

Forming a Culture of Giving: A Case Study in Successful University Internal Fundraising

Jamie M. Byrne

Abstract

This paper explores the creation of a culture of giving in university fundraising, examining the social relationship dimensions of philanthropy in higher education. It uses fundraising and public relations theory to explain the University of Arkansas at Little Rock's successful Campus Campaign that raised employee giving 36 percent in three years. As a case study in metropolitan university fundraising best practice, it discusses how universities can leverage their employees' giving with external donors, while at the same time providing those employees a sense of ownership in their institution.

Fundraising has always been critically important to the success of institutions of higher education, and it may be even more important in our current times of shrinking and/or uncertain state appropriations. "Many nations are undergoing a dramatic transition in their higher education systems. Previously reliant almost entirely on their governments, colleges and universities in many countries now face declining government funding and are being encouraged to develop alternative sources of support. At the same time, strengthening higher education is viewed as a critical national strategy for growth in a global economy" (Worth 2002, 3). Most fundraising takes two standard forms: the annual giving program, or annual fund, and the capital campaign. (Dove, Lindaeur and Madvig 2001, 7). This paper addresses the success of UALR's annual giving program, dubbed the "Campus Campaign."

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock initiated an annual campus campaign involving employee giving in 2001. At that time, the campus had 6.5 percent of benefits-eligible employees giving to the university. The annual campus campaign was launched that year. The results of the campaign have been nothing short of phenomenal for the campus. Table 1 details the results throughout the history of the campaign:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Participation Goal</i>	<i>Actual Participation</i>	<i>Dollars Raised</i>
2002	15%	18%	\$98,818
2003	25%	39%	\$166,549
2004	40%	42%	\$196,872

This year marks the fourth year for the campaign, with the goal set for 45 percent of benefits-eligible employees participating.

Dove, Lindauer and Madvig write: “The annual fund is the foundation of all other fundraising efforts” (2001, 8). It is the base of the fundraising pyramid, bringing in the greatest number of donors, but usually at smaller gift amounts. The program operates on an annual cycle, with the amount resetting to zero each year. “The process involves efforts that convince last year’s donors to renew their support, while simultaneously developing a case that encourages non-donors to join the ranks for the first time” (Schroeder 2002, 79). “The goal is to create the habit of philanthropy: to work hard in getting the first gift, and then continuing to provide compelling reasons for future, increasing gifts, until a few donors identify themselves as major gift prospects. . . . In essence, the annual fund is in the business of identifying the major donors of the future” (Dove et al. 2001, 8). While the campus campaign at UALR certainly is about trying to identify tomorrow’s major donors, it is also about allowing every benefits-eligible employee at the university a chance to contribute, to have ownership in the institution. The campaign’s participation-based foundation is more than a lure to encourage larger future gifts. It is about providing a way for the university to build lasting relationships with its employee/donors, regardless of whether they become larger contributors in the future. The campaign is based on a relationship fundraising model, which Burnett defines as “fundraising where people matter most.” It’s a donor-based approach to the business of raising money, where understanding of donors is key (Burnett 2002, 37). “What (relationship) fundraisers do is make caring service possible by enabling donors to realize their capacity and potential to support good works” (7).

Literature Review

The relationship fundraising model that characterizes the UALR campus campaign speaks to moving away from a transaction orientation to a relationship orientation – one that is much more in tune with the paradigm shift in fundraising that no longer assumes passive donors, but donors who see themselves as active investors, and demand great involvement and accountability (Burnett, 38). Kathleen Kelly borrows from public relations theory to derive a fundraising theory that resonates with Burnett’s work. She uses the “two way symmetrical” model of fund raising to describe much the same thing as Burnett does. She says that, in this model, “fundraising is evaluated by how well it protects and enhances organizational autonomy and accountability, more so than by the amount of money it generates. . . it represents a break from the predominant worldview that fund raising is a way of manipulating donor publics for the benefit of the organization” (Kelly 2002,157). This model concerns itself with reaching mutual understanding with donor publics. This model “is dependent on donor agreement with the organization’s mission and the means by which it carries out the mission i.e., its purpose and program services” (Kelly 2002, 157).

