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Executive summary

The landscape of corporate giving across the country is shifting, with industry moving away from traditional corporate philanthropy to a focus on return on investment in their relationships with universities.

Institutions that wish to sustain strong industry partnerships are finding that they must listen more closely to the needs of their corporate partners. This means providing coordinated interactions to help companies navigate highly complex, decentralized institutions with many groups that have competing interests.

Thus, the Research Infrastructure Task Force recommendation for a one-stop shop or single-entry portal for all K-State-industry interactions is timely. As a step towards implementing the Research Task Force’s one-stop recommendation, this paper provides information on how other research universities have successfully implemented this more holistic, industry-focused approach. A set of best practices were gleaned from this information and a suggested straw man model developed to serve as a starting point for the discussions and development needed to establish an integrated, single portal for corporate relations at K-State.

The six universities examined include the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Texas-Austin, Northwestern, the University of California-Davis, and the University of Illinois-Champaign/Urbana. All rank in the top 25 American Research Universities and are recognized by the Network for Academic Corporate Relations Officers as leaders in implementing a centralized, holistic approach to industry engagement.

All have a formalized group (e.g., Business Engagement Center, Office of Corporate Relations) that serves as the single entry point for industry and provides coordination of industry interactions. This group also coordinates a “Corporate Liaison Network” that includes representatives from those entities key to developing industry engagement across a campus. Included are sponsored research, key colleges and departments, technology transfer, philanthropic giving, key faculty, student recruitment, university career services, and community/regional economic development. This network has a shared strategic engagement approach, has a process for sharing information (events, facilities, expertise), and coordinates community and corporate outreach. This network meets regularly to develop, plan, and monitor coordination of strategic campus initiatives.

To make this network function properly, there must be buy in at the highest levels of administration with typical reporting for the formalized coordinating group at the vice presidential level (often development or dual with research). The six universities examined have found that corporations are more satisfied with this centralized, holistic approach to industry engagement. This satisfaction has led to more sustainable and valuable partnerships with industry.

Current K-State philanthropic structure
K-State currently has a philanthropic, decentralized approach to corporate engagement. Its legally separate Foundation has a series of development officers in constituencies for colleges,
campuses, and the library, for example who report to the Foundation’s associate vice president for constituent development, but whose positions are funded by those constituencies. Their portfolios consist of both private donors and corporations. The fundraising priorities for the constituencies (and in turn for their development officers) are set by their leaders, reinforcing a decentralized approach to corporate engagement.

The Foundation’s office of corporate and foundation relations (manages approximately 150 companies and reports to the Foundation’s vice president for development, as does the associate vice president for constituent development. While the corporate and foundation relations office does work with the constituency development officers, it does not have direct influence on their corporate engagement goals and activities. In most cases, contact with campus faculty or administrators needs to be coordinated through the constituency development staff.

Other points of entry for corporations include the office of the vice president for research, the National Institute for Strategic Technology Acquisition and Commercialization (technology transfer), the KSU Research Foundation, and individual faculty. The relationships that start by entry through these pathways tend to be focused on research, intellectual property, and commercialization. Career and Employment Services and the Division of Continuing Education also interact with industry, the first for student placement and recruitment and the latter to help market and develop their continuing education client base.

The starting point straw man model

Key points of the suggested starting point straw man model to help bring K-State to a centralized, industry-focused model are as follows:

- A central group (for convenience, hereafter referred to as the Corporate Engagement Center) that will coordinate K-State corporate engagement across the Foundation and all three K-State campuses.

- The Corporate Engagement Center would report to the Foundation president and a key campus administrator at the vice presidential level to assure coordination and cooperation across the Foundation and all three campuses.

- The Corporate Engagement Center’s role will be to work with the Corporate Liaison Network to coordinate and keep active industry engagement across the university by establishing a relationship manager/team to help steward a corporation’s engagement, developing custom engagement packages to help support a corporation’s goals, and communicating with stakeholders across campus to maximize a corporation’s connection to K-State.

- The Corporate Liaison Network will work together to assure holistic corporate engagement at K-State. At least monthly planning and information exchange meetings, chaired by the K-State Corporate Engagement Center, are suggested for this network. Members would include representatives from sponsored research, the KSU Foundation, colleges and departments, the National Institute for Strategic Technology Acquisition and Commercialization, Career and Employment Services, K-State Research and Extension, the Division of Continuing Education, Manhattan’s Knowledge Based Economic Development Partnership, the Salina and Olathe campuses, the KSU Research Foundation, the Advanced Manufacturing Institute, and key research faculty.

- A Corporate Liaison Network Guidance Council will develop the shared strategic engagement approach for K-State. This group would consist of the senior members of
the Corporate Engagement Center and one to two key members of each Corporate Liaison Network constituency. Due to the broad and strategic focus of this group, the suggested chairperson is the provost/senior vice president.

- **Tactical teams** are the groups that would lead the relationship of strategic corporate partners. These groups would be made of appropriate individuals from or identified by the Corporate Liaison Network and coordinated by the K-State Corporate Engagement Center. Certain strategic corporate partners will be managed directly out of the Corporate Engagement Center, but with the help of a tactical team.

- A **website** is needed reflecting K-State’s holistic approach to corporate engagement with the Corporate Engagement Center established as the gateway or front door to K-State resources.

- **Key needed databases** for this structure to function include (1) a shared, all-inclusive corporate engagement events calendar coordinated through the K-State Corporate Engagement Center and (2) online, comprehensive expertise and facilities databases.
Corporate Engagement:

Recommendations for a Holistic, Single Portal Approach for
Kansas State University Corporate Relations

I. Introduction

The vision for Kansas State University’s 2025 initiative is that the university will be recognized
as a top 50 public research university in the next 15 years. To achieve this vision President Kirk
Schulz and campus leaders began this initiative with a realistic assessment of where K-State is
today. To this end the Research Infrastructure Task Force assessed the current status of the
university’s research infrastructure and made recommendations for improvement. One such
recommendation was to create a one-stop shop or single-entry portal for all K-State-industry
interactions. At the late-July retreat of the President’s Cabinet, this was one of the
recommendations endorsed as part of the plan for the university to achieve the 2025 Vision.

