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Abstract

The United Way is an organization that exists for the purpose of helping people in need and bringing about positive social outcomes for the public good. Raising sufficient funds through donations continues to be a challenge in the face of decreasing public assistance, and increased cynicism in the United Way caused by the United Way scandal of 1992. The general downward trend of donations to non-profit organizations is reflected in the donations to the Rochester Institute of Technology's United Way campaign. In the past, employee participation in RIT's United Way campaign was 73%, which has been decreasing throughout the years to a low of 60.5% in 1997. In order to reverse this downward trend, the non-profit organization should be analyzed using the same methods of analysis used in for-profit organizations. One method is use of a questionnaire to determine if the United Way is meeting the needs of its "customers", and also if the campaign events and awareness efforts are effective. The needs of the "internal customers" of RIT's United Way campaign, the Key Captains, are examined as well as the methods used to train the Key Captains. The responses to one major change in the campaign, the distribution method of pledge cards, were also solicited.

Two questionnaires were sent through interoffice mail. The first survey was sent to all RIT faculty and staff, which represent the potential donors to RIT's United Way campaign, and the second was sent to the Key Captains. Data obtained from the two surveys were analyzed using SPSS. The majority of respondents do not attend RIT's United Way campaign events, the United Way Campaign video was rated the
most effective method of delivering the United Way message, and respondents had no preference of pledge card delivery while the Key Captains favored personal delivery of pledge cards. The number one reason why respondents contributed to this year's United Way campaign was due to a sense of responsibility to RIT and/or the Rochester community. The number one reason given for not contributing to this year's United Way campaign was the preference to send a contribution directly to a particular cause.

Crosstabs were also performed to examine potential relationships between the answers given to the survey questions with the gender of the respondent, whether they are faculty or staff, and whether they contributed to this year's campaign.
Chapter I
Introduction

You have just become president of a company. This company does not sell tangible products. The customers do not receive any service that is evident. The "employees" of your company do not get paid, but volunteer their time for your organization. How do you make this type of organization succeed? The United Way Campaign of the Rochester Institute of Technology faces these obstacles every year. The United Way is not selling any product; it is selling a relationship between the United Way and the donor. It is selling the satisfaction of helping others and knowing that the money you donate is being used for a good cause. The employees, or internal customers, likewise, receive only the satisfaction of assisting in the fundraising to benefit those in need.

Due to these facts, RIT's United Way Campaign, as well as any fundraising campaign, has greater challenges than most organizations that directly offer something in return for a person's time or money. How do you interest people in forming a relationship with the United Way, and how do you retain customer loyalty? Those are two major issues. As in any other business, the organization must be willing to change to meet the needs of the customer. One method of determining what the customer needs, and if you are succeeding in meeting those needs, is the customer survey.

RIT's United Way Campaign is designed in a pyramidal structure. The Campaign is headed by one individual, who oversees 105 "Key Captains". Key
Captains are employees who either volunteer or are appointed to represent the United Way campaign effort in their department. The Key Captains are the spokespeople for United Way, and they provide the human touch in the request for donations. The Key Captains are responsible for organizing the departmental United Way presentation during which the United Way campaign video is shown and pledge cards are distributed. In the past, the Key Captains personally distributed the United Way pledge cards to employees. This year, the pledge cards were sent through interoffice mail, resulting in an indirect solicitation for donations. How did the faculty and staff, as well as the Key Captains at RIT feel about this change? What are the opinions of the effectiveness of the various campaign events, and the reasons why people decide to contribute to United Way?

Problem Statement

In the past, employee participation in RIT's United Way campaign has averaged approximately 73%. In 1996, employee participation dropped to 63.95%, and in 1997 participation again dropped to 60.5%. The trend in employee contributions to RIT's United Way Campaign has been one of fewer employees giving larger amounts of money. The Development Office of RIT would like to see a reversal of this downward trend of employee participation. This year's goal is an employee participation rate of 65%. A key to improving employee participation may be to understand the reasons why individuals donate to United Way, and conversely, why they decide not to give. Also, the method in which employees were solicited for
contributions was changed this year, from one of direct contact with the Key Captains to one with a less personal touch. Previously the pledge cards were handed out by the Key Captains, and this year they were distributed through interoffice mail. The reactions of employees to this change in solicitation were measured as well as employees' attitudes toward the United Way campaign activities. Employee suggestions for RIT's United Way campaign were also solicited in the form of an open ended question.

Background

The United Way is an altruistic cause organization, which exists for the purpose of helping other people and bringing about positive social outcomes for the public good. Raising sufficient funds through donations continues to be a challenge in the face of decreasing governmental assistance, and increased public cynicism in non-profit organizations. It is therefore very important that these organizations understand what motivates people to give, and how to motivate people through their marketing strategies. In the past, the same marketing techniques that have been used for consumer goods have been applied to the marketing of altruistic organizations. But these techniques have been unsuccessful, and the classic comment, "you can't sell brotherhood like you sell soap" says it all. The key to marketing altruistic causes is understanding why people help others, and who is most likely to help.

Many believe that demographics play a large role in giving to charitable organizations. The characteristics most likely to be observed in those who contribute
are: ages of 35-64, income extremes - either high income or very low income, college educated, female, married (Anonymous, 1995; Demo, 1996; Mitchell, 1996). Factors influencing an individual's tendency to donate are varied, and include: volunteer work experience, easing of guilt, ego boosting, the desire to get cozy with a clique, a feeling that one is obligated to give due to their prestigious position, people's perceptions of how well off they are and religious belief (Demo, 1996; Edmondson, 1986; Fulkerson, 1995).

Guy & Patton (1988) believes that the strongest motivater in helping others is a deep-seated need to help others without any expectation of reward other than the intrinsic joy of helping. This motivation is translated into behavior only after completion of a decision process ruling an individual's decision to help. The process consists of the following steps: (a) the awareness that another person needs help, (b) interpretation of the situation, (c) recognition of personal responsibility, (d) perception of the ability or competence to help, and (e) implementation of helping action. Each step is necessary but not sufficient, therefore, every step of this process has to be addressed in marketing for altruistic organizations.

**Purpose**

This study will examine the factors motivating people's decisions to give or not to give, analyze the demographics of those who donate, determine the effectiveness of various campaign efforts and peoples' awareness of them, and gain insight on how RIT's United Way campaign can be improved. Attitude toward the new method of pledge card distribution, in which pledge cards are delivered through interoffice
mail, will be compared to the past method in which the Key Captains personally delivered the cards. The effectiveness of Key Captain training methods were also analyzed, and suggestions for improving the Key Captain's job were collected.

**Significance**

Understanding what motivates people to donate to charity organizations can be used for more successful marketing efforts, as well as a more efficiently run campaign. This study will also look at employee participation in the various United Way campaign events, and the extent of employee satisfaction with these events. These results will influence the nature of future United Way campaign events with the goal of increasing employee participation and satisfaction. The major change in the method of pledge card distribution was also analyzed - what were the employee's responses to this change? How did they feel about this method, and did it result in a change in participation in the campaign or the total amount of dollars donated. The Key Captains' preference of pledge card delivery was examined and compared to that of the employees. Analysis of the reactions to the change in pledge card distribution will determine future pledge card distribution methods. The Key Captain's training session elements were examined for their usefulness, allowing future alterations of these methods as needed. In the form of an open ended question, Key Captains were also asked which questions they were asked most frequently by employees. This knowledge will allow the Key Captain trainers to address these questions in the training session, or may lead to modification of the campaign materials to simplify the contribution process for donors.
The United Way of Greater Rochester

The United Way of Greater Rochester has been helping the community for the past 80 years. In 1997, they received the Greater Rochester Quality Award, the only not-for-profit organization to ever do so. This award was the result of United Way's new community investment approach that puts contributions to work in programs that are high performers and get measurable results. United Way distributes donations to over 200 programs and service providers that are striving to implement long-term solutions to important social needs. These programs are divided into the following service areas, called areas of impact: (a) Success by 6, which prepares children for success in school; (b) Kids on Track, which aids teens and adolescents; (c) Strengthening Families, which maintains family stability by offering assistance with food and shelter; (d) Helping Seniors, which encourages older adults to remain independent and involved; and (e) Overcoming Disabilities, which helps people with disabilities in the best way possible.

The percentage of the greater Rochester community that contributes to the United Way is 33.5%, a majority of the donations being from employees and corporations. 99% of the money collected remains in the seven-county area of eastern Orleans, Genesee, Wyoming, Livingston, Wayne, Ontario and Monroe counties. The United Way of Greater Rochester is one of the most efficient not-for-profits in the United States. Only 8% of the funds collected are used for
administration and fundraising (Investing in Greater Rochester, 1998).

The United Way's two themes for 1997 were (a) reaching out to everybody and (b) raising more money. For many years the fund raising efforts of United Way have focused on large corporations, but recently the fund raising efforts have branched out to reach other sectors of the business community. The smaller, privately owned businesses are a relatively untapped source of donations that the United Way is now focusing on ("United Way reaches out", 1997). Locally, the backbone of the United Way campaign were the community's large employers, Kodak and Xerox. Recently, 10,000 workers have left these corporations, placing small businesses in a more prominent role in the local economy. Eighty-six percent of businesses in the Rochester area have 20 or fewer employees, and their workers have become the campaign focus of the United Way of Greater Rochester ("Small businesses", 1998).

The United Way Scandal

Fund raising has been stagnant since 1992, when budgetary scandals at the United Way of America's headquarters in Alexandria Virginia prompted donors to rethink their support ("United Way reaches out", 1997). In 1992 the United Way of America (UWA) released a report detailing numerous financial abuses charged against its former president William Aramony and two of his aids. They are accused of transferring more than $1 million annually from UWA to several of its spin-off organizations, and spending thousands more on blatantly improper travel, personal items, pensions and insurance plans. Kenneth Dam, the interim president for UWA stated "These conclusions are disturbing and will certainly outrage people who have
given their hard-earned money week by week to help the United Way (UW) help those in need. They will, and should, feel betrayed" ("United Way reaches out", 1997, p. SB3).

