He continued by noting that “Men that are effective with a fund-raising organization, once they are on the payroll of the client, lose—by reason of their position—the influence with the College President and the Board.”<sup>63</sup> This phenomenon

---

<sup>59</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>60</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>61</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>62</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>63</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 8, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

echoes a problem still frequently seen in charitable organizations today: a lack of engagement of the board and CEO in fundraising.<sup>64</sup> Fundraising professionals on the staff of a charitable organization can wield some influence on a willing CEO but have no power to enforce board and CEO engagement in the fundraising process. Fundraising consultants, as organizational outsiders, generally wield considerably more influence. Because they generally enjoy a relationship with the CEO and board that is more akin to a peer relationship, the CEO and board are more likely to pay heed to a fundraising consultant's advice. In short, the fundraising professional wields less influence because he is in an inferior position to the CEO and board within the organizational hierarchy. A fundraising consultant, who exists outside the organization hierarchy, wields more influence because while he is working on behalf of the organization, he is not beholden to the organization.

The issue of competition from professional solicitors was mentioned as well, but Mr. Lundy of Marts & Lundy asserted that he was "not worried about that kind of competition," citing a campaign conducted on behalf of Illinois Western University. That campaign was conducted on a commission basis, much to the chagrin of the client, which had to write off pledges to the tune of \$600,000.<sup>65</sup>

No matter what the source of competition from individual practitioners, the common refrain from AAFRC members was that clients were constantly looking to reduce fundraising expense by seeking assistance that did not have the sort of overhead costs associated with fundraising firms. John Price Jones of The John Price Jones

---

<sup>64</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 13-14.

<sup>65</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 4-5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Corporation, for one, saw the issue of overhead as an unwinnable battle. In words that are still relevant to modern fundraising professionals, he said,

I have tired of fighting the question of overhead because the moment you get into a discussion of it, I think it becomes simply useless to argue. You do not get anywhere by arguing it. The fact is that any business man knows he has an overhead cost, and should recognize the same to be true in our business.<sup>66</sup>

Overhead costs in the philanthropic sector remain misunderstood and a source of contention to this day. Efforts to dispel concerns about overhead remain equally unsuccessful for the most part.<sup>67</sup>

Others, however, suggested that what was needed was attention to client education about “the reasons why a firm provided a service which no individual could offer.”<sup>68</sup> To this end, Mr. Sherwood had put together this list:

1. The firm provides a counseling and planning service
2. The Director is backed up by the accumulated experience of the firm
3. The firm, through its executives, has a bird’s-eye view of the campaign field at any given time
4. The client has the benefit of group, rather than individual, experience
5. Because of the known reputation of the organization, the client risks little.<sup>69</sup>

Experience and risk mitigation were the clear selling points for hiring an AAFRC member firm according to Mr. Sherwood’s list. However, as Sherwood was quick to admit, keeping such considerations top of mind among clients required work on the part of the firm through the following means:

---

<sup>66</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 6, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>67</sup> GuideStar, “BBB Wise Giving Alliance, Charity Navigator, and GuideStar Join Forces to Dispel the Charity ‘Overhead Myth,’” last modified June 17, 2013, <https://learn.guidestar.org/news/news-releases/2013/2013-06-17-overhead-myth>.

<sup>68</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>69</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

1. By visits of officers of the firm before and during the campaign
2. Assignments of Directors who are executives, or high ranking men who have absorbed all the principles of campaigning
3. Circularization [sic] of printed materials, with implications that men assigned are following methods based upon definite principles worked out by the firm.<sup>70</sup>

In other words, relationship building, education, and assignment of a suitably prestigious lead counsel were all factors needed to keep clients engaged. More succinctly, John Crosby Brown asserted, “Overhead is experience [and] overhead is information.”<sup>71</sup> To support this, he noted that “The average length of service of the 45 men of Tambllyn and Brown is eleven years. Clients pay for service at such times as they have need of it; whereas, the firm has to pay the salaries of the men the whole year round.”<sup>72</sup> He further enumerated the overhead costs of Tambllyn and Brown, which ran at 100%. As the minutes note:

The overhead figures cover salaries of departmental heads, library research directors, etc. Other indirect charges include salaries of staff during the summer. It was only by paying salaries on an annual basis that they [Tambllyn and Brown] are able, as an organization, to maintain a permanent, competent staff—and the rental of headquarters must be considered. The accuracy of the 100% overhead was confirmed by auditors. In fact, they thought it should be revised upwards.<sup>73</sup>

Brown’s description provides an interesting but brief window into the workings of an early fundraising consulting firm, pointing out the labor-intensive nature of the work. It also points to a competitive advantage enjoyed by AAFRC member firms: the ability to attract and retain high-quality staff through solid compensation, which continues to be a concern of the philanthropic sector today.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>71</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>72</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>73</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 19 November 1940, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>74</sup> Bell and Cornelius, 9.

Given all these factors it is little wonder, then, that AAFRC took the vetting process for members very seriously, as they sought to preserve not only professional excellence but also financial viability for fundraising consulting firms. Despite this, it took some time before AAFRC acted to formalize member application procedures. (This may in part have been due to World War II, as AAFRC records show the organization mostly halting its activities during and immediately after the War because their attention and that of the nation was focused elsewhere.) Meeting minutes from June 10, 1947, show the AAFRC approving a formal process for accepting members:

A prospective new member may be nominated by one member firm and seconded by another member firm:

This nomination to be considered by the Executive Committee on the basis of the standards set forth by the By-laws.

If approved by the Executive Committee the prospective new members will be then invited informally by the nominator to present a written application for membership.

The foregoing will be presented for final action at the next meeting of the Association.<sup>75</sup>

These procedures largely allowed the AAFRC to avoid future cases like that of Dwight Folsom, Jr., as the procedures in essence guaranteed that only firms meeting the AAFRC's criteria would apply for membership. These membership standards and procedures were sufficient enough that the AAFRC did not revisit the issue broached in 1940 of creating a formal code of ethics for the fundraising profession. In fact, the AAFRC found itself occupied with another issue as the 1950s approached: a changing cultural understanding of philanthropy and fundraising, accompanied by legislative efforts to regulate the business of fundraising.

---

<sup>75</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 10 June 1947, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### CERTIFICATION AS A RESPONSE TO REGULATION (1950-1959)

If mass philanthropy and the promise of mobilizing every citizen in the achievement of the common good were the hallmarks surrounding the birth of the fundraising profession, distrust of fundraising and its practitioners was perhaps the hallmark of the profession's "coming of age" years. The methods and systems that allowed fundraising to evolve as a profession during the early twentieth century were also capable of being hijacked by the less-than-scrupulous, whose only objectives were the lining of their own pockets with profit. As the power of mass philanthropy grew and America entered "the golden age of mass fundraising" in the 1950s, the need to define the place of philanthropy in America grew as well.<sup>1</sup> Along with this came not only fundraising innovations such as workplace giving but also an increased focus by state governments on the appropriate way to provide oversight and consumer protections related to fundraising.<sup>2</sup> Prior to the 1950s, the fundraising profession was largely focused on laying the foundation for the profession. Starting in the 1950s, the records of AAFRC indicate that the fundraising profession was largely (and out of necessity) focused on defending fundraising from excessive regulation and government interference caused by concerns about charity fraud. Not surprisingly, these are also the years when mentions of licensure or certification for the fundraising profession first appear.

#### Pennsylvania Solicitation Act of 1951

In the early 1950s, the AAFRC began keeping a watchful yet rather passive eye on state legislation meant to curtail, constrain, or otherwise regulate charitable

---

<sup>1</sup> Zunz, 177.

<sup>2</sup> Zunz, 178.

fundraising. The first instance of such legislation noted in the records of AAFRC is the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act.<sup>3</sup> Enacted in 1951, the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act stipulated that “no person or firm engaged in professional fund-raising shall be paid for its services more than fifteen percent of the funds collected up to the time of termination of the person’s or firm’s services.” Later interpretation emphasized the funds collected and diminished the role of a specific timeframe.<sup>4</sup>

In response to the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act, AAFRC created a Committee on Pennsylvania Legislation. The committee was chaired by A. L. Aderton of AAFRC member firm Aderton-Johnson Associates. At the direction of AAFRC President Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, Austin V. McClain of Marts & Lundy was appointed as chair of a special subcommittee working under Aderton. The purpose of this subcommittee was to work with Pennsylvania legislators to formulate an outcome advantageous to those in the fundraising profession generally and to AAFRC member firms in particular, who would be harmed were the strict interpretation of compensation levels to stand.

Despite having a dedicated Committee on Pennsylvania Legislation, AAFRC remained relatively hands off with its efforts, choosing to hire an attorney to lobby on AAFRC’s behalf regarding the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act. The attorney was Sterling G. McNees of the law firm McNees Wallace & Nurick.<sup>5</sup> It was McNees who was onsite in Pennsylvania, and it was he (or sometimes another member of his firm if he were not available) who regularly reported to Aderton on the situation in Pennsylvania. McNees’s report to Aderton, which was included in the June 15, 1953 meeting minutes of AAFRC,

---

<sup>3</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 October 1952, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>4</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 5 October 1952, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>5</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

gives an interesting portrait of the *realpolitik* and/or legislative inertia faced by AAFRC as McNees and his associates attempted to shape lawmakers' opinions in a way that was favorable to the interests of AAFRC member firms. It also gives insight into just how unformed the regulatory framework for charitable fundraising was in the early 1950s, as even legislators were unclear exactly on where that function rightly belonged.

A brief timeline extracted from McNees's report to AAFRC reveals that when the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act was passed in 1951, enforcement of the Act was first assigned to the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare and then subsequently turned over to the Pennsylvania Department of Instruction.<sup>6</sup> The reason for this change in enforcement authority is not clear; however, it does illustrate that while the regulation of fundraising was something that was a concern of the time, how and by whom regulation should occur was still naturally fluid because the charitable sector itself was still fluid and relatively ill-defined in terms of the regulatory environment. It was only in November 1952, once the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act was under the purview of the Department of Public Instruction, that the Superintendent of Public Instruction asked the Attorney General of the State of Pennsylvania for guidance in interpretation of Section 7(b) of the Act, which dealt with compensation for fundraisers. McNees was quickly at work on AAFRC's behalf and in December 1952 secured a meeting with Pennsylvania's Deputy Superintendent, who had the joy of being delegated the task of dealing with interpretation of the Act. At that meeting, McNees was able to extract an agreement from the Deputy Superintendent that "the Department [of Public Instruction] would explore the possibility of remedying the association's [AAFRC's] difficulties through a new ruling from the

---

<sup>6</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Attorney General. If that could not be accomplished, then conferences would be held looking toward corrective legislation.”<sup>7</sup>

The work of McNees on behalf of AAFRC was truly exhaustive. As a follow up to this December meeting, McNees Wallace & Nurick sent the Deputy Superintendent a memorandum containing “the history of the Solicitations Act, amendments to it, and court interpretations bearing upon it.... We also supplied copies of an earlier memorandum prepared earlier in 1951 outlining the structure of the act, the problems of interpretation involved, and the difficulties of administration created by the language, together with reasons in support of a re-interpretation by the Attorney General.”<sup>8</sup>

McNees Wallace & Nurick also prepared two proposals on behalf of AAFRC—a redraft of the Act and a draft of amendments to the existing act that would ameliorate the conditions found unacceptable by AAFRC members and others working as professional fundraising counsel. When the Deputy Superintendent agreed with the proposals but refused to move them forward because of political inexpediency, McNees consulted with a sympathetic legislator, Mr. Stoner, who had the power to add the provisions into House Bill 42 (a sales tax bill that was a priority piece of legislation) that was being considered by the Pennsylvania legislature. Ultimately, the proposals were not in the bill, and at that point McNees lobbied to have the bill altered on the floor, again to no avail. When the bill passed the Pennsylvania House and went to the Senate, McNees once again tried to work with a legislator, this time Senator Wagner, to get the proposals included. Wagner was sympathetic and suggested a further redrafting of the proposals, with which McNees

---

<sup>7</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>8</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

complied. The end result, though, was that the bill died in the Senate.<sup>9</sup> McNees had a very clear-eyed understanding of why this attempt to alter legislation in AAFRC's favor had failed: first, the Pennsylvania legislature was entirely focused on its sales tax legislation; and second, any new legislation in such a climate made "legislators wary for fear that the new will contain hidden provisions of subtle language, the full import of which they might fail to detect."<sup>10</sup> To support the inertial nature of the Pennsylvania legislature at this time, McNees noted, "Illustrative of this situation is the fact that through May 20, 1953, twelve bills were passed, none of which were controversial in nature and only a couple of which were of any significance."<sup>11</sup>

Given the lack of success in altering or clarifying the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act despite every effort, McNees provided the following legal advice to AAFRC:

Another matter which we discussed with you at our conference was the use of contracts applicable to the two phases of the activities of members of the association [AAFRC]. It is our opinion that during the initial portion of your work, in which no fund-raising activities are carried on, members could quite properly enter into contracts for public relations services. Separate contracts would be used to cover services in connection with fund-raising activities, applicable to furnishing the plan for, managing, directing, or supervising solicitation.

It seems to us that the functions of members of the association may properly be segregated in this manner. The preliminary work which precedes the actual undertaking of the fund-raising campaign would seem distinguishable from the latter and not to be within the purview of the Solicitations Act. Such an arrangement would not be a device to increase fees, but would enable your members to receive compensation for work done prior to commencement of fund-raising activities. As you know, if the entire engagement is considered as one of fundraising, then members are faced with the present, though we think erroneous, interpretation of the statute as prohibiting receipt of any partial compensation which exceeds fifteen per cent of the proceeds received up to the time of payment.

---

<sup>9</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 3-4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>10</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>11</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

You may want to discuss with others of the association the possibility of using separate contracts and obtain their views as to whether there is a line which can be drawn between services which are and those which are not concerned with furnishing the plan for, managing, directing or supervision of solicitation of funds.<sup>12</sup>

In suggesting this contractual arrangement, McNees likely helped AAFRC member firms to start thinking in ways that separated strategic fundraising counsel from professional solicitation. This separation would later prove valuable in Tompkins Committee hearings in New York, where AAFRC was at pains to point out the differences between the services that they provided and those provided by professional solicitors.

Left with the inability to influence or alter legislation that set an arbitrary cap on compensation for fundraising services, the AAFRC was left to determine an appropriate remedy that met the conditions of the legislation while allowing member firms to maintain financial viability and profitability. Their attorney, while unsuccessful as a lobbyist on AAFRC's behalf, nonetheless proved his value by offering an acceptable legal work-around to the dilemma. The setting of arbitrary caps on compensation, overhead, fundraising expenses, and other such items by legislative or watchdog entities are concerns that the nonprofit sector and fundraising in particular continue to face to the present day.

#### Tompkins Act of 1954

While the AAFRC failed to influence the Pennsylvania Solicitation Act, it appears that the AAFRC did learn something important from the failed effort: the necessity of early and proactive engagement with any legislation having the potential to have an impact on regulation of professional fundraising counsel. They did not make the same

---

<sup>12</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 15 June 1953, 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

mistake in their response to the Joint Legislation on Charitable and Philanthropic Agencies and Organizations of the State of New York, a.k.a., the Tompkins Committee.

While mainly ignored by histories of philanthropy, the Tompkins Committee provides interesting insight into what fundraisers of the day saw as a real potential threat to the well-being of the fundraising profession. And, in fact, the Tompkins Committee provided the impetus for the establishment of AAFRC's first central office with paid staff.<sup>13</sup>

The New York state legislature created the Tompkins Committee on March 31, 1953, through a concurrent resolution. Senator Bernard Tompkins led the Committee, the charge of which was to investigate fraudulent fundraising practices. The final report of the Committee, which was released on February 15, 1954, required charitable organizations engaged in fundraising to register with the state. It also required reporting by professional solicitors.<sup>14</sup>

Coming at a time when what we now term the nonprofit sector had not yet truly been solidified as such, the Tompkins Committee was operating somewhat within *terra incognita*. As the Tompkins Committee noted in what can be interpreted both as an apology and justification for its work, "The sparsity of data on the activities of organized charity tends to make this field a playground for the unscrupulous."<sup>15</sup> To somewhat address this sparsity, the public portion of the Tompkins Committee was structured as three solid days of testimony, starting with testimony on "improper practices in fundraising, then from organizations for which funds are raised, and finally from our

---

<sup>13</sup> Cutlip, 343.

<sup>14</sup> Cutlip, 343.

<sup>15</sup> As quoted in Cutlip, 441.

Association [AAFRC] and others.”<sup>16</sup> Despite this dearth of data, the Tompkins Committee came up with findings that were shocking at the time: their best estimate was that 97 percent of charitable contributions went to either “well-intentioned, well-administered” charities or to “well-intentioned, poorly administered charities,” but unfortunately there were no means to distinguish between the two. The remaining three percent of all charitable contributions went to fraudulent causes.<sup>17</sup> The Tompkins Commission Report concluded, “The generosity of our citizens has been consistently and flagrantly abused by a small minority of frauds operating as ‘charities’ which have mulcted New Yorkers out of an annual amount probably in excess of \$25,000,000.”<sup>18</sup> The Tompkins Commission further noted that most fraud took the following forms: misrepresentation of programs; fraudulent sponsorships, which consisted of unauthorized celebrity endorsements; inadequate records that permitted easy diversion of funds; supposed charities which were nothing more than fronts for businesses who reaped profits from providing fundraising-related services; and excessively high administrative and fundraising costs.<sup>19</sup> Particularly egregious examples of fraud cited by the Tompkins Committee included the National Kids’ Day Foundation, Inc., which exploited an unauthorized endorsement by Bing Crosby and collected nearly \$4,000,000 over five years, spending every penny on administration. Not a single dollar was used to help needy children. Disabled American Veterans (DAV) was another case of charity fraud cited in the report. The DAV raised approximately \$21,500,000 from 1950-1953 through

---

<sup>16</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>17</sup> Cutlip, 442.

<sup>18</sup> Cutlip, 443-444.

<sup>19</sup> Cutlip, 444.



the mailing of premiums, with 91 cents on the dollar being paid to its fundraising contractors.<sup>20</sup>

This was the legislative fray into which the AAFRC was thrown. To its credit, and to the credit of AAFRC President Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, the AAFRC met the challenge head on, taking an active role in presenting its case and serving as an expert witness regarding fundraising fraud and the advisability of possible remedies.

The records of AAFRC include both a draft and final report to the Joint Legislation Committee on Charitable and Philanthropic Agencies of The State of New York. Scheduled for discussion at the AAFRC's Executive Committee meeting on December 7, 1953, the undated, nine-page draft reveals the main points and arguments that would be made by Dr. Arnaud C. Marts in his invited testimony to the Tompkins Committee.<sup>21</sup> The ten-page final document differs little from the draft, with the biggest exception being the addition of all AAFRC member firms as signatories at the end. While Marts was the AAFRC spokesman testifying to the Tompkins Committee, AAFRC records show that the written statement was drafted by Chester E. Tucker and David Church of John Price Jones Company.<sup>22</sup>

Clearly not wishing to engender ill will, the official statement to the Tompkins Committee begins with the note that "The Association [AAFRC], and I personally, wish to congratulate you upon the important public service which you are rendering in your endeavor to protect the giving public in the name of charity. We pledge you our fullest

---

<sup>20</sup> Cutlip, 445-450.