The recommendation for a one-stop shop or single entry portal for K-State-industry interactions
is timely. The landscape of corporate giving across the country is shifting, with industry moving
away from traditional corporate philanthropy to a focus on return on investment in their
relationship with universities. Institutions that wish to sustain strong industry partnerships are
finding they must listen more closely to the needs of their corporate partners. Universities that
coordinate internal efforts/interactions with corporations (i.e., provide a single entry portal or
“concierge” interface) demonstrate to industry partners that they are working with an
organization that values their support and understands how to maximize the effectiveness of such
partnerships.

A recent member survey by the Network for Academic Corporate Relations Officers (NACRO)
has found a growing trend toward moving away from philanthropic-centric corporate relations to
a more holistic and industry-centric approach that is centrally overseen. Those member
universities that have made this transition have found that their corporate partners are more
satisfied with their university interactions and that there is a greater potential for a sustained
strategic engagement with those partners.

As a step towards implementing the Research Task Force’s one-stop recommendation, this
paper’s purpose is to provide information on how other research universities have successfully
implemented this more holistic and industry-focused approach to working with industry partners.
We will also examine the benefits this approach and develop a set of best practices gleaned from
their experiences and lessons learned. Finally, we will use this set of best practices to begin to
assess how such an integrated, single portal approach might be structured at K-State.
II. Examples of successful industry-focused corporate relations programs

To identify universities that have developed successful industry-focused corporate relations programs, we worked with NACRO. This professional organization was founded in 2007 to provide a network of colleagues at research institutions that engage in corporate relationships, filling a gap in information and education related to university corporate relations. The organization conducts an annual survey of its membership, part of which addresses the approaches that their member universities use for corporate relations.

While 80 percent of the respondents indicated that their institutions embrace a holistic model for corporate relations, only about 30 percent (~15) have a leadership board/group that oversees the approach (many are informal). Six universities were suggested as leaders in this approach to corporate relations and have a formalized group that oversees industry engagement, serving as a single entry point for industry. The six universities include the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Texas-Austin, Northwestern University, the University of California Davis, and the University of Illinois. These institutions are seen as aspirant universities by the NACRO membership and are often sought out for advice on how to structure an industry-focused approach to corporate relations.

All six of these universities rank in the top 25 of American research universities. Five are public universities. (Northwestern, the only private institution examined, will provide some insights relevant to K-State’s situation since its program is two years old. It used advice from the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Texas-Austin to help structure its program.) Three institutions are land-grant universities (Wisconsin, California Davis, and Illinois), and the regional distribution of the six universities is primarily Midwestern to western.

These six universities have found that a centralized, holistic approach to industry engagement results in the corporations they work with being more satisfied with their university relationships. Corporations have found these universities more open to industry needs and easier to work with to find mutually beneficial activities, initiatives, and research projects. This satisfaction has led to more sustainable and valuable partnerships with industry. The single entry point to these universities helps corporations navigate what seems to them highly complex, decentralized institutions with many groups that have competing interests.

