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MIT’s resource development effort is a critical component to obtaining capital resources for the Institute. In 2012, MIT’s development operation raised substantial dollars for the institute. International resource development is a growing segment of the overall development effort. Currently, 15% of funds raised are from international sources. However, the international development component presents unique challenges. The teams’ goal is to
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Introduction:

How do we improve and increase our international development results? The MIT Development organization is already highly successful, in FY2012 raising $156 million in gifts, $182 million in pledges and $94 million in bequests. Of this $432 million approximately 15% was raised from international sources. However we are living in an increasingly global community with a growing international student population at MIT. MIT’s connections to international alumni and donors are becoming even more critical in today’s global community.

To begin to explore these issues, the MIT Development Office sponsored a MIT Leader to Leader (L2L) Program project to conduct a study to review MIT’s current processes and organization as well as benchmark the international development organizations of several of our peer institutions. The results of the study are summarized in this report.

Mission:

This study was charged by executive sponsor, Mr. Jeffery Newton, Vice President of Resource Development and project sponsor, Ms. Beth Ogar, Executive Director, Gift Administration and Recording Secretary with studying, researching, analyzing and making recommendations on the issue concerning
the growth, resourcing, and coordination of the Institute's international development efforts. Specifically, the tasking for the study was defined by Mr. Newton as follows:

“The team has been charged with defining MIT’s current process(es) for highly decentralized international development. They will gather information from other academic institutions about how they have organized their resource development efforts in the international development arena; determine how they make staff and budget decisions to “cover the globe”; and gather what lessons can be learned from them. The team will then make recommendations for how Resource Development, the schools, and the DLCs can better integrate their information and use it to make wise investment decisions with a clear and prioritized strategy.”

The scope of the study was limited to the international philanthropic donations, and did not include international research grants.

The study started in March of 2012 and continued for 31 weeks. The team started mapping the existing processes at MIT. We interviewed key MIT stakeholders including Resource Development members, centrally involved MIT administrators and involved faculty members. We also engaged in internet based research and focused on the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (C.A.S.E), Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), MIT’s China Strategy, the work of MIT’s International Advisory Committee (IAC), MIT’s International Coordinating Committee (ICC), and other MIT groups with international interests. We also researched assumed leaders in this field such as Indiana University. Benchmarking of MIT peer schools was seen as a critical component of our research. Eight peer schools and MIT were surveyed.

Initial results of the study were presented in two Poster Board Sessions to the 2012 L2L Fellows and the study sponsors. Additionally, the results of the study are also documented within this report, and a condensed report which will be provided to the universities that provided input to our benchmarking of peer organizations. The culmination of the project is a set of recommendations to Resource Development regarding ways to make international development grow through improved communication and coordination as well as a review of several peer institutions to offer context to our own organization and processes.

Study Methodology:

The team followed Deborah Ancona’s change management compass and its four phases: sense making, relating, visioning and inventing throughout the life of this project. We pursued clarification of the scope and problem solving with our sponsors through multiple meetings with Jeff Newton, Beth Ogar, Robert Scott, Executive Director of Development Services and Dr. Arundhati Banerjee, (Director of Global Initiatives). These meetings were also used as check points on our progress and recalibration occurred after each meeting.

The first phase of our work was to interview the Development Officers from each of MIT’s five schools. Each of the five Schools has an independent Development office lead by an Assistant/Associate
Dean level person. A list of questions specific to school development officers was developed to explore the issues posed by the study. Representing each of the schools were: Anne Marie Michel (Assistant Dean for Development, Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences), Elizabeth Chadis (Assistant Dean for Development, Science), Barbara Feldman (Assistant Dean for Development, Architecture and Planning), David Weber (Director of Corporate and International Relations), Kathryn Hawkes (Director, Alumni Relations and Annual Giving), Donna Russell (Senior Associate Director, Alumni Relations), Robin Elkins (Leadership Giving Officer) of Sloan School of Management, and Ralph Scala (Assistant Dean for Development, Engineering).

