



A DATA-DRIVEN APPROACH TO IDENTIFYING TOP PROSPECTS

PG CALC WEBINAR

© All rights reserved

Presented by:

Matt Borden
Team Lead and Director of Planned Giving
University of Dayton
937-397-2001
mborden1@udayton.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

I strongly believe that making data-informed decisions transforms effective fundraising. However, while it can be easy to say in theory, applying data to everyday planned giving and fundraising work is not so easily done. Data can be confusing. There are multiple quantitative planned giving indicators and it can be difficult to prioritize or apply those indicators to constituents or donor populations. Data may also be sparse in some areas, incomplete, or not tell the whole story. As a result, it can further cloud how to be actionable on any data point or indicator.

Data informs decision making at UD and it employs it in several diverse ways. Like many organizations, Dayton uses common inclination indicators to determine how to engage at a macro-level with its donor populations. It has also developed tools to dig deeper and uncover individual constituent interest for making a planned gift.

Dayton's data focus, particularly on uncovering individual inclination has streamlined fundraising. It has also illuminated several biases in its fundraising work. This paper will provide an overview of how UD thinks about data and how it employs it in fundraising and planned gift decision making. First, it will discuss the common quantitative planned giving indicators. It will then walk through the qualitative data tools that Dayton developed to dig deeper and how Dayton employs those tools and outputs to prioritize donor engagement. It will then highlight several lessons from its data analysis. This includes how UD identified several needed areas for improvement for engagement with particular subsets of its donor base. The focus on qualitative data has also streamlined Dayton's planned giving fundraising.

II. PLANNED GIVING TRADITIONALLY EMPLOYS QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS

The starting point in this entire conversation is defining data and, for the purposes of this discussion, there are two kinds: quantitative data and qualitative data. Each type of data is distinct in how it informs an organization about its constituent population. Each also has a different influence in how organizations allocate resources and prioritize donor outreach. Both quantitative and qualitative data have differing utility in planned gift fundraising, too.

A. Quantitative Data is Helpful in Identifying Trends Across Large Populations.

Quantitative data is the sweet spot of fundraising and where most organizations have the greatest familiarity and interaction with data. Quantitative data is deductive.¹ In looking at quantitative data, the University tries to identify trends of a larger population and then apply

¹ See *Data Module #1: What is Research Data*, MACALESTER UNIVERSITY, available at <https://libguides.macalester.edu/c.php?g=527786&p=3608639>.

those trends to make general conclusions about individuals in their own smaller constituent populations.

i. The Biggest Drawback in Quantitative Data is that it is Deductive.

The deductive nature of quantitative data is its greatest drawback. There are several challenges with the concept of applying quantitative data to a constituent population to identify top prospects. First, it assumes that organizations have ready access to those important data points. Second, the data itself can only generalize to an entire population; it provides no insight about a constituent's individual proclivity to make a gift. So, quantitative data about planned giving indicators requires additional steps to identify those individuals who have actual interest in making a gift.

Childlessness is a good example of some of the challenges of quantitative data and its application to individual constituents. Remember that childlessness is one of the strongest quantitative indicators for planned giving.² However, whether someone has children or not is a difficult data point to identify. In fact, one of the only ways that organizations can gain that information is by having a constituent confirm that fact. It is also a data point that can change over time because those without children can later have them.³ Additionally, even if an organization can be certain that a constituent is childfree and is highly likely to remain that way, that data point does not give any context to whether that individual constituent has any actual interest in making a planned gift. It can only lead an organization to conclude that in general, that an individual constituent without children is more likely than an individual with children to make a planned gift.

At Dayton, the University have been able to identify a portfolio of individuals who have told the organization that they do not have children and some of the shortcomings of general data are confirmed by this population. Through the University's data screening tools, which are covered later in this white paper,⁴ UD identified 261 prospects who affirmed to the organization that they did not have children at the time. As compared to Dayton's entire database population, this is a very small number and likely only covers a small percentage of the individuals in the database who are in fact childfree.