Corporate relations profiles for these six universities are summarized in Table 1 and can be found in more detail in Appendix I. These profiles were developed based on (1) phone interviews with corporate relations directors, (2) presentations made at NACRO’s 2010 annual conference, (3) reports, slides, and other background material provided by the universities interviewed, and (4) various ranking reports providing information on university metrics.
### Table 1: Summary of Information from Top Research Universities Using a Holistic Approach to Corporate Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin</th>
<th>University of Texas-Austin</th>
<th>Northwestern</th>
<th>University of California-Davis</th>
<th>University of Illinois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public, Land Grant</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public, Land Grant</td>
<td>Public, Land Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students (2009)</td>
<td>41,674</td>
<td>42,099</td>
<td>50,995</td>
<td>16,377</td>
<td>32,153</td>
<td>41,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, source of Institution</td>
<td>$150 mil (contract research, tech transfer, prof dev &amp; philanthropy) $75 mil of extramural research is from Industry</td>
<td>Does not know what amount of $5 received through foundation are from Industry; $45 mil in research $5 from Industry</td>
<td>$61 million in 2007/2008; $53 mil given from Industry (two key faculty)</td>
<td>$40 mil philanthropic</td>
<td>Overall $75 million corp, foundation, &amp; other gifts, ($26 mil in corporate gifts). $650 mil research with $45 mil Corp.</td>
<td>$55 mil given to the U of Ill Foundation by industry; ~$36 mil for Sponsored research--funding for sponsored research up by 45% for current two years over the previous two year average in spite of economic turn down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Industry Funding: source NSF Table 31 (2008)</td>
<td>$41 mil</td>
<td>$21 mil; have several industry consortia centered around a specific area</td>
<td>$43 mil</td>
<td>$15 mil</td>
<td>$34 mil</td>
<td>$21 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Central Engagement Group</td>
<td>Business Engagement Center (BEC)</td>
<td>Office of Corporate Relations (OCR)</td>
<td>Office of Corporate Relations (OCR)</td>
<td>Corporate Relations Office (CRO)</td>
<td>Office of Corporate Relations (OCR)</td>
<td>Office of Corporate Relations (OCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Corporate Engagement</td>
<td>The BEC provies coordination of industry interactions. There are satellite offices at college of eng, medical School, other campuses; There are corporate relations in key colleges with a dotted line reporting to BEC. See organization chart.</td>
<td>The OCR serves as the front door, but each unit/college has a &quot;go to&quot; person to manage relationships. the OCR acts as an extended sales force for colleges and other groups on campus; Works with entrepreneurs and helps set up new businesses, with a large number of these businesses coming from students; external advisory group--Deans, Head of Tech transfer; VP Research</td>
<td>The OCR serves as the &quot;default&quot; gateway for business and industry. The OCR collaborates with individuals, colleges; tech trans; and VPF for Research. The Office of Industry Engagement (OIE) was recently established by VP of Research to handle sponsored research from industry (likely precipitated because of academic Dean's dissatisfaction with IP/tech transfer office). The OCR has begun informal discussion with OIE to supply outreach and relationship management because OIE has been reactive rather than proactive in seeking industry support.</td>
<td>Corporate Relations Office (CRO) serves as official gateway for Industry. They work with the corporate relations officers in the Schools of Engineering, Business, Medicine. Have a coordinated strategy for contacting corporations and making &quot;asks&quot;. The CRO also works closely with the Director of Economic Development, VP Research, Career Services.</td>
<td>The university is in the process of evolving this structure due to a new Chancellor. Two new Vice Chancellors for: 1) University Relations, Alumni affairs, corporate relations, government and community relations, marketing and communications; and 2) Development and Advancement Services will be hired soon. Faculty work groups with 12-14 members will drive the industry relations strategies directly related to their discipline and research interest. The Director of Corporate Relations will provide a Senior Staff (half time) Faculty Coordinator who will coordinate these groups. There will be a shared service center for corporate relations to 1) manage strategic corporate relations; 2) assessment and consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Structure</td>
<td>BEC Director dually reports to VP of Development and VP of Research</td>
<td>Used to report to Chancellor; now reports to Vice Chancellor for External Relations</td>
<td>The Director reports to the Vice President for Development</td>
<td>The Director for Corporate Relations reports to the Vice President of Development in the University's Central Development office.</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for University Relations, Alumni Affairs, and Corporate, Government and Community Relations; Vice Chancellor for Development and Advancement Services</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Executive Director; 6 relationship managers (equivalent to major gift officers); 2 admin staff; 1 office manager who directs comm &amp; marketing; 1 data information manager</td>
<td>Director; Assistant Director (Entrepreneurship-private equity); Assistant Director (Marketing &amp; communication); Office manager; 3 University Industry Liaisons;</td>
<td>Director--responsible for energy companies; Assistant Director-- responsible for tech companies; 1 Spirit Scholarship Administrator; Events Coordinator; Administrative Assistant shared with their Foundation</td>
<td>Director, Associate Dir (PhD life sciences); Assist Dir--handles other constituencies including career development; Knowledge Management &amp; Communication person--handles data/manages web site/news stories/pr for corporate relations; Program Assistant to run the Office</td>
<td>Director and a Faculy-Coordinator .50 FTE</td>
<td>Director; 3 Associate Directors; 1 Program Coordinator; Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>University of Texas-Austin</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How communication and cooperation across the university are maintained</td>
<td>Routine meetings with internal constituents.</td>
<td>Does not have a central database, but sends emails every other week to academy about OCR activities and industry visits. Maintains a campus-wide Business Events Calendar that can be subscribed to.</td>
<td>For the past year Development Office hosts monthly luncheon for constituent groups (colleges, tech trans etc.) chaired by Development VP—Set strategy and discuss 10-15 strategic corporate relationships.</td>
<td>Everyone shares a Central Development Database; Group meets 4 times per year—half the meeting is external focus—other half is to foster each other’s work with corporations. Prior to Company visits, this group is kept in the loop and info is kept by the main coordinator keeping everyone in the loop.</td>
<td>Does not have a centralized office; OCR acts as shared service center; OCR acts as the main coordinator keeping everyone in the loop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Co-located with Office of Tech Transfer</td>
<td>Quincy Bioscience Center on Campus</td>
<td>Development Office</td>
<td>Development Office on campus</td>
<td>Yet to be determined</td>
<td>Union Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in existence</td>
<td>Three years, but was piloted in College of Engineering for 4 years prior</td>
<td>Seven years</td>
<td>Since 2006</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>Track visit, revenue from corp portfolio; Outputs not outcomes—number of unique companies that you have assisted; number of referrals and requests for assistance.</td>
<td>Don’t have any, but Corporate partners are happy</td>
<td>Missing; would be stronger if had this</td>
<td>First tier—address what happen with the key 10 strategic companies--number of moves, closed proposals. Second tier—number of coordinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, i.e., situation prior to holistic approach</td>
<td>Holistic, CBE approach started in College of Engineering; Structure evolved over the last 11 years. 4 years ago New VP of research saw potential of what was happening in Eng. Set up Advancing Innovation Group—recommended taking the engineering model university wide.</td>
<td>Originally there was no front door—everyone was doing their own thing. Chancellor was behind having an overlay group; they met with Chamber and economic development groups to launch Office of Corporate Relations; Started targeted approach.</td>
<td>Orignally the corporate relations was very split and fragmented. In summer of 2005, a task force reviewed best practices nationally and gave recommendation that the university needed to change its culture from a decentralized, transactional model to a centralized, relationship model. Corporate Relations Council brought everyone to table, determined communication expectations, assessed strategic corporate relationships, created super level of prospect management, i.e., the University Liaison, to manage the relationship. This council still meets.</td>
<td>Before everything was fractionated and relationships were all transactional; groups were a silos; Director was hired to help bring all of this together. She partnered with the Economic Development Office to address the changes needed to foster industry engagement</td>
<td>Groups were dispersed in units with a Central Business Office in the Research/Tech Transfer Office; New Chancellor from Un of Ill initiated assessment using two internal task forces and an outside consultant. Net assessment was that there was little integration of efforts for corporate engagement across the campus. This plus budget cuts allowed Chancellor to reorganize structure. Moving toward a structure like that of University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect on industry involvement</td>
<td>Both dollars and engagement increased exponentially starting in the College of Engineering; longer, more strategic relationships</td>
<td>Increased industry satisfaction and longer, more strategic relationships</td>
<td>Though down because of economy, industry satisfaction has remained high even during economic down turn</td>
<td>Increased industry satisfaction</td>
<td>Increased industry satisfaction</td>
<td>The built the research park corporate partners from strategic corporate relationships. Less than five years old there are six major corporations in the park and additional tenants in the works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to making engagement Center work</td>
<td>Upper administration support; Having the Chancellor as a champion</td>
<td>Having the groundwork to build “community” so that there is an open dialogue across campus—company “ownership” is not anyone college’s/unit’s—it belongs to the university, must develop level of</td>
<td>Doing the groundwork to build “community” so that there is an open dialogue across campus—company “ownership” is not anyone college’s/unit’s—it belongs to the university, must develop level of</td>
<td>Economic Development VP Partnered with group to make this change at Northwestern; showed up at first meeting and kept attending; Tech transfer person helped similarly</td>
<td>Buy in from the top</td>
<td>Buy in from the top; Faculty leadership must be very motivated to raise external funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices List</td>
<td>Provide a single interface to industry to help with management; have an expertise and facilities databases, website;</td>
<td>Upper administration support; get buy in across campus &amp; develop culture of trust, cooperation, and strategic management of corporate relationships</td>
<td>Central Support/Champion; Have a Central Development Data base that is shared; get groups open to collaboration; get faculty involved; make it clear your office is available to provide coordination of proposals and strategies; have a corporate liaison network; central website that illustrates office’s role as gateway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Best Practices

