Untangling Turnover: Why Development Directors Leave and What Nonprofit Organizations Can Do About It

Kristina M. Pepelko

Grand Valley State University

Untangling Turnover: Why Development Directors Leave and What Nonprofit Organizations Can Do About It

Philanthropy has a long tradition in the United States (U.S.) and continues to be deeply ingrained in the fabric of American life (Kelly, 1998). Americans engage in philanthropy—that is, "voluntary action for the public good"—through a variety of means, including voluntary giving, voluntary service, and voluntary association (Payton & Moody, 2008, p. 6). Indeed, as Payton and Moody (2008) state, "organized charity is older than democracy and capitalism" (p. 13). Americans often engage in this organized philanthropic activity through nonprofit organizations, using them as vehicles to exercise their "moral action in response to the human problematic" (Payton & Moody, 2008, p. 6). According to Never (2016), "nonprofits are instrumental in an American's life from cradle to grave . . . the large, dynamic nonprofit sector provides that crucial bridge that may be provided by the state in other societies" (p. 82). In fact, there are over 1.4 million nonprofit organizations registered today in the U.S. and the sector contributes over $900 billion to the U.S. economy (Urban Institute, 2015). However, without support of the American public, especially through voluntary giving, many nonprofit organizations would find it difficult or nearly impossible to survive. According to Urban Institute (2015), most U.S. public charities (i.e. those registered with the Internal Revenue Service as 501(c)3 organizations) receive 13.3% of their revenue from charitable giving. While 13.3% might seem like a small amount, charitable giving in the U.S. accounts for over $400 billion in annual gifts to nonprofit organizations, with about 70% of giving coming directly from individuals (Giving USA, 2018).

To help facilitate this giving, many nonprofits employ fundraisers who acquire revenue from private sources, such as individuals, foundations, and corporations, to support the organization's mission, programs, and services (Duronio & Tempel, 1997). Fundraising is instrumental to U.S. charitable organizations and is a way through which individuals can engage with a nonprofit and express their own personal philanthropy (Nathan & Tempel, 2016). Unfortunately, while nonprofit organizations employ professional fundraisers to involve donors and advance their missions, reports from the sector reveal that nonprofits have trouble retaining their fundraisers, especially their development directors, who usually serve as the lead or only fund development employee (Harrison, 1996; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Kelly, 1998; Thomas, 2010; Pinder, 2012; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). This paper aims to explore why nonprofit organizations (specifically charitable organizations or 501(c)3s) continue to have issues retaining development directors (also referred to as fundraisers) even though they are critical to both resource acquisition and mission fulfillment. To begin, an overview of the strategic importance and key roles of development directors in nonprofit organizations will be provided along with how turnover is defined and what impacts turnover has on organizations. Following these contextual discussions, this paper will untangle the reasons why voluntary development director turnover occurs, highlighting both misconceptions and research-based answers, and what types of retention practices nonprofits can pursue to reduce voluntary turnover. This paper will conclude with an analysis of research findings and important implications for nonprofit leadership and the nonprofit sector as a whole.

This was a really good introduction!

Strategic Importance of Development Directors

Research shows that development directors are strategically significant to the functioning of nonprofit organizations (Payton, Rosso, & Tempel, 1991a; Payton, Rosso, & Tempel, 1991b; Kelly, 1998; Burk; 2003; Betzler & Gmür, 2016; Nathan & Tempel, 2016; Klein, 2016). Development directors not only support internal nonprofit operations through fund development, but also interact with the external environment by managing stakeholder relations and responding to calls for increased accountability (Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Nathan & Tempel, 2016). Additionally, development directors engage in fundraising—an activity that is both "instrumental and expressive" (Nathan & Tempel, 2016, p. 488). Fundraising is instrumental as it provides resources so that nonprofits can operate mission-critical programs and services (Klein, 2016; Nathan & Tempel, 2016). And fundraising is expressive because it connects donors to a cause that is important to them (Nathan & Tempel, 2016). Payton, Rosso, and Tempel (1991a; 1991b) go so far as to state that fundraising is "necessary to a democratic society" as it is a "moral action" and is the exercise of free speech and voluntary association under the First Amendment (p. 5, 9). Yet the most common reason people choose to make donations is because they were asked (Klein, 2016). And so, development directors play a key role in maintaining a flow of resources into an organization while simultaneously engaging donors in causes they care about. As Payton, Rosso, & Tempel (1991a) state, "fund raising does not take place in a vacuum; it is one of the central elements of a larger system of philanthropy and is best seen in its role as the servant of philanthropy" (p. 4). If fundraising is philanthropy's servant, then development directors can be considered philanthropic agents, enabling individuals to fulfill their philanthropic actions and supporting organizations in making a difference for the public good.