<sup>21</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 1-10, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>22</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

support.”<sup>23</sup> This is more than a bit of flattering puffery, as throughout Marts’ testimony he was at pains to place AAFRC on the side of all that was right and good, which in this case was the Tompkins Committee.

At this time in the development of the fundraising profession, terminology had not yet solidified around what are now considered to be established divisions within the fundraising profession: “fundraising professionals,” who are staff employees of charities; “fundraising consultants,” who are for-profit contractors providing strategic services to charities such as fundraising plan development and campaign feasibility studies, and who in this capacity do not directly solicit donors on behalf of a charity; and “professional solicitors,” who are for-profit contractors providing tactical services to charities, with a focus on directly soliciting donors via direct response methods. Throughout the Committee’s work, AAFRC was at pains to separate fundraising consultants from professional solicitors, who were the culprits behind the most notorious fundraising fraud cases. As Marts testified to the Tompkins Committee, AAFRC was happy to serve as an expert observer or witness regarding fraud in the field:

The members of the America Association of Fund-Raising Counsel have no relation to or with so-called ‘charity racketeers.’ We refuse to serve an institution that arouses our own suspicions, and we refuse to hire a fundraiser who violates our code of ethics. However, we are in position to observe ‘charity rackets,’ just as the medical and legal professions are in position to observe ‘ambulance chasers’ and ‘quacks’ in their fields. We will, therefore, present our observations on ‘charity rackets’ for your [the Tompkins Committee’s] consideration.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 1-10, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>24</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Marts further emphasized the distinction by saying that “Members of the Association [AAFRC] do *not* solicit funds directly and, therefore, are not ‘fund-raisers.’”<sup>25</sup> Marts further shared that AAFRC member firms “do not initiate campaigns.”<sup>26</sup> Per the collective wisdom of AAFRC member firms, Marts also made sure to omit any “references to excessive advertising and percentage fees” so as not to invite comparison with professional solicitors.<sup>27</sup>

Marts’ testimony included a brief overview of the genesis of the fundraising profession. While relating the facts of how the mass philanthropy generated by the World War I era had created the fundraising profession, Marts again deftly used the opportunity to point out the difference between high-minded fundraising consultants like AAFRC member firms and low-minded professional solicitors. He noted,

Like every new enterprise, it [the fundraising profession] attracted men of high, low and average ability. It attracted men who wished their lives to be of service to their nation and to their fellow-men and, unfortunately, it also attracted men who were money-hungry and alert for the “quick buck.” It attracted men with high ideals of public responsibility, and others with negative or selfish standards.<sup>28</sup>

Marts was also quick to note that as an exemplar of the more noble aspects of the fundraising profession, AAFRC had had greatness thrust upon it and accepted the mantle of “a responsibility for setting ethical standards and for ‘policing’ those standards in a voluntary way in order to try to protect the giving public from unethical or inefficient practitioners in this new field.”<sup>29</sup> Again showing his rhetorical skill, in this statement

---

<sup>25</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>26</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>27</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>28</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>29</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Marts not only managed to extol the ethos of AAFRC but also succeeded in subtly inserting the idea of self-regulation of fundraising as being a viable alternative to legislation. He further pressed this point indirectly as his testimony continued, noting that “The ethical standards which this Association [AAFRC] has established for the protection of the generous giving public are along the lines of your Committee’s own study and objective.”<sup>30</sup>

Key factors noted that supported the alignment between the goals of AAFRC and the goals of the Tompkins Committee included the refusal of AAFRC member firms to serve unworthy or fraudulent causes; the refusal AAFRC member firms to accept percentage or commission-based compensation; the requirement that all firms accepted as AAFRC members must be led by a fundraising professional with a minimum of ten years of continuous experience in the field; and the discouragement of AAFRC member firms from making exaggerated claims regarding their prior achievements, past fundraising results, or overly rosy promises regarding future results.<sup>31</sup>

The observations that AAFRC proceeded to present to the Tompkins Committee were ones that could likely be made today and addressed (though not explicitly) the crux of most efforts to regulate fundraising: to what extent is it advisable to create legislation to regulate or otherwise control fundraising in the charitable sector, given the small amount of fraud that actually occurs? Marts’ observations start with the estimate that at the time, Americans contributed \$4 billion to charity. Of that amount, the AAFRC estimated that approximately 2.5 to 3 percent of the annual total went to “charity

---

<sup>30</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>31</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 3-4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

rackets,” with the vast majority of the money donated going to worthy causes engaged in reputable fundraising. While acknowledging the unacceptability of any amount of money going to charity fraud and the way in which “racketeering in charity is one of the most flagrant forms of criminal activity, for it exploits the finest impulses of the human heart,” the question underlying Marts’ subsequent remarks attempts to lead the Tompkins Committee inquiry away from outrage at any sort of fraud and back to issues of utility: what sort or degree of regulation would efficiently serve the end of eliminating the 2.5 to 3 percent of fraudulent activity taking place?<sup>32</sup>

In answering his own underlying question, Marts makes several important points that remain relevant today. First, in the most egregious cases of charity fraud (as when professional solicitors create “paper charities,” the fundraising for which primarily serves to line the professional solicitor’s pockets), Marts makes the observation that such fraud can be prosecuted using existing laws, so additional legislation is unnecessary to deal with these cases. Indeed, Marts notes that in an effort to catch the bad actors engaged in outright fundraising fraud, government may end up harming the conscientious charities and fundraising consultants who are operating in good faith. As Marts notes, “It appears to us [AAFRC] that it is difficult to draw up laws and controls at the state level which will set fund-raising standards that can be legally administered with fairness to all the varied philanthropic interests in a state.”<sup>33</sup> As an example, Marts uses the Pennsylvania legislation which the AAFRC failed to remedy (but without referencing it by name), noting that

---

<sup>32</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 4, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>33</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 5, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

One large state [Pennsylvania] has had in effect for several years a law which requires each institution which employs a fund-raiser or counsel, and each fund-raiser or counsel to obtain a license. The renewal of that license each year is based almost solely upon one criterion—did the fund-raiser get less than 15 per cent of the fund raised. If not, his license is revoked, even if his compensation was 16 per cent, due to disappointment in the returns. Of course, this revocation could embarrass, even ruin, the conscientious, decent fund-raiser and the cause for which he labored, but does no harm to the racketeer, who has no reputation to lose, and who darts off to another community to put on a high-pressure benefit from which he will gather in 50 to 80 per cent of the take before the Bureau at the state capitol hears of it.<sup>34</sup>

In highlighting the arbitrary nature of the 15 percent figure, Marts suggests more broadly the difficulties of trying to put in place narrow legal controls for fundraising, which may be neither accurate nor appropriate and which may end up hurt legitimate charities and fundraising consultants while not rectifying problems or abuses.

To address charity racketeering, the AAFRC statement suggested that what was needed was not the licensing of fundraising professionals but rather an information clearinghouse on charities and fundraising in order to increase transparency and help institutions, fund-raisers, and donors great and small become informed consumers. The State Commission for Registration and Information on Philanthropic Institutions and Fund-Raising was to “be made up of leading citizens representative of the public in general, contributors, accredited fund-raising firms [a.k.a., AAFRC members], and private institutions for which funds are raised.”<sup>35</sup> The Commission was to oversee mandatory annual registration of all charities seeking donations from the public as well as all professional solicitors or fundraising consultants operating in the State of New York.

---

<sup>34</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 5-6, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>35</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 6, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

Questions to be answered annually by each professional solicitor or fundraising consultant seeking registration or re-registration were to include the following:

- A. How much money did you help raise from the public in New York State?
- B. What methods did you use? Mail – Intensive Campaign – Benefits – Sale of unordered merchandise – other
- C. What was the fund-raising cost?
- D. Was compensation by salary, fee or percentage?
- E. What fund-raising or counselling do you contemplate for the coming year?

These were criteria on which AAFRC member firms would perform well, as the criteria favored knowledgeable, established firms with ongoing business. However, it was also the case that AAFRC believed “bringing the power of public opinion to bear on the ‘charity racketeers’” would be the most important outcome of the proposed Commission for the simple reason that there was “no official agency in this State to which the public can look for leadership in the war on ‘charity racketeers,’ although certain voluntary groups, such as the Better Business Bureau and the National Information Bureau, are very helpful.”<sup>36</sup>

In addition to hearing the general testimony provided by Marts on behalf of AAFRC, the Tompkins Committee also requested answers to six specific questions dealing with fundraising costs and licensure issues:

- 1. What are the actual cost figures for raising funds by organized campaign methods?
- 2. Should the Committee recommend to the Legislature a law which restricts the cost of fund-raising campaigns?
- 3. Should legislation ban campaigns on a percentage basis?
- 4. Should fundraisers be licensed?

---

<sup>36</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 7, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

5. Should agencies which ask for funds be licensed?
6. Should legislation deal with the distribution by charity organizations of unordered merchandise?<sup>37</sup>

Clearly, the Tompkins Committee was seeking advice from AAFRC for forming quantifiable means for shaping fundraising regulation. In answering these questions, Marts was clear that AAFRC recommended self-regulation of the fundraising profession and registration over licensure. His responses regarding the costs of fundraising echo the same points made today in discussions of charity overhead, namely that one size does not fit all, and costs for fundraising vary according to the size of the organization, with larger charities achieving economies of scale that cause their fundraising costs to be overall lower when measured according to return on investment. His recommendations regarding registration versus licensure do not go beyond the points raised earlier in his testimony, which is understandable but perhaps unfortunate from a historical perspective, as they leave out some very interesting thinking of the AAFRC on this point. As noted by the AAFRC during private discussions preceding Marts' testimony before the Tompkins Committee, AAFRC members viewed registration as preferable to licensure but still not ideal, as it could lead to the imposition of additional future restrictions:

Some [AAFRC member firms] felt that what is needed in New York is a commission of intelligent people to observe and to register, but not to license. Others felt that as soon as a commission is set up it has to be fed and that sooner or later controls never intended develop. It was agreed that if a registration system should result from the hearings, it would be better operated and controlled by a separate commission of top-ranking [sic] citizens than by a governmental agency or someone politically appointed. A warning was also expressed that [if] the committee attempts to remedy the present situation, they be careful not to put a fence around the whole world.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Final Statement to the Tompkins Committee, n.d., 8-9, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>38</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 1-2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.



AAFRC members were naturally wary of fundraising activities being constrained by either the government or the citizenry, both entities which were generally unknowledgeable about fundraising and philanthropy. However, if an oversight body were needed, AAFRC clearly preferred that the group be comprised of citizens rather than the government, as citizens could advise but not regulate.

The Tompkins Committee and its report resulted in New York State legislation known as the Tompkins Act, which was enacted in 1954. The Tompkins Act, which was meant to protect donors to charities, required all charities to register with the State of New York. Charities needed to provide:

(1) The name under which the charity intends to solicit contributions, (2) the names and addresses of the charity's officers and directors, (3) the names and addresses of any fund raisers or professional solicitors who will act on behalf of the charity, (4) the charity's purpose, (5) the purposes for which the contributions will be used, and (6) any other information necessary for the protection of contributors.<sup>39</sup>

These were basic facts for purposes of transparency and no doubt were meant to provide donors with at least some sense of the charity with which they were dealing. Also, by providing the names and addresses of the charity's officers and directors, the Tompkins Act put additional emphasis on the board members' legal duties of care and obedience in matters of fundraising.<sup>40</sup> There were also annual reporting requirements for charities, who were to give a financial statement to New York's Department of Social Welfare. Charities who were found in violation of Tompkins Act legislation could have their

---

<sup>39</sup> Scott L. Cagan, "Charitable Fraud in New York: The Role of the Professional Fund Raiser," *New York Law School Law Review* 33 (1988): 429.

<sup>40</sup> BoardSource, "Board Responsibilities and Structures—FAQs," accessed October 18, 2017, <https://boardsource.org/resources/board-responsibilities-structures-faqs/>.

fundraising activities curtailed, their charity registration canceled, or their charter revoked.<sup>41</sup>

The outcome, while not a complete victory for AAFRC, nevertheless avoided a key AAFRC concern, which was the licensure of fundraising professionals—something that Senator Tompkins had reported to AAFRC as being his preference but that he later amended publicly.<sup>42</sup> Tompkins also expressed his feeling that AAFRC should be engaged in more policing of the fundraising profession.<sup>43</sup>

At this point, AAFRC was thrust into greatness. Named as the voice of reputable fundraising during Tompkins Committee hearings and given the expectation thereafter to provide oversight for the professional's self-regulation, AAFRC could no longer function simply as an exclusive grouping of a small number of large, well-established consulting firms. It is clear from AAFRC records, however, that this situation had the beneficial side effect of forcing AAFRC to think bigger. One of the big ideas to result from the increasing pressure the AAFRC felt to defend fundraising as a reputable profession was the realization that there is strength in numbers, and that it was time "that consideration be given to a substantial increase in [AAFRC] membership."<sup>44</sup> Strict membership requirements such as the one stipulating that "the executive head of a member organization [of AAFRC] must have had continuous experience of at least ten years as a professional counsel in the fund-raising field" were noted as something that "should be redefined" so as not to exclude otherwise worthy firms.<sup>45</sup> The heretofore heretical idea of

---

<sup>41</sup> Cagan, 430.

<sup>42</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 28 January 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC; AAFRC Minutes, Press Release, 28 January 1954, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>43</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 28 January 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>44</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>45</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

the admission of individual fundraising consultants (the so-called “freelancers” that AAFRC had specifically blackballed since its beginning) was floated. Fundraisers who were employed as charity staff, however, were still to be excluded.<sup>46</sup>

To its credit, AAFRC embraced these challenges, noting “we should accept the challenge these hearings have placed before us, and should constantly publicize the standard of [AAFRC], and should increase the membership of [AAFRC] without reducing these standards.”<sup>47</sup> However, AAFRC also noted the challenges of acting as a leader in the self-regulation of the fundraising profession, observing that “it would be difficult to determine the methods by which we might in a practical way police our membership.”<sup>48</sup> It may also have been, however, that in addition to having the collective disposition to embrace the future, AAFRC saw a chance to position itself at the forefront of American fundraising. In a same-day AAFRC press release of Senator Tompkins’ remarks to a meeting of AAFRC, Senator Tompkins’ exhortation to AAFRC is reported:

To supplement his propose legislative action, Senator Tompkins recommended that the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, the only nationally recognized group of fund-raising firms, take the lead in ‘policing its own profession’ and attempt to persuade others to adopt its ‘code of ethics.’

‘Would it not be feasible to welcome additional agencies into your membership, so that, in a sense, you would become the association which represents this important machinery of philanthropy?’ he asked. ‘You would then be in a strategic position to raise the standards for the entire field and to secure a greater understanding by the public for the important work that you do.’<sup>49</sup>

Clearly, Senator Tompkins’ reported remarks reflect steps that AAFRC had already determined to take.

---

<sup>46</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 7 December 1953, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>47</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 28 January 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>48</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 28 January 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>49</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Press Release, 28 January 1954, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

By February 1954, the Executive Committee of AAFRC had voted to establish a national office, hire an executive director to assist the president, and enlist other firms to join AAFRC. AAFRC would also take in freelancers not associated with a firm as associate members. However, AAFRC would not offer membership to persons who were full-time staff fundraisers for charities.<sup>50</sup>

It is also around this time that the first mention of the possibility of certification for fundraising professionals appears in AAFRC documents. A description of far-reaching plans related to the establishment of AAFRC's first office notes that

It has been pointed out that licensing [of fundraising professionals] is of little avail without policing—and by those engaged in the business—as in the cases of the medical and legal professions.... Closely allied to such a service is the question of accreditation used effectively in life insurance (C.L.U.), accounting (C.P.A.), and in many other callings.<sup>51</sup>

Certification—which is what AAFRC meant by the term “accreditation”—was seen as a potential means of enhancing the self-regulation ability of the fundraising profession.<sup>52</sup>

In addition, AAFRC had “a powerful motive” for evolving into a more inclusive and thus more influential organization with a national office. As notes from the time indicate,

under the present dynamic circumstances, some centralized authority in fund-raising is almost certain to spring up shortly. As Senator Tompkins pointed out, ‘...if [AAFRC] does not take the initiative in establishing some agency to control [self-regulation of fundraising], some other group is very likely to do so.’

Senator Tompkins' words were prescient. AAFRC did in fact go on to establish its first national office in 1955 and from that time forward has been a force for good in American

---

<sup>50</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 24 February 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>51</sup> AAFRC Minutes, Plans for National Office, n.d., 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC. “C.L.U.” stands for “Certified Life Underwriter.” “C.P.A.” stands for “Certified Public Accountant.”

<sup>52</sup> Individuals may become certified; organizations or programs may become accredited. The two terms are often—and incorrectly—used interchangeably.

philanthropy, with the current incarnation of the group, The Giving Institute, being perhaps best known for *Giving USA*, an annual report on American philanthropy that has been published continuously since 1956. The group's continued monitoring of regulations affecting fundraising continues to be seen in the regularly published *Giving USA: Annual Report on State Laws Regulating Charitable Solicitations*. However, in choosing to exclude fundraising professionals employed full-time by charities, AAFRC essentially abandoned the issue of certification for fundraising professionals and in the long run also ended up ceding its aspirational position as the leading voice for the fundraising profession. That mantel—and the task of professional certification—was eventually taken up by the National Society of Fund Raisers (the precursor of the Association of Fundraising Professionals), which was founded in 1960.

## CHAPTER FIVE PRELUDE TO CERTIFICATION (1960-1976)

At the end of the 1950s, the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel (AAFRC) was the premier association for the fundraising profession, and it was setting a course to take advantage of its position as the voice for the fundraising profession that it had achieved as a result of its role in the Tompkins Committee hearings on “charity racketeering.” Setting a goal of substantially increasing its membership, AAFRC voted in 1954 to invite other fundraising counsel firms to join its ranks as well as “free-lance fundraisers not associated with a firm,” who were to be entitled to associate membership.<sup>1</sup> The tenure length for the head of a member firm also was reduced from ten years’ experience to six.<sup>2</sup> Further, AAFRC was exploring the advisability of creating a “Board of Consultants,” the purpose of which would be to forge ties with other organizations concerned about philanthropy and thus elevate AAFRC to the position of being a recognized leader in philanthropy and not simply fundraising.<sup>3</sup> However, the one thing that AAFRC decided not to do was to admit fundraising professionals who were employed full-time by nonprofit organizations and institutions. That measure was defeated by a vote of nine to three.<sup>4</sup>

### Origins of NSFR

It took another six years before a few enterprising fundraising professionals in New York became discontent with the few loose, local associations available to fundraising professionals employed by institutions. It was from this void that the

---

<sup>1</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 20 February 1954, 2, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>2</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 4 June 1954, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>3</sup> AAFRC Minutes, 4 June 1954, 3, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

<sup>4</sup> AAFRC Minutes, A Report from the Study Committee, Second Draft, 9 March 1954, 1, Series 1, Roll 1, AAFRC Records, RLASC.