The six top research institutions interviewed all had a formal Corporate Engagement Center office serving as an entry portal or concierge interface to assist companies wanting to interact with these universities. These offices work with companies to help make connections across their campuses, as well as to help groups across campus coordinate their interactions with these companies. They also provide a strategic focus for industry engagement and serve as a focal point for information exchange. Below are some key operating and structural principles for these engagement offices that were gleaned from interviews with them.

Operating model best principles

- Create a Corporate Liaison Network that brings together all the campus groups to:
  - Develop a process for shared information and databases,
  - Build community and corporate outreach coordination, and
  - Develop a shared strategic engagement approach.
- Hold regular meetings of this network to develop, plan, and monitor coordination of strategic campus initiatives (e.g., animal health, food safety, bioenergy, water).
- Develop marketing and outreach plans that synthesize a comprehensive message to external and internal constituencies.
- Develop a central website (including a business events calendar) and inventory of research capacity for internal and external use.
- Provide the central resource to assist faculty and leverage their industry contacts.
- Develop a consistent method that advances current and prospective industry relationships to strategic engagement partnership level.
- Develop tactical groups to lead the relationship of strategic corporate partners. These groups are made of appropriate individuals from or identified by the Corporate Liaison Network and coordinated by the corporate engagement office.

Composition of Corporate Liaison Network

- Sponsored research
- Technology transfer
- Key colleges and departments
- Regional and economic development
- Philanthropic giving
- Graduate recruiting
- Key groups from other campuses
- University procurement
- Key faculty
- International offices
- University career services

Services provided

A single interface, with the help of the Corporate Liaison Network, to assist companies with:

- Student recruiting
- Joint research projects
- Student design projects/team projects
- Technology utilization/commercialization
- Faculty consulting
- Professional development
- Utilizing lab space/facilities
- Speaking opportunities
- Advisory board participation
- Vendor relationships
- Strategic philanthropy
**Staffing structure**

The staffing plan is determined by the size of the university’s existing strategic relationship with industry, but this typically will include a director, several industry liaisons to help manage corporate relationships (an example job description is included in Appendix II), a knowledge management/communications position, and an office manager. In addition, there may be dotted line reporting of corporate liaisons in key colleges and campuses. An example Corporate Engagement Center organizational chart for the University of Michigan’s Center is included below.

**Business Engagement Center Organizational Chart**

---

**Prospect portfolios**

These are in three important separate categories shown below. Internal campus and community relationships are valued because they are the foundation to attracting and sustaining corporate relationships. All three customer categories (portfolios) are interdependent and required for successful internal coordination and cooperation needed to provide the services industry seeks.

These portfolios are:
- **Companies**: Current and potential strategic business partners
- **Campus partners**: Colleges/constituencies, research office, commercialization/tech transfer group, government relations, career services, key faculty, etc.
- **Community partners**: Local, regional, state, and national economic development entities, state and federal agencies

**Engagement approach**

The engagement approach is relationship-focused, rather than transaction-focused (see performance appraisal). Identifying and cultivating relationships that are based on shared interests and values create the environment for long-term collaboration and investment.
Performance appraisal
The performance metrics tend to be organic to each institution. Historically, most corporate engagement staff evaluation models have their roots in a university’s philanthropic organization/function. Thus, the characteristic of assessing philanthropic development is focused on maximizing the benefit received from each transaction with a donor/household. Until recently, similar metrics were used to assess the performance of development professionals whose responsibilities included development from corporations.

Universities are working hard to transition metrics that measure broader and multidimensional interactions required to sustain strategic corporate relationships. The universities we interviewed are at various stages in implementation of this evolving approach.

Performance metrics are generally some combination of the categories listed below:

**Corporate investment**
Funds brought in from companies for research, grants, licensing, continued executive education, and philanthropy.

**Number of contacts**
These can include:

*Strategic corporate management contacts*
These contacts are measured by number of campus visits and visits to companies that have established relationships with the university.

*Prospective corporate contacts*
These contacts are measured by number of site visits with new prospective corporations that align with university assets and goals, yet have not been previously engaged.

*General management contacts*
These contacts are measured by number of unique companies assisted with referrals to university resources or constituencies, community referrals, faculty meetings, and faculty/industry meetings.

**Other measures**
These can include:
- Number of new graduate hires
- Number of internships
- New and renewed research relationships
- Employee hours in executive education, workshops, or other continued education
- New licensed technologies
**Reporting structure**
The Corporate Engagement Centers most typically reported to a vice president or vice chancellor (e.g., development, external affairs, research, public engagement) or through a dual report at this level to development and research.

**Other enhancements**
The universities interviewed mentioned the following additional aspects of a centralized approach to corporate engagement:

- Online comprehensive expertise database
- Online comprehensive facilities database
- Higher profile for industry research
- Improved communication
- Co-located with office of technology transfer
- Reduced indirect cost rate for industrial research
- Cost-sharing for industrial research
- Streamlined contracting process
- Revisions to technology transfer policies
- Enhanced focus on small companies

**IV. Where is K-State Now?**

Through its annual survey of its academic Corporate Relations Officers, NACRO has identified the following three models for corporate relations at academic institutions:

- **Centralized, industry-focused, holistic** (28 percent)
  These institutions have a centralized group that serves as a front door for industry to the entire institution. The engagement is relationship-based, focused on helping companies benefit from a strategic relationship with the university. The main success metrics are student placement, continuing education, sponsored research/licensing, economic development, and goodwill.