Development Director Responsibilities

In addition to facilitating donor engagement and nonprofit financial solvency, development directors embody roles that support a nonprofit's overall mission fulfillment. Some fundraising professionals step into the nonprofit sector with certifications or degrees in nonprofit-related work, yet many come from other fields, including education, law, business, and health care (Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Even though there is no set professional background for fundraisers, sector experts generally agree that a development director needs a college education, strong communication and analytical skills, and an ability to understand people and work with a variety of stakeholders (Ensman, 1991; Kelly, 1998; Burk, 2003). These core skills allow development directors to manage relationships between their nonprofit organization and donors "who share mutual goals and objectives" (Kelly, 1998, p. 9). In this way, the main function of development directors moves beyond the role of securing revenue from private sources to one that is focused on the overall nonprofit-donor-mission relationship (Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Kelly, 1998; Nathan & Tempel, 2016). As Duronio and Tempel (1997) state, fundraisers "create the bridge between the mission and the marketplace" (p. 9). As bri~~n~~dging agents, development directors take on a variety of responsibilities including department management, donor relations, communications and marketing, donor research, event planning, donor stewardship, donor cultivation, and donor solicitation through major gifts, annual giving campaigns, and direct response activities (Ensman, 1991; Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Many development directors are also a part of a nonprofit's executive or leadership team, however this is not always the case (Kelly, 1998).

Indeed, while development directors have a myriad of diverse responsibilities, their central roles vary from organization to organization (Kelly, 1998). According to Kelly (1998), development directors might serve as stakeholder liaisons, supporting connections between the organization and its donors, or they could be considered technicians, carrying out fund development responsibilities without direct involvement in fundraising decision-making, including setting funding goals. And so, even though fundraising is considered essential to charitable organizations, the importance nonprofits place on development directors varies, as highlighted in the types of roles organization leadership prescribes to fundraisers, whether directly or indirectly (Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Kelly, 1998; Nathan & Tempel, 2016). This variance might help explain why development directors face challenges at nonprofits, including limited authority, siloed work functions, work overload, a lack of organizational understanding about their role, and a lack of importance placed on fundraising in general (Kelly, 1998, Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Given these challenges, it is not surprising that development director turnover continues to be a hot button issue among nonprofit practitioners.

Defining Turnover

Turnover, however, is not a one-size-fits-all term. Turnover generally occurs when an employee or employees depart an organization for any reason, and so turnover can be both voluntary and involuntary in nature (Pinder, 2012). Voluntary turnover occurs when an employee elects to leave an organization at their own accord; it is also referred to as employee-initiated turnover (Pinder, 2012; Haggerty, 2015). On the other hand, involuntary turnover is not employee-initiated. Involuntary turnover occurs when an employee leaves an organization because they were fired due to job performance issues or poor behavior (Pinder, 2012; Haggerty, 2015). While voluntary and involuntary turnover are the most commonly discussed varieties, turnover can be furthered subdivided into functional, dysfunctional, avoidable, and unavoidable (Haggerty, 2015). Functional and dysfunctional turnover focus on organizational impact while avoidable and unavoidable turnover center on the organization's role in an employee's departure. Functional turnover occurs when an employee's exit benefits the organization in some fashion, such as by saving on costs and opening up advancement opportunities for other employees (Dess & Shaw, 2001; Haggerty, 2015). Conversely, dysfunctional turnover is when an employee's departure negatively affects an organization by, for example, placing a financial burden on the organization or forcing other staff to pick up additional work (Dess & Shaw, 2001; Haggerty, 2015). Finally, avoidable and unavoidable turnover are determined by whether an organization can or cannot control employee departure (Haggerty, 2015). While turnover on the surface appears like a simple measure of employee departure, it is much more complex as the type of turnover can vary from an employee, organization, and impact standpoint (Pinder, 2012; Haggerty, 2015). What's more, turnover differs from organization to organization, making it difficult to effectively compare one organization's issues with another. However, as Haggerty (2015) states, "it is important for organizations to understand and analyze the various types of turnover they experience and how these turnover variations impact their organizations positively and/or negatively" (p. 28). It is up to organizations, then, to proactively study their turnover issues to identify exactly what is happening and why in order to address any internal problems and improve working conditions.