The report's details were relayed to local UW affiliates with the hope that the UWA's painful disclosures would begin to restore their confidence. Due to the scandal, numerous local UW agencies withheld their dues owed to the UWA, resulting in a $2.5 million drop from 1991's dues. Dam told a national conference of UW representatives that the national organization may go under if their dues payments continue to be withheld. Numerous UW locals withdrew from the umbrella group dropping the membership from 1,400 in 1991 to 1,083 in 1993. Total giving to the UWA declined for the first time since World War II. Elaine Chao, a banker, was brought in to help the UWA. The United Way scandal affected not only the UWA, but all not-for-profit organizations. Kenneth Albrecht, National Charities Information Bureau president expressed astonishment over the 1992 report. "This kind of stuff leaves you grief stricken. It doesn't just affect the UWA, it affects local United Ways, it could affect local senior-citizen and day-care centers. It affects every single one of us who is involved in the charitable field in this country. We are all diminished and the public trust has been diminished" (Scala, 1992, p.11)

**Diminished Funding**

The William Aramony story, the health care system in revolution, various clergy scandals and the shakedown of the educational system have led to many stories involving misuse of funds. Non-profit executives who have adopted a
for-profit attitude are receiving excessive salaries, resulting in more cynicism by the public. This cynicism is a major obstacle for fund raising campaign as well as others. Walton (1997) also believes that two other forces working against not-for-profit campaigns are a decreased sense of community due to a very mobile society, and growing corporate change resulting in downsizing, relocations, takeovers and the growing pressure on workers to produce midst the globalization of the economy. Stable organizations and a steady state environment were important factors in running capital campaigns in the past. At the beginning of this decade, the UWA published "Nine Forces Reshaping America", in which they listed nine change drivers of the 1990's: (a) the maturation of America, (b) the mosaic society, (c) redefinition of individual and societal roles, (d) the information-based economy, (e) globalization, (f) personal and environmental health, (g) economic restructuring, (h) family and home redefined, and (i) the rebirth of social activism. Fundraising success is believed to be affected by these trends and changes in the environment. In addition to these trends, Wagner (1995) has identified an additional set of "change drivers" that impact the ability of fundraising executives to secure resources for their organizations: (a) new types of donors with a focus on minorities, (b) women and graying America, (c) reduction in government spending, (d) more sophisticated donors, (e) shrinking corporate support, (f) increased competition for funds, (g) government regulations of non-profits and fundraising, and (h) the criticisms of the non-profit sector resulting from the UWA scandal.
Finding New Donors

Faced with all of these obstacles, fund-raisers need to focus on finding new donors. A study, "The Voice of the Donor 1995: Who Gives and Why?" revealed three main reasons why people give: (a) they believe in the cause, (b) they believe the charity spends its dollars wisely, and (c) they believe in the organization's effectiveness. The survey also provided seven clues to finding new donors: (a) Target people who give to churches and other houses of worship, whether or not your organization is religious; (b) Target middle-aged donors; (c) Concentrate on planned giving, and target planned giving donors for other forms of fundraising; (d) be sure people know that your organization is effective and efficient. Tell them where their money will be spent and what percentage of donations go directly toward your cause; (e) Identify donors motivations, and use this knowledge to create new segmentation by message elements; (f) Support message segmentation with selective media or lists that are outside your current prospects; (g) Build relationships with donors who give over $500 a year. Do this by sending them relevant information and allow them access to the organization's leaders (Anonymous, 1995). Non-profit groups may also find new donors among younger people by attracting them as local volunteers. A pattern of giving begins when a person feels a personal link to an organization, and young donors will not give more unless they know exactly where there money is going.

The workplace is also a source of potential donors. According to a University of San Francisco study performed by Cathie Witty, one-sixth or more employees said that they had not given at the workplace because they either did not find any
groups to support listed on the campaign materials, or the groups they wanted to support were not included in the workplace campaign. The majority of respondents indicated they might give if there was a greater choice of organizations. In 1992, a Gallup organization survey conducted by the National/United Service Agencies found that half of the respondents indicated that they would prefer that their workplace charitable contributions not be limited locally, but be used across the country (Bothwell & Daley, 1993).

The types of people most likely to donate share the following demographics: most are between the ages of 35-64, the higher the income the more they donate to charity, people aged 65 and above give the largest percentage of their income (although a majority is given to religious institutions), most have a college education, and a professional occupation (Mitchell, 1996; Edmondson, 1986). The average donor in the United States is a religious, middle-aged, married, college educated woman (Anonymous, 1995). Edmondson (1986) listed the top five psychographics of giving: (a) weekly attendance at a religious service, (b) people's perception of how well off they are, (c) little worries about financial security, (d) no worries, and (e) volunteer work for charities. Church goers gave $990 annually compared to $300 annually for a non-church goer. Forty-seven percent of those who volunteered gave a higher donation ($830) than non-volunteers ($510) and people who volunteered more than three hours a week gave the most ($1020).

Why do People Donate?

Understanding the attitudes of donors, and the factors that motivate them may
be the keys to designing a campaign marketing strategy to target new donors, or to further develop existing relationships. The United Way is an example of an altruistic cause organization. These organizations exist for the purpose of helping other people and bringing about positive social outcomes for the public good. Raising sufficient funds through donations has always been a challenge and is becoming more so by the limitation of governmental assistance. For years, altruistic organizations have been using a marketing approach to fund raising, but there have been problems with this approach. The classic comment, "You can't sell brotherhood like you sell soap" illustrates the need for a different strategy. To raise more funds, the marketing strategy of altruistic organizations must be re-examined. These organizations must adopt a new marketing perspective that focuses on understanding the donor rather than attempting to transfer marketing techniques. As with the study of consumer behavior, many studies of charitable giving behavior have attempted to apply economic theory to contributing activity, resulting in few useful insights. As well as economic reasons for donor behavior, there is also a large body of theory in social psychology and other behavioral sciences that should be examined. (Guy & Patton, 1988).

**Altruistic Motivation**

Although much of human behavior can be explained by economic self interest, there appears to be a completely separate, deep seated set of altruistic motivations that cause people to behave in a manner that provides an intrinsic reward from giving for the benefit of others. This basic, deep-seated altruistic motive
is not the only reason behind helping behavior. Social scientists have identified several possible answers to the question of why people help other people: they may help simply because they expect some economic or social reward for doing so, or they may have the expectation that others might help the giver at some future point in time when there is a need. Some people may help in order to adhere to social norms, and others may give because of empathy and guilt. There is evidence that some motivaters are stronger than others, and the strongest seems to be the deep-seated need to help others without expectation of reward other than the joy of helping (Guy & Patton, 1988).

Studies have revealed that people who give to others because of expectation of personal gain, adherence to social norms, or increased status or self-esteem are: less highly motivated to help, less involved in helping others, and less likely to provide appropriate helping responses than are those who give because they have the intrinsic need to help others. The key implication of these findings is that not only is intrinsic motivation the strongest, it is activated and facilitated by the simple fact that someone needs help and the motivation to help is actually inhibited when external rewards for helping are offered. When marketing altruistic organizations, many advertise the benefits of donating to the organization, such as tax advantages, external rewards given throughout the campaign, and social acceptance. These offerings may actually inhibit the giving response of those most likely to give, and give the most. Guy & Patton (1988) believe that a simple appeal to man's deep seated need to help others may be the single most effective activator of motivation to give, and marketers should not overestimate the value of economic or social self
interest or other external rewards as motivating factors.

**Decision Process Leading to Helping Behavior**

People's motivation to help others is translated into behavior only after the individual has completed a decision process that leads to that behavior (this process is different than a purchase decision). The basic steps are: 1. The awareness that another person needs help. 2. Interpretation of the situation. The awareness stage triggers the process, but the remainder of the process depends on how the person interprets the situation in terms of intensity and urgency of the need, the potential consequences to the individual in need as well as to the helper, the extent to which the person may be deserving of help, and the behavior of others who are aware of the situation. 3. Recognition of personal responsibility. Once the situation is interpreted as one in which someone should help, the individual must recognize that he or she is the one who must act to help. 4. Perception of the ability or competence to help. The desire to help and the ability to help are two different things. Unless an individual feels there is something he or she can do that will be effective, no helping action will take place. If the individual identifies actions that he or she feels competent or able to perform, help is likely to be given. In order for this step to be completed, the individual must perceive that there is a course of action that they are able to take and that this action will actually help the person in need. 5. Implementation of helping action. Once the preceding steps have been completed, the individual must take the final step of engaging in the appropriate helping behavior. As with any linkage between intention to behave and actual
behavior, environmental factors such as time, physical barriers, or the weather may enhance or inhibit the actual behavior.

This decision process has implications on marketing. Despite the underlying motivation to help others, a breakdown can occur at any point in this process, terminating the behavior. None of the steps can be ignored. Each is necessary but not sufficient. There are potential mitigating factors that may influence any of the steps, such as internal characteristics and external characteristics (Guy & Patton, 1988).

**Internal Characteristics**

Internal characteristics consist of the following: 1. Demographics such as income, age, location of residence. The wealthier give more, and the wealthy and the poor give higher proportions of income to altruistic causes than do those in the middle-income brackets. Younger people (under 35) give the least to altruistic causes, while older people (50+) give the most. Small town people give more than city dwellers. 2. personality variables - few studies have been able to establish a significant relationship between personality type and helping behavior. The strongest indication of a "giving personality" comes from the studies that indicate that people who focus on other people and value internal/intrinsic rewards tend to help more than do people who are self-centered and value external rewards. 3. social status - people who hold high status in the community and who hold positions of power tend to give more. Professionals also tend to give more than those with occupations of less status. 4. Peoples' moods influence giving behavior. People who are in good moods tend to give more, while those in a neutral mood tend
to help the least. 5. Knowledge, ability and resources - people help others only when they think they can. People who perceive that they lack the appropriate knowledge or expertise will not help. 6. Previous experience - previous experience with an altruistic cause organization may enhance or hinder future helping behavior. People who have given to an organization or have volunteered are more likely to give, and are likely to give more than those who have not. If an individual gave a gift, but felt that it did not benefit the needy are not likely to give further donations (Guy & Patton, 1988).

External Factors

There is strong evidence that factors external to the situation have a considerably stronger influence on helping behavior than do the personal characteristics of an individual, but many of these external factors may be controlled to some extent. The external factors are: 1. The nature of the appeal. If an individual is to become aware of and interpret a situation as one in which help is needed, the request for help must be clear and unambiguous. The appeal must also indicate the intensity of the need and the salience of the consequences of help being withheld. An individual is more likely to help when the situation is interpreted as having urgency and immediacy. The amount of personalized contact in the request for help is also important. Individuals are more likely to help when face-to-face with the person requesting help. To be most effective, the appeal must indicate that the potential donor is personally responsible for helping and is accountable for the well-being of others. Appeals to anonymous occupants are likely to elicit little
response, but appeals tailored to an individual by name and that treat the individual as unique are more likely to engender the desired response. 2. Other people involved in the situation. This is the strongest external influence on helping behavior. People are choosy about who they are willing to help - they are most likely to help others in need who are like themselves and are considered to be "we" rather than "they". Attractive people are more likely to be helped, and people with handicaps unrelated to the request for help are less likely to be helped than those without handicaps. Help is less likely to be given to someone who is perceived to be responsible for being in need in the first place. The largest effect of other people comes from the uninvolved bystander, people who are present but not requesting help. Individuals rely strongly on the reactions of the bystanders to help them interpret the situation. If other people behave as if there is no need for help, the individual will do likewise. The number of bystanders is also important - the more people present when an appeal for help is made, the less likely it is that an individual will help. This phenomenon is called diffusion of responsibility. The findings suggest that a request for donation presented to a large group of people is likely to elicit little positive response. 3. Availability of alternate courses of action - if there is no course of action deemed appropriate for the situation, an individual will not help. If there are alternative courses of action available, the individual may provide help in a way that fits their talents and resources. 4. Environmental factors - although most people want to help others, the effort they exert in overcoming barriers to helping is directly related to the perceived intensity and urgency of the need. Helping behavior will be seen only if there is sufficient motivation to
overcome the barriers presented by time, space, weather or physical obstruction. These potential barriers can be removed by making the action easy (telephone pledge) or scheduling a campaign in times of good weather, which not only removes a barrier but provides a good mood (Guy & Patton, 1988).

