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Chapter 1—Executive Summary

The Arts Management & Technology Laboratory (AMT Lab) is a research center that is a part of the Master of Arts Management program at Carnegie Mellon University. Its online platform audience consists of professionals in the arts management and technology fields. The organization requested a research team as a Systems Synthesis project to assess the status of the arts nonprofit sector in its use of emerging digital fundraising technologies to raise funds for their organizations.1 While many arts organizations are still utilizing traditional methods of fundraising, institutional support priorities are shifting as are the demographics and psychographics of prospective donors. As digital technologies are becoming a staple in everyday life, like their peers in the nonprofit sector, arts organizations should investigate testing and implementing digital strategies in order to remain relevant in today’s fundraising world. If arts institutions want to gain more individual donors, they will need to adapt digitally. There are many emerging fundraising tools like Short Message Service (SMS), Facebook Nonprofit Tools (Facebook NP), Peer-to-Peer (P2P), and Mobile Bidding that arts organizations can test and implement in order to acquire more individual support for their institutions.

To understand the arts nonprofit sector’s digital fundraising strategies, the team used a research methodology of five components:

- A review of literature including overall fundraising in the nonprofit sector, funding patterns in the art sector, and CRM system processes,
- A national online survey of arts organizations’ uses of four emerging digital fundraising pathways,
- Case studies of non-arts nonprofit institutions who have utilized the digital fundraising pathways,
- Case studies of digital fundraising vendors identified by the survey participants, and
- Interviews with users of key constituent relationship management (CRM) systems.

The research revealed interesting findings. SMS tends to be the most under-utilized digital fundraising tool by both arts and non-arts organizations. Facebook NP is the most utilized,

1 The major goal of the Systems Synthesis project course is to provide Master of Science in Public Policy & Management (MSPPM), Master of Arts Management (MAM), and Master of Science in Health Care Policy & Management (MSHCPM) students with the skills necessary for structuring, managing, and carrying out projects in an organization.1 Systems Synthesis projects must also contribute significantly to solving or ameliorating important problems of the public sector, non-profit sector, or arts organizations. Some of the key educational goals of System Synthesis projects for students to learn are problem structuring and solving skills as well as project management, teamwork, and communication skills. It is also an opportunity for students to apply and incorporate the acquired knowledge and skills during their course at Heinz College.
although non-arts organizations tend to use more of its features. The tool with the most potential for the arts is P2P, with similarly positioned non-arts organizations using it to great effect. Another key finding from the research is that most arts organizations want to use digital fundraising tools, but there are real and perceived obstacles. The major implementation barrier is lack of expertise. Furthermore, 58% of survey respondents are not integrating their digital fundraising data into their CRM systems. This could be due to the CRM system the organization utilizes, which may not have integration capabilities with emerging digital fundraising tools, or the organization’s lack of knowledge on how to integrate external data. The arts field needs to learn more about digital fundraising technology and their CRM systems’ capabilities.

Project Overview

Nonprofit arts organizations’ contributed income has shown an increased reliance on individual giving to support the livelihood of their organizations over time due to shifts in institutional funding options. While tactics such as in-person asks, direct mail, and email campaigns are the most common, digital fundraising has become a growth engine for nonprofit giving overall. The arts can take advantage of digital tools for acquiring more donors and advocates for their organizations, as well as for engaging current supporters in a refreshed and efficient way. According to the 2017 Charitable Giving Report, online giving grew 12.1% in 2017 compared to the year before. Also, about 7.6% of total contributed revenue in the nonprofit sector, excluding grants, was raised online.

There are several types of digital fundraising technologies such as Short Message Service, Facebook, Peer-to-Peer, and Mobile Bidding that are used in the nonprofit sector that most arts organizations have yet to tap. There is a need for more research on how arts nonprofit organizations can best utilize these emerging digital fundraising pathways to maximize fundraising revenues while staying relevant to their supporters. Arts organizations have an opportunity to grow their digital fundraising technology use, if they seek to engage the next generation of donors, who have shown to be more present in digital spheres than previous generations. According to a *Washington Post* article, “If cultural organizations want to attract the next generation of supporters, they must go digital.”

By assessing the current situation about digital fundraising technologies in the arts as defined, the team formulated an overarching research question and methodology to find the most meaningful conclusions and make recommendations to the field. Based on preliminary literature review, the team investigated four key areas that impact arts organizations’ decision-making in new digital strategy implementation: practice, purpose, results, and resources. In collaboration with AMT Lab, the team decided to narrow the research on four emerging digital pathways: Short Message Service (SMS), Facebook Nonprofit (Facebook NP), Peer-to-Peer (P2P), and Mobile Bidding. The scope was also narrowed down to philanthropy in the United States, because other countries study the United States model as a standard.

---

3 Ibid, 5.
Also, most online fundraising strategies and social media originated in North America, particularly the United States.\(^5\)

**Research Question**

*In the USA, how do arts nonprofit organizations compare to other nonprofits in digital fundraising practice, purpose, results, and resources using SMS, Facebook, Peer to Peer, and Mobile Bidding?*

**Methodology**

To answer the research question, the research team’s methodology is divided into five components:

- A review of literature on fundraising of the overall nonprofit sector and the arts, digital fundraising pathways, and CRM system integrations,
- A national survey of arts organizations’ uses of the four identified digital fundraising pathways,
- Case studies of non-arts nonprofit institutions who have utilized digital fundraising tools successfully,
- Case studies of digital fundraising vendors identified by participants from the national survey, and
- Interviews with constituent relationship management (CRM) system users, to explore opportunities and limitations for integration with these digital fundraising tools.

**Review of Literature**

The team researched the current state and trends of the overall fundraising sphere in the United States, how much has been given to nonprofit organizations digitally, and how much each artistic discipline depends on contributed income. A review of literature of the four emerging digital pathways was also conducted to learn how each work. The team also investigated the three of the dominant CRM systems in the nonprofit field: Blackbaud, Salesforce, and Tessitura to learn about current features, functionalities, and potential new developments to integrate with digital fundraising tools.

**Survey**

The survey was designed to understand how nonprofit arts organizations in the United States use emerging digital fundraising tools: SMS, Facebook NP, Peer-to-Peer, and Mobile Bidding in their fundraising plans. The objectives of the survey were

- To understand arts nonprofits’ intended goals in using a specific digital fundraising tool

---

• To find what resources arts nonprofits use to implement a specific digital fundraising tool
• To learn the barriers of implementing emerging digital fundraising technologies at nonprofit arts organizations.

Nonprofit Organization Case Studies
The team examined how emerging digital fundraising technologies are being used by examining successful fundraising campaign examples in the non-arts nonprofit sector, which were then used to compare the national survey data of arts organizations. The objectives of the non-art nonprofit case studies were

• To learn more about how the digital fundraising pathways shape the overall nonprofit fundraising world
• To understand the differences and similarities between the arts and non-arts organization regarding using emerging digital fundraising pathways.

The team’s goal was to get diverse nonprofit case study examples from across the United States. The criteria for the case studies was threefold:
1. identify two to five nonprofit organizations who have had successful digital fundraising campaigns using each of the digital fundraising pathways.
2. Create geographic variety by selecting non-art nonprofit organization case studies from the US regions used by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA).  
3. Achieve relevancy for arts organizations by focusing on nonprofit organization categories that closely resemble with the missions of most arts organizations. Using a similar categorization to the 2017 GivingUSA Report, the team looked into nonprofit organizations that support animals, education, human services, and the environment. This excludes organizations that operate internationally, as well as those that support religion, human health, and public policy.

Vendor Case Studies
The team researched four digital fundraising vendors from different pathways, excluding Facebook, based on the national survey’s results of most utilized digital fundraising vendors by the arts. These case studies helped the team understand what vendors features and functions offer for nonprofit organizations and what opportunities are available for arts organizations to take advantage of in the future. To better support the research, a set of questions were formulated on recommended technological features and functionalities based on Idealware’s 2017 Field Guide to Software for Nonprofits. The objectives were:

• To learn which emerging digital fundraising vendors are most commonly utilized by arts organizations

---

8 Ibid.
• To understand why selected emerging digital fundraising vendors are most utilized by arts nonprofit organizations
• To learn the implications of how arts organizations can use emerging digital fundraising vendors.

CRM System User Interviews
The last methodology was conducting Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) system interviews with users of three platforms: Blackbaud, Salesforce, and Tessitura. The objectives for the CRM System Interviews were:

• To learn how external data integrates into CRM systems
• To learn the CRM system vendors’ strengths, limitations, and opportunities in integrating with emerging digital fundraising tools
• To learn what CRM system vendors are currently developing to improve integration with emerging digital fundraising tools.
Chapter 2 Review of Literature Findings

Fundraising Trends—All Nonprofit Organizations

According to the GivingUSA 2017 report, about $390.05 Billion was contributed in the United States by all nonprofit organizations in 2016. With that mind, the majority of total giving came from individuals at 72% and which grew 3.9% from the year prior. While individual giving increased from 2015 to 2016 along with institutional support, institutional giving remained a smaller proportion of total giving. 15% of total giving in the United States in 2016 came from foundations and increased by 3.5% from the year prior. Corporate giving was the smallest percentage of total giving in 2016 at 5%, but it increased 3.5% from the year before. The remaining 8% of total giving came from bequests. Also, the top three areas of giving in 2016 were to religious organizations at 32%, educational institutions at 15%, and human service organizations at 12%. Giving to arts, culture, and humanities fell to eighth place at 5% ($18.21 billion), yet grew by 6.4% from the year prior.

What is important to note from this evidence is that individual giving is the driving force to philanthropic support. A similarity between the arts and other nonprofit organizations is that their attention and contributed income efforts should be focused on individual support in order to stay financially viable. By looking at this evidence, nonprofit organizations, particularly the arts, should be looking into additional channels like digital fundraising pathways to increase support coming from individual giving.

Individual support is important no matter the size of the organization. Small-budgeted nonprofit organizations raised 36% of their annual income from individual giving alone in 2015. In addition, annual gifts from individuals averaged at $435, while the average individual gift from online giving sources averaged at $210. Though the latter online giving figure may appear small, many donations in a similar amount accumulate and are critical to support for an organization. Digital fundraising pathways supplement an organization’s fundraising practices and bring in an additional revenue stream. M+R Benchmarks of 2017 mentions that "Online (giving) revenue increased by 14% in 2016." GivingUSA 2017 supports this trend as well, "Online giving has grown across the sector but remains underutilized in some sub-sectors.[sic]." The arts also have the potential of going digital in.

---

10 Ibid.  
11 Ibid.  
12 Ibid.  
13 Ibid.  
14 Ibid.  
16 Ibid.  
18 Ibid.  
19 (M+R Benchmarks, 2017), 7.  
order to supplement their individual giving streams. The following evidence is a snapshot of fundraising trends specific to the USA’s four major artistic disciplines.

**Fundraising Trends—Visual and Performing Arts**

As noted in the GivingUSA report, giving to arts and culture organizations is rather minuscule when compared to the other sectors, but there is opportunity for more growth, particularly in individual giving. Contributed income for visual and performing arts organizations on aggregated range from 43 to 50 percent of total income. Arts organizations, dependent on discipline and year reported, depended on approximately 50 to 70 percent of their contributed income from individuals. The following figures highlight contributing income trends in the following artistic disciplines: Dance, Music (orchestra), Opera, Theatre, and Museums, from reports by Dance/USA, League of American Orchestras, OPERA America, Theatre Communications Group, and the Association of Art Museum Directors.

**Dance**

According to Dance/USA’s *Snapshot of the Field 2016*, total revenue and support for dance organizations was approximately 44.8% as shown in Figure 2. There was no specific data available of the dance industry’s contributed income proportions in individual, foundation, government, and corporate giving.

**Orchestra**

According to the League of American Orchestras’ *Orchestra Facts 2006-2014* report, the contributed income of symphony orchestras was at 43%, and 70% of contributed income came from individuals (Figures 3 and 4).

---

21 “Snapshot of the Field” (Dance/USA, February 2016), 3.
Figure 3: Percentages of Contributed Income in the Orchestra Industry

- Government: 7%
- Foundations: 13%
- Corporate: 10%
- Individual: 70%

Figure 2: Total Revenue and Support in the Orchestra Industry

- Earned Income: 40%
- Contributed: 43%
- Investment/Endowment: 17%

Opera

OPERA America’s Annual Field report broke down its financial overviews by budget size. Figure 5 represents the contributed income proportions for opera organizations with a budget between $3 to $15 million. About 50% of total revenue came from contributed income, and about 50% of contributed income came from individuals (Figures 5 and 6).23

Theatre Communications Group’s *Theatre Facts 2016* reported that about 48% of total income came was contributed (Figure 7). About 63% of all contributed income came from...
individuals (Figure 8).25 Theatre organizations have been generating more earned revenue, yet not too significant in amount compared to contributed income.