Shortly thereafter we interviewed several key Resource Development staff members to gain insight of the processes, issues, and successes from the perspective of the central organization. Participants included, Karl Koster (Executive Director of Corporate Relations, Industrial Liaison Program), Dr. Arundhati Banerjee (Director of Global Initiatives), and Robert D. Scott (Executive Director of Development Services). Also interviewed were Beth Raffeld (Senior Director or Philanthropic Partnerships) and Lindley Huey (Director of Foundation Relations). The team also interviewed Judith Cole, the Executive Vice President and CEO of the MIT Alumni Association, and several members of the senior administration, including Professor Philip Khoury (Associate Provost), R. Gregory Morgan (Vice President and General Counsel), Claude Canizares (Vice President for Research and Associate Provost), and Suzanne Glassburn (Counsel).

The input from key faculty and administrators was also solicited. Faculty members are often key to the development process and are the sources of initial contact with potential contributors. The tight coordination of faculty contacts with the Schools and with Resource Development was one of the key topics being reviewed. Some of the faculty contacted included Professor Victor Zue (CSAIL), Professor Ernest J. Moniz (Director of the Laboratory for Energy and Environment, and the Director of the MIT Energy Initiative), Professor Tyler Jacks (Director of the David H. Koch Institute for Integrative Cancer Research), and Professor Daniel E. Hastings (Dean for Undergraduate Education).

From our MIT interviews, we established a list of eight important peer schools to benchmark against. The peer schools identified for benchmarking were:

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey
Stanford University, Stanford, California
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
Columbia University, New York City, New York
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

We worked in close coordination with Robert Scott to create a list of targeted survey questions for our peers in this area. For each school, we conducted telephone interviews with two or three of our team members attending each. We documented each question and answer from each peer and tabulated the results in a matrix including MIT’s responses to the same survey. Each of the schools
provided input into our study, and the study team is grateful for their time and participation. The list of peer school contacts, survey questions, and recorded responses are located in appendices a, b, and c.

**Current Process:**

MIT’s international development organization is a complex decentralized operation with many Central offices, School staff, Departments, Laboratory & Centers (DLCs) staff, and faculty involved in the process. There is no single reporting hierarchy for this operation. The Central Resource Development staff report ultimately to the Vice President of Resource Development, Jeff Newton and there is a dedicated central International Development Office headed by Dr. Tuli Banerjee.
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**Figure 1. Graphic Representation of MIT’s International Development Efforts.**

Coordination is managed through meetings and committees. The solicitation of donors may begin with central Development Officers, School and DLC staff, as well as faculty and senior MIT leaders. There are central supporting offices to the operation within Resource Development (RD), such as the Office of the Recording Secretary and Research and Prospect Management. Additionally, there are other central offices at MIT that also play a supporting role, such as the Office of General Council and the Office of Major Agreements.

Preserving MIT’s reputation and a uniform representation of the MIT brand are highly valuable to the international development success.
It is important to note the special context of international fund raising in this organization. International fund raising is an emerging area for many colleges and universities as the alumni and higher educational community become increasingly globalized. This imposes several practical and cultural considerations that must be carefully weighed and applied:

- Global outreach efforts are more costly than domestic fund raising.
- Travel and coordination of events and activity is more challenging.
- The focus is more acutely targeted on large donors.
- Cultural differences and expectations must be appreciated and sensitively addressed.
- International financial transactions and donations can be complex.

**Observations Concerning the Current International Fund Raising Process at MIT:**

As the team reviewed the current processes and organizations in place at MIT, five key themes were encountered repeatedly with the stakeholders within MIT, and mirrored in many of the peer universities that were studied. We introduce these points here, and will return to many of them in the recommendations section that follows.

**Communication and coordination of information and opportunities is paramount:**

There are numerous organizations involved in the international development operation at MIT. Central, School and DLC development officers, senior MIT, School and DLC leadership, faculty, legal counsel, and the Office of Major Agreements are examples of these organizations. These organizations can have competing timetables, individualized agendas, and priorities. When to involve the various offices and coordination of communication between the various entities allowing the operation to work as a cohesive whole is a significant challenge.