Applications to Marketing

These internal characteristics and external factors that affect the helping process have applications to marketing: 1. provide need satisfaction - external rewards for giving, such as tax benefits, admission to special events, and even recognition often satisfy only secondary needs and may even be counterproductive if they overshadow the basic intrinsic need satisfaction. An individual may gain such external rewards from many different "purchases" but the opportunity to help others may be treated as a relatively scarce commodity and thus be of considerable value. 2. Generate awareness that a need exists - marketers of altruistic causes must ensure that the potential donor is first reached by the appeal for help and then convinced clearly that the need is urgent, immediate and serious. The potential donor must also be convinced that those in need are deserving or worthy of help. Mass media may be needed to reach many potential donors with the message of need, despite the fact that the mass media's impersonality may inhibit the effectiveness of direct appeals because of the media's inability to treat the potential donor as unique or to attach personal responsibility. The mass media can be effective, however, in highlighting the nature of the need and the consequences that are probable. 3. Instill a sense of personal responsibility - the potential donor must be approached as a
unique individual in order for personal responsibility to be instilled. Face to face
personal contact is essential at some point for larger contributions. The necessity for
one-to-one contact cannot be taken lightly. Making a plea for donations to groups
must be performed only if one knows that, although the group approach may raise
the awareness that a need exists, it will be typically ineffective in soliciting action
because of the phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility. The members of the
audience in essence become bystanders for one another and no sense of personal
responsibility is aroused. Instead, the organization must build a network of
individuals who are willing to carry the plea to others, who in turn recruit others to
spread the word and ask for help. This "pyramiding" approach allows the inclusion
of large numbers of one-to-one contacts among individuals who know one another
and may thus be able to generate the feeling of unique personal responsibility. Also,
the people who become involved in the helping effort are more likely to make
donations themselves and make larger donations than those who have not been
involved. The organization in need must convince potential donors that their
donation is not merely critical to the success of the campaign, but is critical to those
in need. 4. Demonstrate ability/competence to help - a critical point in
demonstrating the donor's ability to help is being able to demonstrate that the gift to
the organization will actually help the needy. The marketers must keep in mind that
the donor's basic motivation is not to help the organization but to help the needy. The
organization must be able to show through case history examples, or historical data
that the donor's gift will gain the result intended. This point is particularly important
in today's atmosphere of distrust of public institutions and the prevalence of
semi-fraudulent charitable causes (Guy & Patton, 1988).

**Donor Surveys**

Fund raising efforts can be improved by using methods that the for-profit sector uses to determine customer satisfaction - the questionnaire. Donor surveys can be used to determine how people feel about an organization, their reasons for donating or not donating, and who are the people most likely to contribute to the organization. Most successful profit and not-for-profit organizations conduct extensive surveys of their customers at least every three to four years. The survey is essential to the not-for-profit organization, because no commercial product is being sold to the public. Instead, the organization is seeking to establish relationships with the donors, therefore, it is important that it knows its donors. The following topics are useful in a donor survey:

(a) **Awareness of the organization.** Do the donors recall the mission of your organization, and do they understand it?
(b) **The priorities and motivation for giving.** What characteristics do donors look for in deciding when to donate, and what is the most important motivating factor?
(c) **The perception of the organization.** How effective is the organization perceived to be in the fulfillment of its goals? How satisfied are the donors with the way the organization spends its funds?
(d) **How satisfied are the donors overall with the communications they receive from the organization?**
(e) **Demographic information and miscellaneous** (Campbell, 1992).
Improving Fund Raising Campaigns

Donor Choice

Donors like to choose where their money goes (Beattie, 1995; Cotton, 1991; Walter, 1997). Also, adding other organizations to the donor options attracts an increased number of employees to give. Increasing the number of options does not reduce the number of contributions to United Way, and it leads to greater interest in the annual campaign which is shown by increased employee participation (Cotton, 1991).

Kalman Stein, president of Earth Share, a Washington D.C. based federation of 44 national environmental nonprofits and local partners, believes that "Employees in the 1990s are used to having choices in almost every phase of their lives. People have diverse interests and want to express them. Why shouldn't the company facilitate that?". Robert Bothwell, president of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, feels that "Alternative funds offer greater community involvement". He estimates that 15% of funds raised in the workplace go out to about 200 alternative federations, each with a minimum of 15 member charities.

John Coy, president of the Consulting Network of Vienna, Va. states "If you really believe in employee empowerment, you want this to have employee ownership. In an expanded campaign, the emphasis goes on the value of giving, not on giving to a certain organization. It sends a message to employees that we care about their interests and want to serve them" (Walter, 1997, p.108).

Campaign Design

The Gannett Co. media chain's fundraising campaign in their corporate offices in Arlington, Va. is low key. One department is not pitted against the other, and
employees are not made to reach a certain goal. They also do not want a lot of recognition because they believe that giving is a personal choice, and that employees should not feel obligated to give (Walter, 1997).

The public relations committee of the Scott & White Hospital and Clinic in Temple, Texas, believes that a fundraising campaign should be fun and exciting. A campaign theme works well, and campaign efforts and materials should relate to this theme. The theme of Scott & White's fundraising campaign was "The Driving Force". A local car dealership agreed to donate a car for the campaign, and each staff member received one chance to win the car for every gift of $1 per pay period. Larger gifts earned more chances. Several marketing items, including a brochure and campaign pin were distributed to each staff member that attended their campaign presentation, and those who returned their gift cards were given a T-shirt. They felt that the campaign literature was very important in ensuring that every staff member understood the need for their support. To create an atmosphere of fun and teamwork during the campaign, pins, slogans, signs, the car drawing, and monthly staff updates featuring a drive-in theme with popcorn and old movies were used (Reault & Mackey, 1996).

John L. Montgomery, president of the Scott & White Hospital and Clinic believes it's how you ask people to give that counts. Staff were asked to give in staff presentations in which a speech was given by John Montgomery and a video was shown. Each presentation included reasons for the campaign and the reason for soliciting the staff (Reault, 1996). The Orlando Regional Healthcare Foundation also uses management to distribute campaign brochures and pledge cards. The mangers
also collect the pledge cards, which are perforated in order for the card to be closed to maintain employee confidentiality (Beattie, 1995).

The Orlando Regional Healthcare Foundation, the philanthropic link of Orlando Regional Healthcare system found that one of their key challenges in their fundraising campaign was communicating the changes they had made to their employees. They felt that printing new fliers in addition to newsletters already available was not the best way to reach all employees, and video presentations had low turnouts due to voluntary attendance. Instead, they trained volunteers to make presentations to hospital departments. In these presentations, employees received direct information about the campaign from a co-worker who shared their own personal reasons for participating in the campaign. Another communication approach they used was a series of "infomercials" which aired over the hospital's voice mail system during the campaign. Each week, upbeat messages focusing on a specific aspect of the campaign were aired. These received a positive response from employees, and were a fun reminder to donate. In order to focus on the donor's needs, instead of the needs of the campaign, the Orlando Regional Healthcare Foundation did not publish their internal goal of employee participation and the amount of money to be raised. Employees were asked to give based upon their ability, and their interest in the project they were contributing to (Beattie, 1995).

In 1995 the annual fund campaign of Southern Wesleyan College celebrated their third year of 100% employee participation. Wayne King, vice president of development believes that to gain 100% participation, the campaign must be well planned, comprehensive and targeted. Their campaign's theme was "How Do You
Eat An Elephant?", and began with a "kick off" rally. During the campaign the main campus announcement board featured a large elephant puzzle, and as each percentage goal was reached, a piece of the elephant was removed. Status reports were sent to employees with an invitation to attend the victory celebration, which featured a large sheetcake in the shape of an elephant. King feels that the advantage of this approach is focusing the attention on the importance of 100% participation, and it provides an opportunity for the development staff to interact with other employees and to personally express their appreciation for their financial support (King, 1995).

Stressing 100% employee participation stresses needs of the organization more than those of the donor. The donor first approach takes the interests of the donor into account, and focusing on what makes the organization of interest to the donor is the key to growth. Only a long-term approach to building relationships with donors will yield the true rewards of a fund raising program. Before making any decisions or forming policies related to fund raising, the organization must think of the donors' hopes and wishes. At every level of fund raising, within the organization, the donor comes first. As well as establishing this policy, the organization must do the following: (a) highlight an organizational commitment to donors, (b) learn all it can about the interests of its donors, (c) work to educate all employees and volunteers to understand their role in cultivating philanthropic support, (d) encourage all employees to treat donors with respect. (e) have a commitment to encouraging board members, administrators and other leaders to become personally involved in donor cultivation and support the philanthropic solicitation
processes, (f) Have a passionate regard for the need to make giving a gift an enjoyable experience, and (g) be committed to measuring and improving the donor experience (Hart, 1996).

Donors must feel that making a gift to your organization is enjoyable, and that the fundraising campaign is reliable and the money is handled well. Learn how to improve the donation process through the use of surveys and focus groups. Review every part of the campaign from the donor's perspective, not just as isolated events, but the entire process from beginning to end.
Chapter III
Methodology

Anonymous mail questionnaires were sent to two groups of respondents: (a) Key Captains and (b) RIT faculty and staff. The questionnaires included open ended questions, closed questions, and questions containing Likert type attitudescales. These questions were constructed under the guidance of Vicki Dodds, Donor Relations Associate of the Office of Development at RIT. Dodds is currently heading RIT's United Way campaign. Both questionnaires addressed the major change in this year's campaign - the method of pledge card distribution. The Key Captain survey, which was sent to all Key Captains (a total of 100 people), included questions addressing the effectiveness of Key Captain training, the use of various United Way campaign materials and incentives, and how their job can be simplified (see appendix A). The donor survey, which was distributed to all faculty and staff (a total of 1200 people), included questions addressing their attendance at the various United Way Campaign events, the effectiveness of campaign materials, their reasons for giving or not giving, and demographic information (see appendix B). Preliminary questionnaires were reviewed and modified by Dr. Pat Sorce of RIT's College of Business and by Sharon Rosenblum, MPA, Vice President for Operations of Research Re:source. A pilot study was conducted on members of the Development office to ensure that the questionnaire was easy to understand and of reasonable length. The surveys were distributed by interoffice mail and returned to the Development office through interoffice mail. Data from both surveys were analyzed
using SPSS.

**Questionnaire Design**

**Content of the Questionnaire**

In questionnaire design, there are many variables to take into consideration. A good questionnaire should meet the objectives of the research, obtain the most accurate and complete information possible, and do this within the limits of available time and resources. There are several dimensions of public opinion that should be covered in survey research: (a) people's knowledge or awareness of the issue; (b) the respondent's interest in the problem, or concern about it; (c) The respondent's attitudes toward the issue - are they satisfied or dissatisfied; do they approve or disapprove; (d) Why do respondent's feel the way they do?; (e) How strongly is the opinion held? Also, people's attitudes are affected by demographic factors, such as age, income, sex, race, level of education and place of residence, and questions addressing these are routinely included (Rossi, Wright & Anderson, 1983).