National Society of Fund Raisers (later the National Society of Fund Raising Executives and now the Association of Fundraising Professionals) was born. The beginning of NSFR marked a new yet familiar cycle in fundraising professionals' elusive search for professional respect. Founded on June 21, 1960, in New York by Benjamin Sklar of Brandeis University, William R. Sims of the National Urban League, and Harry Rosen of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies (Dr. Abel Hanson of Columbia Teacher's College was later added as a fourth founder), NSFR was envisioned as a national association for fundraisers.<sup>5</sup> NSFR's purposes as outlined in its articles of incorporation included being a support to fundraisers in their practice, a network for exchange of ideas, a unifying body for fundraising, a voice for explaining the many facets of the fundraising profession to the public, a promoter of high standards, and a promoter of study and research for fundraising.<sup>6</sup>

Hanson, who served as NSFR's first president, expressed in the first issue of NSFR's *Newsletter* themes that sound very familiar as the justification for the founding of NSFR. He noted that it was "probably too early to identify fundraising as a true profession," echoing a regularly recurring theme across the decades.<sup>7</sup> However, for the first time in the profession's history, Hanson brings a greatly expanded vision of fundraising to the fore. Placing fundraising clearly within "the history of philanthropy," Hanson emphasizes that "philanthropy is national in scope."<sup>8</sup> Because "giving to worthy

---

<sup>5</sup> NSFR's founders were associated with organizations largely serving causes related to the Jewish community and civil rights. While it might be possible to conjecture that these individuals formed NSFR because they were excluded from other fundraising associations because of their diversity, there is nothing in NSFR's records suggesting any discrimination by other associations.

<sup>6</sup> Association of Fundraising Professionals, *AFP: The First 50 Years* (Arlington: Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2010), 4 (hereafter cited as *AFP: The First 50 Years*).

<sup>7</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 4.

<sup>8</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 4.

causes” is “a historic characteristic of the American people,” NSFR is needed so that “fundraisers may increase their understanding of giving in a free society.”<sup>9</sup> Effectively, Hanson provided a new rallying cry for respect for the fundraising profession: if philanthropy is historically American, and giving is a hallmark of America’s free society, then those whose work to increase giving—fundraising professionals—are part of the backbone of America.

Dedicated to the creation of an association serving individual fundraising professionals, NSFR’s leadership created an ambitious recruitment scheme for the young organization, sending 400 to 500 invitations to fundraising professionals in the New York area. The invitations offered membership for a \$10 annual dues fee. Clearly there was demand because NSFR received a 95 percent response rate to its initial attempt to acquire members.<sup>10</sup>

While the early attendees of NSFR formational meetings were predominantly from Jewish charities such as B’nai B’rith, the Federation of Jewish Agencies, National Jewish Hospital, and Israel Bonds, the leadership made it clear that NSFR was an organization for all fundraising professionals, from whatever faith or sector, saying “this organization [NSFR] would be non-sectarian. It is important for us to ready all fund-raisers in the community.” Further, the founders defined NSFR as

an organization which would set up a code of ethics and publicity to give the fund-raiser the prestige due to him. The fund-raiser is not well known

---

<sup>9</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 4.

<sup>10</sup> Minutes of the Board of Directors of the National Society of Fund Raisers/National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFR Minutes), 20 March 1961, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, Association of Fundraising Professionals, Records 1960-1998 (AFP Records), Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, University Library, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (hereafter cited as RLASC). In 1977, the National Society of Fund Raisers (NSFR) changed its name to the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE). This change happened mid-year and was not a material change for the organization.



in the community. He performs a most important function in the community, and does not receive the recognition. The Society will have as its minimum requirement five years of service as a full-time fundraiser.”<sup>11</sup>

In short, NSFR has as its goal the same sorts of issues—increasing the prestige of the fundraising profession and increasing understanding of the function of fundraising in society—that AAFRC had been pursuing since its founding decades earlier. The leadership of NSFR also from the first had the vision of a national organization. In an early recruitment letter dated August 9, 1961, they expressed this forthrightly: “The National Society of Fund Raisers has been chartered for the purpose of advancing the best interests of fund raisers and the organizations they serve on a nationwide basis.”<sup>12</sup>

Beyond being national in scope, NSFR also wanted to be a voice for good in the seeming perpetual quest to raise understanding of and respect for the fundraising profession. As Joseph F. McNee, Senior Vice President of the National Foundation, noted at the official opening meeting of NSFR on November 15, 1961,

The public image of the professional fund raiser is not a good one. With the constant harassment of the whole area of fund raising, the public is beginning to believe that all fund raising is of the ‘bucket shop’ variety.... The fund raiser must, through organizations such as the National Society of Fund Raisers, do all in his power as an individual and as a member of an agency or association to improve this image....The National Society of Fund Raisers can become an excellent vehicle to (a) set standards of fund raising; (b) help train fund raisers; (c) attract top caliber young men and women into the field; (d) launch a public relations program to bring about a proper understanding of the needs and accomplishments of this field.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> NSFR Minutes, 20 March 1961, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC. The note of the minimum requirement of five years of service is important because it is likely the original source of the requirement that CFREs have a minimum of five years of experience. This requirement for the CFRE credential stood until 2016, when it was lowered to three years of experience because of the greatly expanded array of educational resources available to fundraising professionals.

<sup>12</sup> NSFR Minutes, Recruitment Letter, 9 August 1961, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>13</sup> NSFR Minutes, 13 March 1963, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

In noting these issues and goals, McNee was perhaps unknowingly repeating the litany of issues that had plagued fundraising professionals from the beginning and that AAFRC had pointed out in its early days as problems to be solved and points to be addressed. These issues would only continue to grow over the years as the scale of giving in the United States grew and the philanthropic sector expanded, as documented by *Giving USA*, which was started by AAFRC.<sup>14</sup> However, NSFR was prepared to build on the base of those who had gone before to add two more building blocks to the foundation of the fundraising profession: It was NSFR that suggested—and ultimately pursued—a code of ethics and standards for fundraising professionals as well as the addition of formal training and educational opportunities for fundraisers. Both of these elements were vital precursors to certification.

#### NSFR Ethics Committee

To facilitate the creation of a code of ethics and standards, NSFR set up an Ethics Committee fairly early on. While the exact date of formation of the Ethics Committee is not documented, it was in existence by July 30, 1964.<sup>15</sup> Chaired by Barnet Deutch of the American Red Cross, the Ethics Committee worked diligently and was able to distribute a draft Code of Ethics and Standards at the NSFR Board of Directors meeting on June 11, 1965.<sup>16</sup> At that time, Deutch asked that NSFR Board members submit any suggested changes in writing within a week. The question was broached of whether Board approval

---

<sup>14</sup> The Giving Institute, *Giving USA 2017* (Chicago: The Giving Institute, 2017), 40.

<sup>15</sup> NSFR Minutes, 13 November 1964, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>16</sup> “Paid Notice: Deaths DEUTCH, BARNET M.,” *New York Times*, May 24, 2002, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/24/classified/paid-notice-deaths-deutch-barnet-m.html?mcubz=1>; NSFR Minutes, 11 June 1965, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

was sufficient in order to adopt the Code of Ethics and Standards or whether approval by the general membership was needed, with the decision being deferred to a later date.

Ultimately, the NSFR Code of Ethics and Standards appears to have been adopted with little fuss, as no further mention is made of it in the minutes of NSFR's Board of Directors. The Code did become a centerpiece of membership in NSFR, as the first extant example of a complete application for membership in NSFR features the Code and requires all applicants to sign in confirmation that they will adhere to NSFR's Standards of Practice, which were as follows:

As Members of the National Society of Fund Raisers, Inc. we share a responsibility for upholding the character and reputation of our profession. Accordingly, we will adhere to the following principles and practices:

- We will associate ourselves only with organizations and agencies employing ethical fund raising methods and whose purposes contribute to the preservation and enhancement of a free society.
- We will work professionally only on a salary or retainer fee basis.
- We will cooperate with fellow practitioners in curbing malpractice.
- We will encourage and support educational and training programs for fund raising practitioners.
- We will encourage our members to share ideas, experiences and practices so as to (a) increase the common pool of knowledge about fund raising, and (b) benefit the organizations and agencies they serve.
- We will pursue our professional responsibilities always concerned with protecting the best interests of the giving public and the causes and people for which they give.

Only by living up to these principles and standards will we be meeting our responsibilities for making the profession in which we are engaged worthy of continued public confidence.

It is likely that the development of NSFR's Code took so little time and warranted so little discussion because in many ways, its core principles did not differ significantly from those developed by AAFRC in terms of NSFR members working only with ethical organizations, avoiding fee-based compensation, and

doing a certain amount of self-policing to uphold the integrity of the fundraising profession. Throughout, an emphasis on maintaining the good character of the profession was maintained.

#### Professional Education Programs for Fundraisers

Something that took more time—and significantly more time at that—was NSFR’s stated goal of developing educational programs for fundraising professionals. On this matter, NSFR and AAFRC undertook a formal agreement to work together through a Joint Committee on Careers in Fundraising. Established on June 22, 1965, the Joint Committee on Careers in Fundraising was to consist of five representatives from AAFRC and four representatives from NSFR, with work to be funded by a \$1,500 donation from AAFRC. The Committee’s stated purpose was to “study the extent to which a program of mutual cooperation might be established between the AAFRC and the NSFR with respect to common problems pertaining to individuals in the profession of fundraising, both of an immediate and long-range nature.”<sup>17</sup> By August 13, 1965, this nascent effort had been formalized through a joint resolution of NSFR and AAFRC for the Joint Study on Careers in Fund Raising, which noted:

Whereas there is a common objective on the part of both organizations to establish meaningful professional standards of performance, capabilities and training; and

Whereas there is a need for developing professional standards and definitions of job titles, responsibilities and functions as they pertain to individuals employed in the field of fund raising; and

Whereas, the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel and the National Society of Fund Raisers are the recognized organizations in their fields;

It is therefore resolved that the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel and the National Society of Fund Raisers authorize

---

<sup>17</sup> NSFR Minutes, Resolution of the Executive Committee of AAFRC, 22 June 1965, n.p, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

independently the formation of a joint committee to study the above areas of common interest as they pertain to individuals who compose the fund raising profession.<sup>18</sup>

Most interesting is the way in which this resolution indicates an admission by NSFR and AAFRC that former standards of practice, which were based primarily on undefined measures of experience and good character, were not enough. As the profession matured, it needed to quantify professional standards to some degree, and this resolution acknowledges that fact. Members of the Joint Study on Careers in Fund Raising were AAFRC representatives A. C. Podesta of Tamblyn & Brown, who chaired the Joint Study; Edwin E. Armstrong of Ward, Dreshman and Reinhardt; George A. Brakeley, Jr., of G. A. Brakeley & Co.; Austin V. McClain of Marts & Lundy, Inc.; and Raleigh L. Smith of Will, Folsom and Smith. Jess W. Speidel II of the American Cancer Society; Abel A. Hanson of the Teacher's College at Columbia University; Ben Sklar of Brandeis University; and Harry Rosen of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies represented NSFR.<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to note that NSFR loaded its representation with heavy hitters, as the current NSFR President (Speidel), the former NSFR President (Hanson), and two founding NSFR members (Sklar and Rosen) were included. Unfortunately, despite the high-profile volunteers and funding afforded to the project, it appears to have produced little in the way of results. The only further mention of its work occurs as a short note in 1968, where it is reported that "an ad hoc committee comprised of representatives of NSFR and AAFRC [met] to discuss education, recruitment, accreditation and

---

<sup>18</sup> NSFR Minutes, "NSFR and AAFRC Joint Study on Careers in Fund Raising," 13 August 1965, n.p., Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>19</sup> NSFR Minutes, "NSFR and AAFRC Joint Study on Careers in Fund Raising," 13 August 1965, n.p., Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

classification of fund raisers.” A draft pamphlet from AAFRC entitled “For You—New Career Opportunities in a Growing Profession” was distributed to the NSFR Board of Directors, presumably as a sample publication related to the ad hoc committee’s work.<sup>20</sup>

Despite a philosophical commitment to promoting educational opportunities for fundraisers, NSFR’s records show that its efforts to professionalize fundraising further by providing training opportunities for its membership went in fits and starts at best. The bulk of the organization’s efforts during the 1960s and 1970s went towards growing its membership (by the end of 1976, membership in NSFR was estimated to be at more than 1,300 nationwide) and growing affiliations through creating of new chapters or absorption of independent groups into the NSFR chapter structure.<sup>21</sup> As a testament to NSFR’s tenacity in the area of chapter growth, by the end of 1976 there were 20 NSFR Chapters across the United States and Canada: New York, Washington DC Metro Area, Massachusetts, Greater Atlanta, Greater Los Angeles, Greater Houston, Greater Philadelphia, Minnesota, Greater Toronto, Golden Gate, Maryland, Mid-America, Greater Milwaukee, New Jersey, San Diego, St. Louis Regional, Miami-Dade County, Chicago, and Mahoning-Shenango. NSFR’s presence was strong on the East Coast, West Coast, and Midwest but weak in the South. Interestingly, the Chicago chapter of NSFR had formally been an independent association, the Chicago Society of Fund Raising Executives (CSFRE). It was CSFRE’s concern that if a merger were to occur with NSFR, that there would need to be a “name change to reflect executives [and] managers.”

---

<sup>20</sup> NSFR Minutes, 5 April 1968, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>21</sup> NSFR Minutes, 17 September 1976, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

Once the merger between NSFR and CSFRE was effected, NSFR became known as the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE).<sup>22</sup>

However, during this same period, training and education for fundraising professionals languished at NSFR. In 1966, “training programs” were listed as a “service function” that could be “undertaken in fulfillment of the Society’s central purpose, as it relates to the membership of the Society, to the profession generally, and to the public at large.”<sup>23</sup> Toward that end, Barnet Deutch—who prior to this had been chair of NSFR’s Ethics Committee—made an impassioned argument for “a training program to attract qualified personnel to the fundraising profession.”<sup>24</sup> Deutch noted that large nonprofit organizations—including some of those represented on the NSFR board—had training programs already. He believed that NSFR needed its own training program in order to serve both individual members and chapters. Deutch volunteered to set up a training program for NSFR, a suggestion which was well received.<sup>25</sup> By February 1967, Deutch was chair of NSFR’s Committee on Training.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, it appears that training and education for fundraisers outside of NSFR’s annual conference was mostly aspiration and/or ad hoc, as the Committee on Training was not among the standing committees listed in the NSFR minutes of March 24, 1967.<sup>27</sup> By 1968, however, more interest was starting to be expressed at by the NSFR Board of Directors about how to encourage fundraising professionals to seek education in fundraising. The existence of a “course in fund raising” at the New School for Social Research in New York City caused the NSFR

---

<sup>22</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 December 1976, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>23</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 October 1966, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>24</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 October 1966, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>25</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 October 1966, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>26</sup> NSFR Minutes, 6 February 1967, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>27</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 March 1967, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

Board of Directors to note that “Since so little is known about the formal [fundraising] courses being given at various educational institutions, and since there are demands by both experienced professional and the beginner for formal educational training to serve his own needs,” an article “outlining what is available and perhaps what should be available to the profession” would be helpful.<sup>28</sup>

The mention of courses in fundraising offered by academic institutions seems to have set off a spark of sorts in terms of jumpstarting NSFR’s consideration of supporting educational opportunities for fundraising professionals. Around this time, NSFR began to discuss setting up a foundation “to receive grants to further the purpose of the Society.”<sup>29</sup> Maurice G. Gurin, head of the New York consulting firm Bowen, Gurin, & Barnes, Inc. and chair of NSFR’s Legislative Committee, was at the same time having conversations with the Ford Foundation. The Ford Foundation was interested in providing funds to NSFR to train African-American fundraisers at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), though at the time different nomenclature was used. As Gurin expressed in a letter to James W. Bryant, Project Specialist at the Ford Foundation, the project was for “the recruitment, training, and employment of Negroes for fundraising assignments with predominantly Negro colleges.”<sup>30</sup> The need for the project was described like this:

Direct foundation support for the predominantly Negro colleges will never be sufficient to bring these important institutions to the levels that we hope they will achieve. Challenge grants, which must be matched, are not the answer either because these colleges do not have the requisite alumni, parent, and community support. The solution is the training of competent

---

<sup>28</sup> NSFR Minutes, 9 February 1968, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>29</sup> NSFR Minutes, 14 June 1968, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>30</sup> NSFR Minutes, Maurice G. Gurin to James W. Bryant, 1 July 1968, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.



development officers and the establishment of effective development offices for these institutions. Only through this approach can their potential sources of support be adequately developed.<sup>31</sup>

With foundation support and direct constituency support being judged as insufficient, the program description implied that engagement of individual philanthropists on a grand scale would be needed, and for this a dedicated cadre of fundraising professionals for HBCUs needed to be trained. NSFR was not the only organization proposing the training program. AAFRC; NSFR's New York affiliate, the Association of Fund Raising Directors; the National Public Relations Council; the American Alumni Council; and the American College Public Relations Association were also invited to participate. The Ford Foundation's endorsement of the program "could expedite organizational cooperation on the program."<sup>32</sup> It could also potentially provide NSFR with sorely-needed funding for developing training programs.