![Figure 6: Total Revenue and Support in the Theatre Industry](image)

**Figure 6: Total Revenue and Support in the Theatre Industry**

- Contributed: 48%
- Earned Income: 52%

![Figure 7: Percentages of Contributed Income in the Theatre Industry](image)

**Figure 7: Percentages of Contributed Income in the Theatre Industry**

- Government: 7%
- Foundations: 23%
- Corporate: 7%
- Individual: 63%

Art Museums

According to the Association of Art Museum Directors’ *Art Museums by the Numbers 2016* report, about 43% of total revenue came was contributed (Figure 9).26 About 65% of all contributed income came from individuals (Figure 10).27

---

27 Ibid, 5.
Contributed and earned income levels for arts organizations are similar with slight differences dependent on artistic discipline. Dance and Theatre organizations generate slightly more earned income, while Orchestra, Opera, and Art Museums depend more on contributed income. Regardless, for overall contributed income, individual giving is the largest portion of support for the arts. An advantage that the arts have comparing to other nonprofit sectors is that they have the opportunity of generating income from two channels: contributed and earned income. Depending on an individual organization’s revenue breakdown, this evidence suggests that the arts should be investing their resources for generating contributed income.
in a similar manner as they are for earned income. This is where digital fundraising technology can help to better support this particular revenue stream.

Emerging Digital Fundraising Pathways

This section introduces the four emerging digital fundraising pathways: Short Message Service (SMS), Facebook Nonprofit (Facebook NP), Peer-to-Peer (P2P), and Mobile Bidding. Each pathway in this section includes its definition, how it works, and a few non-arts nonprofit case studies. Two to five nonprofit organizations were selected for the case studies based on the US regions listed by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA). Two case studies are highlighted in each digital fundraising pathway section. There were limitations in finding case studies for each pathway from each of the 6 US regions, particularly for SMS and uses of Facebook NP tools. Additional case studies can be found in Appendix D.

SMS

Definition

Short Message Service (SMS) is commonly known as text messaging. While it is mainly used as a form of quick communication between people in everyday life, it has been utilized by nonprofit organizations as a pathway to enhance donor relationships and fundraising. For this report, SMS is defined as the use of short message services on mobile phones, channeled either person-to-person or application to person, to facilitate donations to an organization by either an addition to their phone bill, called Text to Give, or a third-party merchant services, called Text to Donate. Vendors in this pathway include companies such as mGive, OneCause, MobileCause, Txt2Give, and @Pay.

Trends

According to the 2018 Global NGO Technology Report, over "15% of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) worldwide regularly send text messages to donors and supporters." In addition, "43% of those NGOs use a Text To Give service for SMS fundraising." These trends continue in the United States, with the mGive Foundation's 2015 Text Donation Study finding "that for 46% of donors, giving via text is a preferred method." The most popular SMS campaigns tend to favor urgent crises, with over 65% of donors giving via text supporting disaster relief organizations, followed by health institutions and human services organizations. This particular study also referenced a "Giving Gap" where people who responded that they strongly favored using text as a method of donation rarely followed through with that wish. This led mGive to conclude that "it is likely that many donors are not being given ample opportunity to make text donations."

31 Ibid, 16.
34 Ibid.
Given this evidence, there is a want from donors for text-based giving that is not being fulfilled, even in the non-arts nonprofit world. However, when looking at research contained in this report on both non-arts NPOs and arts NPOS, it seems as if neither sector is meeting this supposed demand for SMS.

**How it Works**

There are two main methods of garnering donations through text: Text to Give and Text to Donate. Text to Give is most often used in disaster relief campaigns. The organization finds a host vendor for its campaign and creates a short-code of letters and numbers (i.e. HAITI1) that a donor can text to a 1-800 number to initiate the process. After a donor has texted that code, they receive an automated reply that allows them to select pre-set donation amounts. The selected donation amount will later be added to the donor's next phone bill. That donation, once paid and all processing fees get deducted, are then sent along to the nonprofit.  

The second option, Text to Donate, offers both the host organization and donors more flexibility in what information is communicated. Like Text to Give, a host vendor is still chosen, but the generated short-code resembles a word or a phrase (i.e. "Donate"). The phone number is also shorter than in Text to Give and resembles phone numbers received from automated messages (i.e. 95-111). Once the short-code is texted, the donor gets the opportunity to enter his or her donation amount, which is not preset. The organization can also provide donors other options, such as make a recurring gift, or to update their contact information. In the end, once host vendor fees and credit card processing fees are charged, the donation is transferred to the nonprofit organization, usually in the form of a monthly lump-sum check. Donor information is also available through the host vendor's website.

**Nonprofit Organization Case Studies**

**Western US Case- Youth on Record**

Youth on Record (YoR) is a nonprofit educational organization founded in 2008 and located in Denver, Colorado. Their mission is to "empower Colorado’s under-served youth to achieve their academic, artistic, and personal best by employing local, professional artists as their educators." YoR offers various programs for Denver youth to learn artistic skills that help them transition into life after high school and provide a creative outlet for expression. YoR also provides counseling services with partner organizations that focus on the emotional and psychiatric well-being of young adults dealing with the effects of poverty, abuse, or addiction. The organization is also dedicated to making sure that their youth graduate from high school, so they offer arts classes that count towards graduation credit. These classes focus on creating deliverables of either "a student performance, music recital, book of poetry, recorded class song, compilation of student beats, collaborative community event, etc."
While the organization receives earned revenue through a partnership with the Denver Public School District and merchandise sales, the majority of YoR’s expenses are covered by grants and contributions. Over the past three years, the organization has been steadily receiving more government grants, however, their reliance on individual support and donations cannot be understated. In 2016, the organization held the first annual block party, in which they debuted their compilation CD of students’ work. While the event was free admission, it featured numerous opportunities to donate from food vendor partnerships to a mobile giving campaign. While SMS fundraising was not the highlight of the event, it was a way for individuals to donate directly to YoR without having to purchase food or merchandise.

In addition to fundraising, YoR uses SMS in other aspects to keep its supporters engaged throughout the year,”Youth on Record relies on their mobile subscriber list in order to keep their volunteers notified about upcoming events and opportunities to donate. They also use polling keywords to learn about their supporter base, and carrier-billing-style donation keywords to provide an easy method for their supporters to donate to the cause.” While the financial outcome from the fundraising event was not publicly available, this case study suggests that the organization sees potential in SMS given that it was utilized again in 2017. While it was not the primary method of giving, the staff advertised it as an option, as showcased by the mGive blog piece covering the second annual event: "Located at the front of the room, well-lit, and clearly visible, was a massive TV displaying a prominent mobile call to action." YoR’s actions surrounding their SMS platform show that they see potential, not only as a volunteer engagement tool, but as a donor acquisition and cultivation tool as well.

Southern US Case- Davidson College

Davidson College is a small, private liberal arts college located in Davidson, North Carolina with a mission, "to assist students in developing humane instincts and disciplined and creative minds for lives of leadership and service." The school was founded in 1837 with Presbyterian roots and now has over 1,800 students enrolled and offers 26 majors.

In spring of 2017, Davidson College tested a new way to reach its alumni for annual gifts. The college signed up for Relay, a company that creates texting software for donor engagement. Relay’s texting software is designed for person-to-person conversations, so donors do not receive automated responses. While this may be a concern for nonprofit organizations with smaller development teams, Davidson used student volunteers to assist in the effort.

During the school’s annual day of giving, student volunteers sent over 2,300 text messages to alumni. Using alumni contact information uploaded into Relay’s software, students sent texts with predetermined language, sometimes personalizing it if relevant information was available. If an alum responded to the text message, the student volunteer would then send

---

41 Ibid.
out one of four template replies which would either provide them with donation page link or a polite response to a decline.\textsuperscript{46}

While the campaign only brought in 50 lapsed donors, the college found that its alumni were more receptive to responding to the text messages than anticipated. 1/3 of the individuals reached out to by text message responded and updated their contact information. While donor engagement was not the primary goal of this campaign, it seemed to be an unintentional outcome. When asked by a \textit{Chronicle of Philanthropy} writer if they would use this type of campaign again, a school representative replied that, while they did not want to "use it for everything" they did want to keep strategically experimenting with it.\textsuperscript{47}

\textbf{Facebook Nonprofit}

\textbf{Definition}

Facebook Nonprofit (Facebook NP) is when a nonprofit organization registers to use Facebook's fundraising functions which include donation buttons and fundraising campaigns. In order to use the functions provided only for Facebook Nonprofit organizations, an organization has to register with Facebook and be certificated as a Facebook Nonprofit Organization. In consultation with AMT Lab the research on Facebook as an emerging fundraising tool in this report is narrowed to focus on donation buttons and fundraisers.

\textbf{Trends}

According to the \textit{2018 Global NGO Technology Report}, social media networks are on track to become one of the most powerful and effective fundraising tools.\textsuperscript{48} The report indicates that 97\% of nonprofit organizations in North America have a Facebook page and that 71\% of nonprofit organizations around the world agree that social media is effective for online fundraising.\textsuperscript{49} 25\% of donors in the report also say that social media is the communication tool that most inspires them to give and 62\% of those same donors say that Facebook as their reason to give.\textsuperscript{50} “Today, social networking is an integral part of an NGO’s communications and fundraising strategy.”\textsuperscript{51}

Most nonprofit organizations use Facebook to raise awareness, engage with donors, and attract people to events. However, not all nonprofit organizations on Facebook are registered as Facebook Nonprofit Organizations, and even those that do not utilize all its functions. Because of this, there are potential opportunities they can use in future.

\textbf{How it Works}

Facebook offers a suite of tools that allows donors to donate directly through Facebook and to fundraise on behalf of eligible nonprofit organizations. To use these tools, nonprofit organizations must be a US-based 501(c)(3) organization and register on Facebook as a nonprofit organization. To directly receive donations through Facebook, nonprofit

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 9.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, 10.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, 11.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, 10.
organizations must apply and be approved by Facebook Payments.\textsuperscript{52} If this step is not taken, the nonprofit organization will receive donations through a Network for Good donor-advised Fund or through its own website.\textsuperscript{53}

One of the features that Facebook NP provides is a Fundraiser (named Fundraisers by Facebook). Fundraisers allow people to create a personal campaign on behalf of a nonprofit organization that they select on their personal page. This then allows them to create posts advertising this fundraiser to friends and family on Facebook offering them an easily accessible donation button on each post. Users can also add a donation button to a live video post which allows viewers to donate during the live video or from the published recording on the fundraiser’s profile.

A way to help arts nonprofit organizations’ donors understand Fundraiser on Facebook is to create a customized nonprofit landing page about the Facebook Fundraiser. The customized nonprofit landing page is a page solely made for making online fundraising aside of the arts organization’s profile page. “A customized nonprofit landing page is a place where people can create a fundraiser for your nonprofit. Every landing page has a unique URL that can be used anywhere: in email marketing, Facebook posts, your website or other channels.”\textsuperscript{54} Figure 11 shows an example of a Facebook Fundraiser landing page. Another function that being registered as a Facebook NP provides is the ability to add a donation button to any post or live video the organization creates to drive donor engagement. The nonprofit organization can also add donation buttons to their page header.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Figure 10: Feeding America’s Facebook Fundraiser Landing Page}\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{52} “Enable People to Fundraise,” Nonprofits on Facebook, November 9, 2016, https://nonprofits.fb.com/topic/enable-people-to-fundraise/.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} “Feeding America,” Facebook, May 10, 2018, https://www.facebook.com/fundraisers/feedingAmerica/.
Nonprofit Organization Case Studies

Southern US Case- Safe Harbor
Safe Harbor is an organization in South Carolina that provides safe havens and counseling services to domestic violence victims. Its mission is to provide services for victims of domestic violence and their children and to eliminate cultural acceptance of domestic violence through a coordinated community response, prevention and education. In 2008, Safe Harbor launched a 5Dollarsin5Days.org campaign, to raise 10,000. The campaign ran for a limited time from 12:01 a.m. on December 15th through midnight on December 19th.

Safe Harbor utilized Facebook as a primary channel for the campaign, prior to using the 5Dollarsin5Days.org campaign website. Some of the functions used by Safe Harbor were a customized landing page, a donate button, and Facebook nonprofit advertisements. They used it to target 376 group members on December 1st and encourage them to donate as little as 5 dollars through Facebook. The organization also used digital storytelling by sharing a YouTube video on its Facebook Page and also recorded over two dozen videos of individuals sharing what five dollars meant to them. In addition to these strategies, Safe Harbor created an urgency by limiting the donation window to 5 days. They also purchased the Facebook advertisement in a limited geographic area, primarily South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. Safe Harbor received 1,430 new followers and an overall of $10,100 in 5 days with an average donation of $14.60.