great discussion

Impacts of Turnover

Although turnover is complex and unique to each organization, voluntary turnover has been cited as a major issue for the nonprofit sector as it carries undesirable consequences for organizational effectiveness (Opportunity Knocks, 2012; Selden & Sowa, 2015; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Turnover more generally is associated with both direct and indirect costs (Dess & Shaw, 2001; Croucher, Wood, Brewster & Brookes, 2012). Direct turnover costs include expenses from recruitment and training of position replacements, social capital losses, and decreased organizational and team productivity (Dess & Shaw, 2001). Indirect costs, on the other hand, are more difficult to measure as they place a less obvious strain on organizations, such as through lower employee morale and a decrease in staff performance (Croucher, et. al, 2012). For nonprofits, voluntary turnover carries both direct and indirect costs. According to Selden and Sowa (2015), voluntary turnover burdens organizations with added expenses for recruiting and training replacements and increases the workload of other employees, affecting organizational performance and morale. In addition, research emphasizes the loss of institutional knowledge and stakeholder connections when employees depart nonprofit organizations (Pinder, 2012; Haggerty, 2016; Selden & Sowa, 2015). Given that fundraising is relationship-based work, the loss of social capital and the potential loss of donations due to turnover is critical to note (Payton, Rosso, & Tempel, 1991a; Kelly, 1998). Development directors are important to maintaining relationships and in bringing income into organizations, and so when they voluntarily depart, this fund development cycle becomes unsettled (Pinder, 2012). What's more, development director turnover can impact internal organizational operations, driving up costs through lost productivity and position replacement activities (Haggerty, 2015). As with nonprofit turnover more broadly, development director turnover has far-reaching affects across an organization as it not only disrupts the internal working environment, but also the nonprofit's overall efficiency, service delivery, and external relations (Pinder, 2012).

Reasons for Development Director Turnover

Given these negative turnover consequences, it is necessary to examine why development directors voluntarily depart their organizations, especially because this turnover appears to occur with increasing frequency. According to Bell and Cornelius (2013), about 50% of development directors expect to leave their jobs in two years or less, with about 40% also intent on leaving the field of development entirely. A recent survey conducted by the Association of Fundraising Professionals (2018) confirms that many fundraisers (67%) have thought of leaving their positions in the last year. Small to mid-sized organizations are especially vulnerable to voluntary development director turnover and this vulnerability may be due to increased competition for talent by larger organizations (Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Bell & Cornelius, 2013). One result of this voluntary turnover for both small and large nonprofits is position vacancy. According to Bell and Cornelius (2013), the average development director vacancy length for organizations with budgets over $10 million is two months while organizations with revenues under $5 million average vacancy lengths between 10 to 21 months. This research illuminates a difficult reality for nonprofit organizations—that there is a "high level of instability and uncertainty in the development director position" (Bell & Cornelius, 2013, p. 5). Bell and Cornelius (2013) call this the "vicious cycle," whereby a lack of successful work conditions paired with early development director exits result in fund development disruption and unpredictability (p. 22). While there is little to no research on the impacts of development director position vacancy, organizations may experience both direct and indirect turnover costs including lowered work productivity and departure of other development staff members (Haggerty, 2015).

Nonprofit practitioners are especially sensitive to development director turnover, and often cite that it occurs because of low compensation and job dissatisfaction (Carbone, 1989; Kelly, 1998; Pinder, 2012). However, research suggests that compensation, while important to employee motivation, has little to do with voluntary turnover (Haggerty, 2015; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Instead, what appears to impact voluntary development director turnover is a mix of job and organization fit issues that feed into overall job satisfaction (Carbone, 1989; Harrison, 1996; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Haggerty, 2015; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). According to Haggerty (2015), job fit entails how well an employee's abilities and skills coincide with job expectations and responsibilities while organization fit depends on how well an organization's values align with an employee's values. Research shows that development directors often have concerns related to both job and organization fit (Carbone, 1989; Harrison, 1996; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Haggerty, 2015; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). In terms of job fit, research highlights issues with unrealistic performance expectations, difficult relationships with the Executive Director and Board of Director, a lack of role clarity and understanding, a lack of support from staff, limited decision-making power and autonomy, and little access to advancement opportunities (Carbone, 1989; Harrison, 1996; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Haggerty, 2015; Klein, 2016; Association for Fundraising Professionals, 2018). For organization fit, research emphasizes the absence of conditions that value fundraising and effectively support fundraising success (Harrison, 1996; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Dale, 2017). For example, Dale (2017) states that since fundraising is commonly associated with stereotypical female roles and responsibilities, it is often devalued as mission-critical work in our patriarchal society. What's more, Bell and Cornelius (2013) state that many organizations do not consistently and effectively build fundraising capacity and systems and a culture of philanthropy, revealing a general disregard for the fund development work that development directors are expected to carry out. In addition, organization leadership may even be unaware of the gaps in fundraising support that would facilitate better job and organization fit for development directors (Carbone, 1989; Duronio & Tempel, 1997; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Klein, 2016). Taken together, issues with job and organization fit illuminate the nonprofit sector's struggles in cultivating work conditions where development directors can grow and thrive.