- **Decentralized** (46 percent)
  These institutions have various autonomously operating offices that each serve as their own door to a targeted function or activity with corporations. Engagement can be either transactional or relational depending on the office. The main success metrics are highly dependent on office objectives.

- **Philanthropic focus** (20 percent)
  These institutions are focused primarily on obtaining philanthropy from companies. Corporate relationships tend to be transactional, and the main success metric is the number and amount of corporate dollars raised.

These three models are shown pictorially in Figure 1. About 9 percent of institutions are some combination of these three models. As outlined here, K-State falls into this last grouping of institutions and is currently a combination of the Philanthropic and Decentralized models. The Centralized, Industry Focused-Holistic approach is the model addressed by the Research Task Force recommendation.
K-State is among universities across the U.S. that have a foundation that is legally a separate entity (a 501(c)(3)) with its own president and concomitant administrative infrastructure. K-State campuses, colleges and other constituencies, such as the library, may contract with the K-State Foundation for development professional services through a sole source agreement that provides funding for one or more individuals to work on the colleges’/constituencies’ behalf.

These development officers report to the Foundation’s associate vice president for constituent development, who reports to the vice president for development. The development officers will have both private donors and corporations in their portfolios, with each officer typically managing about 150 prospects. Currently, the deans/constituency heads set the fundraising priorities for their colleges/units and in turn, their development officers’ priorities, reinforcing a decentralized approach to corporate engagement. Officers are evaluated by the associate vice president for constituent development. The evaluation metrics are based on the traditional Philanthropic model, focusing on relationships with managed prospects or households and include dollars raised; closed proposals; number of contacts (face-to-face visit, letters, emails, phone calls), and number of travel days.

The Foundation also has an office of corporate and foundation relations to help develop strategic relationships with companies and to help better manage industry engagement that leads to philanthropic investment. The director of the office of corporate and foundation relations, like
the associate vice president for constituent development, reports to the Foundation’s vice president for development. Previously, there were two other staff members (food sciences/animal health industry coordinator; administrative coordinator), but these positions were eliminated in 2009 due to budget shortfalls caused by the severe economic downturn. While the office of corporate and foundation relations does work with the constituency development officers, their goals and priorities are set by their deans/constituency heads in concert with the associate vice president for development. In most cases, contact with campus faculty or administrators needs to be coordinated through the constituency development staff.

The Office of Corporate and Foundation Relations, through its director, currently manages approximately 150 companies and 20 individuals. Company management is assigned to this office because the company has an interest in more than a single college or constituency or because the relationship has significant potential to become a strategic partnership.

The Office of Corporate and Foundation Relations is the primary manager for 140 of its prospects in the case where there are either multiple relationships (interest in more than a single K-State asset, e.g., Cargill, ConocoPhillips) or a multi-constituency relationship (established multiple campus interests, e.g., Cargill, ConocoPhillips). This office is the secondary manager for 30 of its prospects, where: (1) there is a propensity for multiple campus interests (e.g., Honeywell) or (2) where the office is not actively involved in soliciting a corporation, but requests to be recognized as an additional manager to foster communication/collaboration and to explore the prospects interest in a strategic and/or multi-constituency relationship (e.g., Garmin).

The office of corporate and foundation relations has a webpage (http://www.found.ksu.edu/corps_found/corps.html), but it is very hard to find from the main Foundation website. Also, it is not linked from the main K-State webpage, where many corporations would first look to find information about engagement with K-State.

If the relationships are focused on research, intellectual property, and commercialization, other points of entry for corporations include the Office of the Vice President for Research, the KSU Research Foundation, and the National Institute for Strategic Technology Acquisition and Commercialization. However, most corporate research relationships begin with individual faculty. Sometimes, as is addressed in the next paragraph, economic development is also part of the engagement. Career and Employment Services and the Division of Continuing Education also interact with industry, the first for student placement and recruitment and the latter to help market and develop their continuing education client base. Finally, the Advanced Manufacturing Institute engages national and regional companies of all sizes and markets, helping them with engineering design, product assessment and development, manufacturing, and business strategies.

Manhattan’s Knowledge Based Economic Development Partnership is another way that K-State engages with industry. The partnership grew out of some early company recruitment efforts of K-State, NISTAC, the Manhattan Area Chamber of Commerce, and the city of Manhattan. The partnership now also includes the KSU Foundation, the KSU Research Foundation, and the North Central Kansas Community Network. KBED creates an integrated, community and regional economic development program, with K-State and the city of Manhattan serving as
affiliate members and all the others as full members. These partners pool their resources and work together to support new and growing companies in Manhattan. Key attractants to companies are K-State’s research capabilities and infrastructure, combined with the availability of investment capital and economic incentives.

An effort to cooperate across K-State campus groups to coordinate interactions with companies already exists because K-State is an inherently collaborative institution. However, this effort tends to be driven by personal relationships and by requirements for agreements regarding research expectations and IP ownership. The Office of Corporate and Foundation relations does coordinate visits and other industry related activities across campus, but this is primarily with companies that are part of the office portfolio. Alternately, this office also may not know about a company’s visit to campus until after the fact and may not be brought into conversations with industry unless the office is the relationship lead. Currently, no effective mechanism is in place to capture initial industry interactions and track the evolution of these relationships.

Without a centralized, established approach to industry engagement, interactions with industry can be highly dependent on individual unit objectives and agendas rather than on overall university strategic goals and on developing a sustained partnership with a corporation. Such fragmentation can make it difficult for corporations to accurately assess the value of a long-term relationship with K-State. A company may provide a one-time donation and continue to recruit our students without taking the time to assess the benefits that a K-State collaboration might bring to its bottom line.

V. Recommendations for a holistic, single portal approach for K-State corporate relations

The following recommendations are intended as a straw man model for a K-State Corporate Engagement Center. This model’s purpose is as a starting point for the discussions and development that will be needed to establish an integrated, single portal for K-State corporate relations as recommended by the Research Task Force.

**Reporting structure**

To provide the visibility and level of importance that a K-State Corporate Engagement Center would need to work across the Foundation and all three K-State campuses, this group should report to the Foundation president and to a key campus administrator at the vice presidential level or above. A possible choice would be either the provost/senior vice president or the vice president for research, given the important role that the research office plays in K-State’s current relationships with industry and its ties to the regional community and related economic development. Also, it is the latter dual reporting model used by the highly successful Business Engagement Center at the University of Michigan.