The program, while momentous in terms of scope, did not occupy much discussion at the leadership level at NSFR if the association's minutes are any indication. NSFR minutes in late 1968 mentioned that a committee of five had been nominated to carry out the program under Ralph E. Chamberlain, who was President of NSFR at the time, and promised NSFR's full cooperation and resources.<sup>33</sup> However, it was late 1969 before there was another brief mention of the program in a confidential memorandum from George A. Brakeley, Jr., to NSFR leaders Robert V. Donahoe, Ralph E. Chamberlain, and Robert E. O'Brien. In discussing possible advantages to discuss with

---

<sup>31</sup> NSFR Minutes, Maurice G. Gurin to James W. Bryant, 1 July 1968, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>32</sup> NSFR Minutes, Maurice G. Gurin to James W. Bryant, 1 July 1968, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>33</sup> NSFR Minutes, 8 November 1968, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

the Chicago Society of Fund Raising Executives (CSFRE), which NSFR was trying to secure as an affiliate, Brakeley noted, “the intern program for development officers from a number of the ‘black’ higher educational institutions, sponsored by Ford” was something that CSFRE should know about.<sup>34</sup> It appears at this point that AAFRC had taken the role of lead partner in the Ford Foundation project, which may explain why there is little further mention of it in NSFR’s records.<sup>35</sup>

#### NSFR Education Committee

However small the specific impact of the Ford Foundation program on NSFR training efforts, it appears that NSFR’s initial championing of and later involvement in the program acted as a catalyst for NSFR efforts to create its own training programs. In 1972, NSFR created an Education Committee. The Education Committee’s charge was to “investigate and recommend to the Executive Committee and Board programs in education in two areas: for the neophyte or trainee and that for the professional and practicing professional fund raiser.” The Education Committee was chaired by NSFR founder William R. Simms (New York), and the vice chair was L. Lawrence Dixon (Northern California). It is clear that in forming the Education Committee, NSFR was working to have a blue-ribbon panel of trainers and educators. Members of the Education Committee included James Bryant (New York), the Ford Foundation specialist involved in the HBCU training program; Richard Carroll (Massachusetts), a former teacher currently employed by the Harvard School of Dental Medicine; Harold Ifft (New York), National Business Director of Junior Achievement, who was responsible for that

---

<sup>34</sup> NSFR Minutes, George A. Brakeley, Jr., to Robert V. Donahoe *et al*, 15 September 1969, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>35</sup> NSFR Minutes, George A. Brakeley, Jr. to Robert V. Donahoe *et al*, 15 September 1969, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

organization's fundraising and training programs; Howard Mirkin (New York), coordinator of the Association of Fund Raising Directors' training course at the New School for Social Research; Robert Duncan (Massachusetts), who was formerly president of John Price Jones, a recognized trainer, and current seminar leader at Harvard; Jess W. Speidel II (New York), former NSFR president and experienced trainer; and Dr. Abel Hanson (New York; in a consulting role), NSFR founding president and retired from the Columbia University Teachers College.<sup>36</sup> Within its charge, the Education Committee saw three primary questions to be answered: "1. What are the problems in training fund raisers? 2. Why is the fund raising field not attracting the young people? 3. Can we compile information on the professions from which the more successful fund raisers come?" Unsurprisingly, these questions are ones to which the fundraising profession continues to seek answers.<sup>37</sup>

As a start to its work, the Education Committee decided to focus on four primary activities:

1. Career counseling—to develop an outline for those interested in fund raising as a career.
2. NSFR Chapter participation—the Committee will prepare an outline of seminars and courses for distribution to Chapters and urge them to establish a relationship with a local college or university and assist the Chapter in further development of their own program. Continue to provide Chapters with information on newly developed and ongoing training programs sponsored by other organizations.
3. NSFR Seminars—the Committee will explore the possibility of its members and/or other NSFR members traveling to Chapter areas to conduct seminars or workshops.
4. Catalogue—investigate the possibility of publishing a NSFR Catalogue of all fund raising courses offered around the country.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> NSFR Minutes, 14 July 1972, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>37</sup> NSFR Minutes, 14 July 1972, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>38</sup> NSFR Minutes, 14 July 1972, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

What is perhaps most interesting about the Education Committee's proposed course of action is the way it illustrates the dearth of educational options available to fundraising professionals in 1972 with the exception of on-the-job training. In assigning itself the role of program aggregator, the Education Committee illustrates clearly that training for fundraising professionals was still operating at a local level, if any programs at all were available. There was no defined career pathway at that time for fundraisers. The little training that was available was offered by experienced practitioners. It is unclear whether the Education Committee's inclusion of local colleges and universities as a source for assistance in developing programming was an acknowledgment of the academy as a source of knowledge, as a source of teaching expertise, or both. In all of this, NSFR conceived its role as an aggregator of resources, which was still something of an ambitious goal given the multiple and largely uncoordinated pockets of activity for fundraising education.

By late 1972, the Education Committee had made some progress on a course in fundraising fundamentals, noting that there was a course for neophytes being offered in NSFR chapters in New York and Boston. However, the course was not written down. The plan was for the course to be "committed to outline" and then shared with all NSFR chapters "for use in cooperation with the local college or university," thus indicating that NSFR very much likely had in mind a model of education delivery similar to that of the fundraising course that had been offered in the past by the New School of Social Research in New York.<sup>39</sup> No progress had been made on a training program for experienced professionals, though the Education Committee did report that its initial

---

<sup>39</sup> NSFR Minutes, 6 October 1972, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

thoughts were running in the direction of seminars and workshops on topics such as “foundation approach, deferred giving, capital campaigns, special gift development, etc.”<sup>40</sup> The august Dr. Hanson noted that “ideas for the education of fund directors are not easy to come by” and that Columbia University, which had offered a fundraising course during his tenure, had not yet been able to find a successor to teach it.<sup>41</sup> Further complicating the Education Committee’s work was its geographical dispersion. Operating in an era before e-mail, free conference calls, and other modern tools for collaboration, the Education Committee keenly felt what it called “the handicap of wide geographical spread.”<sup>42</sup> This is noteworthy because it provided a learning experience for NSFR leadership. A “chapter as committee” approach was used in the subsequent development of the CFRE credential.

By early 1973, NSFR’s Education Committee had distributed a course outline for new fundraisers to all NSFR chapters, and plans for a course outline for experienced fundraising professionals was underway.

#### A False Start for Certification

Concurrently with NSFR’s early efforts to establish educational programs for fundraisers, initial discussions about certification for fundraisers started to occur. The first notes about certification in NSFR’s records show the organization was approached on the topic in October 1970 by A. Creed Barnett, president of the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel. Barnett “announced that his organization [AAFRC] is considering a program to establish standards for accreditation of professional fund raisers

---

<sup>40</sup> NSFR Minutes, 6 October 1972, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>41</sup> NSFR Minutes, 6 October 1972, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>42</sup> NSFR Minutes, 6 October 1972, 4-5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

on staff of their member firms, and invited NSFR to collaborate with AAFRC.”<sup>43</sup> The proposed partnership between AAFRC and NSFR on certification went nowhere. The word “accreditation” may provide a clue to the difficulties, as accreditation is awarded to an organization or institution, and AAFRCs members were all corporate bodies. Certification, on the other hand, is awarded to individuals, and individual fundraisers were NSFR’s base. Accreditation and certification have different requirements, with the former focusing on adherence to established standards and procedures by organizations or programs and the latter to assessment of individuals. Therefore, it is possible that discussions between AAFRC and NSFR showed that while each supported the idea of enhanced professional standards, the professional standards they sought to establish were sufficiently different to warrant separate conversations. It is just as possible—and perhaps more likely—that the organizations were incorrectly using “accreditation” and “certification” interchangeably, as the distinction between the two is not something that most individuals outside the credentialing profession instinctively understand.

However, once brought up, the idea of the importance of certification stayed with NSFR. In January 1971, NSFR introduced a resolution “for establishment of an accreditations committee to establish standards and procedures for accreditation of professional fund raisers.”<sup>44</sup> NSFR President Robert V. Donahoe appointed Robert Girmscheid, Jr., as chairman of the Standards and Accreditation Committee. The Committee’s charge was to create recommendations about certification for the consideration of NSFR’s Board of Directors.<sup>45</sup> In October 1971, Girmscheid proposed to

---

<sup>43</sup> NSFR Minutes, 21 October 1970, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>44</sup> NSFR Minutes, 21 January 1971, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>45</sup> NSFR Minutes, 21 January 1971, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

conduct a survey of NSFR membership regarding their thoughts on a certification program, and the NSFR Board of Directors asked him to report results at their April 1972 meeting.<sup>46</sup> There is no record of Girmscheid reporting any polling results to the NSFR Board of Directors in April 1972. The next mention of certification occurs in January 1973, when Girmscheid reported that the Accreditation Committee planned a “two-phase program” for certification:

The first, to begin immediately, would be to set up a code of ethics and practice ‘with teeth’—this would entail a major change in the NSFR By-laws, and eventually would provide for a grievance procedure and a provision for revoking membership. The second phase would be a long term project, directed toward the eventual establishment of a voluntary certification program for NSFR members.”<sup>47</sup>

What is perhaps most interesting about the “two-phase program” is the way in which it shows how fundraisers conflated ethics and certification at the time. Certification did not appear again in NSFR records until the March 1976 report of the Ethics Committee.<sup>48</sup>

Indeed, records show that at this point in its history, NSFR leadership understood that there were important connections among educational programs for fundraisers, fundraising ethics, and the nascent idea of certification for fundraisers. The challenge was in setting boundaries that defined how each of these areas stood in relation to the others in terms of imparting authority to the profession (educational programs), right relations among stakeholders of the profession (ethical codes), and community sanction (certification). The other challenge occurred in how to fund such programs, none of which really flourished until the founding of the NSFR Institute of Continuing Education (NICE).

---

<sup>46</sup> NSFR Minutes, 29 October 1971, 1-2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>47</sup> NSFR Minutes, 25-26 January 1973, 6, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>48</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 March 1976, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

## NSFR Institute of Continuing Education (NICE)

NSFR was an association with an ambitious agenda. It was not, however, an association of significant means. In 1972, NSFR's cash on hand was \$29,220.15 (the equivalent of \$165,994.16 in inflation-adjusted dollars in 2017), and its expenditures for the year were \$28,531.43 (the equivalent of \$162,080.00 in inflation-adjusted dollars in 2017). NSFR started 1973 with just \$689.02 in cash on hand (the equivalent of \$3,914.15 in inflation-adjusted dollars in 2017).<sup>49</sup> Recognizing that its efforts to professionalize fundraising through improved education, ethics, and certification would require outside funding, NSFR established the NSFR Institute for Continuing Education (NICE) as a 501(c)3 organization in 1973. NSFR records note that NICE would allow NSFR to solicit gifts and grants, provide a vehicle that education programs could be "run through," establish a tax-exempt arm, and in the process make NSFR as a national association "more viable."<sup>50</sup> It was the

‘research organization or some such appendage to receive tax-free gifts’ that the founders had discussed at NSFR’s first annual meeting back in February 1961. The institute also provided the society with the means to renew its commitment to one of its founding principles: education in the fundraising field.<sup>51</sup>

By stating the relationship between NSFR and NICE in this fashion, NSFR was able to claim the new entity as a fulfillment of NSFR’s historic plans.

NSFR records show that the formal structure for NICE was put in place before NSFR had entirely defined who would govern it and what exactly its programs would be. The first NICE Board essentially consisted of the NSFR Education Committee, which

---

<sup>49</sup> NSFR Minutes, 25-26 January 1973, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>50</sup> NSFR Minutes, 15 June 1973, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>51</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 11.



noted that “NICE board members should be other than NSFR board.”<sup>52</sup> It was reiterated by the ersatz NICE Board (a.k.a. the NSFR Education Committee) that training curricula for beginner and advanced fundraisers were still needed, as were a strong case for NICE and a formally constituted NICE Board. Robert Pierpont, who would later serve as the chair of the NSFR Certification Board, agreed to chair a nominations committee for the NICE Board that would include Lawrence Dixon, Cyrus Liberman, Laurence O. Pratt, C. Wilson Schroeder, Byron Welch (NSFR President from 1975-1978), and Norman C. Smith (NSFR President from 1971-1973). Further, the Education Committee voted that NSFR give a grant of \$1,000 to NICE to give it an auspicious start.<sup>53</sup>

By December 1974, Pierpont reported that the NICE Task Force was pursuing an ambitious plan: “a model curriculum and concept for a half of a master’s degree program.”<sup>54</sup> The program would cover subjects related to fundraising, would be developed over the course of a year (July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976), and would require approximately \$100,000 in funding (roughly three times NSFR’s annual budget). The program was presented as a joint venture between NSFR and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), which had an interest in U.S. education and workforce development. The plan was for members of the NICE Task Force to contact unspecified potential partner organizations to provide funding for the program.<sup>55</sup>

While the NICE Task Force was composed of expert fundraisers, their expertise perhaps did not extend to grantsmanship. The first funder approached for the NSFR/AED curriculum development project was the U.S. Department of Health,

---

<sup>52</sup> NSFR Minutes, 15 March 1974, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>53</sup> NSFR Minutes, 15 March 1974, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>54</sup> NSFR Minutes, 13 December 1974, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>55</sup> NSFR Minutes, 13 December 1974, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

Education, and Welfare—an unlikely match for such a relatively small project, given the potential funder’s purview and resources. At the time, NSFR President Hank Goldstein remarked that “lessons are being learned.”<sup>56</sup> He also noted his frustration with the “lack of progress in moving ahead on the professional education program” during his tenure.<sup>57</sup>

Later notes on the proposed curriculum project show that the formal proposal to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was for \$121,000 and called for NICE and AED “to work with 10 or so universities in developing a certificate program for fund raiser management.”<sup>58</sup> At the same meeting, the Education Committee discussed actions that NFRS should pursue regarding training opportunities such as seminars and workshops around the United States without reaching any resolution.<sup>59</sup> By September 1975, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had turned down NICE’s proposal, and Pierpont was regrouping by creating a new prospect list that included key foundations and also by rewriting the proposal. Rather than focusing on fundraising management *per se*, the proposal was being adjusted to aim toward “philanthropic financial management.”<sup>60</sup> It is hard to tell whether this was a true refining of direction or simply the substitution of a phrase with a loftier connotation. It may be as well that the substitution was a sign of the times, as a mention of the Filer Commission at the same meeting noted that one of its early findings was that “basically the public at large has no understanding of the role of philanthropy and the impact it has on American life.”<sup>61</sup> As is

---

<sup>56</sup> NSFR Minutes, Annual Meeting, 10 March 1975, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>57</sup> NSFR Minutes, Annual Meeting, 10 March 1975, 2, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>58</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 March 1975, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>59</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 March 1975, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>60</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 September 1975, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>61</sup> NSFR Minutes, 12 September 1975, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

still the case today, philanthropy and fundraising are often conflated with or confused for each other.

By December 1975, a new draft proposal for the NICE/AED curriculum project—now for \$140,000—was underway. By March 1976, NICE had submitted the proposal entitled “Proposal to Develop an Educational Program in Philanthropic Financial Management” to the Henry Luce Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, and the Sloan Foundation and planned to make simultaneous submissions to the Carnegie Foundation, Kellogg Foundation, and A.W. Mellon Foundation.<sup>62</sup> It was only after having submitted the proposal that the NICE Ad Hoc Committee considered that there was a need for letters of intent from colleges and universities who were interested in being academic partners for curriculum development.<sup>63</sup> This oversight was noted by the potential funders. By June 1976, the proposal had been refused by the Sloan Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the A.W. Mellon Foundation, and the Xerox Foundation. While the NICE Ad Hoc Committee did eventually receive a letter of intent from the University of Chicago to be a partner in curriculum development, by then it was too late. Potential foundation funders made it clear that they felt that “rather than a NICE proposal it should be an educational organization proposal.”<sup>64</sup> By December 1976, the NICE Ad Hoc Committee had decided to abandon fundraising for the NICE curriculum development proposal, stating that NICE’s structure “is not [the] proper vehicle for developing [the] academic curriculum

---

<sup>62</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 March 1976, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>63</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 March 1976, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>64</sup> NSFR Minutes, 17 September 1976, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

desired.”<sup>65</sup> NICE further suggested that any responsibility for continuing education should be shifted to the Education Committee, thus finally making something of a clear delineation between the role of the Education Committee and NICE’s role.<sup>66</sup> From this point onward, NICE focused on two key projects: a study of fundraising costs at U.S. charities and the long-deferred development of a certification program for fundraising professionals.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 December 1976, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>66</sup> NSFR Minutes, 10 December 1976, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>67</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 12, 14.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE CERTIFIED FUND RAISING EXECUTIVE CREDENTIAL (1977-1985)

Having abandoned its ambitious plans at the end of 1976 to create an academic curriculum for fundraising professionals, NSFRE turned its sights to creating its certification program.<sup>1</sup> The time was right for work to commence. The move of NSFRE's headquarters from New York to Washington, D.C., was seen as "symbolic of the growing national scope of the organization," and the establishment of NSFRE's first paid presidency in 1977 was an indicator of NSFRE's growing resources—resources that were necessary if programs such as certification were to take hold and flourish.<sup>2</sup> In addition, NSFRE was feeling greater pressure from inside and outside fundraising to raise professional standards. NSFRE members were cognizant of the need to "assure the public and the institutions we serve about the competence and quality of practitioners in the field."<sup>3</sup> Members also felt the "growing certainty of more regulations of charitable solicitation by the states and the Federal government, and the imposition of external controls over the qualifications and performance of fund raising practitioners."<sup>4</sup> During the Carter administration in the late 1970s, the Federal Trade Commission pursued legal action against the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, and other professional groups over antitrust issues related to fees and services.<sup>5</sup> A few years

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1977, the National Society of Fund Raisers (NSFR) changed its name to the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE). Because this change happened mid-year and does not have a material bearing on the development of the certification program, NSFRE is used throughout this chapter for ease of reference.

<sup>2</sup> *AFP: The First 50 Years*, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Minutes of Ad Hoc Committee on Certification of the National Society of Fund Raisers/National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification), n.d., 1, CFRE International, Alexandria (hereafter cited as CFRE).

<sup>4</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d., 1, CFRE.

<sup>5</sup> "The Feds Take on the Professions," *San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle*, May 7, 1978, Section A, 4. This article was included as Attachment C in the NSFRE Ad Hoc Committee on Certification's report to the NSFRE Board of Directors on 7 December 1978, CFRE.

later, Lyle E. Cook, the NSFRE volunteer leader who was the driving force behind the development of the CFRE credential, made the case for certification for the fundraising profession in this way:

...the rise of consumerism and demands for accountability have increased the attention given to charitable solicitation, the ways in which it is done, and the management of philanthropic organizations....

Investigative reporting about philanthropy has focused on flagrant abuses, but only occasionally do the communications media show understanding of the subject.

Attorneys general regularly discuss how to protect the public from abuses, and legislation regulating at least some aspect of fund raising has been passed in 34 states and proposed in most of the others....

This interest and attention, if based on understanding of fund raising and the role of professional management in it, can be a strong, positive force in strengthening the philanthropic sector. For this to come about, there must be standards which can be applied in judging the competence and performance of fund raising executives.<sup>6</sup>

As a profession familiar with the challenges posed by prior government regulation efforts, fundraising took seriously both the unfriendly environment for fundraising and the important role the profession had to play in raising its standards. It was under these circumstances that NSFRE sealed its commitment to creating a certification for fundraising professionals.

#### Initial Work on the Certification Program

Work on certification began in earnest in March 1977, when the NSFRE Board of Directors established an Ad Hoc Committee on Certification.<sup>7</sup> The Committee was chaired by Lyle E. Cook, a member of NSFRE's Northern California Chapter and co-founder of The Fund Raising School.<sup>8</sup> The membership of the Committee was wide-

---

<sup>6</sup> Lyle E. Cook, "Certification of Fund Raising Executives: A Step on the Road to Professionalism," *NSFRE Sightlines*, no. 2 (1980): 2.

<sup>7</sup> Certification Program: Chronology of Development (Chronology of Development), n.d., 1, CFRE.

<sup>8</sup> Dwight F. Burlingame, *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*, Volume 1 (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO), 169.

ranging and included Donald A. Campbell (Chicago), Clifford L. Culp (Baltimore), Warren Gould (Dallas), George V. Hill (Southern California), Sam Naparstek (Milwaukee), Laurance O. Pratt (Massachusetts), John J. Schwartz (New York), and I. Brewster Terry (Washington). Ex officio members were Richard J. Crohn, chair of NSFRE's Education Committee; Dorothy L. Sutherland, Chair of NSFRE's Ethics Committee; Byron Welch, Chair of NSFRE's Board of Directors; and Fletcher Hall, NSFRE's President.<sup>9</sup> While the Committee was named in April 1977, Cook did not contact the Committee to get started on its work until November 1977. Cook squarely took responsibility for the delay, noting that work demands "and, to be honest, some procrastination" had prevented him from getting in touch with Committee members for around six months.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, he hoped that "this time lapse has not diminished the uniformly high enthusiasm" for the Committee's task.<sup>11</sup>

The Committee's charge was "to develop standards and criteria for and methods of implementing a program for certifying the competence and experience of fund raising and development professionals, and for maintaining certification."<sup>12</sup> They estimated that a solid two years of work would be required to develop the certification program but acknowledged that "actions by legislative bodies and regulatory agencies may require a shortening of that time."<sup>13</sup>

Cook posited that there would be four stages to the Committee's work and gave the Committee a tight schedule, perhaps in part to make up for the delay in getting

---

<sup>9</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, 7 April 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>10</sup> Lyle E. Cook to Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, 11 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>11</sup> Lyle E. Cook to Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, 11 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>12</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 1, CFRE.