In determining the content of the questionnaire, these steps should be followed: (a) Decide what information is required, (b) Draft questions that will elicit the needed information, (c) Place the questions into a meaningful order and format, (d) Pretest the resultant questions, (e) Go back to step number one (Rossi et al., 1983). If the questionnaire will be administered to a large number of people, the questions must be standardized; there needs to be a prescribed wording for each question so that each respondent receives the same stimulus. Slight changes in wording can significantly alter responses. Standardized questionnaires have disadvantages - respondents interpret the questions differently, they are forced into
what may seem to them an unnatural reply, and they have no opportunity to qualify their answers or explain their opinions more precisely. The questions of the survey, therefore, must meet the data needs, but also be understandable to most respondents.

**Open vs. Closed Questions**

Another major decision is the use of open versus closed questions. Both have advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage of open questions is that they allow respondents to answer in their own frames of reference, uninfluenced by any specific alternatives suggested by the interviewer. They also reveal what is most salient to respondents, what things are foremost in their minds, while closed questions do not allow this. The researcher should be aware that some of the closed responses were selected only because the respondent was reminded of them. Closed questions have a number of disadvantages. They suggest answers that respondents may not have thought of before, they force respondents into what may be an unnatural frame of reference and they do not permit them to express the exact shade of their meaning. In answering an open question, respondents can attach qualifications to their answers or emphasize the strength of their opinions. Open questions have disadvantages as well; they inevitably elicit a great deal of repetitious, irrelevant material (Rossi et al., 1983).

Efforts are sometimes made to combine open and closed forms of question, but these are rarely successful. One example of this is to ask a closed question but allow for an "other" answer. This type of question gives the respondent a chance to mention something else, but many who would have chosen a different reason if it had
been suggested to them will simply choose one of the listed choices without bothering themselves to think of something else. The researcher is advised to close up as many questions as possible. Open questions are usually employed only:

(a) when there are too many categories to be listed or foreseen; (b) when one wants the respondent's spontaneous, uninfluenced reply; (c) to build rapport during the interview; (d) use in exploratory interviewing and pretesting, when the interviewer wants to get some idea of the parameters of an issue, followed by a closing up of the questions later (Rossi et al., 1983).

Open questions should be limited on self-administered surveys. A survey should not begin with an open ended question; the best place is at the end of the survey, to give respondents a chance to make additional comments (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

**Questionnaire Format**

Sudman & Bradburn (1982) also list many useful suggestions for the format of a questionnaire: (a) Use booklet format for ease in reading and turning pages and to prevent lost pages; (b) The appearance of a mail or self-administered questionnaire has an important impact on response. The questionnaire should look easy to answer and professionally designed and printed; (c) a date, title of the study and the name of the organization conducting the study should be on the first page of the questionnaire for identification; (d) Do not crowd questions. Be sure that sufficient space is left for open-ended questions, since the answer will not be longer than the space provided; (e) Use sufficiently large and clear type so that there is no strain in
reading; (f) Colored covers or sections of the questionnaire may be helpful to interviewers when multiple forms are used or for complex skipping patterns; (g) Each question should be numbered, and subparts of a question should be lettered to prevent questions from being omitted in error and to facilitate the use of skip instructions. Indent subparts of questions; (h) Do not split a question between two pages, since interviewers or respondents may think that the question is completed at the end of a page; (i) When asking identical questions about multiple household members or events, use parallel columns and facing pages if necessary. If questions about one person or event cover more than one page, use die-cut (shortened) pages so that the identifying information is always visible; (j) Provide directions and probes for specific questions at appropriate places in the questionnaire; identify these directions with distinctive type, such as capitals or italics; (k) Use vertical answer format for individual questions; (l) In face-to-face interviews, use cards to show the respondent the scale. To save space, the verbal answers for a scale may be read across rather than up and down; (m) Place skip instructions immediately after the answer; (n) For personal interviews, put spaces on the questionnaire to record the time the interview started and ended and other information on any special problems. (o) Precode all closed questionnaires to facilitate data processing and to ensure that the data are in proper form for analysis; (p) Precolumn the questionnaire; (q) Always end the questionnaire with a thank you.

**Threatening or Nonthreatening Question?**

The way a question is asked is influenced by whether that question or the topic of the survey in general is threatening or nonthreatening. To determine if a
question is threatening or nonthreatening, ask whether respondents can possibly feel that there is a "right" and a "wrong" answer to it. Certain behaviors are seen by many people as socially desirable, and therefore may be overreported. One of these behaviors is fulfilling moral and social responsibilities, such as giving to charity and helping friends in need, being employed, or actively participating in family affairs and childrearing. Use of the words "happen to" is intended to reduce possible biases caused by socially desirable answers. "...or not" is intended to give equal weight to both the positive and negative answer. Although the responses to this question might not differ substantially from those to the question without "happen to" and "or not", the additional words are intended to act as insurance in the absence of a split-ballot experiment. For example, a question may be worded: "Did you happen to give to United Way this year?" versus "Did you give to United Way this year". A 1949 Denver Study performed by Parry and Crossely worded a question concerning charitable giving using the suggestions mentioned above. The question read: "Did you, yourself, happen to contribute or pledge any money to the Community Chest during its campaign last fall?" The results were compared with the records of the Denver Community Chest. About one third of respondents reported giving and actually gave; 34% did not give but reported that they did. As the topic becomes very socially desirable, words such as "happen to" evidently have little effect on reducing overreporting. The following are suggestions for reducing the overreporting of socially desirable behavior: (a) The casual approach. The use of the phrase "Did you happen to..." is intended to reduce the perceived importance of a topic; (b) reasons why not - if respondents are given reasons for not doing socially
desirable things such as voting they should be less likely to overreport such behavior. Anonymous procedures seem to work better for socially desirable behavior than for socially undesirable behavior. In a personal situation, respondents will feel a need to impress the interviewer by reporting behavior such as voting, and giving to charity. They do not feel the same need to impress anonymous researchers (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

Scaling

Likert scales are commonly used in social research. A set of statements are given that reflect favorably or unfavorably on the attitude object. After each statement an agreement scale is given, and respondents are asked to indicate on the scale the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement. The agreement scale may have only two choices - agree or disagree, but most commonly, five categories are given. The five categories used are: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. If the statement is unfavorable toward the subject the scoring is reversed. The scale can be adapted to the particular application, and in some cases more categories are added to permit finer distinction, and in others the neutral category is omitted. It is usually recommended that an equal number of positive and negative statements be used. After the respondent has responded to each statement, the scores are summed and the respondent's attitude is assumed to be represented by the sum. High total scores represent favorable attitudes and low scores represent unfavorable attitudes toward the subject.

To use the Likert scale it is assumed that there is a continuous underlying attitude dimension and that each item is monotonically related to that continuum. It is
also assumed that the sum of the item scores is monotonically related to the attitude. It is assumed that the sum is a linear function of the individual items equally weighted (this assumption is not necessary). Third, there is assumed to be a single common factor - what is being measured is only one underlying common attitude. Each item score is assumed to be the weighted combination of two independent factors, one of which is the attitude we are attempting to measure, and the other factor being some specific component belonging to the individual item (Rossi et al., 1983).

Likert type scales have a greater advantage than questions that limit the response to a "yes" or "no" answer. From a statistical perspective scales with two response options are less reliable than scales with a five response options. Likert type scales will also allow the determination of positive and negative responses for a given item. The responses at the end of the scale may be combined. For example, the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" categories can be combined, as well as the "agree" and "strongly agree" categories. A response of 1 or 2 is then considered to be a response of 1, a response of 3 is considered to be a response of 2, and a response of 4 or 5 is considered to be a response of 3. The five point scale then becomes a three point scale, with a score of 1 representing a negative response, and a score of 3 representing a positive response (Hayes, 1998).

Scope and Limitations

Mail questionnaires are well known for receiving a low response rate, therefore, I am expecting a low percentage rate of return, which may affect the conclusions. Also, the use of mail questionnaires tends to result in bias due to the low
response rate of those who are "middle of the road" on a particular issue. The survey was also limited in the number of questions asked in order to increase the potential number of respondents, therefore not all information that may have been useful was obtained. I would also have preferred to receive more demographic information, such as yearly income, but these questions were omitted upon pretesting, due to their offensive nature.
Chapter IV

Results

RIT's United Way Campaign Events

A majority of the faculty and staff do not attend the United Way campaign events. The most popular of the events is A Taste of RIT, with 80% of those who attended rating it a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5. The golf tournament was second in popularity, with 82% those who attended rating it a 4 or 5, although 95% of respondents did not attend (Table C1 & Table E1).

RIT's United Way Campaign Efforts

In measuring the effectiveness of the various United Way campaign efforts in delivering the United Way message, the majority of respondents have seen or experienced the events. Most of the events were rated as effective (a rating of 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5). The campaign video was rated most effective; 72% of respondents who have seen the video rated it a 4 or 5. 50% of respondents reported that they did not see the United Way campaign video, and 48% of respondents did not attend or were not offered a department presentation, which was also rated as effective by 56% of those who attended a presentation. The least effective campaign events were the United Way campaign newsletter and the News & Events articles (Table C2 & Table E2).

Method of Pledge Card Distribution Preferred

43% of respondents had no preference as to the method of pledge card
distribution, whether they be hand delivered by their Key Captain or sent through interoffice mail. With those who indicated a preference, delivery by interoffice mail was the most preferred (Table C3).

**Rating of Key Captains**

86% of respondents knew who their Key Captains were, and in general the Key Captains were viewed positively. They were able to answer questions, and they appear to be supportive of United Way (Table C4).

**Contributions**

88% of respondents contributed to this year's campaign, and 84% contributed to last year's campaign. Of those who contributed to this year's campaign, the most frequently reported reasons for contributing were: (a) a sense of responsibility to RIT and/or the Rochester community (51%), (b) the convenience of payroll deduction (34%), and (c) the donor choice options (31%) (Table C5). The most frequently reported reasons for not contributing to this year's campaign were: (a) I prefer to send my contribution directly to a particular cause (7%), and (b) I do not like the fact that I am asked to give through my employer (6%) (Table C6).

**Bruegger's Bagels Offer**

Only 42% of respondents reported that their departments took advantage of the Bruegger's Bagel's offer, and only 7% of respondents felt the bagels influenced
their attendance at their department's United Way campaign presentation. (Table C7).

Demographics of Respondents

The average length of years respondents have worked at RIT was 13. A majority of respondents were female (72%), staff (78%) and full-time (93%) (Table C8), and a majority of respondents (26%) were from the National Institute for the Deaf (Table C9).

Open Ended Questions

Answers to the open-ended questions were affinity sorted into several categories (Appendix H). The top reasons why respondents did not contribute to this year's campaign were: (a) issues with the campaign - people did not like being pressured to contribute at their place of employment, and (b) issues with United Way - problems with the manner in which United Way conducts its business. The top reasons why respondents contributed to this year's campaign: (a) a sense of obligation, (b) to help others and (c) to support specific agencies. The most frequently stated suggestions for improving RIT's United Way campaign fall into the following categories: (a) decrease the number/cancel the campaign events (or cancel the campaign), (b) decrease the pressure to give at place of employment, (c) increase the number of events - create more events that are more flexible for those who work unusual hours and events that are more varied, (d) solve the envelope problem, and (e) increase the number of raffle prizes.
Methods of Becoming a Key Captain

The average number of years the Key Captains have served was 5 years. Only 11% of the Key Captains were appointed, with the remainder volunteering or being asked in approximately equal percentages (Table D1).