Retention Practices for Reducing Development Director Turnover

While change is difficult, research provides several practices for combating voluntary turnover that nonprofit organizations can use to create a more welcoming, clear, and supportive working environment for their development directors. What's more, if nonprofits can successfully engage and support development directors, they will likely see improved organizational outcomes, from better service delivery to an increase in donations (Duronio & Tempel, 1997;

Betzler & Gmür, 2016; Nathan, 2018). Research recommendations for reducing voluntary turnover fall within two main categories: employee-specific practices and organization-specific practices. Employee-specific practices focus on improving employee motivation and job satisfaction while organization-specific practices concentrate on educating leadership and enhancing understanding and the overall value of fundraising and philanthropy across the organization. Many studies emphasize the importance of taking a multi-faceted approach to combating voluntary turnover, incorporating both employee-specific and organization-specific improvement techniques (Carbone, 1989; Payton, Rosso, & Tempel, 1991a; Thomas, 2010; Opportunity Knocks, 2012; Ban, Drahnak-Faller & Towers, 2013; Bell & Cornelius, 2013; Haggerty, 2015; Selden & Sowa, 2015; Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018).

Employee-specific retention practices tie into supporting a better person to job fit. Given that development directors can encounter issues with unrealistic performance expectations, work relationships, and role clarity and autonomy, nonprofit organizations can adopt practices that specifically target these areas. More generally, high performance work practices, from effective onboarding to leadership development, help to lower rates of voluntary turnover (Selden & Sowa, 2015). More specifically, nonprofit organizations can focus on educating prospective development directors on the organization's mission and how their role connects to it in addition to what their job will entail and what type of workload they will have (Thomas, 2010; Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). By being deliberate and honest in presenting the full scope and purpose of a development director position, nonprofits can better determine if job candidates will be a good fit for the role. As the Association for Fundraising Professionals (2018) states, organizations should focus on "recruiting and retaining personnel to reflect workload and expectations" (p. 8). In aligning the way an organization approaches development director hiring with the realities of the position, a nonprofit can create a stronger foundation from which it can hire appropriate talent, increasing not only role clarity, but also the potential for overall job satisfaction on the part of the employee. Along with thoughtful recruitment, nonprofit organizations can offer opportunities for both recognition and advancement, giving development directors the chance to be rewarded for their performance and to further develop their skills (Opportunity Knocks, 2012; Ban, et. al, 2013; Haggerty, 2015; Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). Recognition through a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards can be especially useful. According to Brown and Yoshioka (2003), intrinsic motivation can decrease if employees are underpaid, leaving them dissatisfied and unengaged. And so, nonprofit organizations can develop competitive compensation and benefit packages while also providing opportunities for advancement and skill development so that development directors can feel well-supported and well-recognized in their roles.

Along with positively impacting employee motivation and clarifying job roles and expectations, nonprofit organizations need to pay attention to cultivating caring and respectful work relationships between development directors and other members of the leadership team, especially the Executive Director and the Board of Directors. According to Moynihan and Pandey (2017), strong social connections within an organization can diminish turnover intentions. To nurture these types of connections, nonprofits can train their boards and top managers in how to effectively manage employees (Ban et. al, 2013). If, however, an organization lacks capacity to undertake such trainings, then Ban, Drahnak-Faller, and Towers (2013) suggest outsourcing the support to a consultant or firm to ensure that staff is well-educated in how to communicate with employees and handle conflicts. Cultivating strong work relationships also includes creating an environment where employees can participate in decision-making and feel they have ownership over their work (Opportunity Knocks, 2012). As Crutchfield and Grant (2007) state, leadership needs to give "top managers real authority and accountability for the organization's success . . . [which] helps retain top talent over time" (p. 178). These practices can help to retain talent as they create ongoing, energetic connections to an organization's core mission and goals and an employee's position responsibilities. In this way, intrinsic motivation is enhanced alongside providing a more satisfying work environment.