Dayton's identification of childfree individuals also provides no direction about individual giving interests. Of the 261 individuals confirmed as childfree, only 59 (22.6%) had documented planned gifts with the University. An additional 21% had never made a gift to the University, negating other factors (namely giving history) which point towards strong planned giving prospects. An additional 14 (5.3%) expressly stated no interest in making a gift. So,

² See Russell James, *supra* note 2.

³ In keeping with this idea, wills, trusts, and estates has the concept of the fertile octogenarian, which assumes that individuals can always have more children (through natural means, adoption, etc.). See Jeffrey A. Schoenblum, *2008 Multistate Guide to Estate Planning*, at Table 10 (2008).

Conversely, some states have amended their statutes to limit the presumption of fertility in perpetuities law. See 765 Ill. Comp. Stat. §205/4(c); N.Y. Est. Powers & Trusts Law §9-1.3(e).

⁴ See *infra* SECTION 2.B.i.

individual data points in and of themselves are not dispositive markers of planned giving inclination.

ii. The Biggest Strength in Quantitative Data is that it is Deductive in Nature.

While deduction is a significant drawback to quantitative data, it is also one of quantitative data's most-significant benefits. Because quantitative data is deductive and makes conclusions based on trends derived from larger populations, its greatest utility is in prioritizing resources within large populations. The clearest example of this is print marketing, which has a high cost and, in the case of most organizations, cannot reach an entire constituent population. Applying quantitative indicators to an organization's population can help organizations prioritize marketing resources to individuals who are most likely to be receptive and responsive to it. Dayton, like many organizations, utilizes data in just this manner. When Dayton thinks about mailing lists, it prioritizes individuals who are older, unmarried, and who have made the largest and most consistent financial impact at the University.

Again, childlessness confirms how applying quantitative data to a larger population can help prioritize the allocation of resources within a larger population. In addition to making an individual constituent more likely to make a planned gift, childfree individuals, on average, make larger bequests. The average documented bequest size for a known-childfree individual at Dayton is \$540,442.31 for confirmed childfree donors, compared to \$362,105.16 for all other documented bequests. So, the childless indicator, while not an indicator of individual proclivity, shows that increased attention to those donors that are known to be childfree can be a worth investment of time and resources. Similarly, increased attention to other planned gift indicators such as gender, giving, and marital status can allow organizations to prioritize resources and attention to those who are more likely than others to make a planned gift.

In short, planned giving data, which is usually quantitative, is most-commonly used to apply indicators to a larger population and identify those individuals who are most likely to make a gift based off those indicators. This strategy can be helpful when engaging with a larger population and maximizing how the University uses limited resources. But, it is not dispositive and when looking at any individual constituent, the data gives no indication of individual proclivity. The next section will share how the University of Dayton developed tools to look at individual interest through qualitative indicators and how those tools have bettered and streamlined the University's planned gift solicitation process.

B. Qualitative Data Helps Deepen UD's Understanding of Top Donors

Data helps a fundraising organization's ultimate goal of increasing philanthropic support. But, qualitative data, in which an institution applies general indicators to an entire population requires a significant amount of work to identify who those top prospects are. And, as mentioned, even with the expenditure of time and resources, there is no direct line between quantitative planned gift indicators and a constituent's individual proclivity for giving.

Qualitative data is different from quantitative data in that it is descriptive. Qualitative data is collected through questionnaires, interviews, or observations. As a result, qualitative data focuses much more on individual characteristics rather than general characteristics.

At Dayton, the University have developed data tools to dig deeper into planned giving data and identify top planned gift donors. The University's premise in developing these tools is that it could use the qualitative information in its constituent databases to more-precisely identify which constituents have an interest in making a planned gift to support the institution. It can also supplement and expand the utilization of quantitative indicators. UD's efforts in this area have paid dividends and streamlined the planned gift fundraising process. The next section provides an overview of the University's data approach and the impact that its approach has had.

i. The Qualitative Data Model at Dayton.

