WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, HAVE APPROVED THIS PROJECT

ETHICS IN FUNDRAISING TRAINING PROGRAM

BY

HOLLY LYNN HIRSCH VOLL

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Division of Communication

University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

2017

PROJECT APPROVED:

[Signature]
Date
7 April 2017
Chair

[Signature]
Date
7 April 2017
Reader 1

[Signature]
Date
7 April 2017
Reader 2
Dedication

I dedicate this project to my family, who supported me and put up with my work for the past decade!

Chris Voll
Jessica Voll
Heather Voll
Lois Papa
George Hirsch

I would like to thank Dean Emeritus Justus Paul and his late wife Barbara Paul who started me on this journey and inspired me (and cajoled me) to keep at it until I finished.

I'd also like to thank my committee members for their insight, edits and ideas.

Jim O'Connell
Tim Halkowski
Tom Salek
Ethics in Fundraising Training Program Final Report

The training program that I created has taught me that although people have come in contact with the ideas of ethics and what may constitute good behavior, giving more thought and discussion to the topic next to the field of fundraising generates new and important knowledge for future use. My original thought was that providing resources and opportunities for discussion about ethical dilemmas would allow people to develop a larger base of knowledge about the value of ethics in the field of fundraising. I believe that my training program and the subsequent follow-up survey data proves an interest in the topic, as well as a successful way to education fundraisers on the value of ethics.

The training program included me as a speaker who provided attendees with a broad overview of ethics and the evolution of fundraising practices today. I pointed out a few pivotal moments in time when ethics became clear, such as the Tuskegee syphilis study, the human medical studies conducted during World War II in Nazi Germany, and the collapse of business giant Enron. These are powerful stories of corruption and inhumanity. They are very useful in learning why ethics needs to be taken into consideration when doing something as simple as giving a survey to students. Again, that evolution of how our current rules, laws and attitudes about ethics came to be is necessary to know when considering how we move forward.

While I was considering the format of my training program, I thought it was important to give the workshop attendees some resources they could review at another time, as well as providing them references for the presented information. The value of this information can be seen the survey results of this project. As some of the students expressed in their surveys, knowing that groups existed such as the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and GuideStar was helpful. Providing them with the Donor Bill of Rights and the eDonor Bill of rights from AFP was noted as valuable in a number of student surveys. Of the 20 post-surveys received, five respondents pointed out that the AFP resources would be valuable to them in their careers. As the AFP resources took me a while to find as a fundraising
professional, I was glad to have had five of the 21 students attending the training know that these existed and were available to them.

One other thing I thought was interesting from the pre-surveys was the fact that all six of the senior seminar student students responded in Question 1 (Please explain any participation you have had in any classes or trainings about ethical behavior) that they had learned about ethics in their classes. While they did not specify the level of courses, they did recognize that course content for Business, Arts Management, Public Relations and other Communication programs include ethical content. In comparison to the undergraduate students, five of the 14 respondents said they learned something in classes that included Sociology, Psychology and Public Relations.

Providing small-group discussion opportunities about ethical dilemma scenarios proved effective and some students asked for more on their surveys. When I was building the training program, I wanted people to be able to take a situation and review it, discuss it and come to their own conclusions before learning the final results of the situation because I am that kind of learner. I have to experience something, not just read it. I think the scenarios can cover any topic and be used in any training format.

After I am finished with my master’s program, I will work on submitting this as a workshop topic for consideration at the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) conference for Region 5 in Chicago in December 2017. I will also work with Continuing Education offices at various University of Wisconsin System schools to determine their interest in offering this workshop in the same format in communities to support professional development for fundraising professionals at all types of organizations. After that, I am not certain what I will do, but I know that this is a new opportunity for me and I am going to continue exploring my options. I also know that completing my master’s degree will allow me to push further into teaching and I plan to apply for opportunities to teach online classes in communications programs. I have greatly enjoyed creating this training program and have learned so many things about myself. I am looking forward to using this as a stepping stone.
Holly Voll

Communications Master’s Degree Prospectus as of January 31, 2017

Project results as of March 28, 2017

Research Goals:

1. Can a training program about ethical behavior provide people involved with non-profit organizations with knowledge so they can exercise ethical behavior in their work? My project is to create a training program to address ethical dilemmas for current university graduate and undergraduate students who have shown an interest in careers that will likely involve fundraising. This project provides them with information about ethical fundraising behavior, guiding attendees to make informed decisions when acting in roles that require the handling of money, power, and gifts.

The goals of this project are to:

1. Create a training program that provides resources for students to reflect on ethical behaviors with the use of guidelines recommended by the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP).
2. Use real-life ethical case studies experienced by fundraising professionals for review and discussion.
3. Foster a deeper understanding that ethical decision-making should be present in personal and professional aspects of life.

Results:

I presented the training program to two Arts Management classes at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point on March 14 and 16. The first class on March 14 was presented to a group of 15 undergraduate students and the second class was to six senior seminar students. Each group was given the same pre-training and post-training survey to fill out anonymously. After the first presentation, I made some changes to the PowerPoint presentation to fix problems like a duplicate slide and erroneous verbiage. I also added the word “million” after a dollar amount on slide 12. I did not make changes to the surveys or any other documentation, nor did I change the format of the training between the two groups. I also did not change anything based on surveys of the first group for the second group’s training. I did include the use of information about GuideStar and other charity-rating organizations, which were discussed during the first training session. I handed out the scenario references differently between the two sessions. During the first session, I handed them out immediately after the groups finished small-group discussions. In the second training, we discussed the findings of the groups before I handed out these documents. I liked the way I handled it better for the second training, as the handing out of documents may have impacted discussion or attention of the students to the discussion.
Results of undergraduate pre-survey:

Of the undergraduate students, 15 completely answered the pre-training survey and 14 answered the post-training survey. The first question was about prior experience with their participation in classes or trainings about ethical behavior. The responses were similar with most students stating that they had little to no experience. Two respondents said they learned something about it during sorority recruitment, four said none at all, three said they experienced some level of training through work experiences, and six students reported learning something about ethical behavior in classes including Business, Sociology, Psychology, and Public Relations.

The second question asked students if they were able to identify ethical behavior and there were two students who responded with short ‘no’ answers, while the other 14 students wrote about “not harming others,” “being moral,” and not taking advantage of others.

The third question asked students to think about their own behavior by asking if they were ever in a situation where they questioned their actions. One student said they had not questioned their actions, two simply said yes, and 12 students wrote comments about specific situations in their lives when they thought about their behavior as right or wrong.