In addition to instituting practices that boost employee-job fit, nonprofit organizations can adopt techniques that promote a higher level of employee-organization value congruence. According to Moynihan and Pandey (2007), employees that find harmony between their values and an organization's values are more likely to commit to staying in the short and long-term. Although nonprofit values differ from organization to organization, there are general strategies that leadership can implement to show that they value the work of fundraising and philanthropy in general (Haggerty, 2015). In this way, nonprofit organizations can meet their development directors with support and encouragement head-on, providing them with a strong basis to begin their work and sustain high performance. A key cultural shift that nonprofits can take on is by cultivating a culture of philanthropy. Indeed, if an organization chooses to neglect the development of a philanthropic culture, it will likely struggle in retaining development talent and in achieving its financial and programmatic goals (Bell & Cornelius, 2013). A culture of philanthropy involves everyone across the organization by training them to "act as ambassadors and engage in relationship-building" (Bell & Cornelius, 2013, p. 17). By upholding a culture of philanthropy, everyone is responsible for "promot[ing] philanthropy . . . [and] fund development is viewed and valued as a mission-aligned program of the organization" (Bell & Cornelius, 2013, p. 17). Signs of a strong philanthropic culture include fund development systems that facilitate donor support, raising up the role of the organization's development director so that they are a leader and perceived as such, and full leadership commitment and involvement in fundraising (Bell & Cornelius, 2013). However, the biggest change that needs to happen in order to embrace an organizational culture of philanthropy is teaching leadership and staff about how essential fund development work is and that solicitating financial support is in fact a positive activity and not one to be ignored, undermined, or looked down upon (Bell & Cornelius, 2013). As Bell and Cornelius (2013) state, "to foster and develop a culture of philanthropy, individuals' beliefs and perspectives cannot be at odds with its principles. In other words, a culture of philanthropy has little chance of taking hold when people think asking for money is distasteful" (p. 23). While developing value congruence between an organization and its employee can be complex, nonprofits have an underutilized advantage with development directors—they can choose to develop a culture of philanthropy that will not only strengthen the organization as a whole, but also create a value-bond that feeds directly into the roles and responsibilities of its development director.

Analysis of Research Findings

If a nonprofit organization hopes to fulfill its mission, then it must develop an environment where its development directors are well-supported. It is clear from the literature that development directors help to undergird the missions of nonprofits by engaging in fund development activities. These activities, from donor cultivation to solicitation, assist nonprofits by bringing in needed financial resources for program and service delivery and enhancing the organization's reputation through relationship-building with community stakeholders. Unfortunately, nonprofit organizations appear to be missing out on utilizing the full potential of their development directors. Research shows that many development directors intend to depart their organizations and may even exit the fund development field entirely, creating position vacancies, instability, and both direct and indirect costs. Given that nonprofits have a vested interest in both philanthropy and the public trust, the lack of attention to and action on development director turnover is in direct opposition to a charitable organization's core functions as a vehicle of moral, voluntary action for the public good. Tense work conditions, highly demanding and nearly impossible expectations, limited staff support, and role devaluation contribute to a development director's overall job dissatisfaction and is tied to their intent to leave. However, nonprofit organizations have the power to cultivate strong congruence between a development director's abilities, skills, and values and the organization's needs and ideals. Strategic human resource management practices, work environment enhancement, and shifts in organizational culture can support a nonprofit's efforts in retaining its development talent and are not yet used enough.

While the available literature provides opportunity for consideration and analysis, a research gap remains. Most research on turnover and retention centers on general nonprofit circumstances and practices. While these studies and reports can be applied to an organization's unique experience with its development director, they do not offer specifics to tackle the nuances or complexities of this relationship. What's more, many studies focus on specific nonprofit sub-sectors, such as health or education, and employ small sample sets, making it difficult to generalize across the sector. Additionally, virtually no studies offer concrete measures for nonprofit employee turnover and retention and almost none exist that provide such information specifically related to development director turnover and retention. Furthermore, the most comprehensive reports that do capture a wide variety of development director experiences at nonprofit organizations were created by organizations with a stake in amplifying philanthropic work, leaning more toward a specific agenda rather than objectivity. In sum, more research is needed to understand the nature of development director turnover across different organizations and how nonprofits can work toward effectively recruiting and retaining development talent.