Along with the nature of the donor changing, the nature of the gift is also changing – from a transactional gift to a transformational gift. Wendorff defines a transformational gift as “voluntary contributions from individuals, foundations, or corporations to

nonprofit organizations, the size and focus on which initiate and often sustain significant transformation or change in the organization, in the donor, and even in the community. These contributions may be categorized as ‘big’ or ‘major’ gifts, but their unique capacity to alter the programs, perception, and future of an organization distinguish them from other big or major gifts. More than gifts, they are true investments in the future of an organization and of the community” (Wendorff 2001, 15-16). While Wendorff’s definition of transformational gifts centers more on those that are larger in nature, it can be argued that even smaller gifts that have a lasting impact on a program are transformational because of the capacity to change the program to which they’re donated. For example, funds donated to an endowment dedicated to purchasing technology for a program or funds donated to a fund to increase faculty conference presentation support or start-up funds for new faculty, while they may not be large donations in and of themselves, have the potential to dramatically change programs because of their lasting impact on the institution’s research profile and the quality of new faculty it hires. Those changes in turn have a positive impact on the community in terms of possible new research centers and faculty who can help to address community issues. Wendorff makes the point that donor-investors should be treated like major donors because of the relationship of the size of their gift to their capacity to give (21). Smaller gifts from clerical or custodial personnel are valued as much as those larger gifts from those who make more – all donors, regardless of the amount they give, are supporting the institution to the degree they are able. Transformational gifts are more than gifts; they are investments (21).

The UALR Campus Campaign

The UALR Development Office and administration saw the need for an annual campaign at the university in 2001. Development personnel formed a steering committee of representatives from across campus, both academic and non-academic units. The steering committee members were carefully chosen, not only to represent each college and major vice chancellor division across campus, but also to include people with a variety of talents and capabilities that would strengthen the planning effort. One of the members of the group is a marketing professor, one is a previous staff member for a major national non-profit, and the chair of the group is a long-time volunteer for a major national nonprofit, with experience doing strategic planning for that organization that has resulted in millions of dollars raised.

The campus campaign steering committee meets monthly throughout the year to plan and monitor the campaign. The group’s first meetings dealt with the shape and nature of the campaign – would the goal be based on total dollars raised or participation? When would the campaign start and how long would it run? How would the solicitations be conducted? What types of appeals would be used? How would donors be thanked and recognized? The steering committee knew that the main charge of the campaign would be to create a culture of campus giving where there had been none. In the earliest stages of the campaign, the steering committee made the decision to base the campaign on participation goals as opposed to dollars-raised goals. This decision was made because it best fits the culture of the institution.

UALR is a metropolitan institution, one that focuses on collaboration and cooperation, and a campaign emphasizing that every contribution and every contributor was important, regardless of the amount, was a much better fit with the culture of the institution. The campaign focuses on the buy-in of the employee and his or her support of the institution, regardless of how much the contribution might be.

Weinstein mentions one of the great fundraising principles: “People give in relation to their means and in relation to what others give” (2002, 2). He continues that focusing on the small size of an offering and not the sacrificial nature of the gift misses the point, and that campaigns based on the “average gift” concept are doomed to fail. Campaigns should give everyone the chance to make a significant gift; a gift that is significant to the donor (3). Appealing to employees in this fashion places everyone – from the custodian to the chancellor – on the same playing field and gives them equal value in the eyes of the campaign, an idea many people found appealing. Worth writes: “Some institutions may undervalue annual gifts, which often comprise a small percentage of the current operating budget. They may be tempted to confine their fund raising efforts to obtaining the ‘big hit’ that will capture headlines and transform the college or university quickly. But, pursuing that approach exclusively shortchanges the future by failing to build the tradition of giving and the broad base of donors from which tomorrow’s major gifts may emerge”(21-22). The UALR campus campaign is definitely grassroots based.