**Coordination of travel and outreach to donors is challenging:**

There are numerous Schools, DLC Initiatives and central development staff, alumni relations staff, Industrial Liaison Program staff, senior School leadership, senior MIT leadership and faculty who travel internationally for various reasons throughout the year. All of these individuals have varying priorities and schedule constraints. Decisions regarding travel itineraries are made by individual faculty and staff. Travel decisions are based on their own needs and constraints and the needs and constraints of their individual units. It should not be surprising that these trips are often not well coordinated with leverage fundraising opportunities as well across the Institute. Just knowing which MIT employees are traveling abroad at any given time is a significant challenge. Lack of such knowledge can lead to unknown overlap in visits, duplication of effort, missed opportunities, as well as having individuals and programs reaching out to the similar constituents resulting in a perception by donors of a lack of central coordination and organization.
Some faculty don’t clearly understand the process and who they should consult:

There are many faculty and staff across campus that do not have a clear understanding of the international development operation. These individuals do not know what the international development operation does, who to contact and how to coordinate discussions regarding potential donations with the appropriate offices and the potential importance of central coordination of solicitations. They may also not understand what legal and procedural constraints may play into the ability of MIT to meet donor requests. This situation is less prominent with DLC and initiative leadership. However, the solicitation of donors may frequently begin with a discussion by a faculty member regarding his or her work or initiative. It is important to set appropriate expectations regarding commitments to donors and negotiating potential donations from the outset. Backtracking on initial commitments of faculty and staff as a result of inadvertent commitments that are not possible can be detrimental to the solicitation process and do not instill confidence in donors’ perception of the MIT operation.

Early and targeted cultivation of international students and alumni is important:

The cultivation of potential donors and alumni is a long process often taking many years. Establishing expectations for giving to MIT as early as possible with both alumni and parents is critical to building a pipeline of donors for the future. A tradition of philanthropy to institutions of higher education is not universally held by many alumni and friends from various cultures outside the United States. In addition, the international portion of MIT’s student enrollment is growing. As of 2010, 10% of the undergraduate student body and 38% of the graduate student population were international students.

Understanding the cultural nuances of a country and the laws and regulations regarding gifts to U.S. higher education institutions is critical

Expectations regarding philanthropy and donations to US higher education vary throughout the globe. Understanding these nuances, as well as cultural norms and expectation on the solicitation process are crucial to effective donor relations. Additionally, the MIT international development operation must understand the laws, regulations and policies in various countries and how to navigate the requirements in order to facilitate donations to MIT.

Key findings from peer institutions:

The MIT Growing International Development project team took the strategic approach in identifying key contacts at our peer institutions by leveraging the influence of Rob Scott at MIT to introduce our project to our peer “Ivy Plus” institutions. Our data gathering process consisted of telephone conversations with our peer contacts on a specific set of survey topics. Our recorded results were sent back to our peer institutions for verification of data. Survey questions, list of interviewees and the complete data set are in the appendices. The following is a summary of our key findings from our peers.

Staffing:
On average the staffing sizes at these institutions dedicated to international resource and development ranges from 2-8 staff members with a median of 4. We learned that they are dedicated professionals with fundraising focus on strategic markets concentrating on alumni and wealth with a limited budget allowance. Most use the services of central resource and development for resource and other administrative functions.

**International Offices:**

We discovered that no institutions have opened offices for international development around the globe. The international development resource staff has geographical responsibilities. Institutions leverage study abroad and academic programs, projects, and global centers to attract potential international donors. Nonetheless, they encounter obstacles that affect their efforts.

**Challenges:**

Our survey tried to identify the challenges or obstacles faced by the international resource development staff. There were several themes expressed by a majority of the institutions when comparing the differences between domestic and international development.

**Culture of philanthropy:**

Most felt that the lack of a culture of philanthropy in foreign countries was one of the bigger challenges they faced in IRD. Many undergraduates receive their education at state run schools so philanthropy is not a consideration. Getting international graduates and/or their parents to contribute to our institutions often begins with changing their philanthropic mindset. In addition, there are cultural nuances that need to be fully understood before approaching a potential donor for a gift. Misunderstandings can place a barrier to success.

**Getting the money out of different countries:**

Getting the money out of different countries presents unique challenges. Local rules and regulations may prohibit a potential donor from giving money to a foreign institution. There can be a negative stigma attached to the donor when donating money to a foreign institution. There are also potential barriers with legal and tax implications of giving. Some schools also expressed a concern about the origin of the donor’s wealth and could “ill-gained” contributions shed a negative light on the recipient institution.