The most common form of qualitative data in fundraising and in planned giving is call reports. In call reports, fundraisers and others describe the information that they learned in various interviews (meetings) and interactions with donors.

Qualitative data in call reports have unique patterns. When fundraisers describe the conversations and interactions that they have with donors in call reports, they tend to write about the planned giving components of those conversations in unique and systematic ways. At Dayton, the University developed tools to systematically look through contact records for key phrases that suggest that a planned giving conversation was had. From this list and with a bit of legwork, UD was able to identify specific donors who had affirmatively expressed interest in a planned gift, but who had not documented an expectancy with the organization.

The first step in creating this data model was to identify those phrases that hinted at a planned giving discussion. In identifying these phrases, the University also wanted to make sure that no phrase was so broad as to catch a large number of contact records that had nothing to do with planned giving at all.⁵ UD's key phrases ultimately included a preposition, followed by a pronoun, and then followed by a noun related to a bequest vehicle. This string generally falls in line with the patterned way that fundraisers write about planned gifts in call reports.

In all, Dayton developed 60 phrases for planned gift conversations. The University strongly believes that it is capturing a profound majority of planned gift conversations through this model. Those phrases are:

⁵ The word "will" for instance has no fewer than 33 definitions in English, including the estate planning vehicle. We are not interested in the other 32 definitions of "will."

- *In his will.*
- *In her will.*
- *In their will.*
- *In his trust.*
- *In her trust.*
- *In their trust.*
- *In his estate.*
- *In her estate.*
- *In their estate.*
- *In his IRA.*
- *In her IRA.*
- *In their IRA.*
- *In his retirement account.*
- *In her retirement account.*
- *In their retirement account.*
- *Of his will.*
- *Of her will.*
- *Of their will.*
- *Of his trust.*
- *Of her trust.*
- *Of their trust.*
- *Of his estate.*
- *Of her estate.*
- *Of their estate.*
- *Of his IRA.*
- *Of her IRA.*
- *Of their IRA.*
- *Of his retirement account.*
- *Of her retirement account.*
- *Of their retirement account.*
- *From his will.*
- *From her will.*
- *From their will.*
- *From his trust.*
- *From her trust.*
- *From their trust.*
- *From his estate.*
- *From her estate.*
- *From their estate.*
- *From his IRA.*
- *From her IRA.*
- *From their IRA.*
- *From his retirement account.*
- *From her retirement account.*
- *From their retirement account.*
- *Through his will.*
- *Through her will.*
- *Through their will.*
- *Through his trust.*
- *Through her trust.*
- *Through their trust.*
- *Through his estate.*
- *Through her estate.*
- *Through their estate.*
- *Through his IRA.*
- *Through her IRA.*
- *Through their IRA.*
- *Through his retirement account.*
- *Through her retirement account.*
- *Through their retirement account.*

Once the Dayton planned gift team identified key planned gift indicator phrases, it worked with Advancement's IT team to develop a tool that could systematically search its database and every call report for those exact key phrases. The tool includes a search bar at the top that allows the planned giving team to enter any phrase that it wants to enter. The tool then produces a list of every instance in which that exact phrase showed up in a call report.

UD's data analysis of 60 key phrases produced a list of 2,929 previous instances in which these key phrases were found in contact records. These contacts were spread over 1,622 individual constituents. From there, the planned gift team analyzed each constituent and conversation to see if 1) UD previously had a planned gift recorded for that individual; and 2) if no gift had previously been recorded, what the ultimate outcome of the conversation was.