The decision was also made to start the campaign in September and run it through the end of the year. There were initially concerns about confusion and competition with the fall United Way appeal, but thus far, problems have not materialized. The decision to time the campaign this way was made for several reasons: 1) People associate the start of the fall semester with the start of the academic year and hence a campaign “kick off” event makes sense. The campaign has a soft close at Thanksgiving, but contributions are accepted until Dec. 31st. 2) A yearlong campaign would tire both campaign planners and contributors and the appeals might lose their strength due to people feeling over-solicited, and 3) People often think about giving towards year-end for tax purposes. The summer is used to recruit ambassadors from units across campus and to calendar and plan the campaign for the upcoming year.

The campaign achieves its initial visibility at the very beginning of the academic year when the steering committee sets up a table with large signs outside the chancellor’s opening university assembly. The group hands out pledge cards as people file into the assembly, and also hands out Payday candy bars as reminders to employees to consider payroll deductions as a way to contribute to the campaign. In 2005, the campus campaign steering committee also had a table set up outside the all-university luncheon as well, hoping to make contact with additional faculty and staff who may not attend the opening year assembly. The chancellor also mentions the campus campaign and asks steering committee members to stand during his opening remarks at the campus assembly to further enhance campaign visibility.

In early to mid-September, the steering committee hosts a campaign kickoff breakfast for all campaign ambassadors. The purpose of the kickoff breakfast is to motivate the ambassadors, and educate them about how the money is used on campus, as well as to distribute their solicitation packets and train them in how to best make calls. The solicitation packets contain a variety of materials including statistics on the campus campaign, pledge cards, and a frequently asked questions sheet to help the ambassadors' field inquiries. An ambassador system is used to compliment other campaign ask methods because "personal solicitation remains the most effective way to solicit gifts for the annual fund as well as for major gifts. It is an excellent way to generate larger gifts and higher percentages of participation than other solicitation methods. . . a personal solicitation, done well, can have a 75 to 80 percent success rate" (Dove et al, 123).

At the kickoff breakfast, ambassadors are encouraged to solicit employees in their units. It's a fun, high-energy, high-participation event with a pep rally theme. All ambassadors are presented with a Campus Campaign T-shirt and the chancellor has declared the 15th of each month "Campus Campaign Day" and encourages ambassadors to wear their T-shirts to stimulate campaign visibility. In addition to the chair of the steering committee, the chancellor and a student or program representative who has benefited from the funds raised also speak.

Several appeals are used to solicit donations for the campaign. One of the main appeals of the campaign is that money donated can go to the unit or program of the employee's choice, so that in most cases, the employee is directly re-investing into his or her unit. Kelly writes that donors "are more likely to contribute if they are offered opportunities for giving that are clearly consistent with their own interests and also have potential for successfully addressing societal problems they view as critical" (2002, 46). Employees are provided with many examples of uses for their donations – scholarships, faculty travel money, technology endowments, student conference travel funds – and they are provided with a list of campus funds to which their donations may be designated, in hopes of helping them find the best match between their needs and wishes and those of the institution.

A second appeal is that, in the face of uncertain state appropriations, additional funding is needed to help UALR maintain its excellence. A third appeal used is that donations from employees can be leveraged when the university seeks external funds. Many external donors look to see what the level of internal giving is before they contribute. Dove et al write that "Not only will these donors provide additional revenue for the organization; it is important to show others that those working for a nonprofit believe in its mission and invest in its success. Individual donors, corporations, and foundations will see this as a major impetus to make gifts of their own to the organization" (47). Similarly, Schroeder writes: "That endorsement carries weight with major donors, corporations, and foundations, our own faculty and staff, and so forth" (77). As an example, a local foundation has funded 18 nursing scholarships largely because its board members were impressed with the nursing

department's participation in the campus campaign. The department participates at 100 percent. A fourth appeal used is that donations are tax-deductible.