Key Captain Training Session

A majority of the Key Captains (71%) attended a training session this year, and 61% rated the training session as effective (rated a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5) (Table D2). All aspects of the training session were rated as useful (rated a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5), with the Key Captain training packet receiving the highest percentage (78%) (Table D2).

Number of Employees, Pledge Card Delivery Preferred & Follow Up Method

The average number of employees a Key Captain is responsible for was 17, and an average of 14 people attend the department presentations. The average number of employees a Key Captain follows up with to give to United Way was 14. 68% of Key Captains prefer to personally deliver pledge cards, while only 16% had no preference (Table D4). Most Key Captains follow up after delivering pledge cards (96%), with the personal visit the favored method (40%) (Table D5).

Open Ended Questions

The open-ended questions of the Key Captain survey were also affinity sorted, and the categories with the highest number of responses will be indicated here. All
other responses can be found in Appendix I. The top reason why Key Captains did not attend the training sessions was a problem of conflicting schedules - the timing of the training session conflicted with an event at work. The questions most often asked by employees were: (a) questions involving the envelope problem, and (b) how to make designations for more agencies. The top suggestions for making the job of Key Captain easier were: (a) solve the sealed envelope problem and (b) reinstate the personal delivery of pledge cards to employees.

Crosstabs

Crosstabs were performed in order to determine if relationships existed between answers given to the survey questions and specific aspects of the contributor. The aspects of the contributor that were examined were: (a) did you give to this year's campaign, (b) gender, (c) faculty or staff, and (d) number of years employed at RIT. A crosstab result was considered significant if the likelihood ratio was 0.05 or below, and these were the only results reported.

Relationships With Whether or Not Respondents Contribute

The first crosstab performed was between question number 5 on the donor survey and all other questions on the survey (Appendix A). Relationships were found to exist between whether or not respondents contributed to this year's campaign and the following aspects of the campaign awareness efforts: (a) the RIT campaign video, (b) News & Events articles, (c) Key Captain efforts, (d) e-mail event reminders,
Contributors found these campaign awareness events to be useful or they liked them very much (rated a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5), while non-contributors gave them a lower rating (Table F1). Contributors were more likely to rate their Key Captain more highly in the aspects examined. A higher percentage of contributors knew who their Key Captains were compared to non-contributors, and contributors rated Key Captains higher than non-contributors on the following: (a) was your Key Captain helpful in answering questions, (b) was your Key Captain supportive of United Way, and (c) did your Key Captain thank you (Table F2). There was also a relationship between contribution to this year's campaign and contribution to last year's campaign. Of those who contributed to this year's campaign, 92% contributed to last year's campaign, while of those who did not contribute to this year's campaign, only 24% contributed to last year's campaign.

**Relationships With Gender of Respondent**

The possibility of gender playing a role in answers given to the survey, crosstabs were performed between question 9a and the other questions on the donor survey (Appendix A). Males rated the golf tournament higher than the females, with 87% rating it a 4 or a 5 (Table G1). A larger number of males than females had moral issues with one or more agencies that United Way supports (Table G4), and more males hold faculty positions than females, 44% vs. 13%. More females than males answered yes to the following aspects of Key Captain performance: (a) did you know who your key captain was, (b) was your Key Captain
helpful in answering questions, and (c) did your Key Captain thank you (Table G3). More females than males also believed their department took advantage of the Bruegger's Bagels offer, 49% vs. 27%, and more staff positions are held by females than males, 87% vs. 56%.

**Relationships With Faculty or Staff Position**

With regards to any differences in answers depending upon whether the respondent was a faculty or staff member, there were few correlations. The faculty felt the campaign posters were very effective, 72% rated them 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5 compared to 58% of staff members. 10% of faculty members who did not contribute to this year's campaign answered yes to "I do not like the fact that I am asked through my employer" compared to 3% of staff members who did not contribute. In comparison to faculty members, more staff members felt that their Key Captains were helpful in answering questions, 60% vs. 44%, and more staff members contribute for the chance to win valuable raffle prizes (21%) than faculty members (13%).
Chapter V
Discussion

Need For Survey

In the past few years, the trend in employee contributions to RIT's United Way campaign has been one of fewer employees making larger contributions. Employee participation in the United Way campaign has dropped from 73% to 60.5%. The Development Office at RIT would like to see a reversal in this downward trend. The first step in improving campaign participation is to measure the effectiveness of the campaign events and awareness efforts, as well as how well the campaign is meeting the needs of the donors. The role of the Key Captain also needs to be examined in order to ensure proper training. Two sets of questionnaires were developed to examine RIT's United Way campaign. The first questionnaire was sent to all RIT faculty and staff. A total of 1200 questionnaires were sent, and 370 responses were received. The second questionnaire was sent to all Key Captains, a total of 100 people, of which 56 responded.

Pledge Card Distribution

As well as the overall performance of RIT's United Way campaign, there was one change in campaign efforts. The major difference in this year's campaign in relation to last year's campaign was the method of distribution of pledge cards. This year the pledge cards were distributed through interoffice mail, compared to hand delivery by Key Captains as in the past. On the part of respondents to the survey,
there seems to be no particular preference between the two. The Key Captains
prefer to hand deliver the pledge cards. The method of distributing pledge cards
should return to hand delivery of the pledge cards. An important part of the Key
Captain job is the human touch from the interaction with the employees in their
department. Guy (1998) feels that a donor must be approached as a unique
individual in order for personal responsibility to be instilled. This can be
accomplished by the organization building a network of people to carry the message
to others; in this case, by use of the Key Captains. This will also solve the problem of
employees not knowing who their Key Captain is, and will allow the employees to
approach the Key Captain more easily if they have questions or concerns about the
campaign. The human touch has also plays a role in the decision to contribute to
charity.

RIT's United Way Campaign Events

A majority of the respondents did not attend the various United Way campaign
events RIT organized. The open-ended question on the survey asking for ways to
improve the campaign yielded a number requests to reduce campaign events
and/or efforts. There were also a number of respondents with positive comments
regarding the events, and even a few suggestions for new events. Either the events
should be canceled, or the most unfavorable events should be discontinued, with the
addition of new events that would attract more people. The most popular event was
A Taste of RIT. There were a few useful suggestions regarding this event.
Respondents suggested that this idea be expanded into possibly a breakfast as well
as a dessert offering late in the afternoon for those who could not attend A Taste of RIT offered during lunch time. The video and departmental presentation were also rated as effective in delivering the United Way message. Showing of the video should be increased as well as attendance at the departmental presentations. A small percentage of respondents indicated that the Bruegger's Bagels offer, in which Bruegger's Bagels supplied free bagels and cream cheese for departmental presentations in which the United Way video was shown, influenced their attendance at their department's presentation. This would indicate that a stimulus, such as food would not be an incentive to attend the departmental presentation. There were respondents that commented that they would have given more if their department had taken advantage of the Bruegger's Bagels offer. There were comments from Key Captains about the difficulty in carrying out the offer. If there is method of supplying incentives to attend the video presentation that is easier, incentives should be used. The results of the survey indicate that the bagels did not influence very many, but personal experience suggests that food is a good incentive to attend almost any event.

RIT's United Way Campaign Efforts

The campaign newsletter is an area for improvement; it was rated the least effective in delivering the United Way message. A useful suggestion from one of the respondents would be to have people that have received help from United Way speak at the campus. This would be a clear example of how the money United Way receives is spent to help people in the community, give the human touch factor, and
may influence people to give who otherwise may not give. This would be more effective than any article that could be read in the campaign newsletter.

Reasons For Contributing

The most cited reasons for contributing to this year's campaign were: (a) a sense of responsibility to the RIT and/or Rochester community, (b) the convenience of payroll deduction, and (c) the donor choice options. The donor choice options should clearly remain varied and many, and payroll deduction should continue to be offered. The sense of responsibility to RIT and the Rochester community can be used to the campaign's advantage. The United Way video is very good at imparting a sense of responsibility and should be viewed by as many people as possible. Speakers from the Rochester area who have benefited from the help of United Way would be a plus - what better way to induce a sense of community? If people that work at RIT have received help from United Way in the past, or if their relatives have received help, they could also speak at department presentations. This would demonstrate that even the RIT community itself is affected by the dollars given to United Way. This would also generate awareness that a need exists, and that the need is immediate, meeting one of the two basic requirements for marketing altruistic causes.

Relationships of Contributors & Campaign Efforts

Performance of crosstabs between whether the respondent contributed to this year's campaign and the remaining questions on the survey indicated a positive
relationship between United Way campaign awareness efforts and contributors. There was also a positive relationship between contributors and Key Captain efforts. The campaign awareness efforts are important for contributors as well as the efforts of the Key Captains, and efforts should be made in order to continually improve them. Key Captain efforts are positively viewed by the respondents, and the training sessions were rated as effective by a large percentage of the Key Captains. The questions Key Captains were most frequently asked regarded how to fill out the donor choice forms and the pledge cards. Answer to these questions may be addressed during Key Captain training sessions, or these forms may need to be simplified to be more easily understood by contributors. There was also an envelope problem this year, which many people mentioned. The sealed return envelope problem should be looked into, and should easily be remedied.

Reasons For Not Contributing

The most frequently stated answers as to why respondents did not contribute to this year's campaign were a preference to send the money directly to an agency, and the dislike of being asked to contribute through the place of employment. The United Way scandal of the past may still influence people to believe that a large portion of the dollars donated is used for overhead and frivolous expenses. The continuous reinforcement of the small percentage of contributions used for overhead may make people feel more comfortable about contributing their money through United Way rather than directly to an agency. If a donor feels that their contribution did not benefit the needy they will most likely stop contributing. Also by
maintaining a large donor choice option, people are likely to find a cause that they believe in supporting. Not much can be done about the fact that people are asked to give through their employer. If this wasn't the case, there would be no RIT United Way campaign. The pressure can be reduced slightly by not pressuring individual departments to obtain 100% participation, or pressuring all of RIT to reach a certain percentage of people contributing for the year. Goals are important, but if people are pressured to give in order to reach some quota, it detracts from the fact that people are contributing to help other people improve their lives, not to reach a quota. And the pressure may make some people feel animosity toward United Way, which may override their giving behavior.

Demographics of Respondents

A large percentage of the respondents were female (72%), full-time (93%), and staff members (78%). According to data supplied by Nicoletta M. Bruno of the Human Resource Department, there are approximately the same number of males and females employed by RIT (1036 vs. 1182). Therefore females had a higher tendency to fill out the survey compared to males. There was no significant relationship found between tendency to contribute to this year’s RIT United Way campaign and gender. According to most demographic information on donors, females are more likely than males to contribute. This may still be a possibility if the males that were interested enough to complete the survey happened to be the ones who contributed to this year’s campaign.