**Staffing**

A director and at least two industry liaisons are needed to develop and sustain corporate relationships with existing and emerging strategic corporate partners as well as work with specific constituencies to advance their corporate interest areas (see example job description in appendix II).
The focus of these positions would be industry engagement and the building of relationships, rather than transactional with a development orientation. (See example job description in Appendix II.) An information management/communications person would help develop the marketing and outreach plans and oversee the development of the K-State Corporate Engagement Center website, calendar, and databases needed to help with corporate coordination across campus. An administrative assistant would help manage the office, events, and updates to the calendar and other databases.

Because of the corporate focus of the Olathe development position, it is suggested that this position report directly to the K-State Corporate Engagement Center.

The metrics for evaluating the K-State Corporate Engagement Center should be based on the concepts outlined in the evaluation portion of the best practices section of this paper.

Role
The role of K-State Corporate Engagement Center would be to work with the Corporate Liaison Network to coordinate and keep active industry engagement across the university, including establishing a relationship manager/team to help steward a corporation’s engagement, developing custom engagement packages to help support a corporation’s goals, and communicating with stakeholders across campus to maximize a corporation’s connection to K-State.

The K-State Corporate Engagement Center would work with the corporate liaison Guidance Council to develop and help implement a shared strategic engagement approach, including establishing a proactive engagement plan to expand existing corporate relationships and create new relationships with corporations that would be complementary partners in K-State’s strategic initiatives.

Corporate Liaison Network
This group will work together to assure holistic corporate engagement at K-State. The K-State Corporate Engagement Center will be key to coordinating this group and making sure that information continues to flow among its members and that initiatives and corporate engagements move forward. At least monthly planning and information exchange meetings, held by the K-State Corporate Engagement Center, are suggested for this network.

In addition to the Corporate Engagement Center, members should come from at least the following groups/constituencies:

- Sponsored research
- National Institute for Strategic Technology Acquisition and Commercialization (NISTAC)
- Colleges and departments
- Knowledge Based Economic Development Partnership (KBED)
- KSU Foundation
- Career and Employment Services
- Division of Continuing Education
- K-State Research and Extension
- Salina and Olathe campus reps
- VP finance/university procurement
- Research faculty reps
- Government relations
- KSU Research Foundation
- Advanced Manufacturing Institute
- International outreach assets
Corporate Liaison Network Guidance Council
The role of the Guidance Council is to develop the shared strategic engagement approach and the engagement plan to expand existing corporate relationships and create new corporate partnerships to help further K-State strategic initiatives. This group will also provide overall guidance to the K-State Corporate Engagement Center and the Corporate Liaison Network.

This group should consist of the senior members of the Corporate Engagement Center and one to two key members of each corporate liaison constituency. Because of the broad and strategic focus of this group, this council should likely be chaired by the provost/senior vice president.

Tactical teams
Tactical teams are the groups that would lead the relationship of strategic corporate partners. These groups would be made of appropriate individuals from or identified by the Corporate Liaison Network and coordinated by the K-State Corporate Engagement Center. Certain strategic corporate partners will be managed directly out of the Corporate Engagement Center, but with the help of a tactical team.

KSU Foundation constituency development officers
The Corporate Engagement Center director will work closely with the associate vice president for development and have direct input into the performance reviews of the development officers who manage corporations as part of their portfolio. This approach is recommended to help foster the collaboration that the K-State Corporate Engagement Center will need to work across campus groups and establish the type of engagement corporations are coming to expect from universities with whom they establish long-term relationships. The metrics for this portion of their evaluation should be updated to reflect the concepts outlined in the evaluation portion of the best practices section of this paper.

The website
This site would reflect K-State’s holistic approach to corporate engagement with the K-State Corporate Engagement Center as the gateway or front door to K-State resources in research, student and alumni talent, professional development/executive education, high-tech assets/facilities, technology transfer, and community economic development. There should also be information on the site for faculty and staff about their role in industry engagement. Good model websites include:

- [http://bec.umich.edu/index/](http://bec.umich.edu/index/)
- [http://corporate.northwestern.edu/index.html](http://corporate.northwestern.edu/index.html)

The development of this website would be overseen by the K-State Corporate Engagement Center information/communications manager with input from the Corporate Liaison Network.

The databases
These should include (1) a shared, all-inclusive corporate engagement events calendar coordinated through the K-State Corporate Engagement Center and (2) online, comprehensive expertise and facilities databases. Off-the-shelf products such as Thomson Reuters “InCites”™ should be assessed to provide quick access to research capabilities on our campuses. See: [http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/incites/](http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/incites/).
Appendix I:
University Corporate Relations Profiles
A. University of Michigan

**R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008):** $41 million

**Institutional report of $$ from industry (2009):** $150 million (includes contract research, tech transfer, professional development, and philanthropy); $75 million of extramural research is from industry

**NSF R&D expenditures rank** (2008): 4

**Number of students** (2009): 41,674

The Business Engagement Center is industry’s gateway to the University of Michigan assisting companies with identifying and accessing this university’s vast resources, including research assets/partnerships, high-tech facilities, student recruitment, joint commercialization opportunities, continuing education programs for professional development, and strategic giving opportunities. The Business Engagement Center’s goals are to integrate university functions to fundamentally improve partnerships with industry, connect industry needs with university assets, promote economic development, and maximize industry/university engagement at all levels. See: [http://bec.umich.edu/index/](http://bec.umich.edu/index/).

The Business Engagement Center approach to industry was started in the College of Engineering with a resulting exponential increase in industry engagement and funding. The vice president of research saw the potential of taking this approach university-wide, and in 2007 the Business Engagement Center was established, sponsored jointly by the office of the vice president for research and the office of university development.

The Business Engagement Center has a central office on the main campus where it is co-located with the office of technology transfer. There are satellite offices in the College of Engineering, the Medical School, and the Flint and Dearborn campuses. There are also corporate relations liaisons in key colleges with dotted line reporting to the Business Engagement Center. This center also is a key partner in local economic development and works closely with several regional and city chambers of commerce, as well as the Michigan Economic Development Corporation.