Implications for Nonprofit Leadership and the Nonprofit Sector

Despite the lack of research specific to development director turnover, important implications for nonprofit leadership and the nonprofit sector as a whole can be teased out from available literature. As the sector continues to expand, there will be an increased demand for skilled development directors (Duronio & Tempel, 1997). However, given current vacancy and job satisfaction issues, there is more demand than available talent (Bell & Cornelius, 2013). To ensure that the sector grows in a robust and sustainable way, organizations need to acknowledge and champion fundraising as a profession worthy of investment (Haggerty, 2015). If the sector broadly recognizes the importance of fund development to mission fulfillment, it will be able to attract and cultivate new talent while nurturing current development professionals. In this way, the sector's attention to the strategic importance of fund development supports not only the retention of directors already in the field, but also the creation of an essential development talent pipeline. This talent pipeline can give the sector a strategic advantage as it can enhance the sector's reputation as a welcoming and attractive place to work while developing its own cohort of strong leaders that will achieve ambitious outcomes and bring in resources that may still be untapped or under the radar.

At the organization-level, the responsibility of attracting and developing talent rests squarely in the hands of the executive director and board of directors. Since nonprofit leadership has issues with full involvement in fund development activities, ensuring that the organization hires a dynamic, skilled, and experienced development director can support fundraising capacity expansion (Bell & Cornelius, 2013; BoardSource, 2017; Association of Fundraising Professionals, 2018). However, development directors, no matter how talented they are, can only move organization leadership so far in the direction of collective fund development work; a nonprofit's executive director and board must step into a partnership role with their development director and intentionally adopt practices and a culture where fundraising can prosper (Bell & Cornelius, 2013). Board members need to not only provide monetary support to their organizations, but also engage directly in fund development activities (Klein, 2016). While not all board members will be expert solicitors, they can still assist with fundraising by participating in donor prospecting, cultivating, and stewardship. Executive directors, on the other hand, need to be more hands-on with donor solicitation as they oversee their organization's short and long-term solvency and mission attainment (Herman, 2016). By being active participants in fund development, the board and executive director can create a work environment where fundraising is valued. When fundraising is respected and appreciated across a nonprofit organization, a development director's job is made easier, more attractive, and ultimately more rewarding.

I'm glad that you included the board's role!

Conclusion

With a strong philanthropic tradition, the U.S. nonprofit sector is well-positioned to engage all forms of voluntary action for the public good, from volunteer service to financial giving. To capitalize on voluntary giving specifically, nonprofits usually deploy professional fundraisers to support both revenue stream development and relationship-building that will help the organization achieve mission-critical goals and outcomes. Unfortunately, nonprofits have difficultly creating working environments where a development director's work can thrive. From problematic staff relationships to position devaluation, a development director may often enter a nonprofit organization that is geared more toward their failure than fund development success, contributing to their eventual decision to voluntarily depart. As philanthropic vehicles, it's essential for charitable organizations to embrace recruitment, hiring, and retention best practices to ease strain placed on development directors and to foster a strong culture around fundraising more broadly.

Kristina –
this was a really well-researched
essay – the sourcing was fantastic &
very thorough. It was also really
well-organized.
Great job!
Prof. Woodell

Clarity of Argument – 40/40

Support for Argument – 30/30

Organization of Paper – 20/20

Intangibles – 10/10

100/100

References

Association for Fundraising Professionals. (2018). 2018 AFP compensation and benefits report. Retrieved from https://www.pathlms.com/afp/courses/8546

Ban, C., Drahnak-Faller, A., & Towers, M. (2003). Human resource challenges in human service and community development organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 23*(2), 133-153. doi:10.1177/0734371X03023002004

Bell, J. & Cornelius, M. (2013*). UnderDeveloped: A national study of challenges facing nonprofit fundraising* [report for CompassPoint]. Retrieved from CompassPoint website: https://www.compasspoint.org/underdeveloped

Betzler, D., & Gmür , M. (2016). Does fundraising professionalization pay? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 27*(1), 27-42. doi:10.1002/nml.21212

BoardSource. (2017). Leading with intent: 2017 national index of nonprofit board practices. Report from BoardSource. Retrieved from https://leadingwithintent.org/

Brown, W.A., & Yoshioka, C.F. (2003). Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 14*(1), 5-18. doi:10.1002/nml.18

Burk, P. *Donor centered fundraising: how to hold on to your donors and raise much more money.* Chicago, IL: Burk & Associates Ltd.