There were also few significant correlations in relation to position held, and
whether respondents were full-time or part-time. The majority of the respondents that were full-time (98%) correlates well with the percentage of RIT employees that are full-time (94%), and the number of respondents who were staff members (78%) also correlates well with the actual number of staff members (71%). These data were also supplied by Nicoletta M. Bruno.
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Appendix A contains the Rochester Institute of Technology's United Way Campaign survey that was sent to 1200 faculty and Staff members in May 1998.
RIT's United Way Campaign Survey 1998

Please take a moment to complete the following survey. Your participation is appreciated and will help us improve RIT's United Way Campaign. Please return the survey to the Office of Development, Building #1-2100, by May 11. Mail labels have been used for the ease of mailing these to you, but responses will remain anonymous. If you would like to blacken out your name label, feel free to do so. Thank you for your help!

1. How did you like the following United Way campaign events?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>did not like</th>
<th>liked very much</th>
<th>did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Golf tournament</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A Taste of RIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sink the Tiger Raffle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Wrap up celebration with The Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How would you rate the effectiveness of the following campaign awareness efforts in delivering the United Way message?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>very ineffective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>did not see/experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. RIT campaign video</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. RIT campaign posters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. News &amp; Events articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Key Captain efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. E-mail event reminders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. United Way Campaign newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Department presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. This year the United Way pledge cards were delivered through interoffice mail. In the past Key Captains personally delivered the pledge cards to all faculty and staff. Which method did you prefer?
   - interoffice mail
   - personal delivery
   - no preference

4. Please rate your Key Captains on the following:

   a. Did you know who your Key Captain was?  ○ yes  ○ no
   b. Was your Key Captain helpful in answering questions?  ○ yes  ○ no  ○ not applicable
   c. Was your Key Captain supportive of United Way?  ○ yes  ○ no  ○ not applicable
   d. Did your Key Captain thank you?  ○ yes  ○ no  ○ not applicable

5. Did you give to this year’s campaign (1998)?
   - ○ yes  ○ no
   - c. If so, why?
     - o I know my money is being spent wisely through United Way
     - o I feel a sense of responsibility to RIT and/or the Rochester community
     - o I have had a personal experience with United Way
     - o I enjoy RIT’s campaign and feel that it is well run
     - o The departmental presentation/video
     - o The convenience of payroll deduction
     - o I like the donor choice options
     - o The chance to win valuable raffle prizes
     - o So my department will have 100% participation
     - o Other: ________________________________

(Over ➔)
6. Did you give to last year's campaign (1997)?  ○ yes  ○ no

7. This year Bruegger's Bagels provided free bagels and cream cheese for department presentations in which the United Way video was shown.
   a. Did your department take advantage of this offer?  ○ yes  ○ no  ○ not sure
   b. Did the bagels influence your decision to attend the presentation?  ○ yes  ○ no  ○ not applicable

8. How many years have you worked at RIT? _______

9. Please indicate whether you are:
   a. ○ male  ○ female
   b. ○ faculty  ○ staff
   c. ○ full-time  ○ part-time

10. Please indicate your college/division (please check one):
    ○ Academic Affairs  ○ Enrollment Management
    ○ College of Applied Science & Technology  ○ Finance & Administration
    ○ College of Business  ○ National Technical Institute for the Deaf
    ○ College of Engineering  ○ President's Office
    ○ College of Imaging Arts & Sciences  ○ Student Affairs
    ○ College of Liberal Arts  ○ University Relations
    ○ College of Science

11. What can we do to improve RIT's United Way Campaign?
    __________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________

Thank You!
Appendix B

Appendix B contains the Rochester Institute of Technology's United Way campaign survey that was sent to 100 Key Captains.
RIT's United Way Key Captain Survey 1998

Please take a moment to complete the following survey. Your participation will help us to better understand your role as Key Captain, and how we can assist you in this role. Please return to the Office of Development, Building # 1-2100, by May 11. Mail labels have been used for the ease of mailing these to you, but responses will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your help!

1. How many years have you been a Key Captain at RIT? ______

2. How did you become a Key Captain?
   □ was appointed   □ was asked   □ volunteered myself

3. Did you attend a Key Captain training session this year?
   a. □ yes   □ no (please answer question 3d)
      b. If yes, please rate its effectiveness:
         ineffective  very effective
         1    2    3    4    5
   c. If yes, please rate the following aspects of the training session in terms of how useful this information was in carrying out your responsibilities as Key Captain:
      
      content 1 2 3 4 5
      panel discussion 1 2 3 4 5
      Key Captain training packet 1 2 3 4 5

   d. If you did not attend the training session this year, why not? ____________________________

4. Please answer the following questions about your experience as a Key Captain this year:
   a. Did you use the RIT campaign posters in your department? □ yes □ no
   b. Did you use your steering committee liaison as a resource during the campaign? □ yes □ no
   c. Would you be willing to serve as a Key Captain again next year? □ yes □ no
   d. Did you arrange a presentation in your department about the RIT United Way campaign? □ yes □ no
   e. Did you show the video? □ yes □ no
   f. Did you take advantage of the Bruegger's Bagels offer? □ yes □ no
   g. How many people attended your presentation? (Over ➔) ___
5. This year the United Way pledge cards were sent directly to the faculty and staff through interoffice mail. Which method do you prefer?

☐ interoffice mail   ☐ personally deliver cards  ☐ no preference

6. Did you follow up with employees after their pledge cards were delivered?

a. ☐ yes  ☐ no

b. If yes, what method did you use to follow up?
   ☐ personal visit
   ☐ e-mail
   ☐ both
   ☐ other: ____________________________

c. How many employees were you responsible for as Key Captain? _____

d. How many employees did you follow up with to give to United Way? _____

7. Did you receive questions from employees concerning (check all that apply):

☐ where does the money contributed to United Way go?
☐ how to fill out the pledge card?
☐ how to fill out the donor choice form?
☐ other: ____________________________

8. What can we do to make your job as Key Captain easier?

_________________________________________
_________________________________________
_________________________________________

Thank You!
Appendix C

Appendix C contains tables outlining the results of the donor survey that are best represented by tables.

Table 1. Popularity of RIT's United Way Campaign Events
Table 2. Effectiveness of RIT's United Way Campaign Awareness Efforts
Table 3. Method of Pledge Card Delivery Preferred by Respondents
Table 4. Rating of Key Captains
Table 5. Reasons Why Respondents Did Not Contribute to This Year's Campaign
Table 6. Reasons Why Respondents Did Contribute to This Year's Campaign
Table 7. Bruegger's Bagel Offer Results
Table 8. Demographics of Respondents
Table 9. College/Division of Respondents
### Donor Survey Results

Table 1. Popularity of RIT's United Way Campaign Events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Way campaign events</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% did not like at all</th>
<th>% 2</th>
<th>% 3</th>
<th>% 4</th>
<th>% liked very much</th>
<th>% did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>golf tournament</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Taste of RIT</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sink the tiger raffle</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrap up celebration at The Creek</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Effectiveness of Campaign Awareness Efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>awareness effort</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% did not like at all</th>
<th>% 2</th>
<th>% 3</th>
<th>% 4</th>
<th>% liked very much</th>
<th>% did not see</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign video</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign posters</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News &amp; Events articles</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Captain efforts</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail event reminders</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.W. campaign newsletter</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department presentation</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. Method of Pledge Card Delivery Preferred by Survey Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>method of delivery</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interoffice mail</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal delivery</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no preference</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Rating of Key Captains on Various Aspects of Their Position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet of Key Captain position rated</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% yes</th>
<th>% no</th>
<th>% not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you know who your Key Captain was?</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your Key Captain helpful in answering questions?</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your Key Captain supportive of United Way?</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your Key Captain thank you?</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Reasons Why Survey Respondents Did Not Contribute to This Year's Campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not contributing</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to send my contribution directly to a particular cause</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot afford to give</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe my money is being spent wisely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have moral issues with one or more agencies that United Way supports</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like the fact that I am asked to give through my employer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give to charities not affiliated with United Way</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Reasons Why Survey Respondents Contributed to This Year's Campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for contributing</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know my money is being spent wisely through United Way</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of responsibility to RIT and/or the Rochester community</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had a personal experience with United Way</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy RIT's campaign and feel it is well run</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the departmental presentation/video</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the convenience of payroll deduction</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the donor choice options</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to win valuable raffle prizes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so my department will have 100% participation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Use of the Bruegger's Bagels Offer and its Influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions regarding the bagel offer</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% yes</th>
<th>% no</th>
<th>% not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did your department take advantage of the offer?</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the bagels influence your decision to attend the department presentation?</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Demographics of Survey Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic analyzed</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. College/Division of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/division</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Applied Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Imaging Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Technical Institute for the Deaf</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Appendix D contains tables outlining the results of the Key Captain survey that are best represented by tables.

Table 1. Method of Becoming a Key Captain
Table 2. Usefullness of the Key Captain Training Components
Table 3. Examination of Various Aspects of the Position of Key Captain
Table 4. Method of Pledge Card Delivery Preferred by Key Captains
Table 5. Methods Used to Follow Up With Delivery of Pledge Cards
Table 6. Questions Received by the Key Captains From Employees
Key Captain survey results

Table 1. Method of Becoming a Key Captain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was appointed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was asked</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteered</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Usefulness of the Components of the Key Captain Training Session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>component</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% not useful</th>
<th>% 2</th>
<th>% 3</th>
<th>% 4</th>
<th>% very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panel discussion</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training packet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Examination of Various Aspects of the Key Captain Position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Key Captain position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you use the RIT campaign posters in your department?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you use your steering committee liaison as a resource during the campaign?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you be willing to serve as Key Captain next year?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you arrange a presentation in your department about the United Way campaign?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you show the video?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you take advantage of the Bruegger’s Bagels offer?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Method of Pledge Card Delivery Preferred by Key Captains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of delivery</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interoffice mail</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personally deliver</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no preference</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Methods Used to Follow Up With Employees After Delivery of Pledge Cards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>method</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal visit</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Questions Key Captains Received From Employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where does the money go?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to fill out pledge cards</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to fill out donor choice forms</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Appendix E contains the attitude scale results of respondents who attended the various RIT United Way campaign events, and/or experienced the various campaign awareness efforts.

Table 1. Rating of the Campaign Events

Table 2. Rating of the Campaign Awareness Efforts
## Attitude Scale Results

### Table 1. Rating of the United Way Campaign Events by Respondents Who Attended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>% rated 1 or 2</th>
<th>% rated 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>golf tournament</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Taste of RIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sink the tiger raffle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrap up celebration at The Creek</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Effectiveness of the Campaign Awareness Efforts by Respondents Who Attended/Experienced These Efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness effort</th>
<th>% rated 1 or 2</th>
<th>% rated 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign video</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign posters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News &amp; Events articles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Captain efforts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail reminders</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way campaign newsletter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department presentation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F contains crosstab results of the questions on the RIT United Way campaign donor survey with question #5 of the survey: Did you give to this year's campaign that were best represented by tables.

Table 1. Effectiveness of the Campaign Awareness Efforts

Table 2. Rating of Aspects of the Key Captains Position
Crosstab results of all questions with question # 5 Did you give to this year's campaign?