The fourth question asked them their expectations for the training and three respondents said they had no clear expectations while 12 expressed quite clearly that they expected to know more about how to behave ethically in fundraising situations.

Results of the undergraduate post-survey:

Of the undergraduate students, 14 submitted post-surveys. The first question asked respondents to circle Yes or No if they felt they learned something. Thirteen students circled Yes and one student circled No. The student who circled No followed up when asked to comment, by saying that “I did not come to class prepared and I’m tired… (unintelligible) I was incapable to learn more.” The responses of the other student to follow up with why they said Yes, included comments: “I learned about the ethics of fundraising,” “I learned a lot” by five students, and other comments about now knowing more information.

The second question asked if they now had new resources and 13 survey respondents said they did learn that resources were available to them. The third question asked about the resource they believe was most valuable, and 13 respondents made comments that included naming specific items handed out, citing the sources that I had provided them, as well as responding that asking questions while in a situation was a valuable tool for them as they negotiated through non-profit organization work.

The fourth question asked students the most important thing they learned. Again, 13 responses were given including a definition of ethics, knowing the law or a lawyer, and staying calm in difficult situations. Eight respondents answered that being transparent
was very important. Some answers added that many situations at non-profit organizations could have negative consequences so being prepared to face those was important.

Questions 5 and 6 asked respondents to explain which of the three scenarios was most enjoyed and least enjoyed. All respondents answered that question, although three said they were all enjoyable and they learned something from them. Three people liked the first scenario best (Dennis Kozlowski and Tyco), six liked the second scenario best (a controversial question asked by a confrontational person), and two liked the third scenario best (UW-Oshkosh Foundation legal troubles). I was happy to see that all scenarios were mentioned because it helped me see that all the scenarios made an impact. Of the least favorite scenario, only one student declined to write anything down. One student thought the first scenario was the most difficult, two students chose the second scenario and said confrontation was very difficult for them, and the rest of the students said all the scenarios held good lessons.

Results of the senior seminar student pre-survey:

There were six senior seminar students attending the training on March 16. All provided pre-training and post-training surveys.

All six respondents said that they have received some type of training in ethics from previous classes that included business, communications and a freshman ethics class in response to the first question, asking for prior participation in ethics trainings.

For question 2 about identifying ethical behavior, four students wrote very detailed information and included phrases like right and wrong, making good decisions and making the largest number of people happy. Two respondents had short answers about honestly and being moral. For question 3 about being in a potentially ethical dilemma, one said no, four explained situations, and a student admitted to theft as a child. For question 4, all responses were positive in looking forward to learning more about ethical behavior.

Results of the senior seminar student post-survey:

Question 1 resulted in all six students circling Yes, that they had learned something from the training, which I was very happy to see. They explained that the range of information covered was more than they expected and one student said that the training showed that ethics is not always easy or apparent and not so black-and-white. For question 2, everyone responded that they had learned something, but five pointed out specific examples including the Donor Bill of Rights, online resources, and about GuideStar and ratings organizations, which was part of the discussion, not the PowerPoint presentation.

For question 3, all six respondents provided feedback to answer what was most valuable about the resources provided to them. One person thought it was important to connect with people within your own organization while another thought it was important to know about the Association of Fundraising Professionals as a source. Two students said
that they learned about the fact that ethics and ethical issues continue to evolve. The most important thing learned in question 4 ranged from the fact that the “right thing for you isn’t the right thing at all” to knowing that it is okay to ask questions of those you work with. Four respondents did say that ethics is integrated in most organizations in some way.

Questions 5 and 6 about the most enjoyable scenario and the least brought a range of answers. All six students responded to question 5 about the most enjoyable scenario with one student naming the first one as favorite (Kozlowski), two students choosing scenario two (CEO pay/confrontational person), two choosing the third scenario and one student saying all were equality thought-provoking. Of question 6, one person did not answer, one said “Not necessarily” and another simply put “No.” One person named the third scenario as the least-liked, as it was within the UW System. One student said the UW-Oshkosh scenario was very complicated and one student said all three scenarios were “vague.”

Question 7 asked them to explain any changes they thought could be made to the training and two students said no changes needed to be made. One student said they thoroughly enjoyed it and had no suggestions for changes. One student said adding scenarios would be good to add. One student suggested finding a way to have people talk at the beginning of the training but liked the discussion aspects of the training. One student said that more explanation would be good about what goes into making ethical decisions and key things for people to think about on a regular basis.

For the last question, three students did not share any comments or suggestions. Two said it was a “great presentation.” The sixth student was my favorite, even if I do not know who it is, because they said that the presentation was really well done and that it was obvious that it was “thoughtfully put together” and that the format of learning some background and then asking them to discuss situations was “very good.”

2. Indicate why your research project is worthwhile and how it will contribute to your field.

From my personal experience in fundraising and academia, I have noticed there is not a consistent framework for fundraising ethics. In contrast, there is literature connecting ethical behavior training to medical personnel or business ethics, but a minimum of information about fundraising is widely available. One example of that is the professional fundraising journal The Chronicle of Philanthropy. In the October 2016 edition, stories cover topics including a new philanthropic organization in Silicon Valley, finding the next big fundraising project idea, and the next chapter in President Barack Obama’s life of service. There was only one story about acting good or ethically, which was a story entitled Did Foundation Do the Right Thing? In that story, this is about the involvement of foundations in the rebuilding of the city of Detroit through infusions of cash and the role of philanthropy in the community. The story covered opinions of individuals about that long-term event, but did not include any summation of behaviors. As a regular reader
of *The Chronicle*, I have noticed articles about subjects such as pay for fundraising CEOs, embezzlement at prominent organizations, and lawsuits between institutions and donors. However, there are not articles about how embezzlement happens, how pay is set for CEOs or what led to lawsuits between institutions and donors.

In just one example, at 4 p.m. on Friday, October 28, 2016 the CNN website included at least seven stories about questionable behaviors by individuals and organizations including Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, Bill Cosby, the family of Eric Garner, Senator Mark Kirk, and Anthony Weiner.

Fundraisers that I know and talked with have expressed interest in learning more, but are not sure where to find a consistent set of best practices. This project’s purpose stresses that giving students an opportunity to participate in a small introduction to the history and evolution of ethics, paired with reviewing and reflecting on the ethical dilemmas faced by real people will help advance the overall ethical body of knowledge held by people with ties to fundraising.