Western US Case- Lifeline Puppy Rescue
Lifeline Puppy Rescue is a Colorado-based organization that rescues puppies from shelters that are not prepared to care for and find homes for them. The organization has adopted over 36,000 dogs to families across the Rocky Mountain Region, Kansas, Texas, and New Mexico areas since 1993. Lifeline offers low-costs adoption fees and a recommended veterinarian list for puppy adopters to receive continuous care advice.

In 2016, Lifeline launched a donation campaign on Facebook to help pay for the rescue and care of Charley the puppy. Charley had hip fractures and the purpose of the campaign was to help cover Charley’s of $1,200 medical expenses and find him a new home. The Facebook functions that Lifeline used included a donate button on their posts and a customized landing page. Lifeline also created a Facebook campaign page with digital storytelling that connected

60 Ibid.
63 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
Facebook users to the cause. They featured pictures and videos of Charley and showcased their $1,200 goal. Lifeline included a clear call to action at the end of the campaign description “Will you help Charley?” and asked for small gifts of $10. Lifeline worked with ActionSprout, a platform that helps with designing and operating Facebook donation campaigns. Lifeline reached its goal within 24 hours. Lifeline received $300 in donations and reached about 7,745 people who shared 169 of the campaign’s posts. 24 donations raised about $1,145 through Action Sprout, and Lifeline also received $250 from its website.

---

Figure 11: “Will You Help Charley?” Image on Lifeline’s Facebook Landing Page

---

Figure 12: Fundraising Thermometer of $1,200 goal on Facebook Donation Page

Please donate and give Charley a fighting chance!
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Figure 13: LifeLine Puppy Rescue Facebook Homepage
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Peer-to-Peer

Definition

Peer-to-Peer fundraising is the use of a digital platform by an external party to raise funds for an organization by asking friends, family, and peers to donate. Vendors such as CauseVox, Razoo, and Salsa are popular peer-to-peer platforms among nonprofit organizations.

Trends

According to the 2017 Global Trends in Giving Report, 33% of all online donations are made through a peer-to-peer platform. Additionally, individual donors across generations are receptive to using peer-to-peer. 87% of Millennials and Generation Xers are willing to use peer-to-peer for their giving. Relatively high numbers of Baby Boomers (77%) and the Silent Generation (63%) also prefer to use a peer-to-peer platform as opposed to other digital fundraising methods. Hence, peer-to-peer fundraising has become more popular in online giving, and there is opportunity for arts organizations to use it to increase their contributed income from individuals.

How it Works

There are three steps to implementing a Peer-to-Peer campaign. First, organizations select an appropriate peer-to-peer platform that offers the services that they need. Second, they register their organization on a host website and create a main page for the overall campaign, which provides all the required information for peer-to-peer fundraiser hosts to use to launch their own campaigns, which is then marketed to the organization’s current supporters. As the hosts post their individualized campaigns on their social media, individuals can either donate or create their own fundraising campaign and can share it with their peers.

Nonprofit Organization Case Studies

Mid-Atlantic US Case-Homeward Trails Animal Rescue Incorporated

Founded in 2001 in Arlington, Virginia, Homeward Trails Animal Rescue Incorporated "seeks to find permanent adoptive homes in the Mid-Atlantic Region for dogs and cats from under-resourced shelters or whose owners can no longer care for them." With the goal of lowering the euthanasia rate of animals in shelters across the state, Homeward Trails (HT) provides shelter, medical treatment, and behavioral training for dogs and cats that come into their care. In the past few years, they began to use peer-to-peer fundraising to raise money for initial care for animals they take in, as well as for animals who require special attention before they can be placed with a permanent new family.

Under its donate button, HT’s website provides an option for donors to "Sponsor an Animal". This page is full of animals that need attention, from an MRI to identify a tumor for further
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treatment to initial veterinary care for a pet who was brought in as a stray.\textsuperscript{81} Clicking on a particular animal's picture takes the potential donor to a peer-to-peer fundraising platform, Razoo (now known as Mightycause). If an animal isn't already sponsored by someone, the individual can create a new campaign for them with the information provided on HT's website. If they are already special, then there is the option to donate to that animal's cause.

On HT's main Razoo landing page, it indicates that the organization has had 3,297 donors and raised over 250,000 through their platform.\textsuperscript{82} Looking at the organization's Form 990's from various years, HT's contributed income has been steadily increasing, going from over $260,000 total in 2012 to over 430,000 in 2016.\textsuperscript{83} This data suggests that the addition of peer-to-peer fundraising opportunities has helped raise the organization's overall contributed income.

New England US Case- The Education Cooperative
The Education Cooperative (TEC) is an organization in located in Walpole, Massachusetts that specializes in creating opportunities for "students 3-22 years of age with moderate to severe special needs."\textsuperscript{84} Established in 1968, the organization works with 16 separate school districts within the state to provide "an engaging and supportive learning environment that offers students opportunities to grow as individuals and become productive members of society."\textsuperscript{85} TEC's campus has a highly trained staff that is attuned to the needs of each student to provide them with a sense of confidence and independence while building "functional and age-appropriate academic skills."\textsuperscript{86}

For its 50th anniversary, TEC created a fundraising campaign to build a fully accessible playground for its main campus in Walpole. TEC wanted to target the community it had built throughout the school districts it served. To help accomplish this, TEC engaged in a peer-to-peer campaign through QGiv.\textsuperscript{87} TEC branded this campaign by dubbing its supporters "Playmakers" in their "Navy". Different "sponsorSHIP" giving levels were delineated with Navy inspired names.\textsuperscript{88} Through TEC’s QGiv platform, it gave its crew of ambassadors, consisting of staff and community members, the information, and data they required to inspire their networks to give, which mainly consisted of "a simple, inspiring story".\textsuperscript{89} Over 500 individuals and local community organizations are listed on the TEC website as a part of the Playmakers campaign. The campaign overall raised over $200,000, which went directly into building the playground, which finished construction in September 2016.\textsuperscript{90}

organization has continued to reach out to this community of supporters, and as of 2018, TEC also added a therapeutic pool to its main campus.91

Mobile Bidding

Definition
Mobile bidding is the use of mobile technology that allows guests to bid and raise funds for an organization at both silent and live auctions.92 Vendors in this space include Bidpal, 501 Auctions, BiddingForGood, and Gesture.

Trends
Nonprofit organizations that activate mobile bidding at their live events generation between 10 to 50 percent more revenue from using mobile bidding.93 The use of mobile bidding software is a way of transforming the auction into a 24/7 online fundraiser that allows users to raise money before, during, and after a live event.94

How It Works
An organization selects a mobile bidding vendor. Fundraising staff and auction managers procure and enter the selected auction items into the mobile bidding platform and sell tickets to the event online. When guests arrive, event staff or volunteers register them by logging them into mobile devices and entering their payment information. Guests have the option of using their own mobile devices or to borrow one provided by the organization or vendor. During the event, guests receive notifications about their items and when they are outbid. Live auction integration is also available for organizations who utilize both types of auctions at an event. At the end of the auction, guests not only pay for items that they won on the app, but also receive email receipts recording their donation. The organization can view an ad hoc report during the event that the platform automatically generates to review the event’s analytics.

Mobile bidding technology not only makes auction events easier for the organization’s staff, but also for participating donors. In traditional auctions, guests would need spend most of their event experience at the silent auction tables to maintain an active bid. With the use of this technology, guests can continue to roam through the event, enjoying food, socializing and other activities, while still bidding in the auction. This allows for auction revenue to rise, as guests have more opportunities to outbid the competition for desired items.

Nonprofit Organization Case Studies

Western US Case- Make-A-Wish Colorado
Make-A-Wish Colorado is one of the country’s oldest chapters of the Make-A-Wish Foundation. The mission of the organization “grants the wishes of children with life-threatening medical conditions to enrich the human experience with hope, strength, and
joy.” Overall it has granted over 5,000 wishes to eligible children throughout the state. A challenge Make-a-Wish Colorado faced during live auctions was during the checkout process. It took too much time and resources to execute. There were also customer experience concerns due to complaints of not enjoying the event. For example, some complaints occurred during a sporting affair when athletes were present at the event, but guests were too busy to both meet the athletes and bid auction items simultaneously.

Make-a-Wish Colorado worked with Gesture. By utilizing mobile bidding technology, guests were more flexible during the live auctions at the Sporting Affair events because they received outbid notifications from their mobile devices and did not have to miss meeting the athletes. The organization also used electronic email receipts to avoid the resources required for printing. Both the organization’s efficiency in operating auction events and the guests’ experience were improved over the last two years. Furthermore, Make-a-Wish Colorado saw a 45% increase in auction revenue when they first implemented mobile bidding at the Sporting Affair event. From 2014 to 2017, the organization raised over $770,700 from over eight campaigns.

Southern US Case- The Pine School
The Pine School is a private college preparatory school that serves students from kindergarten to 12th grade and provides a strong traditional core curriculum while instilling high achievement and a lifelong love for learning in its students. Besides academic excellence, the school aims to “develop each student’s intellectual, physical, and creative talents in a supportive and moral environment.” The challenge was that sponsorships for the school’s Annual Evening at Auction were decreasing year to year. With a lack of growth in sponsorships, the Pine School needed to collect more donations from individuals and targeted growth from auction revenues.

The Pine School chose to utilize OneCause’s mobile bidding technology, Bidpal, to support its gala. Bidpal supports auction events in various capacities from designing a personalized event page on mobile devices to sending email receipts. This technology is able to integrate with online auction platforms and provide a digitally improved engagement for participants. See Appendix C to learn more about Bidpal’s features and functionalities.

While sponsorships continued to decline, revenues from the silent auctions increased with Bidpal. The Pine School raised $77,000 in total contributions in 2012, more than double compared to the year before. The Pine school also used Bidpal to sell 24 tickets to a special
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luncheon where it sold out in less than five minutes, earning the school an additional $3,600. According to the auction coordinator’s comment, the technology simplifies payment collection steps and the process became more efficient in time.

Conclusions

SMS is still taking root as a fundraising pathway inside the non-arts nonprofit sector in the United States. However, when utilized well, these campaigns can be successful as a stand-alone event or as an additional feature to an established event. While SMS use still tends to be utilized as a fundraising remedy or for large-scale emergency situations, the potential of this platform cannot be understated, certainly in terms of donor engagement. While the Davidson College example did not present a large success in terms of raising funds, it did re-engage a significant number of lapsed donors who showed interest in continuing their relationship with the institution. A pathway to successful communication with donors can be key to increased fundraising and support, but it needs to be utilized in a way that those communities will respond in a manner that nonprofit organizations desire.

In Facebook NP cases, the most utilized function for fundraising is the donate button. This evidence resembles the Facebook NP findings in the national survey of arts organizations where the donate button that links to a donation page on an organizations’ website is also the most utilized function. The Facebook NP case studies also used the platform to support an event or host a fundraising campaign. This is similar to the national survey’s, where the second most popular Facebook NP function used is the peer-to-peer-esque fundraiser feature.

An observation made from this research is that Facebook NP is used commonly when organizations need to fundraise in a short period, or they have a clear and not-large goal. Lifeline Puppy Rescue set up a campaign goal of $1,200 and Safe Harbor planned to complete the campaign within 5 days. Both campaigns outperformed expectations. For example, Lifeline reached its goal in only 24 hours. However, some of the case studies suggest that non-arts nonprofits utilize more functions than arts organizations. Two other commonly used functions are Facebook Nonprofits ads, some along with donate buttons in the ads, and a customized nonprofit landing page. From the survey and CRM system user interviews, only about 12% of survey participants selected ‘Other or exclusive’ reasons other than a donate button and Peer-to-Peer fundraiser.

P2P campaigns are used often among the non-arts nonprofit community in the United States. The examples came from various organization types. These campaigns vary either as an annual use or a one-time event. Marathons or walkathons seem to be the event types that are commonly connected to P2P campaigns. Getting donors engaged and motivated by

having them reach a personal achievement while having their peers support them by donating seems to be a format that works well for non-arts P2P campaigns. Not only does this fundraising event type seem lucrative in raising money, but it also seems to build a strong community of supporters. In contrast, the arts nonprofit community does not utilize P2P as much as their non-arts counterparts. Given the successes and techniques discussed in the non-arts nonprofit case studies in this report, P2P campaigns could be a big help to arts organizations worrying about overcoming the challenge of an aging donor base. Also, P2P allows for building solid relationships with an organization’s existing communities that then expands to new donors. This approach not only increases individual contributed income, but also the awareness of the organization. It is a multi-tier approach in which arts organizations can ask their donors not only to donate, but also to create fundraising pages and share with their own networks. There is also great opportunity for this tool in the arts as only 18% of survey participants identified as having used P2P fundraising at their organizations. P2P provides more opportunities of making impactful contributions as supporters will be more actively engaged with the organization via their P2P hosts.