**Centralized services in a decentralized environment:**

Another challenge is the resource development programs at universities are a centralized function trying to operate in a decentralized environment. The institutions are comprised of many schools, departments, labs, and centers that undertake their own development initiatives thus coordination of information, especially leadership and faculty travel, presents a significant challenge.

**Prioritization:**
Finally, prioritizing international development efforts with limited resources for travel and staffing has been a barrier to additional success. Some described success as a direct result of face-to-face meetings. Covering the globe with as few as four people can be a potential barrier for future success.

As a result of these obstacles, institutions offered their best practices. A paradigm for best practices may include the following considerations.

**Cultural:**

Development officers are successful when they have an understanding of cultural sensitivities including regulatory issues that restrict money from leaving the country as well as the lack of a culture of philanthropy. To assist with this understanding, an institution might utilize international students as interns in its office to gain further insight to cultural sensitivities. Institutions are careful in protecting their brands and ensuring that there is not a perception that donations can “buy” a degree from their universities.

**Donor:**

Resources officers need to understand from an intellectual perspective what the donor’s interest is. Focusing on “high net worth” and with assets outside of restrictive countries is paramount. It is important to understand the source of the donor’s wealth. Establishing a reasonable timeline to secure the gift is essential. There was mention of a three year time period to secure an international gift.

**Cultivation:**

Early cultivation of international students and families will instill a sense of philanthropy for those who might not understand the value of it. This philanthropic seed can be planted in “send-off” events for undergraduate students and families. An institution may cultivate it further by hosting a “welcome event” with international students with the President of the university.

**Strategic:**

Aligning the institution’s international research and academic priorities with potential donors while protecting the institutional brand. Identifying areas of critical masses is beneficial especially if an institution is able to take advantage of the senior leadership and faculty potential presence. One suggestion is the creation of a central administrative mechanism to coordinate all institutional travel for faculty and senior administrators. The development of internal partnerships with departments, laboratories and centers will enhance communication in a decentralized model.

**International and emerging markets:**

All of our peer institutions have concentrated on Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC countries) in the past. We learned that new emerging markets range from cities to countries. These areas include Germany, Hong Kong, Middle East, Seoul, Switzerland, Taipei, Tokyo, and Central and
South America. Most have powerful bases in the United Kingdom. Some consider this as an extension of their domestic development.

**International funds raised:**

Conversations regarding international dollars raised ranged from $300,000 to approximately $50,000,000. The difficulty in normalizing the data provided arises from multiple years counting, counting the money in the year of the commitment (although commitment is over a period of time), and inclusion of international dollars as part of a capital campaign. As one interviewee stated, “(It’s) hard to say—it varies year to year; relative handful of large donors that influence numbers.”

**Recommendations:**

After review of both our internal processes and organization, and that of several of our peer universities, the team makes the following observations and recommendations concerning International Development at the Institute.

**Improve Coordination**

*The international resource development operation should utilize a spoke and hub model for the coordination of international fundraising.*

This model has been the hallmark of many successful operations at MIT and reflects our culture of decentralized participation and decision making coordinated through central support and coordinating committees. MIT’s Environmental Health and Safety operation’s oversight of research laboratories is a prime example of the success of this model. Primary international fundraising work should be handled by the departments, laboratories, centers, and schools. In this model, local development officers directly connect faculty, students and initiatives to potential donors interested in supporting their needs. We clearly heard in various interviews that donors are most interested in meeting those whose work they will support. These DLC development professionals will have a strong knowledge and understanding of the unique needs and programs of their particular unit. They will also concentrate on developing relationships with potential donors whose interest lie specifically with the activities of their unit.

*Cultivate country and regional experts who understand the culture, language and donor logistics of an area.*

Typically generalists from international and cultural perspective, the DLC development staff and faculty are called upon to solicit to all potential donors interested in the work of their unit. They need assistance from area experts who understand the culture, language and donor logistics of various regions. Cultivating country and regional experts who understand the culture, language and donor logistics of an area will provide invaluable resources to the operation and to the success of the solicitation process. Providing this expertise as a central resource and making it
widely available to the Schools, DLC and faculty is one way that the centralized development staff can fill a critical need.