<sup>13</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 1, CFRE.

started. Stage I was the development of criteria for certification and certification maintenance. This stage involved determining what practitioner knowledge and experience was to be evaluated, how testing would be accomplished, what levels of achievement would be certified, how to weight certification criteria, and what the requirements would be for the certified individual to maintain certification. (It also would involve determining the cost for the assistance of the professional testing agency required in Stage II and submitting a funding request to the NSFRE Board of Directors.) The estimated completion date for Stage I was February 1978—less than a year since the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification. Stage II was to focus on designing and testing instruments for measuring achievement and would require the assistance of a professional testing agency. Curriculum vitae (for reporting on a candidate’s education, experience, and other achievements), written exams testing both knowledge and application of knowledge, and interviews or oral examinations were all listed as possibilities. Stage II was slated to end by August 1978.<sup>14</sup> Concurrently with Stage II, Stage III would be completed. Stage III was to focus on developing procedures for certification, including the establishment of a certification board or commission and appropriate administrative procedures. Cook noted that “a key question in establishing a [certification] board or commission is ‘Who is to certify whom?’ Should certification be a peer review or should qualified persons from other fields or organizations participate?”<sup>15</sup> Stage IV was to focus on the adoption and implementation of the certification program. This stage included the adoption of the certification by the NSFRE Board of Directors, the roll out of the certification program to NSFRE members, the

---

<sup>14</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 1-2, CFRE.

<sup>15</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 2, CFRE.



announcement of the certification to fundraisers and to the general public, and some initial testing and evaluation of the certification program. With Stage IV completed by February 1979, Cook anticipated that the first group of individuals would be certified by June 1979.<sup>16</sup>

The description of subjects and questions for Stage I showed the enormity of the task at hand. In addition to deciding what formal education and practical experience would be counted by the certification program, the Committee would need to create some sort of an outline of the body of fundraising knowledge that would be tested. Cook's notes to the Committee show that the early knowledge outline included two main categories: fundraising vehicles such as the capital campaign, annual giving, direct mail, deferred gifts, special projects, and grants; and ancillary skills such as fundraising communications, volunteer relations, government relations, and program management. Handwritten notes on Cook's copy of the work plan show the difficulty of demarcating where fundraising knowledge ends, as he added items such as accounting, oral and written communication, economic and business trends, taxes, the role and function of voluntary organizations, and long range and institutional planning as addition areas that might be considered for testing.<sup>17</sup> Fundraising performance, ethics and standards of conduct, service to the profession and the philanthropic sector, and awards and achievements were also items that Cook thought might figure into the certification program.<sup>18</sup> Finally, Cook proposed that there might be different levels of certification considered, with the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) certification forming the

---

<sup>16</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 2, CFRE.

<sup>17</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 3, CFRE.

<sup>18</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 3-4, CFRE.

baseline certification. The advanced levels suggested were the Diplomat [sic] of NSFRE and Fellow of NSFRE. In Cook's handwritten notes, a refinement of these advanced levels was recorded as Member of the Academy of Fund Raising Executives (AFRE) and Fellow of the Academy of Fund Raising Executives (FAFRE). This suggests that despite having been frustrated in earlier efforts to establish academic programs for fundraising, NSFRE had not entirely given up on the idea of an added level of expertise beyond baseline practitioner knowledge.<sup>19</sup>

Cook requested that the Committee share comments on the work plan. One surviving set of comments from Laurence O. Pratt notes some of the very practical difficulties facing the Committee in doing its work. Cook had noted in the work plan that the wide geographic dispersion of the Committee, coupled with no travel budget and no paid support staff, made the Committee's work challenging. Pratt suggested that it might be helpful for Cook to appoint "a small kitchen cabinet" in the Northern California Chapter (of which Cook was president) that could meet regularly to do the actual work of hashing out requirements for certification. The work of the "kitchen cabinet" could then be reviewed and approved by the Committee.<sup>20</sup>

Pratt also gave Cook additional practical advice in thinking through the proposed work plan for the CFRE certification program. Noting that "we all recognize that we are working under the gun of outside pressures and that the timetable [for development of the certification program] must therefore be unrealistic," Pratt noted that cataloguing the knowledge of the fundraising program was "extremely difficult."<sup>21</sup> Further complicating

---

<sup>19</sup> NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, n.d. (circa 1977), 4, CFRE.

<sup>20</sup> Pratt to Cook, 21 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>21</sup> Pratt to Cook, 21 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

the cataloguing of the body of knowledge was the fact that “there is no present system of accrediting the training programs available to [fundraisers], and many are proprietary in nature.”<sup>22</sup> In short, the knowledge that was available could not be validated by an objective third party and/or was someone else’s intellectual property. Pratt was also dubious about offering levels of certification, saying, “but isn’t our first and most vital chore to work out a basic certification scheme? Diplomats [sic] and Fellows would merely be the frosting on the cake. The really good development directors don’t need this kind of recognition.”<sup>23</sup>

Cook heeded Pratt’s advice—and presumably also advice received from other Committee members. Cook’s notes from December 1977 show his intention to establish working groups on certification within NSFRE chapters both to facilitate the “widest possible participation” and to overcome problems in having widely dispersed individuals trying to work together.<sup>24</sup> He mentions that some of this had already begun, with certification working groups existing in the Southwest, Southern California, Chicago, and Northern California chapters of NSFRE.<sup>25</sup> Cook further records that Henry A. Rosso, his fellow co-founder of The Fund Raising School, had offered the aid of The Fund Raising School’s faculty and students in “defining the body of knowledge essential for competence in fund raising.”<sup>26</sup> One thing Cook makes clear: the Committee’s commitment to making baseline certification “accessible to as many as possible.”<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Pratt to Cook, 21 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>23</sup> Pratt to Cook, 21 November 1977, 3, CFRE.

<sup>24</sup> Cook Notes, 9 December 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>25</sup> Cook Notes, 9 December 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>26</sup> Cook Notes, 9 December 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>27</sup> Cook Notes, 9 December 1977, 1, CFRE.

## Early Polling on Certification

To gain a greater understanding of NSFRE member attitudes and recommendations regarding certification, the Committee enlisted the NSFRE Northern California Chapter in an October 1978 grassroots workshop on opinions on who should be responsible for standard setting, criteria for certification, and who should certify.<sup>28</sup> Partly this was an effort to expand the conversation, but partly it was also likely because after initial Committee discussions, the sheer enormity of the task at hand was increasingly evident. As one of Cook's early notes indicates, the "farther we get into this [the] more complexities we find."<sup>29</sup> Workshop results show the wide variance of opinion regarding the value and purposes of certification. When asked, "What does accreditation [sic] mean to you," answers were mostly positive and included "professional recognition—a peer endorsement that you have 'earned your spurs,'" "public recognition of an individual's knowledge (but not competence)," "prestige," and "establishment of minimum standards of competency." The one naysayer's response to the question was a succinct "not much."<sup>30</sup>

Another noteworthy question asked in the Northern California Chapter workshop was, "How heavily do you weigh experience as a factor in determining whether or not a person is qualified to be an 'accredited fundraiser'?" The consensus, unsurprisingly, was that experience was weighted very heavily, with the accompanying acknowledgment that on-the-job experience was still the way fundraisers learned their craft. However, what is interesting about the responses is the acknowledgment by several that experience was not

---

<sup>28</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 1, CFRE.

<sup>29</sup> Cook Notes, 9 December 1977, 1, CFRE.

<sup>30</sup> NSFR Survey, n.d., 1-2, CFRE.

everything. A few noted that experience cannot be equated to expertise, while others noted that until the profession developed a credible certification, experience was the only measuring stick available.<sup>31</sup>

Answers to remaining questions explored at the Northern California Chapter workshop show little consensus, other than asserting that ideally a certified fundraiser would have a baccalaureate degree and five years of experience.<sup>32</sup> Responses regarding the individuals or entities who should be charged with administering the certification were particularly varied, with answers ranging from NICE; NSFRE in cooperation with other major associations such as AAFRC, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and the National Association for Hospital Development (NAHD, which in future would be renamed the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy); a National Accreditation Board; regionally approved colleges or universities; top people in the field; NSFRE Chapters; and a testing service in conjunction with a certification board.<sup>33</sup>

What makes the answers of the Northern California Chapter particularly noteworthy is the Chapter's heavy concentration of fundraising leadership. At around this time, the Board of Directors of the Northern California Chapter included all three founders of The Fund Raising School (Lyle E. Cook, Joseph R. Mixer, and Henry A. Rosso) and two future presidents of NSFRE (Robert C. Blum and Barbara H. Marion, who was NSFRE's first female president).<sup>34</sup> Their answers, and their points of consensus

---

<sup>31</sup> NSFR Survey, n.d., 3-4, CFRE.

<sup>32</sup> NSFR Survey, n.d., 6-7, CFRE.

<sup>33</sup> NSFR Survey, n.d., 10-11, CFRE.

<sup>34</sup> Cook to NSFR Ad Hoc Committee on Certification, 11 November 1977, 1, CFRE.

and disagreement, show the challenges that even thought leaders faced when considering how to structure and implement certification for fundraisers.

### Investigation of Comparable Certification Programs

The Northern California Chapter workshop immediately spurred one key piece of work: the investigation of certification schemes used by other associations. By December 1978, the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification had identified the certification programs of the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE), the International Association of Business Communications (IABC), the National Association for Hospital Development (NAHD), and the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) as potentially comparable to what NSFRE wished to create. These certification schemes were reviewed on four points: whether they were voluntary or mandatory, the form of the examination, responsible parties (who administered the certification, and to whom administrators reported), and fees.<sup>35</sup>

Interestingly, the certification scheme used by NAHD ultimately had the most influence on application criteria developed for NSFRE's CFRE certification program. NAHD's application criteria required achievement in education (continuing education in fundraising), professional practice (experience as a fundraising professional), and professional performance (success in raising funds), and service to NAHD. The level of achievement was measured using a points-based system, and the number of points awarded per accomplishment was weighted to favor senior professionals. For instance, the unit of measurement for accomplishment in actual funds raised was \$100,000. Directors were awarded 5 points for raising \$100,000, while associate directors received

---

<sup>35</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on Certification Meeting Agenda, 7 December 1978, Attachment E, CFRE.

only 2 points and staff members received only 1 point for raising the same amount.<sup>36</sup>

There appears to have been no debate about this inequity, likely because it was already an accepted model in use by a respected association. It is also possible that the model was seen as being appropriately weighted to accommodate the additional, time-consuming leadership and management responsibilities of senior professionals—duties that might not necessarily translate directly into the senior professional’s actual funds raised.

However, it was ASAE’s form of examination that appears to have had the most impact on NSFRE’s certification program. NAHD’s certification had no examination component at the baseline credential level. ASAE required personal data on achievement, a written examination, and an optional interview.<sup>37</sup> It was ASAE’s overall certification format that ultimately was adopted by the NSFRE certification program as the best means of quality control for the CFRE credential.

#### White Paper on Certification

After making a preliminary report to the NSFRE Board of Directors in December 1978, the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification formally presented a white paper to the Board in March 1979. The Committee was forthright in noting that

In adopting a Certification Program, there are two somewhat contradictory objectives. One is to make certification possible for a maximum number of persons without their putting in years of work and incurring great expenses. The other is to assure that certification will have significance within the profession and, more importantly, to those who judge fund raisers—boards of institutions, legislators, government regulators, and the concerned public.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on Certification Meeting Agenda, 7 December 1978, Attachment H, 4, CFRE.

<sup>37</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on Certification Meeting Agenda, Attachment E, CFRE

<sup>38</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on Certification White Paper (White Paper), 3-4 March 1979, 3, CFRE.

To reflect this, two levels of certification were recommended: the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE), which as the baseline credential would “be granted to those who meet the minimum eligibility requirements of the Certification Program” and which would be implemented immediately; and Fellow Status (FAFRE or FCFRE), which would mark “extensive experience and achievement” and be implemented at some unspecified time in the future.<sup>39</sup> The white paper stated that the certification program was to be self-supporting, first through gifts and grants and then through certification fees. The program would be led by a volunteer Certification Board supported by NSFRE’s Executive Vice President (as the paid CEO of NSFRE was termed at the time).<sup>40</sup>

The Committee proposed that a candidate pass through four stages to achieve certification. While the stages were well developed, particularly given that the white paper was the first attempt to articulate the overall concept of the proposed certification program, the content of the stages showed that there were still contradictions that needed to be resolved. The development process continued and further refinement was brought to the certification scheme.

The first stage of the proposed CFRE certification process was determining eligibility. To be eligible for certification, candidates would need to have five consecutive years of experience as a member of fundraising staff for a nonprofit organization or as a fundraising consultant working with nonprofit organizations. Candidates would also have to pledge in writing that their professional conduct comported with the NSFRE Code of Professional Practices. Finally, candidates needed

---

<sup>39</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 3, CFRE.

<sup>40</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 1, 4, CFRE.



to be “an active senior member of NSFRE.”<sup>41</sup> The third criterion pointed to two as yet unresolved tensions: The first was the conflation of a baseline credential with senior-level recognition, as the CFRE certification was designed to acknowledge attainment of the minimum standards expected of a competent practitioner, not to denote senior status. The second was the role of CFRE certification for the profession. By limiting eligibility to NSFRE members, the certification would have significance only within the association rather than within the overall fundraising profession. Ultimately, NSFRE chose not to require NSFRE membership as a condition for certification, though all candidates were required to pledge that they conducted their fundraising activities in compliance with the NSFRE Code of Professional Practices.<sup>42</sup>

Upon determination of eligibility, the second stage of the proposed CFRE certification process was completion of the formal application. This consisted of a weighted, points-based application that documented a candidate’s experience, performance, academic education, continuing education in fundraising, service to the profession, professional stance, and awards and recognition. While the categories were straightforward, the proposed means of calculating the points was not. The Committee’s points system retained NAHD’s convention of weighting points by task according to a candidate’s job title, with senior individuals receiving more points than their junior colleagues for accomplishing the same tasks. However, the Committee’s points system then complicated things further in three significant ways. First, each subcategory had a range of minimum and maximum points allowable. Second, each subcategory was

---

<sup>41</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 3, CFRE.

<sup>42</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, Report to the NSFRE Board of Directors, 6 December 1979, 4, CFRE.

allotted a certain percentage of the overall points available, which further complicated the math. Third, several items (such as continuing education seminars and workshops, professional stance, and teaching under service to the profession) were to be assigned points according to “R&J”—“review and judgment” by the Certification Board.<sup>43</sup> This last point was particularly problematic, as it practically guaranteed the impossibility of providing consistent ratings for candidates in the areas of the points-based application that were designated as “R&J” judgment calls.

The third stage of the proposed CFRE certification process was “a written examination on fund raising principles, practices, techniques, ethics and related disciplines, and laws and regulations affecting fund raising.”<sup>44</sup> The Committee further specified that “because of the wide range of knowledge and techniques used in fund raising, the examination should permit the candidate to choose questions and subjects. Some questions will be required of all candidates.”<sup>45</sup> While a worthy attempt to acknowledge the complexity of the fundraising profession, the exam structure suggested shows a lack of awareness of conventions for standardized exams on two counts. First, changing the test content to suit candidate knowledge areas means that candidates would not be evaluated on the same knowledge, thus compromising the ability of the exam to provide a level playing field for candidates and make consistent distinctions between qualified and unqualified candidates. Second, the long timeline (generally two years) between the time an exam item is written, pretested, and then included as a scored item on an exam means that timely questions (such as those related to laws and regulations,

---

<sup>43</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, Exhibit I, p. 1-3, CFRE.

<sup>44</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 4, CFRE.

<sup>45</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 4, CFRE.

which can on occasion change fairly rapidly) become problematic. However, the Committee was aware of the need for professional assistance in the design of the examination instrument, and noted that funding for this work should be sought by NSFRE through NICE.<sup>46</sup>

The fourth stage of the proposed CFRE certification program consisted of community sanction of the candidate, with the Certification Board responsible for final decisions on candidate certification. The names of candidates who had proven their eligibility, met application requirements, and passed the exam were to be published. Any NSFRE member who “believes there is just cause for withholding certification” from a candidate had 30 days in which to contact the Certification Secretary (a.k.a. NSFRE’s Executive Vice President). Candidates thus affected were to be notified and would be granted a hearing in front of the Certification Board. Alternately, if the Certification Board had any concerns about the candidate, the Certification Board could request a personal interview with the candidate. The fact that a candidate could meet all eligibility and application criteria, pass the exam, and still not be granted certification was a problematic part of the white paper outline for the CFRE certification program. A prime concern of the Committee was that “if we are to be recognized as professionals, we must be able to assure the public and the institutions we serve about the competence and quality of practitioners in the field.”<sup>47</sup> Another key concern was that the CFRE certification was meant to “contribute to the acceptance of NSFRE as the leading national organization of professional fund raising executives.”<sup>48</sup> This last review of the candidate

---

<sup>46</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 5, CFRE.

<sup>47</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>48</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 2, CFRE.

by the Certification Board and the opportunity for community comment was no doubt meant to assure that no unqualified candidate slipped through the process, thus potentially sully the reputation of the CFRE certification and the association bestowing it. In particular, it was probably the last opportunity to identify those few candidates whose professional ethics may not have been up to snuff, as a candidate's attesting to following the NSFRE Code of Professional Practices during eligibility determination would not necessarily validate that the candidate was indeed fulfilling that obligation. However, this last step in the certification process also meant there was potential for lack of impartiality in evaluating candidates. It would make it possible for an otherwise qualified candidate to be denied the CFRE based on potentially nebulous reasons, given the last stage essentially consisted of the Certification Board's judgment call regarding the candidate's fitness based on a loosely structured review of the candidate's "Personal Record."<sup>49</sup> In a later questionnaire on requirements for the CFRE certification, NSFRE members remarked on this review and noted that those administering the certification should "take care to avoid [the] possibility of lawsuits" that might be engendered by an adverse personal review.<sup>50</sup>

Despite some elements needing additional refinement, the white paper of the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification is a remarkable achievement by the members of the Northern California Chapter of NSFRE led by Lyle E. Cook. The NSFRE Board of Directors affirmed the white paper at its March 1979 meeting, thus paving the way for the CFRE certification program to proceed. The NSFRE Board of Directors further signaled

---

<sup>49</sup> White Paper, 3-4 March 1979, 5, CFRE.