The primary purpose of mobile bidding from the examples was to better facilitate live or silent auction events by using technology everyone has, mobile devices. As a result, the team found two key findings. First, mobile bidding generated the largest average gift when the nonprofit used it for the first time. Second, attendees appreciated the independence. Finally, organizations experienced more streamlined check-out and live-reporting processes.
Chapter 3 Survey, Interviews, and Findings

The largest part of the study was the design, distribution, and analysis of the national survey. The survey results were then cross-referenced to the non-arts nonprofit case studies detailed in the previous section. The survey results helped shaped the framework of what features and functionalities to look for in a Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) system. To better understand survey results interviews of users of 3 large CRM systems (Tessitura, Raisers Edge and Salesforce) were conducted. Lastly, the results also determined the most common digital fundraising vendors used by arts organizations that participated in the national survey. This study evaluated the top vendors to determine what might make them leading choices.

Survey

To understand the trends of emerging digital fundraising technologies in nonprofit arts sectors in the United States, the team conducted a national survey. Survey participants were arts and culture fundraising professionals who oversee fundraising planning in their organizations and have information regarding digital fundraising tools. This study addressed fundraising tools use patterns and implementation barriers to these technologies in arts organizations.

As stated earlier, the survey’s objectives were:

- To understand arts nonprofits’ intended goals in using a specific digital fundraising tool
- To find what resources arts nonprofits use to implement a particular digital fundraising tool
- To learn the barriers of implementing emerging digital fundraising technologies at nonprofit arts organizations.

Design

The survey needed to be taken by arts professionals who are responsible for planning fundraising strategy in their organizations. In order to target the appropriate participants, the survey using a screening question and skip logic to sort the survey with relevant questions to the participants’ digital fundraising experiences. The qualified individuals then selected any emerging digital fundraising tools that their organization used within the last two fiscal years. If they have not used any of the tools before, they were asked about implementation barriers at their organizations. Figure 15 illustrates the overall structure of the survey.

Based on the overarching research question, the survey questions are divided into four categories: practice, purpose, results, and resources. Organization discipline, budget size, staff size and location information was collected to allow for trend analysis. See Appendix A for the official survey questionnaire.
Distribution Plan
The survey was distributed to arts organizations in the United States through four main channels. It was launched on March 22, 2018 and closed on April 9, 2018 at midnight. All survey participants went through the survey landing page on AMT Lab’s website in order to participate in the study. The original distribution plan consisted of asking five major arts associations in the United States to distribute the information to their membership: American Alliance of Museums (AAM), Dance/USA, League of American Orchestras (The League), OPERA America, and Theatre Communications Group (TCG). Only Dance/USA assisted with the survey distribution, and an announcement was posted on AAM’s MuseumJunction discussion forum. The study’s advisory board members helped expand reach to two other associations, American Museums Membership Conference and Art Museum Development Association. These associations forwarded the survey to fundraising professionals within their membership organizations. Additionally, premium advertisement was placed on the homepage of ArtsJournal website for two weeks. Finally, AMT Lab shared the survey through their website, email lists, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter including social advertising on both Twitter and LinkedIn. Google Analytics identified 324 people visited the survey landing page and 173 arts fundraising professionals participated in the survey. The following section summarizes the survey participation.

Participants
As of April 11, 2018, there were 173 responses. 93 complete responses and 80 partial responses.

Geography
The responses were from different regions in the United States including 23 states and territories and 47 cities. The states and territories include California, Colorado, Connecticut, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Maine,

**Discipline**
Out of the 121 responses, there were 19 responses from dance organizations; 1 from Media Arts organizations; 17 from Multi-Disciplinary organizations; 16 from museums or galleries; 6 from Music organizations; 4 from Opera organizations; 17 from theatres; and 6 from other disciplines.

**Budget**
Out of the total responses, 21 were from small arts organizations with annual budgets below $1 million, 40 were from mid-sized arts organizations with annual budgets between $1 million to $10 million, and 25 were from large arts organizations with annual budgets of above $10 million.
Key Findings

1. Arts organizations located in eastern states have more experience in emerging digital fundraising tools than arts organizations in middle and western states.

2. In general, the biggest barrier of using emerging digital tools is lack of experience.

3. Small and mid-sized arts organizations have more issues with staffing and budget when trying to use emerging digital fundraising tools. Large arts organizations have issues with lack of experience and/or didn’t know the tools existed.

4. 58.1% of survey respondents said that they were not integrating their digital fundraising data into the CRM system. The reason behind that will be answered through the CRM system interviews and vendor case studies later in this report.

5. Organizations with larger budget sizes tend to use more pathways overall for their fundraising.

6. Organizations that were founded after 1960 have a higher adoption rate of emerging digital fundraising tools.

7. Organizations, regardless of artistic discipline, share similar goals when using digital fundraising tools.

8. The primary goal with using digital fundraising tools among all organizations, regardless of founding year is to acquire new donors.

9. Arts organizations were using SMS, Facebook NP, and P2P mainly to test these tools, increase total contributed income and reach new donors, arts organizations were using Mobile Bidding to support special events and to engage current donors.

10. More than half of the survey respondents that have an annual budget size of over $10 million pay a flat vendor fee when they use digital fundraising tools.

11. Out of the four emerging digital pathways, Facebook NP is the most used digital fundraising tool and SMS is the least used digital fundraising tool.

Geography
According to the density maps in Figures 18 to 22, arts organizations located in the eastern United States have more experience with emerging digital fundraising tools. The top three US states/districts in which arts organizations use digital fundraising tools most are New York,
Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Surprisingly, arts organizations in western states have less experience in emerging digital fundraising tools. There were no responses from western arts organizations about peer-to-peer fundraising, and most of them selected that they did not use any of the four digital fundraising pathways.

The top three states that use Facebook NP most were Pennsylvania, New York, and California.

*Figure 17: Density Map of Survey Participants who use Facebook NP*

Pennsylvania had the highest response number on using mobile bidding for fundraising. On the other hand, states like New York were not active in using mobile bidding. California had even zero response on using mobile bidding.

*Figure 18: Density Map of Survey Participants who use Mobile Bidding*
Overall, arts organizations in the US rarely use P2P as their fundraising tool. The majority of arts organizations that use P2P are located on the east and west coasts. This marks a significant difference between the arts and other nonprofits which frequently and successfully use P2P.

Figure 19: Density Map of Survey Participants who use Peer-to-Peer

SMS was the least used fundraising pathway regardless of location.

Figure 20: Density Map of Survey Participants who use SMS

California had the highest response number for not using the four emerging digital fundraising pathways. Although Pennsylvania received a large number in responses, with only
2 responses on the None of Above option which suggested that arts organizations in Pennsylvania were relatively more active on emerging fundraising technologies than other states. Interestingly, Pennsylvania was also the state that launched the Community Data Project (now Data Arts) indicating that Pennsylvania seems digitally inclined overall as a state.

**Figure 21: Density Map of Survey Participants Who Are Not Using Any Digital Fundraising Pathways**

![Density Map of Survey Participants Who Are Not Using Any Digital Fundraising Pathways](image)

**Budgets**

As shown in Figure 23, arts organizations with annual budgets above $500,000 tend to use more types of emerging digital fundraising pathways. Although the highest responses came from arts organizations with annual budgets between $1 million to $10 million, the percentage chart in Figure 23 shows that these arts organizations are less inclined to using these digital pathways. Arts organizations with smaller annual budgets had more free and donated vendor services while arts organizations with larger annual budgets had more services with a flat vendor fee. In addition, about one third of the arts organizations no matter budget size chose to pay a percentage of each donation throughout their campaigns.
As shown in Figure 25, more than half of the organizations that have an annual budget size over $10 million pay a flat vendor fee when they use digital fundraising tools. Organizations with a larger budget size tend to use a greater variety of digital fundraising pathways, while smaller organizations utilized less digital fundraising pathways (Figure 26). Small organizations with annual budget sizes of under $500,000 mainly use Facebook Nonprofit for their fundraising.
Experience

Organizations with a smaller annual budget size have more limitations in implementing digital fundraising technology due to budget and staffing. On the other hand, larger organizations did not use emerging digital fundraising pathways mostly due to a lack of experience or knowledge. (Figure 27).
The biggest barrier to implement emerging digital fundraising technologies for all survey respondents is lack of experience. The least common barrier is that they didn’t know the tools existed.

**Founding Year**

The findings in Figure 29 suggest that organizations founded between 1960 to 1999 utilize more digital fundraising tools and those founded before 1959 use less. A common barrier by provided by respondents in these older institutions was difficulty in convincing board members to test new technologies.
Figure 30 suggests that all other organizations, except those founded between 1920-1939, tended to have higher emerging digital fundraising tool adoption rates. Also, the 100% adoption rate for organizations founded between 1920 to 1939 skews biased based on the limited responses received in this year range. Out of all the responses, only 3 respondents were from organizations founded between 1920 to 1939, while other year ranges received significant amount of responses from organizations.

**Staff**

Organizations with an annual budget size under $250,000 usually do not have any fundraising staff. Overall most arts organizations regardless of budget size, run on a fundraising staff of 1 to 5 members in their fundraising department. However, 21% of the survey respondents
suggested that the biggest barrier for them to implementing emerging digital tools was staffing.

**Figure 31: Number of Fundraising Staff by Budget Size**

Organizations with a budget size between $250,000 and $5 million usually have 1 to 5 staff members in their fundraising department. Organizations with a budget size between $5 million and $25 million also have 1 to 5 staff members in their fundraising departments. Organizations with a budget size above $25 million usually have at least over 11 staff in their fundraising department.

**Pathways Goals**

Organizations that were founded in different years and regardless of artistic discipline share similar goals when using digital fundraising tools. To acquire new donors is the primary goal among all organizations from different founding years. However, there are varied goal differences dependent on selected digital fundraising pathways. The top three goals for using SMS are to test the tool, support an annual campaign, and to reach new donors. The top three goals for using Facebook NP are to test the tool, increase total contributed income, and reach new donors. The top three goals for using P2P are to reach new donors, increase total contributed income, and to test the tool. The top three goals for using Mobile Bidding are to support a special event, engage with current donors, and increase total contributed income.
Goals of Using Digital Fundraising Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test certain tools</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase total contributed income</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pathways Comparison
Out of the four emerging digital pathways, Facebook NP is the most used digital fundraising tool. SMS is the least used digital fundraising tool.

CRM Systems
CRM System Interviews
To better understand digital fundraising technology integration, the team conducted a review of literature and interviewed three database administrators that use dominant CRM systems in the nonprofit sector: Blackbaud, Salesforce, and Tessitura. Interview and review of
literature questions were formulated to understand how CRM systems are used with integrating with digital fundraising technologies. This study is limited to the knowledge of the interviewees and the data available online.

While Blackbaud, Salesforce, and Tessitura can integrate with SMS, Facebook NP, P2P, and Mobile Bidding, Salesforce has the highest compatibility with many emerging digital fundraising tools. Each CRM system vendor has a different recommended process for integration. For example, both Blackbaud and Tessitura have more digital fundraising products and services that are developed internally rather than collaborating with third-party vendors. Although Blackbaud and Tessitura have flexibility in design and control over the products. However, they have not solved some external data integration obstacles. According to the Tessitura user, their biggest obstacle with the system is that it creates duplicate accounts after data integration. This leads to more work with data maintenance. The Blackbaud users stated that the SMS integration is a high expense to the organization. Salesforce has built several partnerships with third-party vendors with digital fundraising platforms. There is also a free Salesforce AppExchange application, OneCause Connect, to boost data exchange with Salesforce and improve data security. In order to prevent data duplication and security problems, Salesforce developed four distinct layers: Identity, Data, Process, and Presentation layers.

According to the national survey, 58% of respondents from arts organizations are not integrating digital fundraising data into their CRM system. Cross-referencing with the survey response “lack of experience” suggests that arts organizations may not fully understand the technical functions of data exchange between digital platforms. Other data integration concerns may be issues like acquiring duplicate constituent accounts and data security. SMS, Facebook NP, P2P, and Mobile Bidding are growth engines that foster growth of individual contributed income as evident in the non-arts nonprofit case studies. CRM system vendors may have to either improve their capabilities or better educate their clientele for them to use their CRM systems to the fullest capacity and implement digital fundraising campaigns easily.

Vendor Case Studies

The selected digital fundraising vendors in these case studies were identified from the national survey’s results as the most utilized by arts organizations. The most utilized emerging digital fundraising vendors are Mightycause for P2P, Bidpal and 501 Auctions for Mobile Bidding, and MobileCause for SMS. Bidpal and 501 Auctions tied with the most utilized mobile bidding platforms by arts organizations. Facebook was excluded from this analysis because it is a social media platform and it is widely utilized by nonprofit organizations. The team formulated a questionnaire to help guide the research based on Idealware’s 2017 Field Guide to Software for Nonprofits. The complete criteria questions can be found in Appendix C.