This expert central staff should also have the capacity to advise school, DLCs and faculty regarding complicated donor solicitations, manage large and complex solicitations, and also cultivate donor relationships for campus wide initiatives and needs. Centralized services such as research and rating of potential donors, legal review and advice and gift recording should remain as a centrally supported resource.

**Utilize working committees to bridge the gap between the departments and centralized experts.**

Coordination between centrally staffed experts and the departmental and school staff is critical. This relationship should be managed on various levels including goals and objectives, policy and process and practical logistics and advice. The organization should utilize various committees to bridges the gap between the departments and centralized experts. The committees should vary in frequency and agenda. Much of this infrastructure is already in place.

Additionally, we recommend that the international development operation establish regular (weekly) coordinating and working committee meetings focused specifically on international fundraising that includes central development staff, School officers, Alumni Relations, key MIT staff and faculty to create strong information sharing, strategic planning and support links between the committee members.

**Strategically use and expand existing international connections such as those of the Industrial Liaison Program to cultivate and solicit international donors is also recommended.**

The Industrial Liaison Program has a highly successful and well maintained global network and infrastructure of contacts. The international development operation should partner with this team to strategically utilize their network of contacts and area expertise.

**The focus of international travel and events should be strategic**

**The international development operation should focus on large donors.**

International development is expensive and expansive. MIT cannot in all practicality research out to all donor levels and all areas of the world. While some effort is purely opportunistic as potential donors show interest in MIT, the international development staff should concentrate their effort on those donors with the largest capacity to give. This means investing in cultivating these donors through relationship building trips, events and solicitations. Additionally, research and qualification of new potential donors throughout the world will also be important and adequate resources should be made to ensure that a specific effort is done, including additional support to address the increased complexity of researching and qualifying donors outside the US.

**Frequency of targeted regional travel should be both realistic and centrally organized.**
Utilizing recommended working committees, the international development operation should set international travel agendas for various regions and strategically plan with consultation of Alumni Relations, ILP, Dean’s Offices, and key faculty fundraisers such as initiative heads.

Given the academic calendar, US and international holidays, the number of major solicitation trips per year is very limited. International development should consider scheduling approximately 4 major trips per year to targeted regions/countries. These trips should involve visiting as many potential donors and coordinating various school, DLC, and senior leadership. They should also include planned activities centered on alumni events and ILP events. These trips should coordinate not only with the central staff but also the school and departmental staff.

**Appoint an individual with sole responsibility to track international development travel**

MIT should improve the tracking of international travel and its relationship to international development by appointing an individual with sole responsibility for this task. This individual should know the travel schedules of all development officers, key leaders and key faculty. While some of this work can be accomplished through access to travel data, advance knowledge of travel plans and network building to encourage that MIT’s administrative staff coordinate and report plans will require personal intervention.

**Set criteria for aligning international development resources and activity**

Allocation of international development resources criteria should consider areas of concentrated qualified donor wealth, areas containing potential significant new donors; established areas of MIT interests; concentration of alumni; and MIT campaign goals. This effort should include those areas currently part of our international efforts such as Brazil, Russia, India, China, and Western Europe. Additionally, the MIT international development operation should utilize the IAC to determine areas of strategic importance for the development operation; such areas may include Singapore and Abu Dhabi.

**Improve faculty and community understanding and engagement in the international development process**

**The international development operation should define and clearly communicate a flowchart outlining the process and roles of the international development operation to the MIT community.**

This information should be easily accessible via Development’s website and include key individuals or offices and the resources and services that they provide. It should also provide easily understandable scenarios of when and who should be contacted when soliciting an international donation. An example would be when should the Office of General Counsel or the Office of Major Agreement become involved in the process. This information should be conveyed to the community via established channels such as faculty meetings and School Administrative Officer meetings, as well as email.

**Establish a faculty development liaison reporting at the Provost level.**
MIT’s faculty are pulled in many directions and they have many demands for their time. Their primary mission is teaching and research but they also serve on many administrative and advisory committees, consult, and perform service to the community. Yet their presence and participation is often critical in soliciting international donations. Coordinating faculty engagement in the international development operation would greatly benefit by having an individual who directly understands these pressures and also has the mission to work with the International Development Office on how and when to strategically engage the appropriate faculty as needed in the solicitation and donor relation process.