After analyzing prior gifts and the outcome of the conversations, the Dayton team developed a ranking system between 0 and 5 and assigned each constituent a rating. This made the data actionable. Each number in that rating system has an individual meaning:

- 0 = the constituent is now deceased.
- 1 = the constituent affirmatively stated that they would not make a planned gift.
- 2 = not enough information available to derive a conclusion.⁶
- 3 = documented planned gift.
- 4 = expressed an intent to make a planned gift, but at the time of the contact report had not incorporated a gift in their plans.
- 5 = University in their estate plan, but that gift is not documented.

These rankings are important to help us prioritize follow up with individual prospects. Those with the highest ratings—4 and 5—have the greatest priority because they have at some point expressed an affirmative interest in making a planned commitment to the institution, but no gift has been documented. Additionally, those with a 2 or a 3 rating were valuable indicators for stewardship and for continued general outreach. In particular, those with a two rating previously had a planned giving conversation, but there was no direction about how the donor's interest. Those conversations are deserving of follow up, because the prospect, while they did not say "yes," they also did not say "no."

Those rated with a 1 have their own unique value. While the prospect declined interest in making a planned gift, that declined interest can help inform Dayton's other outreach. For instance, at Dayton, the University has removed these individuals from its regular print marketing outreach and replaced them with individuals who may be more receptive to planned gift information. This in turn makes the University's other prospecting with quantitative data more efficient with its limited resources.

⁶ Often, we assigned a two when a development officer mentioned that they asked about a planned gift and the prospect said that they would consider a commitment.

ii. Dayton's Focus on Qualitative Data has Produced New Prospects, Illustrated Bias in its Interaction with Certain Prospect Groups, and Has Improved Fundraising

The information gleaned from Dayton's data analysis has produced several valuable insights and impact for the University's planned giving program. First, the constituents identified as having an interest in making a planned gift are generally new donors. In other words, the organization was not previously aware of that interest in a systematic context. Second, the focus on qualitative data has improved planned gift fundraising overall. Finally, the data about the effectiveness of individual key phrases has shown important trends about the planned giving conversations that the institution previously left on the table.

a. The Prospects Identified Are New Prospects.

Dayton's qualitative data focus has produced new prospects and planned giving opportunities. Only 50% of the prospects identified through the University's analysis as having expressed an affirmative interest in a planned gift were in a managed portfolio at the time of the analysis. Moreover, even if a prospect were in a managed portfolio, the assigned manager was often not aware of the prospect's previously-expressed interest in a planned gift. Overall, the average age of the conversation uncovered was 7.64 years old and those conversations ranged from one to 29 years old. Even for managed prospects, the average conversation age was 6 years old and those individual conversations ranged in age from 1 to 25 years old. This is especially significant because the average tenure of Dayton's front line fundraising team is only 6 years old itself. Thus, the average planned gift conversation that the University discovered was older than the tenure of its average gift officer.

In addition to the age of the conversations Dayton found, it also found that relatively few of the individuals that it identified as having an affirmative interest in planned giving had a solicitation strategy entered into its database. In fact, only 11.7 % of the individuals identified ever had a planned giving solicitation strategy in their record. This further suggests that a significant number of conversations are for prospects of whom the organization has no current knowledge of planned gift interest, even if that individual was included in a managed portfolio.

b. Prospects Who Previously Expressed Interest in a Planned Giving Meet Common Quantitative Planned Gift Indicators.

The prospects Dayton uncovered may or may not have been eventually discovered through other means. In general, the prospects rated as having affirmatively expressed an interest in making a planned gift (a 4 or 5 rating) had many of the quantitative demographic indicators for strong planned giving prospects.

The prospects Dayton identified as having a strong interest had a very strong history of giving. In fact, the average lifetime giving for this group of prospects was \$7,322.50 and the median time since the last gift was .83 years, meaning that the typical donor in this group made

regular gifts to the University.⁷ The frequency and amount of prior support are each strong quantitative markers for planned giving.