Significant findings from the case studies includes the fact that most of these platforms can integrate with Salesforce, a common CRM platform most utilized by the nonprofit sector.
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overall. If a digital fundraising platform is not compatible to an organization’s CRM system, the data from the campaign can be exported into an Excel spreadsheet and uploaded into the system. A perhaps targeted feature of emerging tools is the access to various types of donor data such as email addresses, phone number, and possibly a mailing address. This leaves room for a fundraising team to retarget those donors for future campaigns. The digital fundraising vendor platforms also generate ad hoc reports so that organizations can keep up the campaign’s progress. Another finding in some featured examples on the vendors’ websites is that arts organizations were able to engage their current donors and also reach new ones while using these tools. For example, the Carolina Ballet in the Bidpal example in Appendix C, not only helped engage and reach donors with the platform, but it also facilitated its finance department’s data entry by exporting the data and uploading it into their finance database. See Appendices C and D for more information on the selected CRM systems and digital fundraising vendors.
Chapter 4 Conclusions

Throughout the emerging digital fundraising studies, the team found similarities and differences in purpose, practice, and resources between arts organizations and the greater nonprofit sector. The findings regarding the results component of the survey were limited to a lack of response to questions about satisfaction, as shown in Appendix A. Overall, there is opportunity for arts organizations to grow contributed income using digital fundraising technology. Digital technologies for nonprofit organizations are being developed very rapidly. To be relevant with donor’s current interests and way of life, arts organizations should take advantage of the opportunity to grow their donors and contributed income in current emerging digital fundraising tools like SMS, P2P, Facebook NP, and Mobile Bidding, before testing even newer technologies like blockchain.

SMS

While both non-arts and arts NPOs that have tried using SMS seem willing to continue its use, it appears to be the least utilized emerging digital pathway. Both sectors reported mixed results, or results that did not align with the original goal. This may explain the logic behind continuing to use the tool, even if it is not having its intended effect. However, there are some differences in practice with using SMS. Survey participants using the technology cited reaching new donors as their main intended goal with SMS, while the non-arts nonprofit organizations studied were using it to engage donors already attending events, as well as to reach existing donors who have lapsed in giving. Arts organizations seem to use it as a pathway for year-round donations, whereas non-arts nonprofit organizations use them to enhance a special event or a strategic campaign.

P2P

Overall, P2P has a significant role in expanding support and awareness of a nonprofit organization. Because of the high level of participation in fundraising and volunteering events, this means that donors value their in-person connections with their favorite nonprofit organization. While this tool encourages widespread engagement, arts organizations and their non-arts counterparts have different purposes in using P2P. Survey participants stated that their primary goal of using P2P is to reach new donors, whereas non-arts organizations appeared use it to engage with existing donors according to the nonprofit case studies. Additionally, most arts organizations implemented P2P campaigns to raise overall total contributed income, while non-arts organizations tended to use it to support specific campaigns such as marathons and walkathons. For instance, in the Homeward Trails case study, the organization created a P2P platform with Razoo and raised over $250,000 to cover service costs for abandoned animals.

P2P is a digital fundraising platform that strengthens the relationship between donors and arts organizations. It is an interactive platform where donors can be more actively engaged.

with their organizations and share their personal stories with their peers. If arts organizations want to build deeper relationships with donors, they should try to include P2P in their fundraising plan.

Facebook NP

The national survey participants and the non-arts nonprofit case studies show similarities in primary objectives for using Facebook NP. The primary purpose for this pathway like the others, is to reach new donors. An example is the Lifeline Puppy Rescue case study where it launched a Facebook NP campaign page to collect $1,200 throughout the United States during a 24-hour period.112

There are differences between the two sectors in how each utilizes Facebook NP. Survey respondents tend to only utilize the Facebook donation. Only 7.8% of survey respondents use functions other than donation button and fundraisers. This contrasts with non-arts nonprofit organizations, like the Safe Harbor case who tended to utilize more of Facebook NP’s features, including customized landing pages. Another difference between the sectors is their use Facebook buttons. For example, arts organizations tend to use the button for multiple purposes beyond soliciting donations. This could be due to arts organizations having two streams of revenue: contributed and earned. This is evidenced in the arts discipline income data where earned revenue is estimated between 30% to 55% and contributed income is estimated from 43% to 50% dependent on discipline.

Mobile Bidding

There are more similarities than differences between arts organizations and their social nonprofit peers in utilizing mobile bidding. Both sectors support special events and enhance engagement with their donors to improve their overall experiences. For example, the Make-A-Wish Colorado case study used mobile bidding for its Sporting Affair to improve its clients’ experience during the auction by speeding up the check-out process. Also, according to survey results, over 85% of arts organizations shared this same goal.

There are organizations in the arts that are either not aware of some emerging digital fundraising technologies like mobile bidding, or do not have funds or staff to support it. According to a CRM system interview, some organizations still use traditional paper-based auctions. This account seems on par for the survey findings where 26% of arts organizations reported using mobile bidding, the second most popular emerging digital fundraising tool by survey respondents. However, there are arts organization success stories like the Carolina Ballet in Appendix C, in how they used mobile fundraising software to raise almost $1 million in four years.113 The results resemble the example of Make-A-Wish Colorado where it used mobile bidding for over eight campaigns.


Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of this study, the research team recommendations the arts nonprofit field look into the following areas in order to better implement digital strategies like fundraising technologies: increase knowledge in emerging technology, choose the right platforms, and work with vendors more closely.

Increase Knowledge in Emerging Technologies

The survey findings suggest that lack of experience, lack of knowledge, and small-numbered fundraising staff are limitations to testing and implementing emerging digital fundraising tools in their organizations. The following recommendations provide pathways for the arts field to increase knowledge in utilizing these emerging technologies.

Most arts organizations are not integrating their external data from technologies like digital fundraising tools into their CRM systems, even if their systems have the capability. The team recommends that arts organizations consult with their CRM system vendors to learn better ways to integrate external data into these platforms efficiently. This way, arts organizations are not missing out on taking advantage of a valuable function when using their CRM system.

Other survey results show that most arts organizations with annual budget sizes smaller than $250,000 have no dedicated fundraising staff members, while mid-sized organizations have only 1 to 5 fundraising staff members and that those staff members are not well versed in digital technologies used in fundraising. Also evident in this study, arts organizations may have staffing and budget barriers that inhibit them from testing and implementing emerging digital fundraising tools. Larger arts organizations also demonstrated implementation issues. About one third of arts organizations with an annual budget size between $5 million to $25 million stated that they too have only 1 to 5 staff in their fundraising departments. Hence, for larger institutions, lack of experience may be compounded by an under-staffed department overall.

The team recommends that organizations take time to research and test digital fundraising technology and offer training and knowledge opportunities for their staff members to learn and gain confidence in digital strategies. Referencing Elizabeth Kane’s AMT Lab post on professional development, “Professional development, much like human resources, is an often-overlooked area in the arts. It is assumed that these are luxuries of bigger firms and for-profit entities. Yet, technology has evened the playing field by allowing organizations of any size to find a simple, low-budget solution to professional development. By improving employees’ growth opportunities, arts organizations can also improve their business capabilities.” There are websites like Lynda.com, Udemy.com and CodeAcademy.com that also cover across many digital topics. This would help small and mid-sized arts organizations raise money more effectively with digital fundraising tools while running on a smaller staff size. There are many free online resources about emerging digital fundraising tools as well as

literature and guidelines for other digital strategies like NTEN, Idealware, and Nonprofit Tech for Good.

Lastly, arts organizations are eager to test digital fundraising tools to raise additional contributed income. For those in the field that have already tested and implemented these technologies, the team recommends that they share their results with other organizations so that their peer arts organizations have references within the sector for how to use them. They can ask for help from the Arts Management and Technology Lab or other entities for writing up case studies, if staffing is a barrier.

Also, most of the non-arts nonprofit organizations case studies in the study reveal that successful digital fundraising campaigns occurred when utilized for specific events or had a direct goal in mind. A recommendation would be for arts organizations to test these technologies around events, rather than using them as supplements to existing strategies. There is also an interest in reaching new donors and increasing contributed income when using digital fundraising tools. Since online contributions have been growing faster than contributed income overall, it is worthwhile for arts organizations to try some or one of these pathways that work best for their organization’s goals to attract new and engaging current donors.

Choose the Right Platforms

More than half of arts organizations in the survey answered that they are not integrating their external data from digital fundraising tools directly into their CRM systems. This can be due to concerns found in the CRM system interviews of data security, creation of duplicate constituent records, or even budgetary issues. Arts fundraising professionals should work collaboratively with their CRM data administrators and vendors in order to implement digital fundraising tools or other digital strategies that require integration. This can lead to using current technological resources to their fullest capacity.

With that in mind, arts managers should also communicate with their CRM system vendors to learn more about opportunities in integrating digital fundraising tools. Some CRM system platforms offer webinars and resources on how to integrate with digital fundraising technologies. If they do not, it can be a dialogue that arts organizations can initiate with their CRM system vendors in order to pave a way for future developments. Also, among three dominant CRM vendors in nonprofit arts organizations, Salesforce has the highest capability of integrating with external technologies. There are numerous CRM platforms available, and if an organization is looking for a new system, arts organizations should review its needs in order to choose the best platform that will accomplish their needs and goals now and in the future. Arts managers can use resources like Idealware’s Field Guide to Software for Nonprofits or AMT Lab’s Ticketing Survey for recommended digital platform features and functionalities.

Conduct Further Research

Research seems critical to future success. One recommendation for the arts sector to conduct further research into hiring practices of arts organizations. A second research opportunity is
to interview non-arts nonprofit organizations that have implemented the four digital fundraising pathways.

The first recommendation is derived from the survey results of arts organizations not being able to implement digital fundraising technology due to lack of experience and knowledge. These meaningful answers can be found by conducting another national survey or through a series of interviews with HR staff members at arts organizations. Some key questions to look into would be: Do arts organizations look for individuals who are skilled in the role they apply to? Or are individuals being hired from within and do not have skills in specific areas like fundraising, marketing, or have skills with digital tools. Also, this recommendation can lead to into learning about an organization’s culture of whether they are interested in pursuing digital solutions in order to stay relevant in today’s world where technology is becoming a staple to success.

The non-arts nonprofit organization interviews would get better implementation results that the team was limited on obtaining during the course of the project. The information from these interviews can inform arts organizations the resources that non-arts organizations are using to get impactful results and use them as comparisons or examples for a proposal to implement digital fundraising strategies in their organizations.

**Final Thoughts**

If arts organizations follow the above recommendations, the sector would be better prepared and more informed about current digital practices that will help them improve their fundraising efforts as well as donor engagement. Having knowledge about these strategies can help arts fundraisers start utilizing digital fundraising tools with more confidence, which can lead to more interest in prototyping newer technologies as they become available. There are many emerging technologies available, and by following these recommendations, arts organizations can expect to run more efficiently as well as staying relevant to today’s digital world.
Appendices

Appendix A—Digital Fundraising Survey

Questionnaire

Inform Consent
1) Are you at least 18 years old?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

2) Have you read and understood the information above?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

3) Would you like to participate in this study and continue with this survey?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

Basic Information
4) Are you involved with the fundraising in your organization?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

5) Which of the following emerging digital fundraising tool(s) has your organization used in the last 2 years?
   [ ] Peer-to Peer (e.g. Razoo, etc.)
   [ ] Mobile Bidding (e.g. Bidpal, etc.)
   [ ] Short Message Service (SMS) - Text Messaging
   [ ] Facebook Nonprofit AND its features (e.g. Donate Button, Fundraising Campaigns)
   [ ] None of above

6) Select all the barriers to implementing digital fundraising campaigns at your organization.
   [ ] Staffing
   [ ] Budget
Lack of experience
[ ] Did not know these tools existed
[ ] Other: ____________________________________________

Peer to Peer

7) Which of the following vendors does your organization use for Peer to Peer?
( ) CauseVox
( ) CrowdRise
( ) Razoo
( ) Salsa
( ) Other: ____________________________________________

8) Select your organization’s intended goals in using Peer to Peer. (Select all that apply)
[ ] To reach new donors
[ ] To reach out to a new donor age group
[ ] To engage with current donors
[ ] To test Peer to Peer within our organization’s fundraising strategy
[ ] To increase total contributed income
[ ] To support an annual campaign
[ ] To support a capital campaign
[ ] To support a special event
[ ] None of the above
[ ] Other: ____________________________________________

9) For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Do you plan to continue to use Peer to Peer in the future?  
( ) Yes  
( ) No  
( ) Unsure

11) On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Peer to Peer during your last digital fundraising campaign?  
( ) 0-5 hour(s)  
( ) 5-10 hours  
( ) 10-15 hours  
( ) 15-20 hours  
( ) 20+ hours
12) How is your organization paying for Peer to Peer platform? (Select all that apply)
[ ] A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign
[ ] A percentage of total campaign donations
[ ] A flat vendor fee
[ ] Free/Donated services
[ ] Other: _________________________________________________

13) Are you integrating data that you receive through Peer to Peer campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I was not aware of this functionality