<sup>50</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, Questionnaire Results (Questionnaire Results), 9 August 1979, 5, CFRE.

its commitment to certification by renaming the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification as the Educational Standards and Certification Committee, thus making it a standing committee. The new standing committee did additional surveying of membership to refine the points-based application, distributing a questionnaire on certification to the NSFRE Board of Directors, chapter presidents and representatives, and Chapter Boards in June 1979. A noteworthy feature of the Educational Standards and Certification Committee's approach was to continue testing assumptions with NSFRE members during the continued refinement of proposed processes for CFRE certification. Cook estimated that "During the design period, over 5% of the NSFRE membership participated in the project. Some served on committees, others participated in chapter and small group discussions or responded to questionnaires and surveys."<sup>51</sup> The 1979 questionnaire received 62 responses, with 17 coming from the Wisconsin Chapter, 13 from the Chicago Chapter, and 32 from other individuals. Donald K. Ross of Donald K. Ross & Company tabulated the results and summarized responses, while Lyle E. Cook and Curtis W. Roberts, Vice Chair of the Educational Standards and Certification Committee, analyzed the results.<sup>52</sup>

The questionnaire showed the Committee wrestling with not only the categories of knowledge to be tested but also how those categories should be tested (multiple choice and/or true/false questions for testing for general knowledge or essay questions for testing application of knowledge) and the level of knowledge (in-depth knowledge, understanding of principles, or ability to apply knowledge) that should be expected of candidates. Not surprisingly, the results of this part of the survey are difficult to evaluate

---

<sup>51</sup> Cook, "Certification of Fund Raising Executives," 3.

<sup>52</sup> Cook to J. Richard Wilson, 9 August 1979, 1, CFRE.

to any great degree, as no definitions were provided to indicate what was meant by the levels of knowledge listed. However, there did seem to be at least some consensus that for baseline certification, testing knowledge rather than asking for application of that knowledge was desirable, which may be part of the reason the CFRE certification eventually settled on using multiple choice exam questions, which are best suited for examinations that seek to evaluate a candidate's mastery of a broad field of knowledge.<sup>53</sup>

The questionnaire also showed consensus that related disciplines and skills such as writing, editing, oral expression, the role of nonprofits, and the history of philanthropy were considered important, as these skills mostly received ratings of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale used by the questionnaire. It is interesting that questionnaire respondents were strongly in favor of a generalist certification, believing that those working mostly in sub-specialties such as direct mail and deferred giving needed to “demonstrate knowledge of the basic principles of fund raising and meet experience and performance requirements.”<sup>54</sup> There was a strong sense that “people are [not] fund raisers if they are only specialists.”<sup>55</sup>

Questionnaire respondents also agreed on the need for a recertification requirement in order to maintain CFRE certification, with most preferring a recertification period of 3 or 4 years.<sup>56</sup> Also striking is the fact that respondents were very open to the idea that “participation in activities of other professional societies should earn credit toward certification,” with 85 percent responding positively.<sup>57</sup> They noted

---

<sup>53</sup> Questionnaire Results, 9 August 1979, 2, CFRE.

<sup>54</sup> Questionnaire Results, 9 August 1979, 3, CFRE.

<sup>55</sup> Questionnaire Results, 9 August 1979, 3, CFRE.

<sup>56</sup> Questionnaire Results, 9 August 1979, 4, CFRE.

<sup>57</sup> Questionnaire Results, 4, 9 August 1979, CFRE.

that “participation in NSFRE should be a ‘plus’ [and] earn points but not [be] mandatory.”<sup>58</sup> However, 57 percent indicated that membership on the Certification Board should be “limited to senior members of NSFRE” and should not include any who were not NSFRE members, saying “it is our show and we should totally control it.”<sup>59</sup>

Perhaps the biggest piece of work to come out of the questionnaire was a resolution of the complicated points-based application system contained in the original white paper. The structure suggested by the questionnaire allotted approximately 40 percent of points to experience and performance; 40 percent to education and knowledge; and 20 percent to “other” such as professional behavior, service to the profession, and awards.

#### Certification Task Forces

The questionnaire aided the Committee in refining the mechanisms for certification while also affirming the basic principles contained in the March 1979 white paper. Knowing that they were heading in the right direction and were in step with the thoughts of NSFRE membership, the Committee formed three task forces in September 1979 to refine further the evaluation point system, the application form, and administrative procedures for the certification.<sup>60</sup> To speed work, Cook selected task force chairs who then worked with members of their local AFP chapter to get the jobs done. Speed was important for another reason as well: unrest within NSFRE. During this period, the organization was undergoing structural change. It had grown by leaps and bounds, with 27 chapters by the end of 1979; 10 more were added the following year.

---

<sup>58</sup> Questionnaire Results, 4, 9 August 1979, CFRE.

<sup>59</sup> Questionnaire Results, 4, 9 August 1979, CFRE.

<sup>60</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 1, CFRE.

The complexity of NSFRE and its programs meant that its Board of Directors could no longer effectively function as a committee of the whole, and Donald A. Campbell, NSFRE's President from 1978-1980, installed a "more effective and efficient governance system" market by a four-division structure that included "professional education, membership activities, public affairs, and marketing."<sup>61</sup> It must have been an interesting time at NSFRE. Campbell recalled,

I will never forget a very significant board meeting we had—in June of 1979, I think—when Wilson Schroeder and I attempted to 'railroad' about six major bylaws changes through the board.... The motions were tabled, and members of the board made it very clear that they wanted policy and practice recommendations to come up through the committees rather than down through the chair. This was a significant step for the long term, for the board had demonstrated real maturity in terms of governance."<sup>62</sup>

In the short term, however, what the governance changes produced were hard feelings.

Robert C. Blum, the Northern California Chapter member who would succeed Campbell as President of NSFRE's Board of Directors, wrote to Cook in September of 1979. He noted,

There is a great deal of excitement regarding the certification program. Unfortunately, there is also a great deal of unrest regarding the timing of the implementation of the program. For the success of NSFRE and the healing of much of the divisiveness in the organization, an early show of activity may help the organization more than the actual certification program itself.<sup>63</sup>

While Blum does not specifically identify the source of divisiveness within NSFRE, the timing suggests it was the governance changes that Campbell had introduced. Blum recommended that the certification program continue apace so it could be implemented as soon as possible. The need for speed was underscored by his comments on engagement

---

<sup>61</sup> AFP: *The First 50 Years*, 13.

<sup>62</sup> AFP: *The First 50 Years*, 13.

<sup>63</sup> Blum to Cook, mid-September 1979, 1, CFRE.



of a testing service. He noted that the service with the “highest prestige might be the most helpful” but that if that mean delaying the timetable, “then prestige may not be worth it as we all feel the implementation of the program as soon as possible is critical.”<sup>64</sup> Another reason that quick implementation of the certification program was critical was because AAFRC and CASE were interested. Blum pointed out that having AAFRC and CASE affiliated with NSFRE’s certification program “would mean we [NSFRE] truly become the base fundraising organization throughout the country.” However, while NSFRE wanted AAFRC’s and CASE’s affiliation with the certification program, NSFRE did not want their input. Blum noted NSFRE’s certification guidelines could “be debated as far as possible changes, but neither AAFRC or CASE should be included in the decision making process of developing the guidelines [sic] and the matter of working.”<sup>65</sup> The CFRE certification program was very much NSFRE’s property, and the best way of protecting NSFRE’s position was to have finished certification program guidelines that made the program essentially a *fait accompli*.

Cook asked Donald K. Ross of the Wisconsin Chapter to head the task force on the points system.<sup>66</sup> Ross then engaged selected members of the Wisconsin Chapter as task force members. These individuals were Bob Anthony, Vice President, United Way of Greater Milwaukee; Bob Flahive, Executive Vice President, Cardinal Stritch College; John Gmeindl, Director of Development, Salvation Army; Gerry Janoseck, Vice President, Milwaukee Children’s Hospital; Bill Murphy, Executive Director, United Performing Arts Fund; Sam Naparstek, Vice President, Mount Sinai Medical Center; and

---

<sup>64</sup> Blum to Cook, mid-September 1979, 2, CFRE.

<sup>65</sup> Blum to Cook mid-September 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>66</sup> Cook to Ross, 7 September 1979, 1, CFRE.

Dick Wilson, Boy Scouts and National NSFRE Board Member and Chairman of NSFRE's Education Committee.<sup>67</sup> The Task Force included representation across subsectors, and Ross noted that both Janosek and Naparstek were past vice presidents of NAHD and therefore presumably were familiar with NAHD's certification program.<sup>68</sup>

The Task Force worked swiftly and gave a two-page report to Cook on October 26, 1979, containing their recommendations on the point system used in the application. They largely accepted the point system that came out of the questionnaire, offering only a few tweaks. These included adding an "Other" category under "Experience" to account for "executives of charities who have responsibilities in addition to fundraising" as well as to allow for the experience of paid professionals who began as "professional volunteers." The Task Force was not fond of this latter category "yet believe it should be provided for."<sup>69</sup> Further tweaks included omitting "Sustaining Funds" under "Performance" because the term was unclear; giving points only for college degrees achieved (as opposed to attempted); and rearranging the listing of positions under "Service to the Profession" so that they were grouped by local chapter and then national responsibilities. Of all the changes made, the only substantive one was the deletion of "Professional Stance" as a category for evaluation. Ross reported that "as desirable as this might be, we believe this is presumptuous and impractical to judge on a point system. A bad apple simply should not be certified." The Task Force recommended adding the five points from this dropped section to the weight of the exam.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Ross to Cook, 26 October 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>68</sup> Ross to Cook, 26 October 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>69</sup> Ross to Cook, 26 October 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>70</sup> Ross to Cook, 26 October 1979, 2, CFRE.

Joseph T. Greco of the St. Louis Regional Chapter was named to the Committee on Educational Standards and Certification and subsequently tapped to draft eligibility and application forms. With the letter requesting Greco's help, Cook enclosed samples of application forms from NAHD and ASAE to aid Greco in his task.<sup>71</sup> On November 14, 1979, Greco returned completed, print-ready eligibility and application forms for the CFRE certification program. However, it is likely Greco's biggest contribution to the CFRE certification program was suggesting Professional Examination Service (PES) as a possible professional testing agency for development of the CFRE exam. Dick Kirk of the American College of Hospital Administrators recommended PES to Greco, as the College used PES to develop its exam.<sup>72</sup> PES was selected as the CFRE certification program's testing agency in 1980 and remained in that capacity until 2015.

Cook turned to his own Northern California Chapter as the Task Force on Certification Program Procedures. He invited Barbara G. Anderson, Doreta W. Chaney, Richard Eastwood, Neil R. Farmer, James W. Graves, Patrick J. Guibao, William Lerrigo, Barbara Marion, R. J. McRostie, Hal Nappan, L. Earle Shipley, and Nick W. Stamos to serve, as each had expressed prior interest in assisting with the certification program.<sup>73</sup>

The Task Force met on November 20, 1979, to review work accomplished to date on the certification program and to review procedural points that had yet to be fully defined. A point of particular interest to the Task Force was the membership of the Certification Board. While the draft procedures indicated that Certification Board

---

<sup>71</sup> Cook to Greco, 11 September 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>72</sup> Cook to Greco, 11 September 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>73</sup> Cook to Prospective Members of the Certification Program Procedures Task Force, 12 November 1979, 2, CFRE.

members were to be CFREs (except for the initial board, whose members would become certified as soon as possible), it did not specify that the Certification Board needed to be composed solely of NSFRE members. The Task Force recommended that the “counsel and membership of others be sought,” even suggesting that a “quasi-independent body” might be desirable.<sup>74</sup>

The other concern of the Task Force dealt with any potential legal liability to which NSFRE might be exposed by the denial of certification to an individual. The proposed practice of publishing the names of candidates 30 days prior to official certification so that NSFRE members would have a chance to share just cause why an individual should not be certified was worrisome to the Task Force. While not articulating their concern precisely, their comments indicate they seemed to detect a conflation of certification with grievance processes with the addition of the review period.<sup>75</sup> Task Force members also questioned whether it would be legal to deny certification to a candidate who met eligibility and application requirements and who had passed the exam, but who for some reason did not pass muster with the members of the Certification Board. There was a concern that this could cause a problem with the Federal Trade Commission given that agency’s recent pursuit of antitrust enforcement within the professions.<sup>76</sup>

The Task Force also made the recommendation that certification fees be paid personally by candidates, not by their employers. This stipulation was a moot point while the CFRE certification was being developed. However, it oddly became a real bone of

---

<sup>74</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 20 November 1979, 1, CFRE.

<sup>75</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 20 November 1979, 2, CFRE.

<sup>76</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 20 November 1979, 3, CFRE.

contention once the CFRE certification program was officially getting underway.<sup>77</sup> Cook and others involved in the development of the certification program believed CFRE certification was a personal commitment to professionalism, and therefore argued strongly that the fee for certification was an individual's investment in his professional development rather than something for which an employer should pay. Others did not share this view, and at the June 1981 NSFRE Board meeting a motion was seconded and carried that dropped the requirement that candidates pay their certification fee via personal check.<sup>78</sup> Executive Vice President J. Richard Wilson pointed out that the choice to accept payment by employers was a practical matter more than anything, given that returning an employer's check would likely cause embarrassment or have other negative impacts.<sup>79</sup> Barbara Marion also chimed in, noting that accepting corporate checks would reduce a potential barrier to certification. Still, she acknowledged the "vitriolic reaction" to the discussion at the NSFRE Board of Directors meeting and suspected that board members were acting out other unnamed frustrations.<sup>80</sup> Cook believed in retrospect that the heated discussion was due to certain "pettifoggers" who were determined to maintain the NSFRE Board of Directors as a "committee-of-the-whole" despite the switch to a divisional structure.<sup>81</sup>

#### Funding the CFRE Certification Exam

Within a space of three short months at the end of 1979, Cook and the three certification task forces managed to create a detailed report on the proposed CFRE

---

<sup>77</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 20 November 1979, 4, CFRE.

<sup>78</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 27 June 1981, 5, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>79</sup> Wilson to Cook, 15 July 1981, 1, CFRE.

<sup>80</sup> Marion to Cook, 5 August 1981, 1, CFRE.

<sup>81</sup> Cook to Marion, 11 August 1981, 1, CFRE.

certification program that included a program summary, eligibility requirements, administration procedures, a point scale for evaluating applications, draft forms, and the need for funding to engage a professional testing service. The NSFRE Board of Directors reviewed all materials at its meeting on December 7, 1979, and passed a resolution that approved the Educational Standards and Certification Committee's report with minor amendments; authorized NSFRE's Executive Committee to select members of a Certification Board, subject to approval by the NSFRE Board; and authorized the Executive Committee to approve certification fees as set by the Certification Board.<sup>82</sup> While much hard work had already been accomplished on the CFRE certification program, the next challenge was likely to be particularly daunting: finding the requisite funding to underwrite the creation of the CFRE exam. With the exception of the Ford Foundation grant to train HBCU development officers, NSFRE had not been successful in prior efforts to fund ambitious professional education programs. Ever the optimists, the developers of the CFRE certification program were determined that this time would be different.

The Educational Standards and Certification Committee's original estimate was that hiring a professional testing service to construct the CFRE exam would cost anywhere from \$20,000 for eight months of assistance to \$100,000 for 18 months of assistance.<sup>83</sup> By June 1980, the estimate had risen to \$120,000 for the first year's work.<sup>84</sup> By September 1981, the total needed was \$130,000.<sup>85</sup> While the certification program

---

<sup>82</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 7 December 1979, 6, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>83</sup> Committee on Educational Standards and Certification Report to the NSFRE Board of Directors, 6 December 1979, 5, CFRE.

<sup>84</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 6 June 1980, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>85</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 9-11 September 1981, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

was intended eventually to be self-supporting through revenue generated from certification fees, outside funding would be needed to develop the first CFRE exam. The Educational Standards and Certification Committee decided to take a slightly different approach from what had been tried before for funding for educational programs. Rather than seeking a sole funder for CFRE exam development, the Educational Standards and Certification Committee cast its net wide. At the behest of Charles A. Johnson, Vice President for Development for Lilly Endowment Inc., Lilly Endowment Inc. became the first funder and the major funder for CFRE exam development, giving NICE a grant of \$50,000 for the project in September 1980.<sup>86</sup> The payment schedule for the grant was \$10,000 in October 1980; \$20,000 in January 1981; and \$20,000 in January 1982.<sup>87</sup> Fundraising efforts continued for several years after the award of the grant from Lilly Endowment Inc. in order to raise the remaining \$80,000 required, and a variety of approaches were used. The Greater Washington D.C. Chapter of NSFRE issued a challenge grant, promising an outright gift of \$2,000 and an additional \$2,000 challenge grant, provided that other NSFRE chapters raised a total of \$20,000 for the certification program by the end of 1981. The Northern California Chapter of NSFRE made a gift of \$2,000, giving special recognition to their member Lyle E. Cook, who had spearheaded development of the certification program. By July 1982, the certification program had accumulated more than 40 donors and was successfully funded. In addition to Lilly Endowment Inc. and NSFRE chapters, donors included AAFRC, Don Campbell &

---

<sup>86</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 1, CFRE.

<sup>87</sup> Cook to Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 23 September 1980, 1, CFRE.

Company, the Institutional Development Council, the Grace Foundation, and numerous members of NSFRE's leadership.<sup>88</sup>

### Development of the CFRE Exam

With initial funding secure, the Educational Standards and Certification Committee was able to proceed with contracting with a professional testing service. While the Committee briefly considered using the services of the American College Testing Service and the Educational Testing Service, neither was selected. The American College Testing Service was taken out of contention because it had declined to submit a proposal, and the Education Testing Service was ruled out because the Committee found the cost to be too high and the timeline too long for NSFRE's purposes.<sup>89</sup>

The Committee decided to contract with Professional Examination Service (PES), the testing agency first identified by Application Task Force Chair Joseph C. Greco. PES's contract with NSFRE was executed in October 1980, and an Examination Committee was selected the following month.<sup>90</sup> The members of the Examination Committee, which PES recommended consist of seven to nine members, were to be the subject matter experts advising the development of the CFRE exam.<sup>91</sup> Maureen McArdle Kaley, Ph.D., was the PES Division Director in charge of CFRE exam development.<sup>92</sup>

Exam development followed a course typical for practice-based examinations. In December 1980, the Exam Committee began its work with a task analysis resulting in a role delineation. The purpose of the role delineation was to "clarify the role(s) of the

---

<sup>88</sup> Report to Lilly Endowment Inc., 27 August 1982, 4, CFRE.

<sup>89</sup> Agenda of the Committee on Educational Standards and Certification, 4 September 1980, 1, CFRE.

<sup>90</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 2, CFRE.

<sup>91</sup> PES proposal to NSFRE (PES Proposal), January 1980, 3, CFRE.

<sup>92</sup> PES Proposal, January 1980, ii, CFRE.



fund raising executive and to identify the competencies expected of fund raising executives in ‘on the job’ situations.”<sup>93</sup> Competencies were to be presented as task statements, with the knowledges and skills needed to perform the tasks following. In February 1981, the role delineation was sent to a diverse group of approximately 50 NSFRE members for review and critique. As part of this work, the reviewers rated each task on

- a) important (how important is performance of this task in an assessment of the fundraising executive);
- b) frequency (how frequently does the fund raising executive perform this task);
- c) discrimination (the extent to which competency in this task differentiates between the acceptable and unacceptable performance of fund raising executives), and
- d) criticality (the extent to which the fund raising executive’s nonmastery of this task results in errors with critical consequences).<sup>94</sup>

This rating scale is interesting in that it reveals what would now be considered a conflation of role delineation and pass point processes. As part of role delineation, which is now more typically termed a “job analysis,” professional testing agencies typically ask about the importance of a task, the frequency of the task, the criticality of the task to fundraising success, and the knowledge used to perform the task.<sup>95</sup> Questions of differentiation between the qualified and barely qualified practitioner are left to the process of determining the appropriate examination pass point score.