So, in summary, the prospects that Dayton uncovered through its qualitative analysis meet many of the top quantitative indicators for planned gift prospects. This further validates the general quality of prospects that the institution identified. The difference, though, is that the qualitative indicators that Dayton uncovered gave far greater certainty to the fact that the individual prospects that Dayton uncovered in fact had interest in making a planned commitment to the University. This has in turn made the University's solicitation of these individuals much more efficient and effective.

c. Dayton's Focus on Qualitative Data has Streamlined Fundraising.

Dayton's focus on planned giving has had a significant effect on planned gift fundraising in four key ways: 1) it has decreased the time between solicitation and documentation; 2) it has led to significantly larger average commitments; 3) it has increased the accuracy of projections; and 4) it has increased the percentage of gift strategies that result in a documented expectancy. The next section of this paper will explore each in turn.

Focusing on data has led to a significant decrease in the time it takes to document expectancies. At Dayton, the University has two types of planned giving prospects - 1) prospects identified through traditional cultivation avenues such as direct mail or solicitation of other gifts; and 2) prospects identified through its data work. There is a significant difference in the time between solicitation and documentation for these two groups. For those prospects identified through traditional avenues, the average time between solicitation and documentation was 199.93 days. For those identified through the University's data analysis, that number was only 109.18 days. In other words, the prospects Dayton identified through qualitative data analysis closed their gifts almost 50% more quickly.

Several things could explain the more-rapid time between solicitation and closure. First, the prospects in Dayton's qualitative data analysis were already qualified. They previously expressed interest in making a gift, meaning that their inclination was much easier to confirm. Additionally, they each had already been partially cultivated for the gift because at least one prior contact report exists for every prospect identified through Dayton's qualitative data work. These previous contacts can expedite the time between the re-qualification and the documentation of the gift. It also means that the prospect has had a pre-existing relationship with the University, even if that relationship is several years old.⁸ In total, each of these factors helps to explain the significantly shorter time that it takes to document a gift from the group of donors identified through UD's data work.

There is also a significant difference in the size of documented bequests between the two groups. The gifts that Dayton identified with data also tend to be slightly larger than those closed through traditional means. For donors cultivated through traditional means the average

⁷ Interestingly, we identified 16 donors in this group who had never made a gift of any kind to UD, but had expressed a strong interest in making an estate gift.

⁸ Recall that the average age of the conversation uncovered was 7.64 years old. *See supra Section IV.A.*

documented amount for an expectancy was \$42,599. Those donors identified through the University's qualitative data work documented gifts with an average size of \$423,500. So, the gifts solicited from donors identified through UD's data work are, on average 10 times larger than those identified through other means.

The large discrepancy in gift size could be due to several factors. First, as previously discussed, the prospects uncovered through Dayton's qualitative data work met other strong quantitative indicators for planned gift prospects. The prospects on average had an exceptionally strong giving history, were older, and were disproportionately unmarried. As a result, they are a much smaller, more highly-concentrated donor pool. They are also significantly more likely to make a substantial gift as a result. Second, these prospects were identified via previous call reports, which means they had some prior personal engagement with the University. Those with closer personal ties to the charity are more likely to make a gift. Together, these factors could explain the discrepancies between gift amounts.

The solicitations for gifts cultivated through qualitative data analysis tend to be more accurate in the final close amount than gifts solicited through other means. Recall that there was a significant difference between the average close amount for gifts identified through Dayton's qualitative data work and gifts solicited through traditional means. However, the average ask amount for each group was relatively similar: gifts solicited through use of qualitative data averaged \$397,650 in value compared to \$436,527 for gifts solicited through other means. So, gifts solicited utilizing qualitative data were actually slightly larger on average (107% of ask amount) than the solicitation amount, while gifts solicited through traditional means were significantly smaller (9% of ask amount).