---

Mobile Bidding

14) Which of the following vendors does your organization use for Mobile Bidding?
( ) AuctionMaestro
( ) BiddingForGood
( ) Bidpal
( ) ClickBid
( ) Other: _________________________________________________

15) Select your organization’s intended goals in using Mobile Bidding. (Select all that apply)
[ ] To reach new donors
[ ] To reach out to a new donor age group
[ ] To engage with current donors
[ ] To test Mobile Bidding within our organization’s fundraising strategy
[ ] To increase total contributed income
[ ] To support an annual campaign
[ ] To support a capital campaign
[ ] To support a special event
[ ] None of the above
16) For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18) On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Mobile Bidding during your last digital fundraising campaign?
( ) 0-5 hour(s)
( ) 5-10 hours
( ) 10-15 hours
( ) 15-20 hours
( ) 20+ hours

19) How is your organization paying for Mobile Bidding platform? (Select all that apply)
[ ] A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign
[ ] A percentage of total campaign donations
[ ] A flat vendor fee
[ ] Free/Donated services
[ ] Other: ________________________________

20) Are you integrating data that you receive through Mobile Bidding campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I was not aware of this functionality

SMS

21) Which of the following vendors does your organization use for SMS?
( ) @Pay
( ) mGive
( ) MobileCause
( ) QGiv
( ) Other: ________________________________
22) Select your organization's intended goals in using SMS. (Select all that apply)
[ ] To reach new donors
[ ] To reach out to a new donor age group
[ ] To engage with current donors
[ ] To test SMS within our organization’s fundraising strategy
[ ] To increase total contributed income
[ ] To support an annual campaign
[ ] To support a capital campaign
[ ] To support a special event
[ ] None of the above
[ ] Other: __________________________________________________________________________

23) For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To support a capital campaign: 

To support a special event: 

Other: 

24) Do you plan to continue to use SMS in the future? 
( ) Yes 
( ) No 
( ) Unsure 

25) On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in SMS during your last digital fundraising campaign? 
( ) 0-5 hour(s) 
( ) 5-10 hours 
( ) 10-15 hours 
( ) 15-20 hours 
( ) 20+ hours 

26) How is your organization paying for SMS platform? (Select all that apply) 
[ ] A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign 
[ ] A percentage of total campaign donations 
[ ] A flat vendor fee 
[ ] Free/Donated services 
[ ] Other: __________________________________________________________
27) Are you integrating data that you receive through SMS campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I was not aware of this functionality

---

**Facebook Nonprofit**

28) Select the function(s) that your organization uses through identifying as a Facebook Nonprofit.
[ ] Donation button that links to the donation page on your website
[ ] Donation button that collects money directly on Facebook
[ ] Peer to peer fundraisers (e.g. birthday and special events)
[ ] Other: __________________________________________________
[ ] Exclusive / None of the above

29) Select your organization's intended goals in using Facebook Nonprofit. (Select all that apply)
[ ] To reach new donors
[ ] To reach out to a new donor age group
[ ] To engage with current donors
[ ] To test Facebook Nonprofit within our organization’s fundraising strategy
[ ] To increase total contributed income
[ ] To support an annual campaign
[ ] To support a capital campaign
[ ] To support a special event
[ ] None of the above
[ ] Other: __________________________________________________
30) For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31) Do you plan to continue to use Facebook Nonprofit in the future?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Unsure

32) On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Facebook Nonprofit during your last digital fundraising campaign?
( ) 0-5 hour(s)
( ) 5-10 hours
33) How is your organization paying for Facebook Nonprofit platform? (Select all that apply)

[ ] A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign
[ ] A percentage of total campaign donations
[ ] A flat vendor fee
[ ] Free/Donated services
[ ] Other: __________________________________________________________

34) Are you integrating data that you receive through Facebook Nonprofit campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) I was not aware of this functionality

Demographics

Please provide us the information about your organization below

35) Which CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system does your organization use to track donor data?

( ) Tessitura

( ) Blackbaud (Raiser’s Edge, eTapestry, Illuminate, etc.)

( ) Salesforce

( ) Spektrix

( ) PatronManager

( ) Other: __________________________________________________________

36) What is your organization’s annual budget size?

( ) Under $250,000
37) In the last fiscal year, approximately how much of your organization’s total contributed income was raised through digital fundraising tools?

( ) <1%
( ) 1-5%
( ) 6-10%
( ) 11-15%
( ) 16-20%
( ) 21%+

38) Which artistic discipline best describes the work displayed at your organization? (Listed below in alphabetical order)

( ) Dance (e.g. Traditional, Contemporary, Ballet, etc.)
( ) Media Arts (e.g. Film, Graphic Design)
( ) Multi-Disciplinary
( ) Museum or Gallery
( ) Music (e.g. Traditional, Multidisciplinary, Symphonic, etc.)
( ) New Media Arts (e.g. Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality)
( ) Opera
( ) Theatre
( ) Other: ____________________________________________

39) During which year range was your organization founded?

( ) Before 1899
( ) 1900-1919
40) How many full-time equivalent paid employees are in your organization's fundraising department?
( ) 0
( ) 1-5 people
( ) 6-10 people
( ) 11-15 people
( ) 16-20 people
( ) Over 20 people

41) What is your organization's zip code?

42) If you would like to receive our final report, please provide your email address below.

________________________________________
**Actual Survey Results**

**Responses Statistics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1. Are you at least 18 years old?**

- **Yes**: 99.4% 167
- **No**: 0.6% 1

**Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. Have you read and understood the information above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3. Would you like to participate in this study and continue with this survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Are you involved with the fundraising in your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Which of the following emerging digital fundraising tool(s) has your organization used in the last 2 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-to Peer (e.g. Razoo, etc.)</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Bidding (e.g. Bidpal, etc.)</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Message Service (SMS) - Text Messaging</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Nonprofit AND its features (e.g. Donate Button, Fundraising Campaigns)</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Select all the barriers to implementing digital fundraising campaigns at your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know these</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools existed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO is old-fashioned, unlikely to approve</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of org is generally opposed to investing in technology tools (even our website and social media)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective for our base</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leadership's unwillingness to integrate emerging technology. Reliance on decade old practices that &quot;have always worked&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure barriers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our patrons are not tech savvy. And, if they were, our peers tell us the return is not worth the effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porting data back into our CRM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional annual fund, membership programs, and major gifts realize higher return on investment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong audience segment for these tools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don't typically do fundraising events so we don't typically see a central need to utilize some of these like mobile bidding. Leadership is typically against using tools like these that make our ask more public.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We use different tools - email, Google AdWords</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you leverage a CRM like Tessitura or Salesforce, there are simply better ways.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university development office prevents individual departments from fundraising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Which of the following vendors does your organization use for Peer to Peer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CrowdRise</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razoo</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salsa</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Rise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GiveMN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoFundMe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great feats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't remember</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.8 Select your organization’s intended goals in using Peer to Peer. (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test Peer to Peer within our organization’s fundraising strategy</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase total contributed income</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

- left over from when you couldn't donate directly to our website | 1
- to help purchase a work of art | 1

Totals | 2
Q9. For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Do you plan to continue to use Peer to Peer in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Peer to Peer during your last digital fundraising campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 hour(s)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 hours</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ hours</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. How is your organization paying for Peer to Peer platform? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A flat vendor fee</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Donated services</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13. Are you integrating data that you receive through Peer to Peer campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 14
Q14. Which of the following vendors does your organization use for Mobile Bidding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BiddingForGood</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidpal</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClickBid</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501 Auctions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GiveSmart</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givergy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Giving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 auctions - used to use BidPal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501Auctions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Cause</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddle 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15. Select your organization's intended goals in using Mobile Bidding. (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test Mobile Bidding within our organization’s fundraising strategy</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase total contributed income</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>remote participation for special event fundraising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

| Totals | 1 |
Q16. For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17. Do you plan to continue to use Mobile Bidding in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18. On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Mobile Bidding during your last digital fundraising campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 hour(s)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 hours</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 hours</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ hours</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19. How is your organization paying for Mobile Bidding platform? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A flat vendor fee</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Donated services</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20. Are you integrating data that you receive through Mobile Bidding campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not aware of this functionality</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21. Which of the following vendors does your organization use for SMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mGive</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MobileCause</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Other**
  - Give Lively: 1
  - Give by cell: 1
  - I messed up: we don't use this, though we have thought about it: 1
  - Mobile Giving Foundation: 1
  - ProTexting: 1
  - bidpal: 1
  - Totals: 6
Q22. Select your organization's intended goals in using SMS. (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test SMS within our organization’s fundraising strategy</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase total contributed income</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (no entered response)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 6.7
Q23. For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes Row %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Row %</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A Row %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24. Do you plan to continue to use SMS in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25. On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in SMS during your last digital fundraising campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 hour(s)</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 hours</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q26. How is your organization paying for SMS platform? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of total campaign donations</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A flat vendor fee</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27. Are you integrating data that you receive through SMS campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not aware of this</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 14
Q28. Select the function(s) that your organization uses through identifying as a Facebook Nonprofit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donation button that links to the donation page on your website</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation button that collects money directly on Facebook</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer to peer fundraisers (e.g. birthday and special events)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive / None of the above</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

- **Boosted ads for special events and campaigns** | 1
- **Posts dedicated to annual fund support and which link to our support page. We do not use the donate button (unfortunately).** | 1
- **Promote Go Fund Me Campaigns** | 1
- **Special Events through a invitation** | 1

**Totals** | 4
Q29. Select your organization's intended goals in using Facebook Nonprofit. (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test Facebook Nonprofit within our...</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase total contributed income</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q30. For each specific goal in last question, please mark whether your organization met the intended goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach new donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reach out to a new donor age group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage with current donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test emerging digital fundraising tools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total amount of contributed income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support an annual campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a capital campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support a special event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31. Do you plan to continue to use Facebook Nonprofit in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q32. On average, how many work hours per week did your organization invest in Facebook Nonprofit during your last digital fundraising campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 hour(s)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 hours</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q33. How is your organization paying for Facebook Nonprofit platform? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of each donation throughout the campaign</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A percentage of total campaign donations</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A flat vendor fee</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Donated services</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know - I don’t think we pay for it?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still testing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34. Are you integrating data that you receive through Facebook Nonprofit campaigns into your organization’s CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not aware of this</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q35. Which CRM (Customer Relationship Management) system does your organization use to track donor data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tessitura</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbaud (Raiser’s Edge, eTapestry, Illuminate, etc.)</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PatronManager</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomerang</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Perfect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts People</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience View</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AudienceView</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently researching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Pro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DonorPerfect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel &amp; MailChimp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel spreadsheet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filemaker Pro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising module as part of our association management system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highrise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insighty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Green Light</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailchimp B.c we dont have the $ for the technologies above.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raisers Edge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeatAdvisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netforum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q36. What is your organization’s annual budget size?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $250,000</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000-$4,999,999</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000-$9,999,999</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000-$19,999,999</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,000-$44,999,999</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,000 and above</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q37. In the last fiscal year, approximately how much of your organization’s total contributed income was raised through digital fundraising tools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%+</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q38. Which artistic discipline best describes the work displayed at your organization? (Listed below in alphabetical order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance (e.g. Traditional, Contemporary, Ballet, etc.)</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts (e.g. Film, Graphic Design)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Disciplinary</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum or Gallery</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (e.g. Traditional, Multidisciplinary, Symphonic, etc.)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Visual and Performing arts: We do them all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts (Fine Art and Hand Crafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service to elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q39. During which year range was your organization founded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1899</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1919</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1939</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1959</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1979</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1999</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2018</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40. How many full-time equivalent paid employees are in your organization's fundraising department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 people</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 people</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 people</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 people</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 people</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41. What is your organization's zip code?
Total responses :72

Q42. If you would like to receive our final report, please provide your email address below.
Total responses: 74
Appendix B— CRM System Interviews

The goal for the CRM System interviews was to learn their users’ experiences in integrating between their CRM system and emerging digital fundraising technology. From the interviewees experiences with implementing these digital fundraising tools, they found both benefits and limitations with integrating them into their CRM systems. This study focused on the three common CRM systems used by arts organizations and other nonprofit organizations: Blackbaud, Salesforce, and Tessitura. The team also conducted a review of literature on these vendors to understand their strengths and weaknesses in terms of integrating with emerging digital fundraising tools. The interviews were conducted in-person or over the phone.

Review of Literature

Blackbaud

Blackbaud has strived to serve “entire social good community, which includes nonprofits, foundations, corporations, education institutions, healthcare institutions, and the individual change agents who support them.” To accomplish this, they offer many platforms, each with its own level of expertise required, services offered, and integrations with other Blackbaud partners or acquisitions. Their four main products are Raiser’s Edge NXT, Blackbaud CRM, Luminate Online, and eTapestry. While all these platforms can function as a Constituent Relationship Manager (CRM), Raiser’s Edge NXT and Luminate Online are specialized in assisting organizations with optimizing their fundraising potential. However, their ability to integrate with all four emerging digital pathways studied in this report are piecemeal at best.