Carbone, R.F. (1989). *Fund raising as a profession.* College Park, Maryland: Clearninghouse for Research on Fund Raising.

Croucher, R., Wood, G., Brewster, C., & Brookes, M. (2012). Employee turnover, HRM and institutional contexts. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 33(4), 605-620.

Dale, E. J. (2017). Fundraising as women's work? examining the profession with a gender lens. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 22(4), e1605-n/a. doi:10.1002/nvsm.1605

Dess, G.G. & Shaw, J.D. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital, and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 446-456.

Duronio, M.A. & Tempel, E.R. (1997). *Fund raisers: Their careers, stories, concerns, and accomplishments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ensman, R.G. (1991). The small-shop director: One job, many occupations. *Fund Raising Management, 22*(8), 80. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.gvsu.edu/docview/195932738?accountid=39473

Giving USA. (2018). *Giving USA 2018 infographic*. Retrieved from https://givingusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/GUSA-2018-Infographic-FINAL.png

Haggerty, A.L. (2016). Turnover intentions of nonprofit fundraising professionals: The roles of perceived fit, exchange relationships, and job satisfaction. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Virginia Commonwealth University Scholar Compass: https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4888&context=etd

Harrison, B. J. (1996). Why do development professionals jump ship? *Fund Raising Management, 27*(1), 16. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.gvsu.edu/docview/195867537?accountid=39473

Herman, R.D. (2016). Executive leadership. In D.O. Renz & R.D. Herman (Eds). *Nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 167-187). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Kelly, K.S. (1998). *Effective fund-raising managemen*t. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Klein, K. (2016). *Fundraising for social change, 7th edition*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2008;2007;). The ties that bind: Social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 18*(2), 205-227. doi:10.1093/jopart/mum013

Nathan, B. R. (2017). Employee engagement in nonprofit organizations. *Employment Relations Today, 44*(3), 27-36. doi:10.1002/ert.21637

Nathan, S.K. & Tempel, E.R. (2016). Philanthropy and fundraising: The comprehensive development program. In D.O. Renz & R.D. Herman (Eds). *Nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 488-508). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Never, B. (2016). The changing context of nonprofit management in the United States. In D.O. Renz & R.D. Herman (Eds). *Nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 80-101). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Opportunity Knocks. (2012). Engaging the nonprofit workforce: Mission, management, and emotion [report]. Retrieved from https://www.gcn.org/sites/default/files/ctools/OK_Engaging_the_Nonprofit_Workforce_Report.pdf

Payton, R. & Moody, M. (2008). *Understanding philanthropy: Its meaning and mission.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Payton, R.L., Rosso, H.A., & Tempel, E.R. (1991a). Toward a philosophy of fund raising. In D.F. Burlingame & L.J. Hulse (Eds). *Taking fund raising seriously: Advancing the profession and practice of raising money*. (pp. 3-17). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Payton, R.L., Rosso, H.A., & Tempel, E.R. (1991b). Taking fund raising seriously: an agenda. In D.F. Burlingame & L.J. Hulse (Eds). *Taking fund raising seriously: Advancing the profession* *and practice of raising money*. (pp. 272-282). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Pinder, J. (2012). Development professionals at religiously based nonprofit organizations. *SAGE Open, 2*(3) doi:10.1177/2158244012458510

Selden, S. C., & Sowa, J. E. (2015). Voluntary turnover in nonprofit human service organizations: The impact of high performance work practices. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 39*(3), 182-207. doi:10.1080/23303131.2015.1031416

Thomas, C. (2010). Retaining educational fundraisers: Reducing turnover by investing in human capital management. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 10*(2), 99-107. doi:10.1057/ijea.2010.13

Urban Institute. (2015). *The nonprofit sector in brief 2015: public charities, giving, and volunteering*. Retrieved from https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/72536/2000497-The-Nonprofit-Sector-in-Brief-2015-Public-Charities-Giving-and-Volunteering.pdf