Results:

As I prepared for the presentation and made changes and additions, I did note that something new popped up in the news every day during my preparation. I ended up using that as a point in the training, sharing newspaper articles and stories I found online about ethical situations from current events. I thought it was useful, and the students responded positively about it, to help them understand that ethics and ethical behavior is part of everyday life. The students did accept that information and some even mentioned that fact in their surveys.

3. Describe the experience you have in the given research area, including all academic and practical preparation you have made for your current project.

I have been a non-profit fundraising professional for more than 20 years, beginning with my first full-time non-profit role in 1992 working for the American Diabetes Association. At the time, obtaining an advanced degree was not in my plans, but as my career continued to evolve, I began to realize difficulties with the way I, fellow employees, board members, volunteers, supervisors, and others behaved and interpreted policies. While working at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point between 2000 and 2005, I was given the opportunity to begin working on a master’s degree and chose fundraising ethics as my topic because of my personal experience in the area and the scholarship gap.

Personally, I have not attended a workshop or training about ethical behavior even though it has been of interest to me for many years. These opportunities just do not seem to exist, or if they do, they are short and give a basic overview but do not allow people an
opportunity think deeply about how actions in the workplace as a fundraiser have an impact. I believe it will be worthwhile to add to the body of knowledge in ethics with a specific focus on fundraising. It is my hope to take this and create journal articles as well as offer the training at conferences and as non-credit classes in communities.

Results:

Using my experiences and telling stories with the students about things that happened to me was very cathartic for me and it did make an impression on the students. Many remarked either in their surveys or during the training that hearing about real-life situations was valuable and eye-opening. I was glad to be able to share with them my stories and it helped me understand that I really have seen many situations in my career, allowing me to be more comfortable in the role of ethical behavior researcher and educator. The students helped me see that experiences I have had are relevant to helping others understand problems, alleviate situations or eliminate experiencing the same problems. I have experience and am able to use it to my advantage.
**Literature Review:**

4. Describe how your research goals relate to other work in the field. Indicate your mastery of the relevant literature.

This topic has been of interest to me since 2000 and throughout my career as a fundraising professional. While meeting with a client in the years 2002-2005, I learned more because that person had been the CEO of a Fortune 500 company and had lengthy discussions of ethics in business. This conversation led to another investment in the area of fundraising ethics while I attended the 2004 Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) conference. They offered a session on fundraising ethics but the presenter did not show and they turned it into a discussion. I was the only person who provided material for discussion.

In my research, I have found that the Association for Fundraising Professionals (AFP) has been the lead group generating information on fundraising ethics policies or educational literature. In a recent conversation with Chronicle of Philanthropy writers, they asked about my work and acknowledged not writing much content about ethical behavior by fundraisers. They expressed interest in my work and asked that I contact them after finishing my project to help foster content about fundraising ethics.

**Results:**

I have not changed my mind about my mastery of the relevant literature, but I do recognize that more is added every day, especially through news reports and online stories and citations. It seems that each day I worked on this project, I found many more pieces of current events that dealt with an ethical issue. That was something I took into the two classes and made sure I told them that ethical behaviors are always evolving and that now they have been informed about this, they will likely see more situations in the news or in their personal lives. It does seem that when a topic is discussed and reviewed, people recognize the topic more often.

After I finish with the project and graduate, I plan to work on an article about training and will also submit my idea for a workshop at the CASE conference in Chicago for December of 2017.

5. List all sources you plan to consult during your research project.

- The Chronicle of Philanthropy
  - Various online editions including a review of May through October, 2016 editions to identify behavioral ethics articles.
- Books about non-profit management and fundraising

- Articles about non-profit fundraising and non-profit law

- Articles and books about business ethics

- Interviews
  - In-person interview with Chris Sadler on Monday, June 6, 2016 at 10 a.m. to discuss creating a training program.
  - In-person interview with Chris Clarke-Epstein on Friday, May 6, 2016 at 3 p.m. to discuss creating a training program and workshop format.

Results:

The books and online resources were very valuable to me and I did end up using more periodicals than I thought I would. Part of the reason for that was because I wanted to give the students the resources that I had available when I chose the information that I was going to present. I think the in-person interviews were helpful in order to teach the groups, but it would have been equally valuable to talk with someone specifically about teaching in a classroom, as I do not have a lot of experience as a teacher in a classroom setting like this. I have taught many groups of various ages, but the mystical qualities of being a college teacher. I really do want to have more experiences as a teacher, so I will continue to get more comfortable in that setting.

Methodology:

6. Describe your research methodology, including details about any special research you hope to conduct, any travel plans, and any facilities you will require.

I will research current and past literature on the topic including Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) information, scholarly books about fundraising, and will conduct interviews with workshop presenters. There are two primary documents that I
will rely on throughout this project: the Donor Bill of Rights and the Code of Ethical Standards that AFP adopted in 1964 and amended in October 2014.

I expect that travel to be at a minimum because the people I will meet with personal are located in Wausau and Stevens Point, Wisconsin. I will interview two individuals with decades of experience presenting workshops in order to learn how to best present the material to an audience. With their input and advice, I will study presentation methods in order to create a good training program.

I will create a two-to-three-hour fundraising workshop that includes lecture, small group work and large group discussion. I will also create a pre and post training survey for the attendees to gauge questions, opinions, and the overall comprehension of the ethical behaviors presented in the training workshop. This feedback will be useful to improve future versions of the training program.

This project will produce the workshop for two groups of university students. One group will be advanced senior seminar students and another group will be undergraduate students who are taking an introduction course in arts management. We will hold the training for the advanced group first, giving us the opportunity analyze the pre- and post-training surveys of that group first, allowing us to make adjustments for the undergraduate training program.

Results:

I did present the training to the two classes and I believe it was successful. It gave me a good feel for presenting information to an audience, and it also helped me see college classrooms from a different perspective. It is my goal to continue presenting this information and also to teach as an adjunct, so this was very valuable experience for me. I was very happy with the responses and input from the students, both in the training and from their surveys.

If I present the material again to other audiences, I do have responses from the students in order to pull from my material the most valuable and useful information for different audiences. Responses were clear from the students about the best parts of the training, so I can highlight that for presentation to other groups, specifically addressing information a group may request or need. The scenarios were successful but the scenario I used first, about Dennis Kozlowski, was the most successful. It was also the scenario I did the most work and research on and the one that I was most familiar with, which could have led to that conclusion.