With the importance of social media as a tool to reach supporters, it’s not surprising that all Blackbaud’s major platforms have integrations that allow organizations to easily track and customize their Facebook pages. eTapestry has a Social Media Finder, which “will identify constituents social media handles, provide actionable insight into the networks constituents are most active on, and intuitively group constituents into easy to use queries so you can easily communicate with your constituents and invite them to take action on the social networks your organization has a presence on.” Raiser’s Edge NXT has the ability to “share online donations pages through popular social media outlets” Luminate Online lets users "Add your donation forms to Facebook pages, optimize for mobile phones, or create a mini giving form for use on your site or others.”

P2P is also an up-and-coming fundraising demand from various nonprofit organizations that are finding success from it. However, only two Blackbaud products seem to have solutions for it, Raiser’s Edge NXT and Luminate Online. Raiser’s Edge NXT has a Blackbaud acquisition incorporated into it called EverydayHero. This service “provides the tools for supporters to set

---

up personal fundraising pages for your cause, and Online Express enables social sharing to make it easy to share and ask friends and family to give.”

Luminate Online has another product acquisition called TeamRaiser, which is a full-fledged P2P software all on its own. Along with this, Luminate Online also integrates with partner organizations such as QGiv, another P2P platform.

The last two emerging digital fundraising pathways, SMS and mobile bidding, do not have their own products or software acquisitions present in any of the Blackbaud products. What they do have are integrations to organizations that provide those services. Snowball (formerly known as @Pay) is a Text to Give SMS platform provider. Potential SMS users also have an integration within Raiser’s Edge to uplandMobileMessaging. For mobile bidding, our research encountered just one partner integration with the company Maestrosoft, which only works with eTapestry.

It seems like the main barrier to enabling more integrations and partnerships between Blackbaud and these digital fundraising technologies is the way Blackbaud expands its offerings, which is mainly through the acquisition of other software companies that offer those desired services. However, the one Blackbaud platform that has not been mentioned in this review, Blackbaud CRM, seems to be attempting to counter this. Blackbaud CRM has a feature called the Developer Network, which gives users who want to develop their own integrations the ability to do so within this CRM platform. This is a huge departure from how Blackbaud has previously operated, and hopefully a step in the right direction in terms of more flexibility and variety in the services that Blackbaud provides its users.

Salesforce

Salesforce has strived to create an environment that encourages its users to use digital fundraising tools. It has built several partnerships with various platforms. For example, it works collaboratively with OneCause, a commonly used platform by both non-arts and arts organizations as evident in the non-arts nonprofit case studies and national survey results. OneCause offers a variety of digital fundraising tools like P2P, Text-to-Give, and Mobile Bidding. An example of this is Bidpal, which is the mobile bidding component of OneCause, both of which can be found in Appendix C. To boost data exchange with Salesforce, OneCause developed a Salesforce AppExchange application called OneCause Connect. Users can directly import and

export their constituents’ information between the two platforms. It is a free application and has a robust security system which was tested by both teams thoroughly. According to the Salesforce user in the CRM system interviews, the organization did not have any concerns regarding data security because Salesforce reviews all the publishing data meticulously. Salesforce has four distinct layers in the process of the integration with external system; Identity, Data, Process, and Presentation layers. These layers prevent data duplication and security problems.

This application also saves users time in data cleaning during the integration. When the users import external data from OneCause into their CRM system, they can choose one of two options. One is adding new contacts that will only add the data not previously recorded in the Salesforce database. The other one is making changes to existing Salesforce data by updating the only necessary information from OneCause. According to a Tessitura user, a big concern with direct integration from third-party platforms is the acquiring duplicate accounts during the process.

Salesforce has understood their users’ concerns about the integration with digital fundraising platforms. Collaborations with distinguished digital fundraising vendors enable Salesforce to provide the best services for implementing digital fundraising campaigns. Salesforce will continue to invest in the Nonprofit AppExchange and to look for collaborations to help their users strengthening their communities.

**Tessitura**

Tessitura originated from the Metropolitan Opera’s need to build a CRM system that catered to the needs and functionalities of arts organizations. It was founded in 2001 and is a nonprofit organization that services over 600 arts and cultural institutions. Ever since, Tessitura has been developing in-house technology and working with partners in finding integration solutions. Tessitura also hosts their own conference for professional and technological development, provide webinars and workshops, and customizes its platform based upon an organizations’ needs.

Although Tessitura has many external partnerships with various nonprofit technology platforms such as for ticketing and wealth screening, it does not have specific partnerships or integrations with digital fundraising vendors. They develop technology that facilitate the work of fundraising staff members. For example, Tessitura has a mobile technology called Tessitura On The Go, which allows fundraising professionals access the database and input data and updates.

---
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immediately after meeting donors. However, Tessitura does have technology available that integrates patrons’ ticketing engagement data into an organization’s main database. TN Mobile plus allows for patrons to digitally keep their membership card and tickets in their mobile device. As for the data security aspect, Tessitura users are the only parties that have access of their organization’s constituent personal data.

Interviews

Blackbaud
The chosen interviewee for this platform has been using Blackbaud products such as Raiser’s Edge and Luminate starting in 1992 and 2000 respectively. SMS is the only emerging digital fundraising tool that the user has utilized in the last two years. Although the organization has a Facebook page, it is not using the Facebook NP donation button function. ProTexting is a current SMS platform that the organization utilizes, with “Text-to-Give” signs posted around its venue to encourage donor participation. One of the interviewee’s biggest limitations with this SMS platform is that it does not have an integration with Blackbaud. Although the organization’s previous SMS platform, Mobile Commons provided this integration, it was a costly investment. The organization decided to work manually to update their donors’ information within their Blackbaud database. In the future, the organization would like to explore Peer-to-Peer.

Salesforce
The user chosen as interviewee for this platform is a newer client of Salesforce, and its organization as whole is still in the process of learning it. In addition, the user has not had an opportunity to explore any of the emerging digital fundraising tools yet but would be interested in the future. Currently, the user has only tried P2P over the phone. They worked with Cloud for Good to do some integrations with the CRM. Besides Salesforce, the user also utilized some external technologies. For example, the user participated in a local program which worked with an agent to analyze organizations’ donor behaviors to improve engagement. The user has only used Salesforce to track constituent data since it did not fully integrate with Facebook or another social media. However, the user possessed a positive attitude towards the future of such integrations. From this report’s national survey, 71.4% of respondents have integrated data through P2P campaigns into their organizations’ CRM system. This signifies that this user is very likely to achieve its integration in the future. The most useful function of Salesforce that the user indicated is its ability to minimize the need for manual data entry. They also indicated that they appreciated the account management solutions for different types of campaigns. According to the user, one area that Salesforce could improve is its calendar for event management. They believe this could be improved if it users were able to schedule and manage class registrations. Currently, the biggest concern for the user is how to fully optimize its use of Salesforce.
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Tessitura

The user chosen for this interview has used Tessitura for over a decade, as well as the digital pathways Facebook NP and SMS, in the last two years. They have used the Facebook NP donation button during certain periods of the year, such as for a special event or end of year annual campaigns. During other times of the year, the donation button is replaced with a “Learn More Button” that links to an e-newsletter. The organization is currently using the SMS platform provided by the Mobile Giving Foundation. This platform does not integrate directly with Tessitura, but it provides a spreadsheet that summarizes donors’ information, which is able to be uploaded into the CRM. Although Tessitura has the capability to integrate with Facebook, the organization refrains from using this function because of the possibility of it creating duplicate user accounts, since donors usually have multiple email addresses or phone numbers and the integration does not allow for the CRM to add to existing accounts. Tessitura is currently unable to identify duplicate accounts like other systems, so to work around this, users must enter the information manually.

The interviewee would like to see a feature in Tessitura that can prevent duplicate account creation with the integration with digital fundraising tools. This will save time and help them to communicate with donors more efficiently. In the future, they would like to explore mobile bidding and P2P campaigns to build stronger relationships with their donors.

General Interview Questions

1. Which emerging digital fundraising tools has your organization used in the last two years?

2. Which CRM system is your organization using? How long has your organization been using this CRM system?

3. How does your organization use the external data from [digital fundraising tools] or any other external technologies to operate the organization?

4. Why does your organization integrate from digital tools to CRM and from CRM to digital tools? Can you give us an example?

5. Which is the most useful function of your CRM system in terms of integrating with [digital fundraising technologies]?

6. What obstacles did you encounter as you were integrating CRM system and digital fundraising platforms?

7. What were the limitations you encountered when integrating the data between CRM system and [digital fundraising tools]?
8. Which features or functions do you wish your CRM system had to accelerate the use of [digital fundraising tools]?

9. Do you have any concerns about the integration between CRM system and [digital fundraising platforms]?
Appendix C—Vendor Case Studies

The following digital fundraising platforms were selected based on the national survey's results of most utilized vendors by arts organizations. This section will encompass the following digital fundraising vendors in Peer-to-Peer, Mobile Bidding, and SMS. Facebook is excluded from this analysis since it is the most utilized digital fundraising tool as evident in the survey results. The most utilized emerging digital fundraising platforms by arts organizations were Mightycause (formerly Razoo) for Peer-to Peer, Bidpal and 501 Auctions for Mobile Bidding, and MobileCause for SMS. Per the survey results, Bidpal and 501 Auctions tied with the most utilized mobile bidding platforms by arts organizations. These case studies highlight each vendor's features and functionalities in order to demonstrate why they may be preferred by arts organizations.

This section will also look into what CRM systems the digital fundraising vendors are compatible with. Some of the findings discovered through this research connect back to the non-art nonprofit organization case studies and CRM system interviews (Appendix B). The research team formulated criteria of what features and functions to look for each vendor type based on Idealware's 2017 Field Guide to Software for Nonprofits\textsuperscript{135}.

Questions

1) What functions does the digital fundraising vendor offer?
   a) P2P
      i) Ability to customize fundraising pages
      ii) Easy sharing on social networks and/or personal emails
      iii) Mobile-responsiveness
      iv) Fundraising staff oversight and generates ad hoc reports
   b) SMS
      i) Text to Give vs Text to Donate services
      ii) Branching text responses
      iii) Set donation amounts
      iv) Person to person or application to person functionality
   c) Mobile Bidding
      i) Mobile operating system (e.g. Apple iOS and Google Android)\textsuperscript{136}
      ii) Ability to connect without Wi-Fi\textsuperscript{137}

2) How is payment of the digital fundraising vendor organized for nonprofit organizations? Is there a nonprofit pricing offered?\textsuperscript{138}

3) How does data integrate from the digital fundraising vendor into an organization's CRM system?

\textsuperscript{135} The Idealware Field Guide to Software for Nonprofits (Idealware, 2017).
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid.
a) Are some of these tools compatible with specific CRM System?
b) How does the digital fundraising tool connect to and from the CRM System?

4) Which arts organizations does the digital fundraising vendor feature as a success story on its website?

5) Does the vendor offer technical support? For free or for an extra fee?

6) Does the vendor offer internal dashboards?

7) Does the vendor offer additional or unique engagement tools?

8) Are donations via the vendor tax-deductible for donors?

9) How often does the vendor transfer donations to the designated nonprofit organization?

Mightycause (formerly Razoo)
Mightycause is a platform that is designed for small and mid-sized nonprofit organizations to raise funds. This platform offers a suite of various digital and online fundraising technologies, but this report will focus on its Peer-to-Peer (P2P) component since it was the most utilized by arts organizations according to the national survey. Mightycause calls its P2P product, Charity Fundraising.

Mightycause provides customers features to customize their fundraising pages as they like, including logo display and color. Also, all necessary information for interested donors can be displayed on a fundraising page, such as the organization's Employer Identification Number (EIN), website, address, and an “About Me” section. It also shows individual and team fundraisers that support the organization on this page. Anyone who is interested in supporting a specific nonprofit organization has the option to do so as an individual or a team. The Homeward Trails non-art nonprofit case study showcases how donors can support individually through this platform. There are also options to share the Mightycause fundraising campaign via email and various social media channels, including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Google Plus, and Periscope, as well as an organization’s website. The fundraising pages are also mobile responsive, making it accessible for potential donors to donate directly from their mobile device.

To keep track of the campaign's progress, Mightycause allows for nonprofit organization users to run ad hoc analytic reports, as well as look up individual donors and individual peer-to-peer
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campaigns. Organizations can also obtain donor data from the platform, such as email addresses. Organizations can customize data fields specific to what a fundraising department wants to acquire, like home addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses, for export files or view it directly from Mightycause’s internal “donor management system”. Like many digital fundraising platforms, all fundraising data from Mightycause can be exported as a spreadsheet and uploaded into any CRM system. The current CRM system integration that is listed on Mightycause’s website is Salesforce. The platform also provides technical support, which is included with the nonprofit subscription plans.