To enhance and encourage communication and bonding between campus campaign leaders, a listserv has been established for ambassadors and campaign steering committee members, so that they can share best practices, cheer on each other and the steering committee can share information regarding upcoming campaign functions and salute units as they reach 100 percent participation. In 2004, 17 units reached 100 percent participation. During the term of the campaign, periodic messages, which provide updates on the progress of the campaign by listing college and unit participation rates, also are sent out via email blast to all-campus listservs. These messages reach all campus employees and serve as a salute to those units doing well. They also act as an incentive to do better to those units not performing as well. Participation rates have become "bragging rights" on campus.

A half-time event about mid-way through the campaign is also held for ambassadors to re-energize them, give them progress reports, salute the effort thus far, determine what additional support they may need and prepare them for a final push. The Development Office secures door prizes that are awarded to ambassadors. Ambassadors are encouraged to have fun, get to know each other and share best practices regarding what's working best for them. Best practice examples include deans who have instituted matching programs for their employee contributions, and some ambassadors who use the door prizes they win as incentive items for those within their units who give to the campaign.

At Thanksgiving, the "soft close" of the campaign, a "Thanks for Giving" mailing is sent around to express gratitude to all who contributed to the campaign. The Athletics Office is very supportive of the campaign, and in 2004 worked with the steering committee to organize a "Campus Campaign Night" at a Trojan basketball game. All donors to the campus campaign received two free tickets to the game and had a chance to win a Bushnell telescope and official UALR team basketball signed by all Trojan team members. During a special half-time program the prizes were awarded to campaign participants and the game attendees were updated on the end result of the campaign for the year. This not only had the effect of a celebratory event for campaign donors, but also served to inform external community members and other influentials attending the game of the level of contribution of UALR employees to their university.

Donors to the campaign are recognized in several ways – those making contributions receive a UALR lapel pin to be worn to increase campaign visibility as well as to honor that individual's contribution to the campaign. Donors are listed in the Chancellor's Donor Honor Roll each year, and those donating \$1,000 or more are included in the university's Society of Philanthropy, which includes invitations to a high-end recognition dinner held annually at a local country club. A certificate signed by the chancellor and a nice recognition gift at year's end recognizes steering committee members.

Why it Works

The annual campus campaign at UALR works largely because it is based on relationship fundraising principles. Burnett offers this expanded definition for relationship fundraising: “Relationship fundraising is an approach to the marketing of a cause that centers on the unique and special relationship between a nonprofit and each supporter. Its overriding consideration is to care for and develop that bond and to do nothing that might damage or jeopardize it. Every activity is therefore geared toward making sure donors know they are important, valued, and considered, which has the effect of maximizing funds per donor in the long term” (38). Other scholars’ work echoes that of Burnett. Schervish and Havens’ study in 1997, noted a “community of participation” phenomenon, in which “Charitable giving is largely a consequence of forging a connection between the existing inclinations and involvements of individuals and the needs of recipients” (Kelly in Worth, 47).

The UALR campus campaign has moved beyond what Warwick terms a “growth model” to what he terms an “involvement model,” and by doing so, it has strengthened the involvement of donors in the campaign and in the institution. Growth strategies are often used for new campaigns because they are dynamic, have audacious goals, bold leadership, low entry-level gifts, and feature a broad reach and substantial impact (Warwick 2002, 9). While that model sounds good, and the UALR campaign does feature some of those qualities, growth model-based campaigns can have their drawbacks. Warwick writes that growth model-based campaigns see growth as a meaningful increase in the number of donors, which is not necessarily good. “For many an organization, the character of its relationships with its donors or members is far more important than sheer numbers. The extent to which individual supporters become involved in the work of the organization may be just as meaningful, perhaps even more so” (14-15).