7. Estimate the time you will need to finish your project.

I expect the literature review to commence in early fall 2016 and used time in summer and fall 2016 and early 2017 to formulate the plans for the IRB approval, survey and prospectus. I have also met with a professional seminar presenter to get information and
tips about creating training programs. I expect to submit IRB in early February, 2017, as well as submitting the final prospectus in order to finish that by early February. The training program will be finished in February and presented in March. The surveys will be conducted on the day of the trainings.

Results:

I submitted my IRB application in spring of 2017 and was asked to make some changes to the surveys, informed consent document and the application. The changes were small and I was able to make corrections and resubmit within a few days, obtaining approval. Along with submitting the application, I was required to complete online training modules and that was confusing and time-consuming. I spent more than six hours taking the trainings and answering quizzes in order to successfully complete the training. I will admit it was ironic that the trainings consisted heavily of information about treating people ethically and it was a good help for me as I worked my way through the trainings and was able to add some good information from the IRB training to my ethics training program. I thought it was very worthwhile and I have talked with colleagues about the training, as we are now required to take that same training program in my role as grant writer for UW-Platteville.

8. Indicate the expected cost of your research project, itemizing all expenses.

I do not expect to incur many expenses, other than those of travel to visit with the one training professional and my Project Team. Most additional interviews, input with my content, or reviews can be done via email and telephone. I already own a computer and telephone, so there would be no costs associated with that. My work will be completed on a computer and emailed, so printing will also be a minimal cost.

Budget:

Gas for vehicle: $2.50 per gallon for an estimated driving distance total of 30 miles, for a total of $75.

Results:

I was wrong about the costs for printing, as I needed to make many copies of documents for the students in the training programs. It was more expensive than I anticipated. My bill for making copies for the training program was just over $58.00 from the Copy Center in Stevens Point, Wisconsin. I copied the pre- and post-training surveys, informed consent document, Donor Bill of Rights, eDonor Bill of Rights, PowerPoint presentation in notes format, my three scenarios and the results and references for those, and other documents for the students. I did expect gas would be a cost and I did not document the mileage or gas costs, as I knew they would be inherent with visiting my advisor and presenting the trainings.
Documents included:

1. Informed Consent document
2. Pre-survey
3. PowerPoint presentation, “Ethical Behavior in Fundraising”
4. AFP Donor Bill of Rights
5. AFP eDonor Bill of Rights
6. AFP Code of Ethical Standards
7. Scenario 1
8. Scenario 1 Conclusion/references
9. Scenario 2
10. Scenario 2 Conclusion/references
11. Scenario 3
12. Scenario 3 Conclusion/references
13. Post-survey
1. Informed consent

Informed Consent to Participate in Human Subject Research

Jim O’Connell, Assistant Professor of Arts Management at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, and his graduate student, Holly Voll, would appreciate your participation in a research study designed to determine the effectiveness of an ethics in fundraising training program. You are being asked to complete an anonymous pre-training survey, participate in a 2-hour training workshop, and complete an anonymous post-training survey. Neither survey should take up more than 15 minutes of your time. The training and surveys will be conducted during a regular meeting of your Arts Management class.

While this information could be obtained by interviewing you, we feel that the survey is the quickest and easiest method for obtaining this information.

We anticipate no risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the inconvenience of the time to complete the surveys and training. You could, however, experience some emotional distress if the training or the surveys cause you to recall some past situation you may decide in retrospect involved unethical behavior.

Mr. O’Connell and Ms. Voll believe that the immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study is learning about ethics in fundraising, especially if you engage with not-for-profit organizations in the future as a fundraiser, employee, grant maker, philanthropist or donor.

The information that you give us on the questionnaire will be recorded in anonymous form. We will not include nor release information that could identify you.

If you want to withdraw from the study at any time, you may do so without penalty. The information collected from you up to that point would be destroyed, which would be the pre-survey test or post-survey test.

Once the study is completed, we would be glad to give you the results. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please ask us or contact:

Jim O’Connell
College of Fine Arts and Communication, Division of Communication
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Stevens Point, WI 54481 (715) 346-3379

If you have any complaints about your treatment as participant in this study, please call or write:

Dr. Debbie Palmer, Chair
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Department of Psychology
Science Building, D240
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Stevens Point, WI 54481
(715) 346-3953
dpalmer@uwsp.edu

Although Dr. Palmer will ask your name, all complaints are kept in confidence.

Your completion and submission of the surveys to the researchers represents your consent to serve as a subject in this research.

This research project has been approved by the UWSP Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.
2. Pre-training Survey

Your completion and submission of the survey to the researchers represents your consent to serve as a subject in this research.

This research project has been approved by the UWSP Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

1. Please explain any participation you have had in any classes or trainings about ethical behavior.

2. Are you able to identify what it means to exemplify ethical behavior? Please explain.

3. Have you ever found yourself in a situation where you questioned the outcome, or your own actions?
   If so, can you please explain?

4. What do you anticipate taking away from the training?

If you have any complaints about your treatment as participant in this study, please call or write:
   Dr. Debbie Palmer, Chair
   Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
   Department of Psychology, Science Building, D240
   University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, WI 54481
   (715) 346-3953    dpalmer@uwsp.edu

Although Dr. Palmer will ask your name, all complaints are kept in confidence.
3. PowerPoint presentation, “Ethical Behavior in Fundraising”

Ethical behavior in fundraising

Holly Voll
March, 2017

Background

BA: Journalism from UW-Eau Claire

- Journalism courses taught some ethics – history of payola, photography ethics and plagiarism.
- Handling tough situations – when do you do the job and when do you call it?
- Tabloid journalism versus reporting
Social service organizations where I worked

American Diabetes Association
American Cancer Society
Special Olympics

Other employers of mine

Hearing Speech & Deaf Center of Greater Cincinnati
Northcentral University
University of Wisconsin Stevens Point
UnitedHealth Group
University of Wisconsin Platteville
After graduating from what is now UWSP, Ray went to work for Kimberly-Clark in 1953 as a paper salesman. He later became a Vice President and General Manager. In 1970, he went to work for ALCO Standard Corporation, a paper distribution group, and held positions including COO, President, CEO and Chairman of the Board by 1986. During this time, ALCO acquired over 140 companies and grew to a $8 billion company. He retired in 1994, but returned to take Unisource Worldwide public in 1996.

I met him in 2001, when he was a member of the UWSP Foundation Board. Together, we signed the largest planned gift in UWSP’s history at $3.5 million.

Ray knew Ken Lay from Enron and that’s how it all began.