Table 1. Effectiveness of the Campaign Awareness Efforts in Relation to Whether or Not Respondents Contributed to This Year's Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness effort</th>
<th>likelihood ratio</th>
<th>rating</th>
<th>contributors</th>
<th>non-contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign video</td>
<td>0.00033</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News &amp; Events articles</td>
<td>0.04342</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Captain efforts</td>
<td>0.00385</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail event reminders</td>
<td>0.00065</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way campaign</td>
<td>0.00044</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department presentation</td>
<td>0.00121</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Analysis of Specific Aspects of the Key Captains' Position in Relation to Whether or Not Respondents Contributed to This Year's Campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Key Captain position</th>
<th>likelihood ratio</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>contributors</th>
<th>non-contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you know who your Key Captain was?</td>
<td>0.01368</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your Key Captain helpful in answering questions?</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your Key Captain supportive of United Way?</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your Key Captain thank you?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you give to last year's campaign?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G contains crosstab results of the questions on the RIT United Way campaign donor survey with the gender of the respondent that were best represented by tables.

Table 1. Popularity of Campaign Events

Table 2. Effectiveness of Campaign Awareness Efforts

Table 3. Rating of Aspects of Key Captain Position
Crosstab results of all questions and gender of respondent.

Table 1. Popularity of the Campaign Events in Relation to Gender of Respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign event</th>
<th>likelihood ratio</th>
<th>rating</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>golf tournament</td>
<td>0.04716</td>
<td>did not like</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liked very much</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Effectiveness of Campaign Awareness Efforts in Relation to Gender of Respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign effort</th>
<th>likelihood ratio</th>
<th>rating</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIT campaign video</td>
<td>0.00121</td>
<td>very ineffective</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very effective</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail event</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>very ineffective</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminders</td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very effective</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rated 4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Rating of Aspects of Key Captain Position in Relation to Gender of Respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Key Captain position</th>
<th>likelihood ratio</th>
<th>% males responded yes</th>
<th>% females responded yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you know who your Key Captain was?</td>
<td>0.01539</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your Key Captain helpful in answering questions?</td>
<td>0.01501</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your Key Captain thank you?</td>
<td>0.02019</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H contains the answers to the open ended questions of the donor survey that have been affinity sorted.

Did You Give to This Year's Campaign (1998)? If Not, Why Not (Other)?

Issues with RIT's Campaign

Issues With United Way

Could Not Afford to Give

Other

Did You Give to This Year's Campaign (1998)? If So, Why (Other)?

Sense of Obligation

Relative Works for United Way

Support of Specific Agencies

To Help Others

Key Captain

Other

What Can We Do to Improve RIT's United Way Campaign?

Reduce Campaigning Efforts

Positive Campaign Statements

Decrease Pressure to Give at Place of Employment
Campaign Event Suggestions

Logistics of Campaign

Raffle Suggestions

Eliminate Raffle Prizes

Clarify Giving to Agencies

Bagel Concerns

Key Captain Concerns

Issues With Agencies United Way Supports

More Contact With Key Captains

Other

No Changes Needed
Answers to Open Ended Questions Asked on the Donor Survey

5. Did you give to this year's campaign (1998)?
   b. If not, why not?
   Other:

   Issues With RIT's Campaign:

   object to tactics used

   object to employees knowing what you give

   object to obnoxious push during a certain time

   I am quite angry at RIT. I believe that helping someone you know is the greatest charity of all - to paraphrase a teaching of Jesus Christ. Also, I feel my right to privacy to be violated when my employer pressures me to give money. It is wrong, I think. Every year I ask not be bothered again but my request is ignored.

   I refuse to be under duress at my place of employment.

   Issues With United Way:

   I have moral issues with the way United Way treats Planned Parenthood. That is why I donate to them directly.

   I have moral issues with the way United Way conducts its business.

   have a real problem how dollars are spent on administration

   UW reduces support to "designated agencies" if contributions exceed their "centrally planned budgets". We have lost the sense of initiative and creativity in voluntary agencies as a result.

   do not like United Way

   Could Not Afford to Give:

   am making arrangements to move and could not give this year

   I am retiring in June.
Other:

My husband did

live outside Monroe county and contribute at home county.

I forgot.

If there are funds to give to prizes, give the funds to a charity.

c. If So, Why?

Other:

Sense of Obligation:

It's the right thing to do.

obligation

I feel obligated to give.

the necessity of financially supporting certain agencies

I believe in contributing to charitable organizations.

sense of obligation

feel pressured to give and will be looked down upon badly if do not give

Relative Works For United Way:

My wife works for a United Way supported agency.

My sister works for a United Way agency and they've lost a lot of funding so I wanted to support it through United Way.

I'm on the board of a United Way agency.

Support of Specific Agencies:

The "cause"/agency I support.
to donate my contribution to a specific area
I like the continuing support of the agency I select.
duty and the fact that I could designate one service provider specifically.

To Help Others:
feel good helping others less fortunate in the community
to help others
I feel it helps a lot of people and I would be thankful for the help if I ever need it.
for a good cause.
It's a great way to give back the many blessings I have.

Key Captain:
mostly a personal favor to Key Captain, really
my Key Captain

Other:
Efficient - fewer solicitation efforts
So I can tell all the phone solicitors that I'm doing my giving via United Way.
I support United Way in spite of RIT not because of it.
for the community - not for RIT

An Associate Director (B. Grubski) presented United Way to directors in a very special conversation.
taxes
11. What Can We do to Improve RIT's United Way Campaign?

Reduce Campaigning Efforts:

To be honest, I don't know why all the events are needed. Perhaps I feel that way because in the past, Key Captains were more assertive and it felt like participation was mandatory. I still would have contributed, but I don't understand the hullabaloo. I guess it must make a difference in level of contributions, but I am not aware of how much.

I'd be really cautious about so much e-mail!

I feel the ad campaign is too long and too much. It saturated TV, radio, mailings, email and posters. I give what I can and don't need the hype. I'd like to think that my donation is helping the needy, not next year's campaign advertising.

I don't need a campaign - I give anyhow.

I think United Way's money (it would be my money if I gave) is wasted on these campaigns. Please do not campaign at places of employment. Stop this practice. Those of us who do want to help others can do so through voluntary activities through our churches, temples and community centers.

Too much!!!! It really turned me off!

Stop using e-mail.

More emphasis on giving - less on "hype".

Get rid of it

Stop showing those stupid videos year after year. It insults our intelligence.

If all the bells, whistles, hoops helps to attract others to the effort - fine - I prefer to quietly give and leave it at that.

You've covered all media available on campus. I think people decide to give regardless of additional campaign efforts. I do!

Cancel it.

Don't overdo it so much. Less is more.
Don't waste our time with videos and flyers, contests and give the money to United Way that would have been spent promoting the events.

To me, the special events are unnecessary but that's probably because of my personal experience with United Way agencies. I give because I believe in it. I want to support RIT's efforts. I think the diminished role of Key Captains did have an effect in the personal touch and effectiveness of those volunteers.

I feel the ad campaign is too long and too much. It saturated TV, radio, mailings, email and posters. I give what I can and don't need the hype. I'd like to think that my donation is helping the needy, not next year's campaign advertising.

Cut the spending and trust people will give.
Just send one announcement - save paper and decrease e-mail. One is plenty. We know the story.

I'm happy to give without all the hype. I wonder if most people really need all the incentives??

Positive Campaign Statements:

I enjoy the posters the most.

I really like the posters and how the UW helps my co-workers.

Decrease Pressure to Give at Place of Employment:

Skip the video and presentation. People really resent having to sit through it. Our department next voted not to have this "opportunity". The people who give, gave. Those who don't, didn't. People who choose not to give should not have to feel pressured by presentations and "100% campaigns". Everyone ought to be able to choose to spend their own money as they wish without guilt being imposed at the office. Everyone I know has more than enough guilt and no one I know has enough money!

I think RIT does a very good job of promoting United Way. I just don't have much confidence in the organization itself and I don't think it's RIT's place to push it on the employees.

It is not my employer's place to monitor/badger or otherwise pressure my contributions. Although I give a great deal of money to charities privately, I am
offended by the pressure of the United Way Campaign.

I would prefer very much not to have contribution cards distributed through my employer. This is arm twisting at its worst and I do not wish RIT to keep track of what I choose to give or not to give.

I have given to United Way for the past ten years and have done so willingly; however, this year I felt like I was being forced into giving so that the division could say they had 100% participation. Offering bagels and other prizes is a mere bribe to get people to pledge and is totally offensive to me. Even though I gave this year and will continue to do so in future years, it will be in spite of RIT's campaign efforts. I really feel that United Way is a worthwhile organization. It's unfortunate though that RIT feels the need to pressure its employees into contributing.

I don't like feeling obligated. The form makes you. Should have option on card to say why cannot contribute. General feeling of too much pressure makes me not want to give even if I could.

After having worked for a United Way organization, there is nothing RIT or United Way could do to change my mind. I wish there was a choice and I really RESENT having to be hounded by a designatee to participate. It's supposed to be about choice.

**Campaign Event Suggestions:**

I'd like to see the running/walking race reinstituted.

Make sure the video is shown!

In the past I have suggested a flower sale and call it "Daisy Day for United Way". Just keep up the good work.

Never saw or was offered a video presentation.

I used to really enjoy RIT - Buffalo Bills basketball game. There was nothing I felt I could be a part of this year. I have very mixed feelings about United Way.

I believe that even though video was given there should have been a TV rented and used in faculty/commons. When I inquired about this I was given video to watch at home or etc. But I just felt that this wasn't a teamwork effort. Nor did I know of bagels. Maybe instead of each department showing video have RIT do it in the Ingle Auditorium and at certain times and days. That way its a group effort and no one in department will feel pressured to show or Key Captain will feel pressured.
More involvement of deans/department heads - Student Affairs Division's case this year was excellent way to get more participation.

Have other charities available to donate to in addition to United Way.

more on campus events!

The taste of RIT seems to be a popular event - I have attended in the past but was unable to do so this year. How about just a dessert offering late afternoon next year? Although I realize more people attend during lunch hour.

Have a speaker that has received assistance from United Way. Make it more personal.

Since I work during the middle of the night it would be great if there was a breakfast held on campus to benefit United Way. I am not able to attend most events due to my work hours.

personal stories about faculty/staff use of United Way

Don't emphasize sob stories, i.e., don't be emotionally manipulative.

Logistics of Campaign:

Provide return envelopes for the pledge cards.

Make sure all paperwork comes at same time - I thought I had lost my pledge card (because we had received other papers already). In reality, the pledge cards had not yet been distributed.

This year the way the envelopes were sealed or something was confusing.

Not seal the envelopes and confuse people.

Put pledge cards and information cards (blue outline fill in blank forms) smaller so all in one place.

Key Captains need several labels for person and place to send pledges to.

Your return envelopes were pre-sealed this year - should be unsealed so we can use them.

Put the envelopes in the right way.
Enclose separate envelopes in which to seal and return pledge cards.

So not seal return pledge envelopes!

Please do not put in long form for donation information and don't seal the return envelopes.