In March 1981, the Examination Committee examined the results of the role delineation review and prepared final test specifications for the CFRE exam. The test

---

<sup>93</sup> PES Proposal, January 1980, 6, CFRE.

<sup>94</sup> PES Proposal, January 1980, 6, CFRE.

<sup>95</sup> “Creating Test Blueprints Through Job Analysis,” Pearson, accessed October 18, 2017, [https://home.pearsonvue.com/Documents/Security/pearson\\_vue\\_test\\_blueprints\\_US.aspx](https://home.pearsonvue.com/Documents/Security/pearson_vue_test_blueprints_US.aspx).

specifications enumerated “the number of items to be generated to measure each task adequately and the knowledge and skill statements from which test items will be generated.”<sup>96</sup> During this same period, an Item Writing Task Force prepared approximately 250 questions to be tested for use on the 200-item CFRE exam.<sup>97</sup> The CFRE exam was pre-tested by NSFRE subject matter experts at three sites on May 29, 1981: Dallas/Fort Worth, San Francisco, and Washington/Baltimore. After a final Examination Committee review in June 1981, the CFRE exam was readied for its first administration on October 3, 1981, in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York.<sup>98</sup> A total of 166 individuals took the first CFRE exam.<sup>99</sup>

#### Administration and Promotion of the CFRE Certification Program

Concurrently with the development of the CFRE exam, the Certification Board was formed. The NSFRE Board of Directors proposed seven individuals for the Certification Board: Robert Pierpont, Robert Means, John Tabor, Phyllis Tritsch, Wilson Schroeder, Byron Welch, and Lyle E. Cook. Alternates were Donald A. Campbell, Jr., Ralph E. Chamberlain, Henry Goldstein, Sam Naparstek, Henry A. Rosso, Dorothy Sutherland, and a Mr. or Ms. Powell.<sup>100</sup> During discussion, it was decided to appoint only six individuals to begin with so that the seventh position could be filled by “someone to represent the black community;” Shirley Brown, a member of NSFRE’s Board of Directors, was asked to help the Board identify a suitable candidate.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> PES Proposal, January 1980, 7, CFRE.

<sup>97</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 2, CFRE.

<sup>98</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 3, CFRE.

<sup>99</sup> “Milestones,” CFRE International, accessed 30 September 2017, <http://www.cfre.org/about/milestones/>.

<sup>100</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 11 March 1980, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>101</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 11 March 1980, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

Members of the initial Certification Board were also required to earn their CFRE certification within 12 months of the start of the program.<sup>102</sup>

At the first meeting of the Certification Board in December 1980, Robert Pierpont was elected its chair.<sup>103</sup> The Certification Board had multiple tasks. It formally adopted the procedures created by the Task Force on Certification Program Procedures and recommended fees.<sup>104</sup> However, its primary function was to evaluate and certify CFRE candidates.<sup>105</sup> Lyle E. Cook noted that he thought it important that the Certification Board be “a rather autonomous body,” saying

I think the degree of independence of the Certification Board will influence the credibility and acceptance of the program among people outside of NSFRE. I wouldn't do so now, but I could argue persuasively for having non-members of NSFRE on the Board at some future time. For the present, I think we have to give evidence to those not in the Society that the Certification Program is soundly conceived, professionally valid and credible on its evaluation procedures, and fairly and objectively administered. Hence, the implications of semi-autonomy of the Certification Board from NSFRE.<sup>106</sup>

Cook's comments were prescient. Today, some AFP members serve on the CFRE International Board of Directors, but they do not constitute a majority. CFRE International was spun off from AFP in 2001 to gain independence as a precondition to its achieving accreditation from the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA) in 2009. In 2017, the CFRE credential achieve international accreditation under ANSI/ISO/IEC 17024 standards for certification of personnel. Accreditation assures that a certification program meets high standards for “development, implementation, and

---

<sup>102</sup> NSFRE minutes, 11 March 1980, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>103</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 3-5 December 1980, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>104</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 2.

<sup>105</sup> Chronology of Development, n.d., 3.

<sup>106</sup> Cook to Donald K. Ross, 3 April 1981, 3-4, CFRE.

maintenance of certification programs.”<sup>107</sup> It is likely that Cook would have appreciated the evidence of the soundness of the CFRE credential that accreditation provides.

Shortly after the formation of the Certification Board, the Educational Standards and Certification Committee was dissolved and reformed as two separate groups: the Certification Operations Committee and the Certification Marketing Committee. The Certification Operations Committee dealt with the necessary but often humdrum details of the CFRE certification program, including setting exam dates and times and recommending that personal liability coverage be secured for volunteers and staff involved in the certification program.<sup>108</sup> The Certification Marketing Committee had by far the more interesting and more challenging job: promoting CFRE certification to NSFRE’s general membership.

The Certification Marketing Committee identified four early priorities: providing information on CFRE certification to other national organizations (being a member of NSFRE was not a requirement for CFRE certification), making sure NSFRE chapters presented CFRE certificates during chapter meetings, mailing information about CFRE certification to NSFRE members and non-members, and getting earned media placements in “major philanthropic publications.”<sup>109</sup> The Certification Marketing Committee was helped in this effort by Lyle E. Cook, whose essay on “Certification of Fund Raising Executives: A Step on the Road from Apprenticeship to Professionalism” composed the content for the second issue of NSFRE’s *Sightlines* newsletter in 1981. Chair William

---

<sup>107</sup> Institute for Credentialing Excellence, “NCCA Accreditation,” accessed October 18, 2017, <http://www.credentialingexcellence.org/ncca>.

<sup>108</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 27 June 1981, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>109</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 4 December 1981, 4, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

Freyd noted that there were three main reasons for certification that the Committee needed to “sell:” the value of NSFRE, the recognition of individuals by society as professional fundraising executives, and ego or pride.<sup>110</sup> In support of CFRE certification, Thomas G. Sanberg, CFRE, Chair of the NSFRE Board of Directors, pledged the support of the Executive Committee, which decided as a goal that all members of the NSFRE Board of Directors should be certified as CFREs.<sup>111</sup>

### Recertification Requirements

In June 1982, the increasingly complex work associated with the CFRE certification was consolidated into the Certification Council. William McDanel was named chair of the newly formed Certification Council, which had a dizzying number of task forces: Task Force on Re-Certification and Additional Levels, Task Force on Exam Revisions, Task Force on Redesign of the Application Form & Evaluation of Categories, Task Force on Examination Site Coordination & Review, and Task Force on Recognition Policies.<sup>112</sup>

The last major structural piece of the CFRE certification program that the Certification Council produced was the recertification requirements for the credential. Recertification was seen as a desirable feature. It meant that CFREs would need to continue to grow in their fundraising knowledge and competence, their professional performance, and their service to the profession. Because certified individuals would require additional continuing education to remain certified, there was also the perceived opportunity for the profession to work more closely with “experts in higher and

---

<sup>110</sup> NSFRE Minutes 16 March 1982, 6, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>111</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 4 June 1982, 1, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>112</sup> NSFRE minutes, 4 June 1982, 3, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

continuing education.” It was hoped that this propinquity would result in the creation of more academic courses and research in fundraising and related fields.<sup>113</sup> In essence, perhaps certification could be the gateway to creating an academically validated knowledge base for the profession and more robust educational pathways for fundraisers—two elements of a profession that fundraising was still sorely lacking and in which NSFRE had not experienced great prior success.

While the work that went into the development of initial certification requirements for CFRE certification had included a significant amount of polling of NSFRE members, the creation of the recertification requirements was much simpler and more straightforward. While the Certification Council noted the need to develop recertification requirements as early as September 1982,<sup>114</sup> a full description of proposed recertification requirements was not reviewed by the Certification Council until March 1984, which was less than a year before CFREs in the Class of 1981 needed to recertify.<sup>115</sup> This did not leave much time for discussion or debate.

The recertification requirements were relatively simple: CFREs were required to recertify every three years in order to maintain their certification. They would need to show evidence of their continuing education in fundraising, their employment as a fundraiser, their service to the profession, and successful performance as a fundraiser. No exam was required for recertification. NSFRE would notify candidates six months prior to the expiration of their CFRE certification; candidates would then need to turn in their recertification application 90 days prior to their certification lapse date. The

---

<sup>113</sup> Cook, “Certification of Fund Raising Executives,” 4.

<sup>114</sup> Certification Council Minutes, 12 September 1982, 4, CFRE.

<sup>115</sup> Certification Council Minutes, 3 March 1984, 4, CFRE.

Certification Board would then review the recertification application to make sure the candidate had met requirements and verify the candidate's status as recertified. In the event that an individual's certification lapsed, the individual had 12 months from the lapse date to submit a recertification application and request reinstatement.<sup>116</sup>

The Certification Counsel presented the recertification requirements to the NSFRE Board of Directors in March 1984.<sup>117</sup> Oddly, it appears the NSFRE Board of Directors never formally approved the recertification requirements, and there also appears to have been no significant discussion of the recertification requirements or expressions of concern. What likely happened was that with the very short timeline between the creation of the recertification guidelines and when the guidelines would need to be used by the first class of recertifying CFREs, there was simply insufficient time to complete formal processes for approval. With no concerns or objections expressed, the CFRE recertification requirements leapfrogged from draft into practice. The solidity of the proposed recertification requirements is attested to by their longevity, as they have remained essentially unchanged to the present day.<sup>118</sup>

By the time the first class of CFREs were due to recertify in 1985, there were 1,206 CFREs.<sup>119</sup> The typical CFRE was male, 41-45 years old, and white.<sup>120</sup> He had a baccalaureate degree, had been out of school for 16-20 years, and had 10-14 years of

---

<sup>116</sup> Certification Council minutes, 3 March 1984, 4, CFRE.

<sup>117</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 4 March 1984, 19, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

<sup>118</sup> In 2016, the CFRE International Board of Directors updated application requirements for initial certification and recertification by eliminating volunteer service as a separate category. Applicants now receive credit for volunteering as service learning within the professional education category.

<sup>119</sup> PES, NSFRE Summary of Responses on the Biographical Questionnaire 1981-1985 (Biographical Questionnaire, n.d., 5, CFRE.

<sup>120</sup> Biographical Questionnaire, n.d., 1. CFRE.

fundraising experience.<sup>121</sup> He was most likely to work for an educational institution, a fundraising consulting firm, a healthcare institution, or a social service agency and hold the title of Vice President of Development or Director of Development.<sup>122</sup> He supervised four to six staff members and had 100 to 149 volunteers assisting the fundraising program.<sup>123</sup> Ninety-one to 100 percent of his work day was spent on fundraising. His program raised between \$1,000,000 and \$1,999,999 annually. Allowing for inflation, the typical CFRE of today is not too dissimilar to the CFRE of over 30 years ago, with one major exception: Today, 74 percent of CFREs are female.<sup>124</sup>

#### Perceptions of the Fundraising Profession in the Early 1980s

The CFRE certification program was developed to assure the minimum knowledge and competence of fund raising professionals. Certification was part of NSFRE's larger effort to increase the overall professionalism of fundraising and to increase the public's understanding of and respect for the profession. A study commissioned by NSFRE in 1983 on perceptions of fundraising professionals showed there was still much work to do in the larger effort to make the profession better understood.

NSFRE's Public Relations Committee commissioned the study, which was conducted by the Rutgers Interfunctional Team at Rutgers University. A mail survey went to 3,000 addresses, and 120 telephone interviews were conducted with three target groups: organizations that depended on fundraising for a significant part of their support,

---

<sup>121</sup> Biographical Questionnaire, n.d., 2, CFRE.

<sup>122</sup> Biographical Questionnaire, n.d., 3, CFRE.

<sup>123</sup> Biographical Questionnaire, n.d., 3-4, CFRE.

<sup>124</sup> Red Argyle to author, Dashboard: CFRE Fast Facts as of 9/30/2017, September 30, 2017.



donors, and legislators or media representatives. The results of the study were summarized as follows:

- 1) the public is not aware of what fund raising executives do—there exists a widespread misunderstanding of the function of a fund raising executive;
- 2) there is inadequate compensation for fund raising as a profession;
- 3) fund raising executives have a low self image because of how they are perceived by the public;
- 4) the term “fund raising” has a negative connotation;
- 5) the public does not regard fund raising as a profession on a par with other professions (such as corporate executives, physicians, engineers, etc.);
- 6) the public does not recognize the positive impact of fund raising activities on the budgets of various social institutions and agencies;
- 7) the public thinks fund raising costs are too high;
- 8) the public is not aware of special skills and abilities that are required to be an effective fund raising executive;
- 9) state legislation and regulations negatively affect fund raising executives and activities;
- 10) the public thinks fund raising executives do not belong to a self-controlling profession;
- 11) philanthropy needs fund raising executives to be effective;
- 12) media projects a poor image of fund raising executives;
- 13) all these factors make it difficult to recruit top members of a graduating class to the fund raising profession.<sup>125</sup>

The findings of this 1983 study were true of the modern fundraising profession at the start of the era of mass philanthropy in the early twentieth century, and many are still true of the profession today. Many of the same challenges—issues such as fundraising’s negative connotation, a lack of public understanding of fundraising, concerns about overhead costs, and the difficulty of attracting and retaining fundraising professionals—remain in evidence. The CFRE credential was developed as a partial answer to addressing a number of issues of perception and practice that continue to persist—both inside and outside fundraising—in what seems to be a perpetually emerging profession.

---

<sup>125</sup> NSFRE Minutes, 6 November 1983, 15-16, Group 2, Part 1, Roll 1, AFP Records, RLASC.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the development of the CFRE credential within the context of the development of fundraising as a profession. It looked at fundraising through the lenses of philosophical and sociological definitions of professions in order to identify the role of certification within fundraising as an emerging profession. To understand fundraisers in their own words, extensive use was made of archival material consisting of records of major fundraising associations that played a role in the development of the profession generally and certification specifically. This chapter offers a summary of the study, discusses findings and themes, and considers implications for fundraising as an emerging profession.

#### Summary of Study

Using a traditional historical methodology and a postmodern theoretical framework that understands text as performative utterances that are used to construct a desired reality, the study examined the professionalization of fundraising in the era of mass philanthropy with an emphasis on aspects of professionalization relevant to the creation of the CFRE credential. The study relied primarily on an analysis of archival materials from the records of AAFRC, AFP, and CFRE International. The study showed how the leadership of the fundraising profession adopted a sociological understanding of professionalism, with each generation contributing to the development of systematic theory, authority, community sanction, ethical codes, and the culture of the fundraising profession. This sociological understanding of professionalism in fundraising has its counterpoint in the philosophical understanding of professionalism, which frames professionalism in terms of personal calling and commitment to mission. The CFRE

credential is an outgrowth of the sociological understanding of professionalism, which helped formalize professional expectations regarding minimal standards of knowledge and competence.

### Discussion

The study demonstrates that the fundraising profession continues to face many of the the same challenges generation after generation. The general public does not understand the role of philanthropy in American life, continues to perceive fundraising negatively, and does not respect fundraising in the same way that more established professions are respected. Fundraising divisions in nonprofit organizations experience high turnover, may not offer sufficient compensation, and lack opportunities for professional development. Legislators and charity monitoring organizations continue to worry about charity fraud and overhead. Fundraisers themselves remain conflicted about the profession, at once desiring a greater level of respect for their knowledge and expertise and yet remaining leery of mechanisms such as certification, which most professions use as a marker of formal entry into a profession.

The fundraising profession also continues to be driven by protectionism. Change in the profession tends to be driven by perceived threats to the economic viability of the profession, with periodic efforts by federal and state governments to regulate the profession answered by increased attention to mechanisms for self-policing. In addition to the development of codes of ethics and professional practice for fundraising, the CFRE credential to date perhaps one of the fundraising profession's most definitive statements of its voluntary efforts to serve and protect the public interest.

Nevertheless, the fundraising profession still exhibits an overall ambivalence to certification. This ambivalence may hearken to the divide between philosophical and sociological conceptions of the profession. Those who see fundraising from the sociological viewpoint of professions are more likely to see the need for certification as an important building block of a profession, whether or not they specifically endorse the particular elements of a certification scheme. Those who see fundraising from the philosophical viewpoint of professions are more likely to judge professionalism according to the strength of an individual's calling or pursuit of mission rather than to any specific knowledge or competence base. However, when used exclusively, it is this philosophical view of professionalism as a calling that comes from the heart that ultimately undermines the profession's efforts to grow in respect.

The philosophical conception of professionalism is essentially self-referential, requiring no community sanction to decide who is eligible to be considered a professional. While clearly offering imperfect tools for determining professionalism, the sociological conception of professionalism offers a gift that the fundraising profession sorely needs: standards that are created through some sort of iterative, consensus-building process of a wider community. The strength of community consensus is at the core of professionalism, and fundraising still has a long way to go in this area. As part of this discussion, it is also worthwhile noting that while philosophical and sociological approaches to professionalism are different in what they prioritize, they are not mutually exclusive and in fact are complementary. There is no reason that a fundraising professional cannot simultaneously be motivated by a strong sense of mission or calling

and still benefit from committing to growing as a professional through traditional mechanisms such as belonging to a professional association and becoming certified.

A second possible reason for ambivalence toward certification is that a large number of fundraisers implicitly or explicitly define fundraising as an occupation (which is task-oriented) rather than as a profession (which requires familiarity with a defined base of knowledge). This would explain the strain of debate among some fundraisers that fundraising is solely about the end (raising money) and not the means (knowing the science behind possible pathways to take to accomplish the goal of raising funds). Contributing to this may be the anecdotal observation that many fundraisers have extraverted personalities.<sup>1</sup> Extraverts tend to focus on the outer world rather than their inner world. They hone in on “people and things” rather than “ideas and images.”<sup>2</sup> They enjoy “moving into action and making things happen.”<sup>3</sup> A bias for action may mean that fundraisers fitting the extravert mold are inclined by nature to view fundraising as an arena in which it is solely the results that count.

A third possible reason for ambivalence toward certification is the fundraising profession’s lack of knowledge of its own history. The only definitive history of fundraising was published in 1965; most other major studies of fundraisers are two decades old, and rarely are they being refreshed.<sup>4</sup> The vast majority of the history of the

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Difference between ExtrAversion and ExtrOversion,” Scientific American, accessed October 19, 2017, <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/beautiful-minds/the-difference-between-extraversion-and-extroversion/>. The spelling “extravert” rather than “extrovert” is used because “extravert” is the preferred spelling of personality researchers and the Myers & Briggs Foundation.