Ethics is old but ever-evolving

• Definitions
• When did it start?
• Bible, Ancient Greece, mythology etc.
• Medical ethics – The Tuskegee study, Concentration camps
• Business ethics – Lehman Brothers, Enron, Wall Street
Ethics definition by Merriam Webster

Definition of ETHIC

- 1 ethics plural in form but singular or plural in construction: the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation

- 2 a: a set of moral principles: a theory or system of moral values the present-day materialistic ethic an old-fashioned work ethic — often used in plural but singular or plural in construction

- b ethics plural in form but singular or plural in construction: the principles of conduct governing an individual or a group professional ethics

- c: a guiding philosophy

- d: a consciousness of moral importance: forge a conservation ethic

- 3 ethics plural: a set of moral issues or aspects (as, rightness) debated

1932-72 Tuskegee Study

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tuskegee_syphilis_experiment

The Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male was an infamous ethical study conducted between 1932 and 1973 by the U.S. Public Health Service. The purpose of this study was to observe the natural progression of untreated syphilis in male African-American men in Alabama under the guise of maintaining health care from the United States government.[1]

The Public Health Service started working on the study in 1932, in collaboration with Tuskegee University, a historically black college in Alabama. Participants were mainly a low-income black community from Macon County, Alabama. The study was conducted with groups of patients in different areas of the state. After withholding treatment, the study was continued without informing the men that they could never be treated. None of the men involved were told they had the disease and none were treated with penicillin even after the antibiotic was proven effective. According to the Centers for Disease Control, the men were told they were being treated for “bad blood.”

The 40-year study was controversial for reasons related to ethical standards. Research on HIV/AIDS is generally used to treat patients appropriately after the 1984 validation of antiretroviral drugs as effective for the disease they were studying. In 1972 of study failure by a whistleblower led to major changes in U.S. law and regulation on the protection of participants in clinical trials. Scientific ethics require informed consent, communication of diagnosis, and accurate reporting of test results.[4]

By 1947, penicillin had become the standard treatment for syphilis. stools available to the doctors involved on the study might have included testing all syphilis patients and closing the study, dropping off syphilis patients, or withholding penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were told they had syphilis and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were told they had syphilis were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients. In addition, some patients who were left untreated with penicillin and information about them from the patients.

The Tuskegee Syphilis Study, cited as arguably the most infamous biomedical research study in U.S. history,[7] led to the 1979 Belmont Report and the establishment of the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) to oversee breaches and regulations requiring institutional review boards for the protection of human subjects in studies involving them. The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) manages this responsibility under the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).[8]
Nazi human experimentation 1942-47


Nazi human experimentation was a series of medical experiments on large numbers of prisoners, including children, by Nazi Germany in its concentration camps in the early to mid-1940s, during World War II and the Holocaust. Chief target populations included Romani, Sinti, ethnic Poles, Soviet POWs, disabled Germans, and most prominently of all, Jews from across Europe.

Nazi Physicians and their assistants forced prisoners into participating; they did not willingly volunteer and no consent was given for the procedures. Typically, the experiments resulted in death, trauma, disfigurement or permanent disability, and as such are considered examples of medical torture. At Auschwitz and other camps, prisoners were subjected to experiments that were designed to help German military personnel in combat situations, develop new weapons, aid in the recovery of military personnel who had been injured, and to advance the Nazi racial ideology. [1] Albert Speer conducted similar medical experiments at Mauthausen.

After the war, these crimes were tried at what became known as the Doctors Trial, and revaluated at the abuses perpetrated led to the development of the Nuremberg Code of medical ethics. The Nazi physicians in the Doctors trial argued that military necessity justified their torturous experiments, and compared their victims to collateral damage from Allied bombings. But this defense, which was in any case rejected by the tribunal, cannot apply to the twin experiments of Josef Mengele, which were performed on children and had no connection to military necessity. Many of the subjects died as a result of the experiments conducted by the Nazis, while many others were executed after the tests were completed to study the effects post mortem. [2] Those who survived were often left mutilated, sustaining permanent disability, weakened bodies, and mental distress. [12][20] On 19 August 1947, the doctors captured by Allied forces were put on trial in USA vs. Karl Brandt et al. commonly known as the Doctors Trial. At the trial, several of the doctors argued in their defense that there was no international law regarding medical experimentation.

Enron

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enron

Enron Corporation was an American energy, commodities, and services company based in Houston, Texas. It was founded in 1985 as the result of a merger between Houston Natural Gas and Intermagnetics, both relatively small regional companies in the U.S. Before its bankruptcy on December 2, 2001, Enron employed approximately 20,000 staff and was one of the world's major electricity, natural gas, communications and pulp and paper companies, with claimed revenues of nearly $101 billion during 2000. [1] Fortune named Enron America's Most Innovative Company for five consecutive years.

At the end of 2001, it was revealed that its reported financial condition was sustained by institutionalized, systematic, and creatively planned accounting fraud, known since as the Enron scandal. Enron has since become well-known example of willful corporate fraud and corruption. The scandal also brought into question the accounting practices and activities of many corporations in the United States and was a factor in the enactment of the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002. The scandal also affected the greater business world by causing the dissolution of the Arthur Andersen accounting firm. [2]

Enron filed for bankruptcy in the Southern District of New York in late 2001. Highly controversial CEO Ken Lay went to prison, as did others in leadership. Lay died of a heart attack in 2006 after being released from prison.
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PayPal Lawsuit Shows a ‘Wild West’ Reality in 3rd-Party Online Fundraising

MARCH 06, 2017
By Rebecca Koenig, Chronicle of Philanthropy

“A lawsuit filed against a donation website operated by online payment company PayPal highlights the extent to which the digital fundraising landscape is still a kind of Wild West, according to experts. The newly filed lawsuit is a case of charities’ donors being held hostage, according to the plaintiff. Terry Kass, who said she has given money to charities for years, sued PayPal after discovering that some donations she’d made through the Giving Fund platform during its 2016 holiday giving campaign never reached the charities she selected...

The reason? The charities weren’t registered with the PayPal Giving Fund. PayPal gives users the option to donate to groups that haven’t registered with the Giving Fund, which is a registered charity that receives financial and technical support from PayPal. To claim those donations, charities have to sign up for a PayPal Giving Fund account, which requires that they have a PayPal nonprofit business account. PayPal’s Giving Fund is just one of many third-party fundraising sites to crop up in the past 15 years. While online donations remain a small share of total charitable giving in the United States, such sites have already altered the fundraising landscape, and charities must be ready for them to play an even bigger role in the future.”