For that reason, the UALR campaign with its relationship-based focus falls more into an involvement model. “Involvement is the fundraising strategy that wise organizations may adopt to narrow the distance between cause and supporter. Involvement means building stronger relationships with your donors” (Warwick, 16). Accountability and communications are two of the hallmarks of an involvement campaign. Donors are kept up to date on where and how their money is being used via meetings, speeches, listservs, the Donors’ Honor Roll and campus publications. “A fundraising strategy built around donor involvement may help an organization increase the number of its donors, gain greater visibility, build a volunteer base, and even over the long haul, help ensure its financial stability” (Warwick, 19). Donors want some measure of control over the uses of their funds, which they get when they direct their gifts towards a specific unit, fund, project, or scholarship. The organizational culture at UALR is very participative in nature. Many major campus initiatives and the strategic plan found their driving principles in campus roundtables comprised of faculty, staff, students, and community members. It would make sense that a fundraising campaign based on those same principles of involvement and interaction would work as well.

Burnett suggests that being faithful is an additional component to building a culture of giving and strong donor relationships (Burnett 2002, 46): “Stand by your organization’s mission and don’t compromise what it stands for.” The university does a credible job of letting people (internally and externally) know what its initiatives and institutional values are. It’s also fortunate for the campaign that the university had just inaugurated a new chancellor and had brought a new provost on board and also was going through a very participative strategic planning process. Both of these occurrences gave the university the opportunity to clearly outline its values and priorities. The institution has high credibility with both internal and external audiences in putting its people, its funds and its other resources where its mouth is where institutional and community priorities and values are concerned. A concern for race relations in the area and for various community issues results in an annual survey and conference on race, as well as in the implementation of interdisciplinary study groups on issues such as water, wastewater, local schools, and mass transit. Internal as well as external donors see that the university is doing more than paying lip service to its concern for making its community a better place. Asking employees to contribute to a campaign that supports an institution so dedicated to its values is a much easier thing than if the values were not as clearly stated or acted upon.

The campaign also has responsible fiscal management. Not only is the university a good steward of the funds that are donated from a program standpoint, but it also keeps the cost margin for the campaign as low as possible through seeking donations for door prizes and incentive gifts wherever possible. Not only does this keep the cost margin for the campaign low, but the level of support in terms of door prizes and incentive prizes from both internal units and external businesses and organizations also serves to indicate to campaign leaders, ambassadors and donors that there is much support for their work at the university and their participation in the campaign.

People give for many different reasons, and the campus campaign is crafted to understand and capitalize on that. The various appeals and their methods address many of the reasons people give. Among the reasons for giving Burnett lists are ego, the quest for immortality, vested interest, giving something back, because they were asked, identifying with the cause, self-preservation, and tax planning (30). The examples that are given regarding where the money goes address many of these reasons. The appeal that in this era of declining or at least uncertain state appropriations additional sources of funds are needed for equipment, faculty travel, scholarships, etc. addresses those who are looking at their donations as a sort of self-preservation, as well as appealing to their vested interests and their compassion and desire to give something back. The appeals for those indicating an interest in making a larger gift address some of these reasons as well as the quest for immortality. Potential donors are informed that when they start an endowment, their name or the names of those the endowment is named after will “live on forever at UALR.”

The chancellor and upper administration are very supportive of the effort. More than that, they understand and appreciate the complexities and importance of the internal donor relationship. Aside from mentioning the campaign in the opening remarks at the

beginning of the year and declaring “Campus Campaign Day” on the 15th of each month, the chancellor and most members of the upper administration wear their lapel pins to contribute to the visibility of the campaign on campus and to signify their support. There is also a growing understanding on campus, particularly where unit heads and administrators are concerned, that giving to the institution is necessary if the university is to have credibility when approaching both its employees as well as external donors.