**Clearly articulate international development goals for the next capital campaign.**

MIT is preparing to launch its next capital campaign. We recommend that the international development team clearly articulate to the MIT community their specific goals as they related to the campaign and how they will need assistance from the MIT community to reach these goals.

**Strengthen and more clearly define the roles of the ICC and IAC**

The International Advisory Committee and the International Coordinating Committee are playing increasingly important roles in establishing and managing MIT’s international presence and strategy. Clearly communicate these committees’ missions to the community and what roles these two committees will play related to international development. We envision that the IAC will be involved with goal and priority setting while the ICC will assist with managing the international development process.

**Expand early cultivation of international alumni and their parents**

*Expand international student and alumni programming*

Given that many cultures have a different philanthropic approach towards institutions of higher education; that MIT is increasingly working in an international arena with a growing international alumni base; and that developing relationships with potential donors can be a long process pursued over many year; we recommend expanding the offering of specialized international students and alumni programs geared towards engaging them in the MIT community and setting expectations of future philanthropy to MIT.

*Establish expectations of alumni philanthropy early*

MIT should set expectation with their students from the time that they arrive on campus that giving back to the community that they have joined is an expectation of all alumni. As part of the MIT alumni community it is important that they help us continue to educate the future inventors, leaders and innovators of the world. In the same light, MIT should also expand programs geared toward the cultivation of international parents and their participation in MIT events.

*Utilize student expertise*
The International Development operation should consider strategically utilizing current students, clubs and groups to reach international parents and alumni. Our students may provide some of the best expertise on how to effectively solicit individuals within their country and plan events that will resonate with individuals from their own culture. UROP or other related programs geared towards undergraduate participation in the international development may be beneficial both to the student and development operation.

Address cultural issues

*Establish cultural experts*

The International Development Office should establish a guide of MIT cultural and regional experts who may be able to assist or consult with campus solicitation of international donors. These experts may be faculty, students or staff with experience or background in a given country or region.

*Explore setting up trusts/foundations with peer institutions to facilitate the flow of money from certain countries*

Peer institutions consistently indicated that they also grappled with legal and procedural challenges of facilitating donations from some countries. MIT should explore establishing consortium developed trusts/foundations to assist with this issue in collaboration with interested peer institutions. By collaborating with peers, MIT and its counterparts could establish standardized mechanisms for wealthy donors who have interests across numerous institutions. Thus making it easier for the donor procedurally to donate in the U.S. Additionally by collaborating with peers the costs of establishing these mechanisms can be shared by the participating institutions.

**International Resource Development Management System (IRD-MS):**

As centralized service entities, both the Resource Development and International Resource Development programs have well established policies and principles that guide their organizations’ success. However, these centralized systems are challenged to operate in the decentralized environment of the Institute’s departments, laboratories, and centers (DLCs). As the resource development efforts continue to increase and our DLCs add additional development officers, integrating central and local policies, procedures, and efforts will be critical. There must be a strong relationship between the IRD Officers and the School Development Officers (SDO). There needs to exist a strong communication system between the central services and the schools to keep abreast of programmatic changes, work production, prospect management, and prospect research.

The project looked at the MIT Environment, Health, and Safety Management System (EHS-MS) for some insight in how the centralized functions of the EHS Office are implemented in the decentralized DLCs. There were several facets of the EHS-MS organization that may be useful to the IRD-MS.
• EHS partners with each school through a DLC EHS Coordinator and a central EHS Lead Contact. The EHS Lead Contact is supported by subject matter experts from the central EHS office. This relationship has allowed EHS to learn more about the EHS needs of our DLCs and has allowed for better services and communications.

• A working group of coordinators, lead contacts, lab representatives, and administration meets monthly to develop new programs to meet new challenges discuss areas for improvement, and methods for communicating/implementing change.

• Routine (quarterly) DLC EHS Coordinator-Lead Contact meetings where new information is exchanged, topical presentations, and a general sharing of what’s going on in the different DLCs.

• An added benefit from the above 1-3 have allowed for the development of some very strong relationships and friendships.

• The Institute Council on EHS is the general oversight committee for policy and procedural developments that affect the global institute on all EHS matters.