PayPal raised $971 million in 2016 compared to $38 million in 2015.
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## AFP Donor Bill of Rights

*Philanthropy* is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To ensure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

| I. | To be informed of the organization’s mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes. |
| II. | To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization’s governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgement in its stewardship responsibilities. |
| III. | To have access to the organization’s most recent financial statements. |
| IV. | To be assured that gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given. |
| V. | To receive appropriate acknowledgement and recognition. |
| VI. | To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law. |
| VII. | To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature. |
| VIII. | To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors. |
| IX. | To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share. |
| X. | To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers. |

**Developed by**

- Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)
- Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP)
- Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)
- Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to NonProfits

**Endorsed by**

- Independent Sector
- National Catholic Development Conference (NCDC)
- National Committee on Planned Giving (NCPG)
- Council for Resource Development (CRD)
- United Way of America
5. AFP eDonor Bill of Rights

Principles of the eDonor Bill of Rights

The eDonor Bill of Rights is intended to complement the original document and provide further and more detailed guidance for the new world of online giving. In addition to the rights outlined in the Donor Bill of Rights, online donors should demand the following of their online solicitors:

- To be clearly and immediately informed of the organization's name, identity, nonprofit or for-profit status, its mission, and purpose when first accessing the organization's website.
- To have easy and clear access to alternative contact information other than through the website or email.
- To be assured that all third-party logos, trademarks, trustmarks and other identifying, sponsoring, and/or endorsing symbols displayed on the website are accurate, justified, up-to-date, and clearly explained.
- To be informed of whether or not a contribution entitles the donor to a tax deduction, and of all limits on such deduction based on applicable laws.
- To be assured that all online transactions and contributions occur through a safe, private, and secure system that protects the donor's personal information.
- To be clearly informed if a contribution goes directly to the intended charity, or is held by or transferred through a third party.
- To have easy and clear access to an organization's privacy policy posted on its website and be clearly and unambiguously informed about what information an organization is gathering about the donor and how that information will be used.
- To be clearly informed of opportunities to opt out of data lists that are sold, shared, rented, or transferred to other organizations.
- To not receive unsolicited communications or solicitations unless the donor has "opted in" to receive such materials.
6. AFP Code of Ethical Standards also found at afpnet.org

Code of Ethical Standards

ETHICAL STANDARDS

The Association of Fundraising Professionals believes that ethical behavior fosters the development and growth of fundraising professionals and the fundraising profession and enhances philanthropy and volunteerism. AFP Members recognize their responsibility to ethically generate or support ethical generation of philanthropic support. Violation of the standards may subject the member to disciplinary sanctions as provided in the AFP Ethics Enforcement Procedures. AFP members, both individual and business, agree to abide (and ensure, to the best of their ability, that all members of their staff abide) by the AFP standards.

PUBLIC TRUST, TRANSPARENCY & CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Members shall:

1. not engage in activities that harm the members’ organizations, clients or profession or knowingly bring the profession into disrepute.
2. not engage in activities that conflict with their fiduciary, ethical and legal obligations to their organizations, clients or profession.
3. effectively disclose all potential and actual conflicts of interest; such disclosure does not preclude or imply ethical impropriety.
4. not exploit any relationship with a donor, prospect, volunteer, client or employee for the benefit of the members or the members’ organizations.
5. comply with all applicable local, state, provincial and federal civil and criminal laws.
6. recognize their individual boundaries of professional competence.
7. present and supply products and/or services honestly and without misrepresentation.
8. establish the nature and purpose of any contractual relationship at the outset and be responsive and available to parties before, during and after any sale of materials and/or services.
9. never knowingly infringe the intellectual property rights of other parties.
10. protect the confidentiality of all privileged information relating to the provider/client relationships.
11. never disparage competitors untruthfully.

SOLICITATION & STEWARDSHIP OF PHILANTHROPIC FUNDS

Members shall:

12. ensure that all solicitation and communication materials are accurate and correctly reflect their organization’s mission and use of solicited funds.
13. ensure that donors receive informed, accurate and ethical advice about the value and tax
implications of contributions.
14. ensure that contributions are used in accordance with donors’ intentions.
15. ensure proper stewardship of all revenue sources, including timely reports on the use and management of such funds.
16. obtain explicit consent by donors before altering the conditions of financial transactions.

**TREATMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY INFORMATION**

*Members shall:*

17. not disclose privileged or confidential information to unauthorized parties.
18. adhere to the principle that all donor and prospect information created by, or on behalf of, an organization or a client is the property of that organization or client.
19. give donors and clients the opportunity to have their names removed from lists that are sold to, rented to or exchanged with other organizations.
20. when stating fundraising results, use accurate and consistent accounting methods that conform to the relevant guidelines adopted by the appropriate authority.

**COMPENSATION, BONUSES & FINDER’S FEES**

*Members shall:*

21. not accept compensation or enter into a contract that is based on a percentage of contributions; nor shall members accept finder’s fees or contingent fees.
22. be permitted to accept performance-based compensation, such as bonuses, only if such bonuses are in accord with prevailing practices within the members’ own organizations and are not based on a percentage of contributions.
23. neither offer nor accept payments or special considerations for the purpose of influencing the selection of products or services.
24. not pay finder’s fees, commissions or percentage compensation based on contributions.
25. meet the legal requirements for the disbursement of funds if they receive funds on behalf of a donor or client.
7. Scenario 1

The CEO as Prospect

You are a fundraiser hard at work at Seton Hall working with a prospect who was a graduate in accounting. This alumnus was a basketball star during his days on campus. He grew up in a working-class neighborhood in Newark and worked his way through school doing odd jobs including being a member of a band that played at weddings.

He is now a CEO at a huge conglomerate. This man has now gone on to build a career in business and has donated tens of millions of dollars to charities he’s favored. You secure a $5 million ‘naming’ pledge to have a six-story classroom building named after him. He has given more than $3 million in cash with more pledged, so you invite him to be the featured speaker at an on-campus conference about business, which is a smashing success in the worlds of both business and education.

But exactly one year later, your alumni is facing up to 25 years in prison on a variety of charges, including evading sales tax on millions of dollars of art he purchased, including a Monet. That investigation leads prosecutors to inquire about possible misappropriation of company funds. A grand jury charges him with illegally reaping $600 million from his company. The charges include one of enterprise corruption.

How does this impact your university?

What happens next?
8. Scenario 1 Conclusion/references

What happened?