The structure and activities of the campaign have worked to build relationships and a culture of giving. UALR is an institution that prides itself on its relationships with its employees as well as its community audiences, so a campaign that is built on relationship management is an excellent fit with the institutional culture. The steering committee works hard to craft the campaign and its appeals to the university’s benefits-eligible employees. Most employees at UALR are there because they think they can make a difference. As a metropolitan institution, UALR prides itself on its relationship with the community and the region beyond, and that focus on relationships extends to university employees as well. In many ways, employees are viewed as co-owners of the institution, and their participation in the campus campaign enables them to enact that sense of ownership.

Conversely, the university takes its accountability to those donors seriously as well. Aside from being listed in the campus Honor Roll of Donors, ambassadors and campaign donors learn about where their money goes through reports at campaign meetings and through listserv postings, as well as through articles in university publications, and public addresses made to various groups, such as the university’s Foundation Fund Board, which consists of the top external donors to the institution. Sharing the stories of the students who have benefited from conference attendance as a result of campaign funds, scholarships that have been started, and endowments for faculty travel and classroom technology have made them well-known on campus and beyond. These stories not only honor the individuals and units attached to them, but also encourage and inspire others to do the same. They also build a common body of institutional knowledge and history, important parts of that culture of giving. Burnett states that being interesting and memorable is part of the foundation of relationship fundraising (46).

As Burnett suggests, the members of the campus campaign steering committee and campaign ambassadors “study and appreciate the unique bond, the relationship that exists between donors and the cause they support” (3). Likewise, they also understand that preserving, developing, and extending that relationship is the primary goal of the campaign if it is to be successful (3). In addition, the committee works with campaign ambassadors to create a shared tradition by building a common history of fun, jokes and stories from previous years’ activities. The steering committee members bond each month over lunch during their meetings, and have formed a group that both works and plays hard. Weinstein writes: “Friend-raising activities are essential to any fundraising effort. As people become more involved, they become more committed” (109). The monthly gatherings also give steering committee members the opportunity to evaluate

campaign activities as they unfold and take mid-course corrective action if necessary. The ambassadors, through the gatherings planned for them and their use of the campus campaign listserv, also get to know each other and the steering committee members. Burnett notes: “Friend making comes before fundraising” (28). Ambassadors use the listserv to share best practices as well as to encourage and sometimes to tease each other. They also work together and play together. Through their T-shirts and their recognition by the chancellor at his opening remarks, they receive recognition across the university and have become proud of their status with the campaign. They also take great pride when their unit reaches 100 percent participation and the message is sent out to all campus employees to celebrate the accomplishment.

The ambassador system is a wonderful complement to the direct mail activities of the campaign and other more “mass appeal” tools that are used. The old fundraising premise that “people give to people” is true – the units with campaign ambassadors do better with the campaign than those that do not have ambassadors. It’s that visit, the personal ask, that makes the difference. People need that sense of connection and gratitude for their gifts, regardless of the size of the contribution. The ambassadors are respected people on campus, and place a wonderful human face on the campaign.

The campaign was also structured to avoid any appearance of coercion of employees to donate. The names of donors are kept confidential until the release of the Donors’ Honor Roll in the spring, after the campaign has concluded, and even then a donor may remain anonymous if he or she chooses. The steering committee was concerned that if lists of donors were made available as the campaign was in progress, it may give the perception that chairs and deans were using the lists to punish those who had not contributed in some fashion. While this decision does have some unfortunate implications (the ambassadors don’t know who to continue targeting in their units, and unit heads don’t know who to recognize individually) the feeling was that the potential harm to the campaign outweighed any problems caused by not having the names of contributors available.