Why does qualitative data produce more accurate projections? First, for donors targeted through other means, many of those asks will be significantly more aspirational. The donors identified through qualitative data analysis, though, already have some basic level of familiarity and cultivation. The gifts documented via Dayton's qualitative analysis also close more quickly. This can in turn influence several things. First, less can change between solicitation and documentation. Second, the discussions are likely more direct in nature. Each combined can lead to more accurate projections.

Finally, gifts identified with qualitative data lead to documentation more frequently. In looking at Dayton's bequests that were solicited by engaging individuals who were identified through its qualitative data work, 62% of those solicitations resulted in a closed gift, 22% were declined, and 22% were still waiting from a response from the donor. Conversely, for gifts that were solicited through other means—57% resulted in a closed gift, 28% were declined by the donor, and 14% were still awaiting a response from the donor.

Many of the previously discussed factors can help understand the discrepancy in close rates. Dayton's qualitative analysis identified prospects with some previous level of cultivation. The smaller prospect pool also had a high concentration of qualified donors. In turn, this likely contributed to the increased close rates.

In summary, Dayton’s increased focus on qualitative data has improved its planned gift fundraising. It has increased the average gift amount, close rates, and projection accuracies. It has also decreased documentation times. In short, qualitative data improves fundraising.

d. Dayton’s Analysis of Individual Key Phrases Uncovered Biases in the Way it Engages Women in Planned Gift Conversations.

The qualitative data that Dayton analyzed produced several interesting conclusions about what key phrases reflect the highest quality conversations. It also revealed what types of conversations were more frequently forgotten or left on the table and the biases that could flow from this.

The key phrases that appeared most often in Dayton’s search results, regardless of how it later rated the prospect, were: 1) bequest; 2) in his estate; 3) in their estate; 4) in her will; and 5) in his will. Conversely, the phrases that most-frequently pointed to an affirmed interest in a planned gift that had yet to be documented were 1) in her will; 2) in her estate; 3) of her will; 4) in her estate; and 5) in their will. There is very little overlap between the most common phrases overall and those phrases that most frequently pointed to an affirmative interest in a planned gift.

MOST COMMON KEY PHRASES	MOST FREQUENT POSITIVE RATE
BEQUEST (1,339)	IN HER WILL (45.7%)
IN HIS ESTATE (312)	IN HER ESTATE (43.8%)
IN THEIR ESTATE (247)	OF HER WILL (36.4%)
IN HER WILL (175)	IN HER ESTATE (32.1%)
IN HIS WILL (145)	IN THEIR WILL (30.5%)

Digging deeper, the results that produced the most frequent positive conversations about a planned gift also illustrated several trends about those conversations that the institution is leaving on the table. Interestingly, the phrases with the most common positivity rate were not the phrases with the most common usage. Thus, focusing more on conversations with the more common phrases could make follow up about these conversations more efficient.

The most frequent positivity rates possibly indicate something deeper about the way that Dayton is having planned gift conversations. UD’s search phrases have three different gender pronoun categories: male (his), female (her), and gender-neutral (theirs).⁹ Dayton had significantly more conversations about planned gifts with men (725) than with women (413) or gender-neutral (465). However, even though Dayton had significantly more conversations with men, women had a significantly higher positivity rate for those planned gift conversations. 38.5% of planned gift conversations resulted in an affirmative interest in making a planned gift. In contrast, only 22.1% of those same conversations with men and 23.4% of those conversations with gender-neutral indicators had an affirmative interest.

⁹ Bequest was removed from this analysis because it does not inherently give any indication on the genders of the individuals involved in the gift discussion.

The affirmative interest differences between gendered pronouns confirms one vital fact about planned gifts and illustrates another. First, it confirms that women are more likely than men to make a planned gift. Those conversations with women were significantly more-likely than conversations with men or gender-neutral conversations to result in an affirmative interest in a planned gift.