Dennis Kozlowski, the former CEO of Tyco International Ltd., and former Tyco finance chief Mark Swartz, were sentenced to up to 25 years in prison for stealing hundreds of millions of dollars from the company. State Supreme Court Justice Michael Obus ordered Kozlowski and Swartz to pay a total of $134 million in restitution; in addition, Kozlowski was fined $70 million, Swartz $35 million. The sentences end a case that exposed the executives’ extravagant lifestyle after they pilfered some $600 million from the company. Kozlowski, 58, and Swartz, 44, were convicted in 2002 after a four-month trial on 22 counts of grand larceny, falsifying business records, securities fraud and conspiracy.

Kozlowski was granted parole in December 2013, and was released from prison on January 17, 2014, after eleven and a half years as an inmate in the New York State prison system.

Seton Hall took the name down off the building but kept the money. And that was a request from Kozlowski himself. Officials took the name off the academic building that houses its colleges of business and of education and human services. The name was changed to Jubilee Hall, to honor the university's sesquicentennial. The Kozlowski name was also removed from the rotunda of the university's library.

A statement from Seton Hall said that Kozlowski spoke with the university's president, Msgr. Robert Sheeran who said that Kozlowski wanted "to spare Seton Hall any further adverse attention or distraction from its educational mission."

The decision to keep the cash and dump the name continues to be met with criticism, with many saying that it was unethical for Seton Hall to keep the cash. Kozlowski also donated to Middlebury College, his daughters’ alma mater, which still has funds in the Kozlowski name.

References cited:


Neal, C. S., TAKING DOWN THE LION The Triumphant Rise and Tragic Fall of Tyco's Dennis Kozlowski. (2013). Kirkus Reviews, 81(21), 118. (Neal is an Associate Professor of Business Ethics and Business Law in the Haile/US Bank College of Business at Northern Kentucky University. She is a graduate of the University of Cincinnati College of Law where she was a Corporate Law Fellow.)


9. Scenario 2

You work for a non-profit organization and part of your role is to speak in public to groups and clubs. A new CEO has started at your organization. While you are speaking at a presentation, someone gets up and asks you to explain why a non-profit organization is paying someone a six-figure salary. The person is obviously agitated and confrontational and making some members of the audience uncomfortable. What do you say and do?
10. Scenario 2 Conclusion/references

I experienced the scenario but the topic was abortion when I worked for the March of Dimes. A man was very confrontational and said that I worked for an organization that ‘provided abortions and encouraged it for babies who had birth defects like Downs Syndrome, so they could cleanse the world.’

My tactic: I offered what brochures I had about the mission of the organization and said that indeed, the organization did not pay for individual’s abortions. I also explained that the organization DID provide brochures to Planned Parenthood about healthy births, premature birth and other topics. I offered to connect him with senior staff, but that was rebuffed.

About pay: it may be uncomfortable, but non-profits should be able to provide salaries in line with the experience of the organization’s leader. But it is also true, in my opinion, that staff salaries are often low. Just like companies, non-profits have a role to play in communities and they need to be able to attract and retain qualified and quality employees, especially in leadership positions (Monk, 2017).

The Chronicle of Philanthropy (Firstenberg, 2011) offered suggestions to nonprofit boards on setting pay for CEOs, explaining that boards should use a systematic review system and that compensation should be tied to organization performance. A necessary component is parity with peer organizations in size, location and mission, emphasizing transparency.

Galle (2014) found through research on non-profits that organizations that relied less on donors for the largest part of their budget were able to set higher salaries for leadership. Their 10 year study of universities and colleges showed that paying higher salaries did not bring about donor angst. They show that compensation of presidents has risen dramatically in the past 15 years. “In the same decade between 1997 and 2007, average president pay at the same 387 schools increased by 50% in real terms, far outpacing gains in overall university expenditures. In 2011, 42 private university presidents received pay packages in excess of one million dollars.” Galle shows that a growth in tuition also brings about rise in leadership pay.

Non-profit salaries are not on par with salaries for corporate leadership, that is certain, and women and minorities are often paid less than their white male counterparts (Solnik, 2016). The majority of my bosses at non-profits have been women, and generally, women who either have a husband or ex-husband who is a corporate executive. GuideStar released their Nonprofit Compensation Report Executive Summary report in September of 2016, showing that men earned 23 percent more than women at organizations with budgets between $25 and $50 million, up 20 percent. That means larger organizations paid men a disproportionately larger salary than what they paid women. Smaller organizations with budgets under $250,000, saw larger salary increases in this report and it was more on par with salaries for
men in the same category. Larger cities paid more to both genders, with the highest salaries in Washington D.C. (Do you know why this would be?).


11. **Scenario 3**

You work for a University Foundation and your boss is the Foundation Executive Director. After a few years of successful fundraising, the economy and your donations have fallen off sharply. While some large projects have been put on hold, a few select ones are continuing, especially building projects. The money seems to be coming from somewhere. You understand that tax dollars go to the university and private dollars go to the Foundation, but you’re not sure if they can flow back and forth. You know you aren’t bringing in the amount of money originally set in your goals. Leadership has a lot of meetings but you aren’t being told much other than being asked to continue the status quo. How do you feel about what’s going on? Who would you talk with and what would you ask?
12. Scenario 3 Conclusion/references

UWO lawsuit documents $11M in illegal transfers

Noell Dickmann and Nate Beck, USA TODAY NETWORK-Wisconsin Published 10:02 a.m. CT Jan. 18, 2017 | Updated 8:53 p.m. CT Jan. 18, 2017

Former University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Chancellor Richard Wells is accused of overseeing the illegal transfer of more than $11 million in university funds to support five Oshkosh-area building projects.

A lawsuit filed Wednesday in Dane County by the UW System claims Wells and Tom Sonnleitner, retired UWO vice chancellor of administrative services, made illegal financial guarantees between 2010 and 2014 to secure backing for high-profile building projects on and around the Oshkosh campus and later used university funds to support foundation projects, which is prohibited by state law.

The UWO Foundation is a nonprofit organization that raises, manages, invests and distributes funds to support the university's programs and initiatives. State law requires a one-way financial relationship between the entities that prohibits using state funds to support a private entity such as the foundation.

The lawsuit seeks unspecified damages from Wells and Sonnleitner and for them to repay the costs of the investigation and any future court action. Wells retired in 2014. Sonnleitner was suspended in May 2016 and retired three weeks later.

"I certainly see this as a setback and one that we will work through and move forward," said Leavitt, who succeeded Wells as chancellor. "This university holds tremendous promise for the future of our students and this region, and I know that we'll persevere and get through this."

Neither Wells nor Sonnleitner could be reached for comment Wednesday.