The glue that holds the campaign together is the Development Office. While one development staff member is the liaison with the steering committee and shepherds a tremendous amount of the work of the campaign, the entire office is committed to the success of the campaign and is involved with it at various levels. Seymour writes: “A good fundraising campaign has two kinds of leadership – the layman who leads and the staff member who manages and serves. The better each is and the better they work together, the better the results will be. Leadership, in itself, let it never be forgotten, is always the key factor in successful fundraising, whatever the course, whatever the goal, and whatever the scope of the campaign” (Seymour 1966, 179). The chair of the steering committee and the development staff member assigned to the project work closely together. When the staff member assigned to the project changed in 2004, the new person hired was as talented as the one she replaced and the excellent working relationship and productivity continued unabated. The director of development attends some steering committee meetings, and is in constant touch with the staff liaison as well as with the chair of the steering committee. The Development Office personnel do

much of the behind-the-scenes work for the campaign, including logistics and arrangements for special events, and the solicitation of many of the door prizes and incentive prizes that are used for the campaign. They also encourage and are quick to respond to questions from donors. One of Burnett's cornerstones of relationship fundraising is being prompt. "Prompt response shows you take the donor's concerns seriously" (46). The most frequent questions involve whether one's contribution from the previous year automatically rolls over or whether one needs to complete another donor form to donate for the current year. Regardless, the office staff quickly responds to each request for information in a friendly and professional manner, thereby encouraging future interactions.

Future challenges and opportunities

One of the largest future challenges facing the UALR Campus Campaign is the effort reaching its saturation point – the point at which the campaign as it is currently constructed has gone as far as it can go, characterized by the percentage rate of employee giving remaining relatively stable over the period of a couple of years. At that point, it will become necessary to re-orient the campaign, and it is anticipated that will occur by trying to get people to ramp up their contributions. This will be a significant change in direction from the campaign's purely participation-driven focus to date, and will present a challenge because the notion that every donor and every gift is valued will need to continue along with the implementation of a plan to increase contributions. The campaign committee is trying to be proactive, and is planning a comprehensive approach, as Weinstein suggests: "treat all donors and prospective donors with the utmost respect, broaden the base of support, and nurture personal relationships with major current and prospective donors."

In conclusion, a comprehensive approach is respectful of major donors and modest givers" (6). The provost has begun hosting get-togethers at his home for long-time university faculty and staff to thank them for their service to the institution, and to get to know them better, as well as to solicit them for larger-level gifts to the university. This is a very friendly soft-sell event that encourages attendees to consider not only payroll deductions for endowments, but also various types of planned giving as well. These meetings have thus far provided a good return on investment with five people invited starting endowments to date. These "lead gift" donors feel good about their donations, as well as about their relationship with the university. Dove et al define a lead gift as "one that serves to establish a trend for giving by others believed to be capable of making gifts as the same level" (8).

With the success of the campus campaign, the hope is to be able to move donors further down their life cycle of giving to the university, while still honoring the relationship with each donor, regardless of the amount of the gift. Worth notes that, "Most individuals begin their support of a college or university through participation in the annual fund. As their interest and financial means increase over the years, they may make major gifts in support of particular purposes or campaigns. And in the end, they may designate the institution in their wills to receive the substantial fruits of a

lifetime's work" (19). Worth suggests that institutions follow a pattern of beginning with an annual campaign to identify those among its total constituents who have the ability and proclivity to give, and move on to soliciting major gifts once that effort has produced a sufficient number of individuals from which to solicit those types of gifts. "And only after these individuals have had the time to develop deeper feelings for the institution would the college introduce a planned giving program to address their estate planning needs" (20). It is hoped that the success of the UALR campus campaign in creating a culture of giving among employees will serve as the context for individuals to not only continue to give, but to also increase the amount of their gift. The initial target for these larger gifts is \$1,000, the minimum contribution necessary to qualify for the institution's Society of Philanthropy. The initial forays into this next phase of the campaign are beginning to bear fruit. After one gathering of approximately 20 people at the provost's targeted ask socials, five new endowments have been created.