The center holds regular groups meetings with its internal constituents on campus (e.g., research office, the recruitment office, the development office, continuing education, technology transfer office, key faculty, and key departments and colleges). The center hosts a website and keeps an up-to-date database on expertise, facilities, and industry development/engagement.

Center staff consists of an executive director, six relationship managers (equivalent to major gift officers), an office manager, a marketing and communication specialist, a data/information officer, and two administrative staff.

B. University of Wisconsin

**R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008):** $21 million

**Institutional report of $$ from industry:** $45 million in research from industry

**NSF R&D expenditures rank** (2008): 3

**Number of students** (2009): 42,099
The Office of Corporate Relations serves as the front door to the University of Wisconsin’s resources for business and industry. The office focuses on providing services to companies in the following areas: recruiting UW-Madison graduates and interns, providing executive education and professional development, accessing faculty and staff expertise, advancing technology transfer, enhancing global competency, and fostering entrepreneurship.

The Office of Corporate Relations was established in 2003. Prior to that, groups on campus were approaching industry individually without any coordination or strategy. The chancellor spearheaded creating this overlay group and worked with the local Chambers of Commerce and economic development groups to launch this office, starting a very targeted and cooperative approach to industry engagement.

A major driver of the University of Wisconsin’s corporate relations is its research centers and industry consortia that are organized around specific research areas (see: http://www.ocr.wisc.edu/expertise/research_centers/). The office acts as an extended sales force for colleges and other groups on campus. It is also highly involved in working with entrepreneurs and setting up new businesses (see: http://www.ocr.wisc.edu/entrep/). A recent trend is that a number of the new businesses are coming from students.

The Office of Corporate Relations maintains a university-wide business events calendar and sends biweekly email across the institution about office activities and industry visits. This office reports to the vice chancellor for external relations and consists of the following staff members: director, two assistant directors (marketing and communications; new ventures and private equity), three university-business liaisons (information technology and engineering; retailing, insurance, and banking; biotechnology and life sciences), and an office manager. There is also a go-to person in each key unit/college to help manage industry relationships. An external advisory group, consisting of the vice president for research, the head of technology transfer, and the deans, provides guidance to the Office of Corporate Relations.

C. University of Texas at Austin

R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008): $43 million
Institutional report of $$ from industry: $61 million total; with $53 million research
NSF R&D expenditures rank (2008): 30
Number of students (2009): 50,995

The Office of Corporate Relations serves as industry’s gateway to the University of Texas-Austin, acting as a conduit between the enterprise of the university and industry priorities (see: http://giving.utexas.edu/how-to-give/corporate-relations/). The office collaborates with its internal constituencies—individual colleges, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the office of technology transfer—to develop strategic involvement opportunities for corporations in the following areas: student recruiting, faculty research, industry alliance programs, service on advisory councils and steering committees, events, conferences, executive education, and corporate philanthropy. This office’s philosophy is that broad engagement of top corporate partners serves as a catalyst for their strategic investment in the University of Texas.
The Office of Corporate Relations, through the office of development, hosts monthly luncheons for its internal constituent groups to set strategy, discuss the 10 to 15 top strategic corporate relationships, and go over upcoming events and corporate visits. Recently, the Office of the Vice President for Research established the Office of Industry Engagement to better manage sponsored research and intellectual property issues related to industry. The Office of Corporate Relations is working with this new group to help with outreach and relationship management.

The Office of Corporate Relations was started in 2006 after a task force reviewed best practices nationally and recommended that the university needed to change its culture from its split and fragmented decentralized, transactional model to a more centralized relationship model. A corporate relations council was established that brought everyone (deans, key departments and faculty, sponsored research, development, technology transfer, etc.) across campus together to determine communication expectations and assess strategic corporate relationships. This group created a super-level of prospect management housed in the Office of Corporate Relations. This council still meets to help maintain trust among the constituent groups, but with the past history of split and fragmented collaboration, there is still a push and pull for control.

Office staff consists of a director who is responsible for energy companies; an assistant director who is responsible for technology companies; a Spirit Scholarship administrator; an events coordinator, and an administrative assistant who is shared with the development office. The Office of Corporate Relations reports to and is housed in the development office.

**D. Northwestern**

R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008): $15 million  
*Institutional report of $$ from industry:* $40 million through the development office  
*NSF R&D expenditures rank (2008):* 32  
*Number of students (2009):* 16,377

The Corporate Relations Office serves as the gateway for the corporate community to all academic areas of Northwestern University, including recruiting resources, sponsored research, licensing, education, and training. (See: http://corporate.northwestern.edu/.) The Corporate Relations Office works closely with its internal constituents across campus, including the Corporate Relations Officers in the Schools of Engineering, Business, and Medicine; the director of economic development; the vice president for research; and career services. Everyone shares a central development database managed by this office.

The Corporate Relations Office and its constituency groups meet four times per year; the meeting agenda includes reporting on the status of corporate engagement strategy (review of top and emerging industry relationships), as well as process improvement that enhances each other’s work across their campus to coordinate corporate engagement. Prior to company visits, this group is kept in the loop and information is shared across campus.

The Corporate Relations Office is the newest of all the business engagement offices contacted, having been initiated less than two years ago. Before this, all of the business engagement efforts were fragmented and not coordinated; the relationships were transactional—focused on the current interaction rather than on building long term relationships with corporations.
The first step was to hire a director to bring together all of the constituent groups across campus. To set up operating procedures, the new director contacted her counterparts, known through the NACRO, at the University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin for advice. She partnered with the economic development office to address the changes that were needed to foster industry engagement. The vice president for economic development and the director of technology transfer also partnered with the Corporate Relations Office to help make this transition occur, and they attend all internal constituency meetings. The office provides central support to all of the constituency groups, including coordination of proposals to industry and the development of strategies for corporate engagement. The office also oversees a Corporate Liaison Network that helps connect the campus constituent groups.

The Corporate Relations Office staff consists of a director, three associate/assistant directors who handle relationships with both industry and with internal constituents, a knowledge management and communications person, and a program assistant to manage the office. A senior associate director for corporate and foundation giving is located in the Feinberg School of Medicine.