The affirmative interest differences in gender also suggest that planned gift conversations involving women are more likely to be left on the table. Conversations rated as a 4 or 5 are conversations in which the University previously had a planned gift conversation, the prospect affirmed interest, but no documented gift had resulted. The top four key phrases with the highest percentage of affirmative interests all had a female pronoun. The fifth most frequent had a gender-neutral pronoun. The concentration of these affirmative interest rates suggests that while fundraisers are having the conversation about planned giving with prospects and that prospects are expressing interest in planned gifts, but that the University is not bringing these conversations full-circle to documentation.

KEY PHRASES WITH MOST FREQUENT POSITIVE RATE (4 or 5 rating)
IN HER WILL (45.7%)
IN HER ESTATE (43.8%)
ON HER WILL (36.4%)
IN HER ESTATE (32.1%)
IN THEIR WILL (30.5%)

The data around documented bequests from planned gift conversations further confirms that planned giving conversations involving women are fulfilled at less frequent rates. While women had the highest rate of affirmed interest, they had the lowest percentage of documented bequests from planned gift conversations. Only 30.5% planned gift key phrases involving female pronouns resulted in a documented planned gift. However, 36.0% of key phrases involving male pronouns and 37.9% of conversations involving gender-neutral pronouns resulted in a documented planned gift. This difference further supports the assertion that women are expressing interest in a planned gift more frequently in conversation, but that the organization is not moving that interest forward in documenting an expectancy.

The dynamics of gift conversations can help inform follow up. In particular, it can help organizations be more conscious of female prospects and make sure that those conversations maintain focus towards documentation. It can also help maximize efficiency by making sure that organizations pay closest attention to those key phrases that have the highest link between the expressed interest and documentation.

III. QUALITATIVE DATA HAS SHIFTED HOW UD EMPLOYS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA.

Not only has qualitative data streamlined Dayton’s fundraising efforts, it has also shifted how the University approaches the traditional quantitative planned giving indicators. In particular, it has supplemented important quantitative data points and influenced the University’s larger-scale outreach.

Qualitative data has supplemented Dayton's quantitative data. In one example, it has helped the University bridge the gap and identify those individuals who do not have children. The way Dayton went about this is to brainstorm keyword indicators that would suggest in a conversation that a person is childfree.¹⁰ From this, the University limited the list by removing constituents who were too young to conclude that they remain childfree, who had never made a gift, and declined interest in making a gift. The resulting list of 140 prospects became a list of highly-engaged prospects who affirmed the all-important childfree planned gift indicator. These prospects have in turn received a greater focus on cultivation.

Dayton also employs qualitative data to inform its mass outreach efforts. While there is greatest utility in knowing which individual prospects have affirmed interest in making a planned gift, the opposite also has value. For those individuals who clearly stated that they had no interest in making a planned gift, of which Dayton has so far discovered 378 individuals, the University removes those individuals from its costly mass outreach efforts and replace them with individuals who may be more receptive to that outreach.

Finally, Dayton has used its qualitative data tool to identify prospects who may have greater interest in a specific planned gift vehicle or university funding priority. For instance, UD has used this tool to search for previous charitable gift annuity conversations and for donors who have previously asked about making gifts of savings bonds. Dayton has similarly used the tool to identify donors with philanthropic interests that are in line with the university library or other specific programs or institutes. As a result, these tools have been expanded to support the larger fundraising efforts at UD and not just its planned giving program.

IV. CONCLUSION.

Data can be a powerful tool for planned gift fundraising. Quantitative data has traditionally allowed organizations to generalize across their own constituencies to identify donors who are most likely to make a gift. By adding qualitative data to an organization's toolbox, it can more-specifically target those individuals who have expressed an affirmative interest in making a gift. In doing so, the University of Dayton has significantly streamlined planned gift fundraising and identified several key improvement areas within its program.

For further questions, please contact

Matt Borden, J.D., M.P.A.
Team Lead and Director of Planned Giving
University of Dayton

Mborden1@udayton.edu
937.397.2001

¹⁰ The indicators that we used were:

1. Does not have children
2. Does not have kids