<sup>2</sup> “MBTI Basics,” Myers & Briggs Foundation, accessed October 11, 2017,

<sup>3</sup> “MBTI Basics,” Myers & Briggs Foundation, accessed October 11, 2017, <http://www.myersbriggs.org/my-mbti-personality-type/mbti-basics/extraversion-or-introversion.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> See Cutlip, *Fund Raising in the United States*, which was published in 1965. As an example of an updated study, Nathan and Tempel’s “Fundraisers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” (2017) offers an update of Duronio and Tempel’s *Fundraisers: Their Careers, Stories, Concerns, and Accomplishments* (1997).

fundraising profession lies in archival materials—association records and collections of personal papers—that few will likely ever read. Santayana noted that “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”<sup>5</sup> Perhaps this accounts for the slow, recursive nature of the evolution of the fundraising profession. Each generation of fundraisers discovers the same problems anew and, with only limited historical perspective, the profession builds itself through accretion and secures a never-ending status as emergent. In this way fundraising is much like the larger philanthropic sector, which also tends to find itself dealing with each new generation of philanthropists offering new ideas for solutions to old problems. From this perspective, certification is significant not only as a milestone in the profession’s development but as something on which future generations working in the philanthropic sector will build.

#### Implications for Future Research

This study intentionally ends with the initial development of the CFRE credential. More than 35 years have passed in the interim. During that time, one of the most significant trends within the CFRE community has been the way in which the CFRE population has moved from being predominantly male to predominantly female. Like the fundraising profession as a whole, CFREs are now predominantly female, accounting for 74 percent of the more than 6,000 CFREs worldwide.<sup>6</sup> Future research might investigate how changing demographics have affected the CFRE credential and the place of certification within the fundraising profession, with a particular emphasis on the roles of

---

<sup>5</sup> “George Santayana (1863-1952),” Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed October 1, 2017, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/santayan/>.

<sup>6</sup> Red Argyle to author, Dashboard: CFRE Fast Facts as of 9/30/2017, September 30, 2017.

women and diverse populations in shaping the fundraising profession generally and the CFRE credential specifically.

A further possibility for future research lies in an analysis of the prevalence and importance of CFRE certification by philanthropic subsector. Identification of subsectors in which CFRE certification of fundraising professionals is most prevalent could reveal new insights into the relative stage of development of fundraising professionalism in the various subsectors. Cross-tabulating certification prevalence with subsector fundraising results might further give some indication of the correlation between fundraising professionalism and an ability to achieve success in fundraising.

Another direction for future research is the role of fundraising certification globally. The CFRE credential was developed primarily for the North American marketplace, which has a historic culture of philanthropy that is not shared worldwide. In 2013, the CFRE International Board of Directors made a conscious decision to grow the CFRE credential as a certification that is internationally accredited and globally available. Currently, there are 172 CFREs in 22 countries outside the United States and Canada.<sup>7</sup> Future research might investigate conceptions of certification and professionalism among fundraisers in other countries and the relevance of the CFRE credential beyond the North American market.

Another opportunity for future research is trends in the development of the body of fundraising knowledge. Every five years, CFRE International conducts a formal job analysis to identify the tasks that fundraisers perform, the frequency with which they perform those tasks, the importance of those tasks to fundraising, and the knowledge

---

<sup>7</sup> Red Argyle to author, Dashboard: CFRE Fast Facts as of 9/30/2017, September 30, 2017.

necessary to perform those tasks. A longitudinal analysis of changes reported by the CFRE job analysis and the resulting CFRE test content outline could provide insight into the ways in which fundraising strategies and techniques continue to change and evolve.

### Closing Comments

The CFRE credential and the role certification plays in the fundraising profession is not entirely well known nor well understood. This study seeks to provide a historical context for the development of the CFRE credential that makes the case for certification as a logical progression in fundraising's slow journey to being recognized as a true profession. Along the way, the study shows that the fundraising profession of today faces many of the same challenges it faced a hundred years ago. So far, fundraisers have not been able to address these challenges through educating the public. If there is an answer to creating more respect and understanding for the fundraising profession, it may be that it lies in fundraisers becoming more knowledgeable about the history of the profession to which they belong. Certification—and the CFRE credential in particular—may be one important step toward the goal of greater self-awareness and greater self-acceptance among those in the fundraising profession.



## REFERENCES

- Aldrich, Eva E. "Fundraising as a Profession." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Fourth Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame, 503-516. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.
- Aldrich, Eva E. "Fundraising as a Profession." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, 427-433. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc. Records, 1935-1992. Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives. University Library, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.
- Association of Fundraising Professionals. *The 2017 Compensation and Benefits Report*. Arlington: Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2017.
- Association of Fund Raising Professionals. Records, 1960-1998. Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives. University Library, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.
- Association of Fund Raising Professionals. *AFP: The First 50 Years*. Arlington: Association of Fund Raising Professionals, 2010,  
[https://www.afpnet.org/files/ContentDocuments/AFP\\_TheFirst50Years.pdf](https://www.afpnet.org/files/ContentDocuments/AFP_TheFirst50Years.pdf).
- Austin, J. L. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bell, Jeanne, and Marla Cornelius. *UnderDeveloped: A National Study of Challenges Facing Nonprofit Organizations*. Oakland: Compasspoint Nonprofit Services, 2013. <https://www.compasspoint.org/underdeveloped>.

- Boland, Harold G., and Rita Bornstein. "Fundraising in Transition: The Professionalization of an Administrative Occupation." In *Taking Fund Raising Seriously: Papers Prepared for the Third Annual Symposium, Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, University Place Conference Center, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, June 6-8, 1990*. Indianapolis: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 1990.
- Boland, Harold G., and Eugene R. Tempel. "Measuring Professionalism." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 5-20.
- BoardSource. "Board Responsibilities and Structures—FAQs." Accessed October 18, 2017. <https://boardsource.org/resources/board-responsibilities-structures-faqs/>.
- Breeze, Beth. *The New Fundraisers*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2017.
- Burlingame, Dwight F. *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*, Volume 1. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004.
- Cagan, Scott L. "Charitable Fraud in New York: The Role of the Professional Fund Raiser." *New York Law School Law Review* 33 (1988): 409-435.
- Carbone, Robert F. *Fundraising as a Profession*. College Park: Clearing House for Research in Fund Raising, 1989.
- Carbone, Robert F. "Licensure and Credentialing as Professionalizing Elements." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 15 (1997): 83-96.
- CFRE International. "Milestones." Accessed September 30, 2017. <http://www.cfre.org/about/milestones/>
- CFRE International. Records. CFRE International, Alexandria, Virginia.

- Chobot, Richard B. "Fundraising Credentialing." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43, (2004): 31-50.
- Coerver, Harrison, and Mary Byers. *Race for Relevance: 5 Radical Changes for Associations*. Washington, DC: The Center for Association Leadership, 2011, [https://www.amazon.com/Race-Relevance-Radical-Changes-Associations-ebook/dp/B0051GXE1K/ref=mt\\_kindle?\\_encoding=UTF8&me=](https://www.amazon.com/Race-Relevance-Radical-Changes-Associations-ebook/dp/B0051GXE1K/ref=mt_kindle?_encoding=UTF8&me=).
- Cohen, T. "Nonprofit Training Seen Trailing Demand." *Philanthropy Journal*, May 29, 2007.
- Cook, Lyle E. "Certification of Fund Raising Executives: A Step on the Road from Apprenticeship to Professionalism." *NSFRE Sightlines*, no. 2 (1980): 1-4.
- Cutlip, Scott M. *Fund Raising in the United States: Its Role in America's Philanthropy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature, Event, Context." In *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass, 307-330. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Duronio, Margaret A., and Eugene R. Tempel. *Fundraisers: Their Careers, Stories, Concerns, and Accomplishments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.
- "The Feds Take on The Professions." *San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle*, 7 May 1978, Section A, 4.
- Forstorp, Per-Anders. "Fundraising Discourse and the Commodification of the Other." *Business Ethics: A European Review* 16, no. 3 (July 2007): 286-301.
- The Giving Institute. *Giving USA 2017*. Chicago: The Giving Institute, 2017.
- Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession." *Social Work* 2, no. 3 (1957): 45-55.

GuideStar. "BBB Wise Giving Alliance, Charity Navigator, and GuideStar Join Forces to Dispel the Charity 'Overhead Myth.'" Last modified June 17, 2013.

<https://learn.guidestar.org/news/news-releases/2013/2013-06-17-overhead-myth>.

Hall, Holly. "Evaluating How Well a Fund Raiser Does in Luring Big Gifts." *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 1, 2007.

Hall, Peter Dobkin. "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Second Edition, edited by Richard Steinberg and Walter W. Powell. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Hodgkinson, Virginia. "Individual Volunteering and Giving." In *The State of Nonprofit America*, First Edition, edited by Lester M. Salamon, 387-422. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 2002.

Institute for Credentialing Excellence. "NCCA Accreditation." Accessed October 18, 2017. <http://www.credentialingexcellence.org/ncca>.

Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "George Santayana (1863-1952)." Accessed October 1, 2017. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/santayan/>.

Jacobs, Jerald A. *Association Law Handbook: A Practical Guide for Associations, Societies, and Charities*, Fifth Edition. Washington, DC: ASAE Association Management Press, 2012.

Levy, Jamie. "The Growth of Fundraising: Framing the Impact of Research and Literature on Education and Training." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 21-30.

MacQuillan, Ian. *Less than My Job's Worth: Is Fundraising a Profession? And Does It Matter if It Isn't?* Plymouth: Rogare, 2017.

[https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/9/9060/Rogare\\_Green\\_Paper\\_-\\_Is\\_Fundraising\\_a\\_Profession.pdf](https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/9/9060/Rogare_Green_Paper_-_Is_Fundraising_a_Profession.pdf).

Myers & Briggs Foundation. "MBTI Basics." Accessed October 11, 2017.

<http://www.myersbriggs.org/my-mbti-personality-type/mbti-basics/extraversion-or-introversion.htm>.

Nathan, Sarah K., and Eugene R. Tempel. "Fundraisers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century."

Indianapolis: IUPUI Scholarworks, 2017.

[https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20\\_%20white%20paper%20\\_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/13845/Fundraisers%20in%20the%2021st%20Century%20_%20white%20paper%20_2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).

Osili, Una, Chelsea Clark, Mallory St. Claire, and Jonathan Bergdoll. *The 2016 U.S.*

*Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy*. Indianapolis: IUPUI Scholarworks, 2016, <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/11234>.

Ostrander, Susan A. "The Growth of Donor Control." Revisiting the Social Relations of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (2007): 356-372.

Ostrander, Susan A., and Paul G. Schervish. "Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation." In *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*, edited by Jon Van Til, 67-98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

“Paid Notice: Deaths DEUTCH, BARNET M.” *New York Times*, May 24, 2002.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/24/classified/paid-notice-deaths-deutch-barnet-m.html?mcubz=1>.

Pearson. “Creating Test Blueprints Through Job Analysis.” Accessed October 18, 2017.

[https://home.pearsonvue.com/Documents/Security/pearson\\_vue\\_test\\_blueprints\\_US.aspx](https://home.pearsonvue.com/Documents/Security/pearson_vue_test_blueprints_US.aspx).

“Poppy Seller Who Killed Herself Got 3,000 Charity Requests for Donations a Year.”

*The Guardian*, January 20, 2016.

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jan/20/poppy-seller-who-killed-herself-got-up-to-3000-charity-mailings-a-year>.

Pribbenow, Paul P. “Love and Work: Rethinking Our Models of Professions.” *New*

*Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 26 (1999): 29-50.

Pribbenow, Paul P. “Public Character: Philanthropic Fundraising and the Claims of

Accountability.” *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 47 (2005): 13-27.

Pribbenow, Paul P. “Public Service: Renewing the Moral Meaning of Professions in

America.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, Divinity School, 1993.

Schervish, Paul G. “Is Today’s Philanthropy Failing Beneficiaries? Always a Risk, But

Not for the Most Part.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (2007): 373-379.

Schervish, Paul G. “The Spiritual Horizons of Philanthropy: New Directions for Money

and Motives.” *New Directors for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 29 (2000): 17-32.

Scientific American. "The Difference between ExtrAversion and ExtrOversion."

Accessed October 19, 2017. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/beautiful-minds/the-difference-between-extraversion-and-extroversion/>.

Searle, John R. *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Sibary, Scott. "Counseling Philanthropic Donors." *Ethics & Behavior* 16, no. 3 (2006): 183-197.

Steinberg, Richard. "Theories of Nonprofit Organizations." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Second Edition, edited by Richard Steinberg and Walter W. Powell, 117-139. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

The Fund Raising School. *Principles and Techniques of Fundraising*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 2013.

Tschirhart, Mary, Chongmyoung Lee, and Gary Travinin. *The Benefits of Credentialing Programs to Membership Organizations*. Washington, DC: ASAE Foundation Research Series, 2013, <https://www.asaecenter.org/publications/107675-the-benefits-of-credentialing-programs-to-membership-assns-pdf>.

Wagner, Lilya. "A Crossroads on the Path of Professionalism in Fundraising." *On Philanthropy*, September 17, 2007.

Wagner, Lilya. *Careers in Fundraising*. New York: Wiley, 2003.

Wagner, Lilya. *Leading Up: Transformational Leadership for Fundraisers*. New York: Wiley, 2005.

- Wood, Ernest W. "Profiling Major Gifts Fundraisers: What Qualifies Them for Success." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 15 (1997), 5-15.
- Zunz, Olivier. *Philanthropy in America: A History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.



## CURRICULUM VITAE

Eva E. Aldrich

### EDUCATION

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Ph.D                        | Indiana University<br>Lilly Family School of Philanthropy<br>Philanthropic Studies, December 2017 |
| Ph.D. candidate             | Indiana University, 1988<br>English Literature  |
| M.A.                        | Indiana University<br>English Literature, 1988  |
| B.A. <i>summa cum laude</i> | Manchester University, North Manchester, Indiana<br>English, 1984                                 |

### PUBLICATIONS

- Aldrich, Eva E. "Fundraising as a Profession." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Fourth Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame, 503-516. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.
- Aldrich, Eva E., interim managing ed. *Giving USA 2011: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for 2010*. Chicago: Giving USA Foundation, 2011.
- Seiler, Timothy L., and Eva E. Aldrich. "The Case for Support." In *Fundraising Principles and Practice*, First Edition, edited by Adrian Sargeant, Jen Shang, and Associates, 188-199. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2010.
- Tempel, Eugene R., Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, eds. *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Aldrich, Eva E. "Developing and Articulating a Case for Support." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, 27-38. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Aldrich, Eva E. "Fundraising as a Profession." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, 427-433. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Aldrich, Eva E. "Fundraising Credentialing." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, 434-436. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Aldrich, Eva E. "Preparing for the CFRE Exam." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, Third Edition, edited by Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Eva E. Aldrich, 437-440. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Grossnickle, Ted R. and Eva E. Aldrich. "Compensation: The Intersection of Valuation and Accountability." *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, no. 43 (2004): 51-62.

## TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Faculty Member, The Fund Raising School, Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, IUPUI (2007-Present)

- Principles and Techniques of Fundraising
- Developing Major Gifts
- Managing the Capital Campaign
- Developing Annual Sustainability
- Proposal Writing and Grant Management
- Social Media in Fundraising
- Leadership in Fundraising
- Fundraising for Small Nonprofits

Assistant Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center, Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana (1991-1995)

- Freshman Composition I
- Freshman Composition II
- Basic Composition I
- Basic Composition II
- Advanced Composition
- Creative Writing
- Honors Seminar in English

Lecturer and Writing Center Tutor, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania (1989-1991)

- Rhetoric and Composition
- Business Writing
- Technical Writing
- Writing for the Professions

Associate Instructor, English, Indiana University (1984-1988)

- Freshman Composition
- Business Writing
- Basic Composition

## SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- “Fundraising for Universities and Research Institutions.” Fundraising Verband Austria. Vienna, Austria. June 30-July 1, 2016.
- “What Do You Mean by ‘Philanthropy’: A Cross-Cultural Perspective.” German Fundraising Association Congress. Berlin, Germany. 28 April 2016.
- “What Can Research on Major Donors Tell Us?” Symposium on Fundraising for Universities and Research Institutions/Fundraising Verband Austria. October 14, 2015.
- “Career Pathways for Fundraising Professionals.” Austrian Fundraising Congress/Fundraising Verband Austria. Vienna, Austria. October 13, 2015.
- “Career Pathways and Certification for Fundraising Professionals.” ABCR Festival/Brazilian Fundraisers Association. Sao Paulo, Brazil. May 6, 2015.
- “The Fundraising Profession.” Japan Fundraising Association Conference. Tokyo, Japan. February 14, 2015.
- “United States Charitable Foundations: An Overview.” United States Embassy in Austria/Fundraising Verband Austria. Vienna, Austria. November 25, 2014.
- “What Do Major Donors Want?” Central & Eastern European Fundraising Congress. Bratislava, Slovakia. October 9, 2014.
- “What Do Major Donors Want?” Fundraising Verband Austria Congress. Vienna, Austria. October 7, 2014.
- “International Perspectives on Fundraising.” Fundraising Verband Austria. Vienna, Austria. June 27, 2013.
- “Ethics in Fundraising Session and Expert Panel.” 2013 Fundraising Institute of New Zealand Conference. Wellington, New Zealand. May 8, 2013.
- “Advancement for Introverts: Using Your Quiet Strengths to Build Outstanding Alumni and Donor Relationships.” 2011 Council for the Advancement and Support of Education District Five Conference. Chicago, Illinois. December 13, 2011. (Forthcoming)
- “Fundraising Trends in the United States.” Fundraising Verband Austria (FVA). Vienna, Austria. July 14, 2011.

“Strategic Board Development: The Role of Fundraising Boards in the Non-profit Sector and Charitable Giving in the U.S.” Fundraising Verband Austria (FVA) and The Embassy of the United States of America. Vienna, Austria. May 20, 2010.

“Philanthropic Giving: Emerging Trends and Recent Studies.” 2009 Association of Professional Researchers for Advancement International Conference. Baltimore, Maryland.

“If Aristotle Wrote Direct Mail: Classic Strategies for Modern Fundraisers.” 2008 Association of Fundraising Professionals International Conference. San Diego, California.

### LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

Association of Fundraising Professionals Governance Task Force (2016)

CFRE International—Board of Directors (2011), Exam Committee (2008-2011; Chair 2011); Expansion Committee (2011); Marketing Committee (2011); Job Analysis Task Force (2009-2010); Pass Point Study (2008); Subject Matter Expert Training (2008)

Franklin Flood Area Re-Use Committee (Chair 2011)

Association of Fundraising Professionals/Indiana Chapter—Member of Fall Conference Committee (2010)

Leadership Johnson County—Board of Trustees (2005-2009); Marketing Committee Chair (2006-2007)

Franklin Heritage—Board of Directors (2000-2005); President of the Board of Directors (2002-04); Campaign Committee to Restore the Historic Artcraft Theatre (2006-2008)

Habitat for Humanity of Johnson County—Inaugural Board of Directors (2005-2007)

Johnson County Community Foundation—Grants Committee (2002-2007)

Franklin College—Admissions Committee (1991-1994)

The Pennsylvania State University—Elected Lecturer Representative to the Composition Committee (1990-1991).

### AWARDS AND HONORS

Awarded the Ernest W. Wood Doctoral Fellowship in Philanthropy (2014)

Named to *Who's Who in America* (2011 edition)

Served as a jury member for the LodeStar Foundation's *Collaboration Prize* (2008)

Served as a proposal reviewer for the Case Foundation's *Make It Your Own* awards  
(2007)

Winner of the first annual HarperCollins Fellowship for excellence and innovation in  
curriculum design (1991)