E. University of Illinois-Champaign/Urbana

R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008): $21 million
Institutional report of $$ from industry: $55 million to the University of Illinois Foundation and $36 million to sponsored research
NSF R&D expenditures rank (2008): 29
Number of students (2009): 41,495

The Office of Corporate Relations serves as the industry portal to the University of Illinois resources. (See: http://www.corporaterelations.illinois.edu/). This office primarily focuses on corporate engagement and works closely with the offices of sponsored research, recruiting, technology transfer, and economic development. Colleagues in key colleges that they coordinate with are also part of the advancement organization.

Select companies are given an Urbana Corporate designation and are assigned an associate director in the Office of Corporate Relations. The criteria for an Urbana Corporate designation are (1) multiple college/units are involved with company; (2) companies whose financial support is $100,000 or greater annually (either philanthropic or research); (3) a company has requested a central/campus point of contact; or (4) campus administration has requested that a company be managed centrally.

Staff consists of a director, three associate directors, one program coordinator, and an administrative assistant. This office reports to the vice chancellor for public engagement.

F. University of California Davis

R&D industry expenditures (NSF, 2008): $34 million
Institutional report of $$ from industry: $26 million in corporate gifts and $45 million corporate funds to Sponsored Research
NSF R&D expenditures rank (2008): 16
Number of students (2009): 41,495
The University of California Davis for many years engaged industry through the Office of Corporate Relations that reported to the office of research. In 2009, due to severe budget cuts, the office was eliminated, and the director was moved to a position in their central development office as director for corporate relations. Their recently hired chancellor, Linda Katehi, is changing the model back to the original reporting structure, but with enhancements resembling those found at the University of Illinois-Champaign/Urbana, where she is from.

The reorganization currently under way will create an Office of Corporate Relations that will provide a central point of contact for companies to access faculty expertise pertinent to their business, students for a talented and diverse work force, continuing education for executives, and marketing for academic programs to campus and the region. (See: http://giving.ucdavis.edu/corporations.html#2.)

The enhancements Dr. Katehi has added to their structure includes two new vice chancellors: one for university relations, alumni affairs, and corporate, government, and community relations and one for development and advancement services. The Office of Corporate Relations will work across the academy through the development and facilitation of faculty work groups of 12 to 14 members centered around a particular research area. These groups will drive the relationship with industry.

The Office of Corporate Relations will be staffed with a director of corporate relations and a faculty coordinator who will report to him or her to coordinate these faculty groups. There will also be a shared service center with staff assigned to manage strategic corporate relationships and to provide assessment and advice to the faculty groups. When a request from industry comes to the university, the office will evaluate the request, match it to campus assets, and develop a critical path and implementation plan for that request guided by the corporate relations staff and faculty team leader. The request will either be delegated to the appropriate campus units or may be managed as a strategic relationship within the Office of Corporate Relations.
Appendix II:
Example Industry Liaison Job Description
Position Description

Title:
Associate Director of Corporate Relations
Division of University Development

Classification:
E-10

Reports to:
Director of Corporate Relations, Office of Alumni Relations and Development

Position summary:
The associate director is expected to manage corporate relationships and execute strategies for solicitation of corporate prospects. The associate director is expected to work independently to be self-motivated in initiating contacts with potential donors. He/she will also be expected to work in a collegial manner with university leaders and the corporate relations team in creating and implementing strategies for cultivation, solicitation, and closure, and set and achieve annual fundraising and activity goals.

Characteristic duties and responsibilities:
• Develop corporate solicitation strategies that meet the priority fundraising needs of the university. As part of the solicitation process, facilitate good communication and access between companies and the university. Develop and maintain corporate relationships to meet University funding priorities. Identify, cultivate, and solicit philanthropic partnerships with companies committed to research in order to develop strategies for mutual benefit.
• Serve as the primary solicitor and manager for a portfolio of corporate prospects. Goal is to understand companies’ interests and to develop complementary proposals for major gifts of $50,000 plus. Determine specific purpose and level of partnership and identify those to be involved in cultivation and subsequent solicitation.
• Discuss, coordinate, and pursue corporate funding objectives, articulated by development, deans, and administrators, with designated Northwestern school/unit development officers, trustees, the president, and other administrators.
• Write proposals, collaborating with other staff in the Office of Corporate Relations and faculty.
• Coordinate effective corporate site visits (on and off campus) involving university administration, trustees, deans, and faculty.
• Maintain an effective program of stewardship of corporate partners, including initiating and writing timely and accurate stewardship reports.
• Work with the corporate researcher to prepare briefings on key prospects and to write descriptions of suggested funding opportunities that will lead to compelling proposals.
• Professionally and positively represent the Office of Corporate Relations (and thus, the development division) as a first-class, effective, and successful operation to all outside constituencies, including corporations, university units, and central administration.
• Maintain project/prospect status reports for the Office of Corporate Relations,
• Planning, developing, and implementing effective corporate relations department procedures

Qualifications:
• Bachelor’s degree required; advanced degree is highly desirable.
• At least three years of successful, direct experience in development in a university, including solicitation of major corporate gifts, or five or more years of industrial experience in sales, marketing, planning, research, manufacturing, or engineering in a technology-based corporation.
• Excellent business communication and presentation skills, both written and oral, are essential.
• Experience in managing a varied and extensive portfolio of projects. Ability to work under pressure of deadlines and fundraising goals, with superior client service instincts and skills, is mandatory. Consistently producing a high quantity and quality of work is required in this position.
• Some travel required.

Skills/abilities:
• Determine how best to develop and maintain effective relationships with corporate partners and determine when and how a corporation can be successfully solicited for a gift. This includes the ability to think strategically and creatively. Must relate to and understand the needs and interests of corporations in order to develop relationships between them and the university and to determine how to market to that company with compelling benefits.
• Ability to promote the university’s fundraising and strategic priorities by developing excellent working relations with faculty, senior academic leaders, senior corporate executives, and development colleagues.
• Demonstrated leadership and the ability to successfully manage multi-functional or diverse areas.
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