The IRD program appears to have many similar components to the EHS Office. The figure below depicts the IRD program organization in a manner similar to the EHS-MS. The study team believes it will be valuable for the IRD and EHS office to discuss their organizational relationships with the DLCs as both face similar challenges operating a hybrid centralized/de-centralized enterprise.

**IRD Management System**

![IRD Management System Diagram](image)

*Figure 2. The IRD Management System Organization.*
Appendix A: Peer School Questionnaire

The following questionnaire was developed by the study team in coordinate with MIT Resource Development to initially solicit input from the eight peer schools. Follow up telephone interviews were also conducted with each school.

1. How do you define and measure your success with international development? Establishing relationships vs. dollars in the door? Over what time periods do you?

2. How large is your development operation? Where does the international development operation fit into the overall structure?

   a. What is the overall staff size for your development operation? How many
   b. How are they organized? Do you have organizational charts available that you would be willing to share with us?
   c. Do you have international development offices situated around the world and where are they located? How are these offices staffed?
   d. How do your International Development Officers interface with faculty? Is there a specific liaison to the faculty? Do they coordinate faculty travel?
   e. Total net return from international development?
   f. How have you grown international development?
   g. What were your strategies?
   h. What have been the results?

3. When do you start cultivating international student prospects? Before or after graduation? How are you developing a culture of giving with your international alumni? Are there specific programs that have netted great results?

4. What is the balance of funds between gifts and international sponsored research projects?

5. What are your best practices?

6. What are your challenges and obstacles?

7. How are you engaging in international projects beyond setting-up campuses? How are you involving donors beyond alumni? Do you collaborate with other institutions in international development? Can you give specifics?

8. What are your strategies in identifying what regions, countries or areas to pursue?

9. What countries have been targeted as emerging markets for philanthropy?

10. Which schools have the most international donors on your campus, i.e., Engineering, Science, Business? Which schools have disproportionate numbers of international alumni?

11. How do you justify or make resource decisions regarding budgets and staffing?
Appendix B: Peer School Points of Contact

The study team acknowledges the time and commitment of the following administrators and leaders from the surveyed peer schools whose input supported this study.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
  Mary Beth Pearlberg, Senior Associate Dean for External Affairs, Kennedy School

Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut
  Donna Consolini, Director, International Development

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey
  Kerstin Larsen, Assistant Vice President of Development

Stanford University, Stanford, California
  Tom Smith Tseng, Director, International Division

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
  Trevor Law, Senior Director, Asia Development

Columbia University, New York City
  Jeffrey Richard, Vice President for University Development
  Sonia Winner, Deputy Vice President
  Robert Franklin, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
  James Mazza, Assistant Dean Alumni Affairs and Development Interim
  Patricia Watson, Senior Associate Vice President of Alumni Affairs and Development¹

Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island
  Josh Taub, International Advancement Officer

¹ Patricia Watson has since left Cornell University and joined Brown University as the Senior Vice President for University Advancement.
Appendix C: Peer School Matrix
Afterword:

This study was conducted by a team of dedicated individuals as part of the 2012 MIT Leader to Leader (L2L) Program. The L2L Program is a unique leadership development program for leaders from the MIT community. The L2L Fellows partner with senior leaders to develop leadership skills, shared experiences, and partnerships both to further their journal as an emerging leader and to foster the leadership skills needed to guide the Institute in the coming decades.

This study team is made of five members with very diverse backgrounds and experience. Karen Shirer is the Assistant Director of Administration in MIT Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory (CSAIL). Debb Hodges-Pabon is a Personnel and Operations Administrator in Microsystems Technology Laboratories. Mitch Galanek is an Associate Director in Environmental Health and Safety leading the Institute’s radiation protection programs. Eric Pearce is an Associate Group Leader of the Space Control Systems Group at the MIT Lincoln Laboratory. Mike Kearns is a Director of Project Management in the Department of Facilities. While the team had little prior experience in resource development, the team brought a broad set of perspectives from many different corners of the Institute.

Consequently, we expect that our findings are expected to be as objective as possible as we are neutral to any stakeholder or group in this arena. This allows a fresh view of the organizational, political or cultural considerations surrounding the current international development efforts at MIT. Most importantly, the study offers a unique, thoughtful, and objective view from a collection of individuals deeply rooted in the values of MIT and knowledgeable of the culture and principles that guide it.