Other challenges or opportunities facing the campus campaign are internal and external occurrences that may impact the campaign's success. UALR is getting ready to embark on a comprehensive campaign, one that will seek to raise millions of dollars for the institution. While the success of the campus campaign will certainly be leveraged with external donors in the comprehensive campaign, the effects the comprehensive campaign will have on the campus campaign are unknown at this time. It could present either a problem or an opportunity, depending on how university employees view the comprehensive campaign effort. If employees view the comprehensive campaign and its millions as lessening the need for their personal giving efforts or if they feel as though they are being over solicited, the result could be a significant downturn in campus campaign contributions. If, on the other hand, employees view the comprehensive campaign as something that makes their campus campaign contributions even more important (i.e. leveraging their contributions and the ability to partner with external donors), it could be a boost to the campus campaign. In large part, how the comprehensive campaign is perceived by campus campaign donors can be influenced by close cooperation and communication between comprehensive and campus campaign planners. The success of both campaigns will rely upon timely, honest, strategic communication with both internal and external donors. The donor relationship will continue to be the driving factor of campaign decision-making.

Another recent external event that may have an impact upon the campus campaign is Hurricane Katrina and the relief efforts directed toward storm victims. Little Rock is six hours away from where the devastation occurred, and much aid in the way of goods and dollars has been directed toward Katrina survivors. In addition, many seeking refuge from the storm came to central Arkansas, either temporarily, or to begin their lives anew. Arkansans are known as being extremely charitable people, despite their own personal financial conditions, and they have been very generous in this instance also. What affect hurricane-related philanthropy will have on the campus campaign has yet to be known. It could have no impact; it may not impact the number of donors, but perhaps the amount of dollars donated; or it may have a substantial impact upon both the number of donors and the amount being donated. Only time will tell. Campus campaign planners will need to monitor the situation closely and be ready

to respond to university employees regarding the progress of the campaign and the role that hurricane-related philanthropy may be playing in it.

What can be learned from the UALR experience with a campus campaign?

There are several lessons that can be learned from the success of the campus campaign at UALR:

- Select a fund-raising program that reflects the institution's strengths, culture, and traditions.
- Know your constituents and use that information to craft a plan specifically for them.
- Constantly monitor the campaign to know when to make corrections – when to back off and when to come on a bit stronger.
- The effort is stronger when the leadership, activities and values of the volunteer and staff leadership of the campaign, as well those of the chancellor, provost and director of development are shared.

Overall, there should be “willingness to assume full responsibility for maintaining constituent regard and interest and taking no gift for granted” (Duronio and Loessin 1991, 186).

References

Burnett, K., *Relationship Fundraising: A Donor-Based Approach to the Business of Raising Money Second Edition* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002).

Dove, K.E., J.A. Lindauer, and C.P. Madvig, *Conducting a Successful Annual Giving Program* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001).

Duronio, M.A., and B. Loessin, *Effective Fund Raising in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1991).

Kelly, K.S., *Effective Fund-raising Management* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998).

Kelly, K.S. “The State of Fundraising and Research,” in M.J. Worth, ed., *New Strategies for Educational Fundraising* (Westport, CT: Prager Publishing, 2002).

Schroeder, Fritz W., “The Annual Giving Program,” in M.J. Worth, ed., *New Strategies for Educational Fundraising* (Westport, CT: Prager Publishing, 2002).

Seymour, H.J., *Designs for Fund Raising* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

Warwick, M., *The Five Strategies for Fundraising Success* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000).

Weinstein, S., *The Complete Guide to Fundraising Management Second Edition* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2002).

Wendroff, G., *High Impact Philanthropy: How Donors, Boards, and Nonprofit Organizations can Transform Communities* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2001).

Worth, M. J., ed., *New Strategies for Educational Fund Raising* (New York: Prager Publishing, 2002).

Author Information

Jamie M. Byrne, PhD, APR, is the director of the School of Mass Communication at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. She has more than 10 years' experience in fundraising for non-profit organizations on the local, regional, national and international levels.

Jamie M. Byrne, PhD
Director
School of Mass Communication
University of Arkansas, Little Rock
Email: jmbyrne@ualr.edu
Telephone: 501-569-3250
Fax: 501-569-8371