Mightycause is free for nonprofit organizations, but it is unclear if a platform fee is charged for organizations that do not hold a subscription plan. However, Mightycause charges a platform fee and a credit card fee to donors on a peer-to-peer fundraising page. The platform also provides technical support, which is included with the nonprofit subscription plans. An interesting feature that Mightycause offers to donors is that they can select to cover these fees at the time of checkout. Mightycause disburses donations electronically to the designated nonprofit organization bi-monthly and all of the donations are tax-deductible for the donor. Since the rebrand from Razoo in April, Mightycause fundraising organizers can now receive monetary tips from donors, where an organizer can opt to keep all tips on their balance or donate a portion or entire balance to the organization he or she is supporting.

An arts organization that is featured on Mightycause as a case study is Cornerstone Theater Company. The organization set up a peer-to-peer capital campaign to raise money for its 30th anniversary campaign, "Vision for the Future", and raised a total of over $100,000 from seven participating teams.

Bidpal

Bidpal is the mobile bidding component of OneCause, a software that facilitates live and silent auctions for fundraising events through its online and mobile app platforms. Bidpal provides a wide range of tools that are specific to event planning, from organizing guest lists to assisting with table seating arrangements. The platform also provides both technical support and onsite event assistance to its customers.

As explained previously, a mobile bidding app can be downloaded onto a guest’s mobile device so they can make instant bids. The Bidpal App can be downloaded to any Apple or Android
device. If there is a concern about guests not having a mobile device, the platform also offers mobile device rentals. Guests are also able to bid online before and after the auction through Bidpal’s online platform.

Part of the services that Bidpal provides to organizations is its quick donation dispersion, as well as ways to monitor an auction’s progress. The platform transfers donations made from an event in approximately two days. Like other digital fundraising vendors, OneCause can also run ad hoc reports of an auction’s progress. As for CRM system integration, any organization that has Salesforce or Raiser’s Edge can connect with Bidpal and OneCause. The fundraising data from the auction can also be exported using a .CSV file which can be uploaded into any CRM system.

The Carolina Ballet is shown as an arts ‘success story’ for its use of Bidpal’s mobile bidding technology on the platform’s webpage. The organization’s concern was that its older patrons would not adapt to a digital solution well, therefore leading to a lack of bidding competition among with other attendees. They consulted with OneCause, which helped the organization better segment its donors and event attendees. The technology also saved the finance department time from manually entering data from paper. Instead, they exported it from the platform and directly into the accounting software. The result of this partnership helped Carolina Ballet raise nearly $1 million in four years.

501 Auctions

501 Auctions is a mobile bidding and online auction vendor headquartered in Brooklyn, New York. Their mission is to “make it easy for guests to use their smartphones to bid on items, receive outbid notifications, and make donations.” Unlike other vendors identified in this survey, 501 Auctions has a narrow focus: working online within the field of online and onsite auctions using mobile technology.

Structured around a flat fee for services rendered, 501 Auctions prides itself on letting its customers take home the entirety of their event earnings, stating on their website: “We believe that you and your cause should be the benefactors of your development team’s hard work... After all, it's your fundraiser!” Along with this, the company aids in making sure that donations are collected easily at customer’s events. They offer services that “charge credit cards, split payments, record donations, and generate tax receipts.” All donations are then transferred to the customer organization’s bank accounts within 48 hours.
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Further research will be needed to discuss data integration or internal event goal tracking, as these aspects are not touched on in the company’s website. However, 501 Auctions does offer technical support that “are ready to provide training, best practices, and support for you and your volunteers.” Their platform also allows clients to pre-sell tickets to an auction, pre-register donors, and collect payment information ahead of events. Some notable clients of 501 Auctions include the Make-A-Wish Foundation, the American Cancer Society, and the YMCA.

MobileCause
MobileCause is a company founded in 2008 whose mission is “to empower nonprofits to enhance donor engagement and funds raised through our digital platform capabilities.” The company offers many different fundraising services of online donor engagement and giving.

MobileCause’s mobile and text related offerings are summed up in two different packages. The first is their “Digital Fundraising & Communications Package: With a multichannel strategy, digital fundraising gives your supporters more choice on how and when to give.” This package gives users access to many forms of digital communication, such as texting, email, and social media, but also direct mail and phone-a-thons. The second package is called the “Messaging Package” which gives users the option to “engage your supporters via mobile and online marketing channels.” This package limits customers to solely mobile communications, such as text messaging and email. To access either of these packages, one must subscribe to MobileCause’s overall platform annually. If additional technical support is needed, each client also gets access to a “resource portal, training webinars, how-to-videos, webmaster support, and 24/7/365 email and phone support.”

Donations processed through MobileCause’s services are met with an automatic receipt which serves as a tax donation letter. The look and feel of this letter can be customized to fit the customer organization’s branding, and include their logo, along with links to social media and details for upcoming campaigns. Donations received will also be deposited into the customer organization’s bank account “within 48 hours of a completed transaction.” An extra perk that MobileCause offers is the creation of a “full nonprofit merchant account” which allows “your organization’s name will appear on donor credit card statements, helping reduce chargebacks.
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You’ll also receive a free credit card swiper to collect in-person donations at events, fundraisers, and more."\textsuperscript{175}

Along with these features, MobileCause also offers customers to add widgets to their websites to “let visitors know they can sign up to receive text message directly from your organization."\textsuperscript{176} This functionality gives potential donors of an organization to be added to a mobile subscription list, which will then be available to the customer organization for download as a .csv file, which “administrators from your organization can download data daily, monthly, or whenever is most convenient.”\textsuperscript{177} These files are basic spreadsheets, which can then be transferred to any database or CRM the customer organization utilizes.

Some notable clients of MobileCause are the Salvation Army, the American Heart Association, the University of Southern California, Habitat for Humanity, and the United Way.\textsuperscript{178}
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Appendix D— NPO Case Studies

The non-arts nonprofit case studies in this section are additional to the cases featured in the report.

Peer-to-Peer

Western US Case- My Friend's Place

My Friend's Place (MFP) is a homeless youth services center located in Hollywood, California. Its mission of the organization is that it "assists and inspires homeless youth to build self-sufficient lives". The organization offers a safe place for homeless youth in the Hollywood area to get food, take a shower, and receive clean clothing. Besides covering basic needs, MFP also offers case management, counseling, legal services, art classes, and employment help through a combination of onsite staff, volunteers, and community partnerships. Given the population they serve, the organization relies on contributed income as it offers its free programmatic services.

In 2015, during a period of growth and increased visibility for the organization, MFP established a relationship with a cast member of the TV show Grey's Anatomy, Giacomo Gianniotti, and the organization Tough Mudder, Inc. Tough Mudder licenses and helps organize boot-camp style obstacle course events where "teamwork isn't just encouraged, it's required." Tough Mudder's partner organizations become obstacle courses for various parts of the year, which allows the company's events to be spread worldwide. The events lend themselves to charity fundraising, which Tough Mudder allows, as long as the organization or a representing donor pays the fee and registers the event on their pre-selected peer-to-peer platform, CrowdRise.

With the assistance of Gianniotti, MFP has had a team running the Los Angeles Tough Mudder, which takes place at East Walker Ranch in Placerita Canyon, California, for the past three years. The latest event, the Los Angeles Tough Mudder 2018, helped MFP raise over $300,000, which was the goal for the event, through 273 donors.

Southern US Case- SPCA Florida

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) Florida is an organization whose mission is "to eliminate animal suffering and to engage the entire community in the welfare and well-being of animals." Founded in 1979 with its headquarters located in Lakeland, Florida, the organization cares for and finds homes for over 6,000 animals a year.
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The organization has long subscribed to an annual Walk-a-Thon, particularly called "Walk for Animals" where a portion of SPCA Florida's overall contributed income is raised.187 These event types have been around for decades and involve individuals who donate money to sponsor friends and family per mile that they walk to support an organization during the event. However, for their 24th Annual Walk for Animals in 2016, SPCA Florida decided to go digital by signing up for a QGiv account.

With a goal of raising $120,000, SPCA Florida set out to make its new online component to an established event run as smoothly possible.188 QGiv's platform allows the organization to create a custom landing page for their event that allowed donors to easily sign-up for and share their own versions of the campaign to friends and family online.189

Throughout the campaign, 322 individuals registered to walk and their sponsors then raised $121,157, which was approximately 10% higher than the campaign goal.190 SPCA Florida has continued to use QGiv for peer-to-peer services since 2016 and had their 28th Annual Walk for Animals on April 21st, 2018, with a goal of another $120,000.191

Midwest US Case- Urban Ecology Center
Founded in 1992 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Urban Ecology Center (UEC) is an environmental protection nonprofit organization whose mission is to "foster ecological understanding as inspiration for change, neighborhood by neighborhood."192 Its programming focuses on providing opportunities for residents to learn about and connect with their natural surroundings, as well as raising awareness about and participating in local sustainability and preservation efforts.

During the last few years, the UEC began using peer-to-peer fundraising in various ways. Starting in 2015, the UEC began hosting an event called HKE MKE, a name created from abbreviated versions of the words "Hike" and "Milwaukee". Individuals were encouraged to take a hike through the local Riverside Park and Milwaukee Rotary Centennial Arboretum while raising money for their hiking team through personalized fundraisers benefitting UEC.193 Another event, called the Green Birding Challenge started in 2010, invited supporters to create a similar team-building fundraiser based around a bird-watching competition. This event "inspires friendly competition and encourages everyone to get outside to explore the wonders of residential and migratory birds in Milwaukee."194 A unique feature about these events was they were branded as family-friendly. The Green Birding Challenge offered three different levels of engagement depending on how experienced a birdwatcher was and how competitive the team wanted to be. Both events also had prizes for the team that raises the most money.195
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According to Classy, the P2P platform that UEC utilized for these events, the organization had a "210% year-over-year growth in revenue" between 2016 and 2017. Furthermore, these results are also evident in the organization's Form 990's for the past three years, which demonstrated a steady growth in fundraising income in particular, going from over $175,000 to over $204,000 between 2014 to 2016.

**Mobile Bidding**

**Mid-Atlantic US Case - PTA of PS 59**

The Parent Teacher Association (PTA) is an organization that supports and enhance their children’s educational experience. The purposes of these programs are to provide support and resources to schools, to develop a cooperative working relationship between parents and teachers, like at schools like PS 59, and to encourage parents to become involved in school governance.

PTA of PS 59 operates silent auctions at their annual galas, where the PTA earns most of its contributed revenue. The biggest challenge for the PTA of PS 59 was that traditional auction processes were time consuming and lacked a fundraising tactic that was in budget. The PTA selected OneCause to support its fundraising campaigns and events. The product integrates with other software such as the online ticketing system used by the organization. It also collects all payments from the events and creates post-event reports based on the event performances. PTA of PS 59 generated $101,000, a high record over the past few years, in total proceeds at its first auction event with the support of the mobile bidding software and raised an average of $110,210 each subsequent year with mobile bidding events.

**New England US Case - WBUR**

90.9 WBUR-FM is Boston’s National Public Radio news station. As a privately and publicly funded nonprofit membership media organization, WBUR relies heavily on contributed support for its overall revenue. WBUR’s use of mobile bidding software not only provided better event experience for donors, but also to solicit more donations from auction events.

WBUR collaborated with Kimbia and 501 Auctions for events like their annual gala and auction. Kimbia provided a personalized pre-event page, an embedded live video feed, and a banner advertisement focusing before and after the events. 501 Auctions provided many services.
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from assisting in advanced purchases and registration, equipment rentals, to technical support. Over the last two years, WBUR reduced its total number of days for fundraising by 50% while it increased its annual donations by 25%. Particularly with mobile bidding, WBUR increased mobile donations by 67%.

**Midwest US Case - LAF**

LAF, formerly the Legal Assistance Foundation of Metropolitan Chicago, is an organization that provides free legal services to the local population living in poverty. As advocates for education, collaboration, and litigation, LAF empower individuals to protect fundamental rights, strengthen communities, create opportunities, and achieve justice, while also ensuring equal justice for everyone. LAF’s main fundraising challenge was finding an accessible way to incorporate technology into their events because their donor demographics are diverse in age and psychographics. In 2015, LAF decided to utilize OneCause for its spring event, *Justice Is Served.*

By using OneCause’s mobile bidding solution, LAF reached their campaign goal of $10,000. The mobile bidding technology not only helped LAF to connect with other donors who are not onsite, but also brings excitement to the donation appeal at the end of luncheon. Besides the financial success, LAF also reached and engaged more donors. In the past, LAF used envelopes on the table to solicit donations with only 10% to 15% return rate. In 2015, LAF tripled the number of donors to 76 from 27 in the year before, receive an average higher gift value of $148.
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