When contacted Wednesday by a USA TODAY NETWORK-Wisconsin reporter, UWO Foundation Board Chairman Timothy Mulloy declined to comment about the situation, saying the publicly available documents speak for themselves.

The lawsuit claims five projects, including four built by corporate entities created by the Foundation for specific building projects, were improperly funded by the university.

Wells and Sonnleitner are accused of authorizing multiple transfers to the projects between 2010 and 2016. They included $1.46 million for the Alumni Welcome and Conference Center; $2.17 million for Best Western Premier Waterfront Hotel and Conference Center in downtown Oshkosh; $4.14 million for a biodigester in Rosendale that converts waste to energy; $2.33 million for a second biodigester on Witzel Avenue; and $806,000 for the Oshkosh Sports Complex, which includes Titan Stadium, according to the civil complaint.
Sonnleitner also authorized transfers to the foundation that were not tied to a specific projects, one of which occurred a week after he was suspended by the university. Those transfers totaled an additional $344,000, according to the complaint.

In October 2014, Sonnleitner also entered the university into a lease agreement with the foundation that obligated the university to pay $700,000 a year to use the biodigester. The university payments required by the lease were unconstitutional, the lawsuit claims.

None of those transfers were properly recorded in the university's financial records.

Memorandums of understanding

Sonnleitner and Wells also used memorandums in which the university promised to cover the foundation's debts, if necessary, to quell unease about the building projects among banks and the foundation's board of directors, according to an investigative report prepared for UWO and the UW System.

Wells and Sonnleitner sent the memorandums to the foundation to reassure board members, and similar agreements, called "comfort letters," were sent to banks financing the Best Western Premier Waterfront Hotel & Conference Center, the biodigesters and the Oshkosh Sports Complex.

A fifth memorandum also blessed all "foundation-sponsored projects," a "catch-all" phrase to refer to all of the foundation's enterprises, the report states. Investigators were not able to find such an agreement for the Alumni Welcome and Conference Center.

Sonnleitner told investigators he knew he did not have the authority to guarantee the university would pay the foundation's debts.

Some members of the foundation board doubted that the charity could pay for two new biodigesters, a hotel and a visitor's center, foundation board member Tom Kell told investigators.

Board member Craig Culver told investigators he was among those concerned that the foundation might overextend itself if it took on too many projects at once. He was skeptical, too, of the university’s plan to back the foundation’s debt. Ultimately, Wells and Sonnleitner swayed him.

“I was a critic, but was assured that everything would be OK,” he told investigators.

Regent Michael Grebe, speaking on behalf of the Board of Regents, called Wells and Sonnleitner's actions "unacceptable and appalling."

"They had no right to make these promises or sign these documents," Grebe said in a statement. "They created a mess, which we are acting swiftly and decisively to clean up and show our citizens this will not be tolerated."

Fallout
The university fired UWO Foundation Board President Arthur Rathjen on Tuesday and has put a foundation accountant on administrative leave. That employee was not identified as officials conduct an internal review, said Stephanie Marquis, a spokeswoman for the UW System.

The university’s relationship with its foundation dismayed lawmakers Wednesday and sparked new calls for increased financial accountability throughout the university system.

UW System President Ray Cross has directed chancellors to examine deals with their foundations and to add language to existing agreements that allows only foundation board members to initiate deals and requires an annual audit of foundations. Leavitt, meanwhile, plans to create a new position at UWO to comply with state rules.

A spokesman for Gov. Scott Walker called the case “troubling” and said Walker “believes further accountability measures need to be taken by the UW System,” but he did not elaborate further on what measures the governor has in mind.

Assembly Republicans signaled they might deploy auditors to further review the relationships between Wisconsin universities and their foundations.

“This situation is alarming on so many levels as it threatens to undermine the integrity of UW-Oshkosh and the UW System as a whole,” Assembly Speaker Robin Vos, Majority Leader Jim Steineke and Rep. John Nygren said in a joint statement. “The misuse of funds, whether it pertains to taxpayer dollars, student fees or foundation money, should never be tolerated.”

Vos said the issue wouldn't affect his thinking on funding for the overall UW System in the upcoming state budget, saying he gives UW-Oshkosh credit for trying to address the problem.

Speaking to reporters in Wednesday in Madison, Vos said he was open to strengthening the law or ordering a legislative audit of the issue, but only if that is needed.

"First of all they discovered the problem, they investigated it, they’ve been working with DOJ and it sounds like the chancellor and some people who worked with him made a huge mistake," Vos said. "If they’ve already identified the problem and it was somebody not following the current law, I don’t know what an audit is going to show."

Senate Minority Leader Jennifer Shilling said she was glad the situation and UW policies are being reviewed.

Local lawmakers, likewise, signaled more tacit support for UWO amid the investigation.

“These unconstitutional actions should never have happened, and I will continue to monitor the situation as we work to find out why and how this was allowed to happen, and to make sure it never happens again,” Rep. Michael Schraa, R-Oshkosh, said in a statement. “It is unfortunate that these irresponsible actions bring negative attention to the University, and I look forward to getting this resolved and moving forward with the business of educating our students.”

Rep. Gordon Hintz, D-Oshkosh, said he was briefed on at least some of the projects as a member of the state Building Commission. Hintz said the state did not have oversight of the foundation’s projects, as the completed projects were essentially to be gifts from the foundation to the university.
Hintz said universities across the state have relied more heavily on their foundations to pay for building projects as the state cut UW System funding.

“I’ve been supportive of many of the UW-Oshkosh Foundation (projects in the past),” Hintz said in an interview Wednesday. “I’m disappointed to discover the improper financial transactions that took place.”
13. Post-training Survey

Your completion and submission of the survey to the researchers represents your consent to serve as a subject in this research.

This research project has been approved by the UWSP Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

1. Do you feel that you learned something from this training? Yes or No
   What lead you to state this?

2. Did you learn about new resources at your disposal?

3. What do you believe is most valuable of the resources?

4. What was the most important thing you learned?

5. Was there a particular Scenario that you enjoyed? Can you please explain what you liked about it?

6. Was there a particular scenario that you did not enjoy? Please elaborate.

7. Would you change anything about the training? Please elaborate.
8. Please leave any comments, suggestions or observations about this training program that would assist your classroom teacher or the trainer.

If you have any complaints about your treatment as participant in this study, please call or write:
  Dr. Debbie Palmer, Chair
  Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
  Department of Psychology, Science Building, D240
  University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, WI 54481
  (715) 346-3953 dpalmer@uwsp.edu

Although Dr. Palmer will ask your name, all complaints are kept in confidence.