Not seal the return envelopes before our donation card is completed.

Do not require pledge cards with my name on them to be returned. It makes me uncomfortable to have my contributions (or lack thereof) to United Way logged with respect with my name.

need return envelope that can be sealed

Maybe sending along something along with the donation cards telling people who their Key Captains are.

Put a return envelope in the mailing. I'm not sure if it was just missing from my mailing or there was not one for all mailings.

I sent my information directly to the woman indicated on the form and instructions and I have not received any confirmation of the receipt of my donation.

change the donor option card - offer more choices and make it same size as pledge card.

Raffle Suggestions:

Suggest each Key Captain be given tickets [for the Sink the Tiger Raffle] in their packet next year to sell or just have other general raffle for free days off, etc.

I would have purchased a Sink the Tiger Raffle ticket if someone had come to our department to sell them, as was done last year.

More raffle prizes!

Raffle information distributed daily would be nice. It can be used as a reminder to people who haven't returned cards yet!

Place the tiger tank in a sunnier location.

Let me win a prize.
I have to admit that one of the things that most encourages me to participate is the chance to win big prizes. The more opportunities to win, the better! A taste of RIT is another big incentive. So...food, prizes, fun! I'm sorry my department didn't take advantage of the free bagels.

A taste of RIT. You should have some tables and chairs set up so people can sit down to eat instead of trying to juggle everything in their hands.

I never even knew Sink the Tiger was going on to get a ticket (I don't have e-mail).

I wouldn't mind winning a prize some year. Thanks!

Eliminate Raffle Prizes:

I wish you'd give up the raffle - it is bad enough that NY State encourages gambling through OTB and the lottery with United Way doing so too. Why not try something different like a key chain or some other items or a gift to those who participate. Convert all the freebies to assets for the United Way - no one in my department has won any prizes in 15 years. cut the giveaways

Clarify Giving to Agencies:

Make it more clear how to give to the general fund.

I was unable to attend evening functions because I work at night, so I felt very unaware of what was happening. I did not feel informed - where did the money go? Who exactly did I help?

Bagel Concerns:

The bagels might have influenced the attendance at the presentation have had I understood it before.

If you do the Bruegger's thing again - a variety of fresh bagels would be better. Could the Key Captain be given a hit for one dozen and cream cheese?

I think I would have given more had I had bagels and saw the video.

If we had the presentation (with bagels) I may have been persuaded to give more.
Key Captain Concerns:

I had to ask Key Captain several questions - not as self evident on "what to do" as before.

Pay the Key Captains.

A good Key Captain for Biology (COS) would help.

Today I received another pledge card stating that you had not received my pledge for this year. Unfortunately, the Key Captains must not be doing their job since I filled out the pledge card the day I received it, over a month ago. So, I thought my pledge card was in for the raffle drawing.

Don't mind the interoffice mail approach, but departments (Key Captains) need to be handled differently. And it's weird to find out what wasn't done through a survey. Keep encouraging good captains like ours to continue (Joyce Bray).

Find a faculty person to be Key Captain.

Issues With Agencies United Way Supports:

Drop Planned Parenthood.

Influence United Way to drop Planned Parenthood and any similar organizations. Make it truly "united", not merely what the organizers want it to support.

Specify where money is going to/or let people choose the program they are sponsoring.
- publicity for donor choice
- allow split of designated funds to at least three different charities

Lobby for fundamental changes in UW policies. Seek change in the policy that discriminates against agencies who attract more gifts. Let the "market economy" and free enterprise factors prevail. Foster innovation and creativity in agency programs. Put control of UW policies more in the hands of clients (at least 50% of all private agency boards should be consumers in order for genuine partnership to become a reality).

Your records will show that I contributed $500/yr. through United Way for many years. Over the past two years I have found the choices for contributions (and non contributions to be too restrictive, so I have contributed directly to five organizations, all of which are affiliated with the United Way ($1,000 each year).
More Contact With Key Captain:

More personal contact by Key Captain.

By putting the pledge cards in mail, you eliminated the personal one-on-one with the Key Captain.

I prefer a live human that explains what is going on - passes out envelopes and collects them when we are ready. I felt totally out of the loop this year.

Less Contact With Key Captain:

Run it like this year's - send a pledge card and don't bother me.

Personal delivery [of pledge cards] gives another opportunity to nag

Other:

Give employees raises.

Please do not ever solicit money from me again for any charity. Thank you. Giving to charity is a personal and private matter, just as religious affiliation is.

It keeps improving every year. I know I'm going to give every year and don't need a campaign to convince me. However, the campaign is vital to increasing the giving among those who haven't given and to inform all of us on how United Way works.

Since my name, department and address are on the label below, this is not anonymous and you certainly do not need questions 8, 9, and 10. This really is an invasion of privacy even if I blackened out the label, there are better ways to collect this info.

Give higher salary raises and accurate market adjustments to our salary so there are no negative feelings toward RIT and giving money to it and programs it sponsors.

It would be great to have better participation across campus but I am not sure what the answer to this would be.

RIT's campaign is well run. However, the United Way has a history of not being run well. In addition, the agency has used its influence to take "political" stands against local causes as well as national agencies.
Please do not ever solicit money from me again for any charity. Thank you. Giving to charity is a personal and private matter, just as religious affiliation is.

It keeps improving every year. I know I'm going to give every year and don't need a campaign to convince me. However, the campaign is vital to increasing the giving among those who haven't given and to inform all of us on how United Way works.

Since my name, department and address are on the label below, this is not anonymous and you certainly do not need questions 8, 9, and 10. This really is an invasion of privacy even if I blackened out the label, there are better ways to collect this info.

Give higher salary raises and accurate market adjustments to our salary so there are no negative feelings toward RIT and giving money to it and programs it sponsors.

It would be great to have better participation across campus but I am not sure what the answer to this would be.

RIT's campaign is well run. However, the United Way has a history of not being run well. In addition, the agency has used its influence to take "political" stands against local causes as well as national agencies.

No Changes Needed:

I think it's fine - no fixing needed.

It sounds to me if you are getting 80 - 90% participation you are doing OK.

I don't know, it's pretty good already!

Thank you for your efforts and continuously trying to improve the campaign. Keep up the hard work!

Good job!

You all do a great job!

Keep up the good work!

OK as is

More of the same good stuff
Great job

Nothing comes to mind right now. I will say that Vicki Dodds is doing a fantastic job as Coordinator.

This campaign was done very well. I personally give directly yearly to charities so that any gift is 100% used by the organization plus I give annually to RIT.

Keep up the good work!

Stay with your good ideas. Food and prizes are always a draw.

For me, nothing. I worked well the way it was handled.

Great job! Keep it up.

well done

Keep up the great job.

Great job. Thanks for your dedication.

Keep up the good work.

Hard to improve on what appears to be an annual success!

Looks OK the way it is!

OK as it is

It is fine.

I feel RIT does a very thorough job in this rewarding endeavor. Keep up the good work!

All your efforts are appreciated in making this campaign a positive experience for all.

I think I would contribute through RIT even if almost nothing were done to promote the campaign. It is hard to even think about participating in any of the events because of the work load level but I'm assuming they're valuable to the success rate. I can't imaging an improvement - it is always a super effort at RIT - a win-win activity/purpose. Thanks to those who did a great job this year!!
It's smooth, well run with enthusiasm.

I can't think of anything. It's a lot of work and effort on the part of many wonderful volunteers.

Can't think of anything at this time. It seems to be a well run campaign here at RIT. Think campaign was well done - although I would give without the fanfare.

Great job!!

doing well, keep up the motivation
Appendix I

Appendix I contains answers to the open ended questions on RIT's United Way Key Captain survey.

Reasons for Not Attending the Key Captain Training Session This Year

Schedule Conflicts
Illness
Unaware of it
Attended Previously
Other

Method of Follow Up After Pledge Card Delivery

Questions Received From Employees

Envelope Problems
Designations
General Bookkeeping
Schedule
Other

Suggestions for Simplifying the Job of Key Captain

Envelope Problems
Video
Forms and Instructions

Method of Pledge Card Distribution

Better Training

Other
Answers to Open Ended Questions on RIT's United Way Key Captain Survey

3. Did you attend a Key Captain training session this year?
   d. If you did not attend the training session this year, why not?

Schedule Conflicts:

Work schedule; can't break away (small department).

Schedule

Schedule conflict

Time conflict with courses I was teaching Spring Quarter.

only part conflict with time

Because of work load.

Was out of town during these times - briefed in by Bob Baker.

Illness:

I was planning to go, but stayed home that day due to a family member's illness.

I was sick.

Was off due to husband's medical problem.

Was ill the day I was scheduled to go.

Unaware of it:

Didn't know about them.

Attended Previously:

Training provided previous years.
Attended one year before

Other:

I am willing to collect form those who wish to give on their own.

My group is small and always gives.

6. Did you follow up with employees after their pledge cards were delivered?
   b. If yes, what method did you use to follow up?

   Message on department white board.

   Staff meetings - reminders every week.

   To see if they received pledge cards. Response is always 100%.

   phone

   weekly staff meeting announcements/requests

   Dept. meeting.

7. Did you receive questions from employees concerning: other:

   Envelope Problems:

   Problems with the return envelope being sealed this year.

   envelope problem!

   envelope problem

   Why the envelope was sealed.

   How to give more envelopes to me, because they were sealed, had to staple or tape top shut.
Problems with sealed envelopes.

**Designations:**

How to make two designations.

Several people expressed their desire to give to more than one of the key areas. Is this something U.W. can address next year?

Number for an affiliated agency

**General Book Keeping:**

Why last year's donation wasn't recorded.

How does RIT know who receives services from United Way and who does and does not contribute?

**Schedule:**

Department meeting.

dates

**Other:**

How to get another card due to lost or thrown out cards - I called x5500 and got them.

People were confused who they should turn their card in to.

Missing donor choice forms.

8. **What can we do to make your job as Key Captain easier?**

**Envelope Problems:**

Don't seal the return envelopes!

Don't seal donor envelopes.
I know it was a mistake, but since you ask, please don't seal return envelopes.

Enclose separate envelopes in which to seal and return pledge card.

Solve the envelope problem.

Be sure people put pledge cards in envelopes so name is in window.

Some kind of notice on envelope

Video:

Provide the video to those who want it.

Everyone really enjoyed the movie.

My group was located in 3 different buildings. - not easy to get together for a video, etc.!

If there is another incentive offer to show the video, please let the offer run the full weeks of the campaign - unfortunately, I was ill during the week of the offer and felt awful when I realized I had missed the offer for my group.

Forms and Instructions:

Print in or on pledge card "Return your pledge card in all instances - pledging or non-pledging".

The pledge cards and donor choice forms were very difficult to fill out this year. There was too much paper.

Method of Pledge Card Distribution:

Let us distribute pledge cards.

I preferred handing out pledge cards myself. There seemed to be more paper floating around. It was confusing because of the additional paper plus we got our pledge cards late.

Please give us the cards and let us distribute to our people.

If pledge cards are mailed again employees need to know who their Key Captain is.
Better Training:

Have better training - make clear who's in charge and how to contact them - and 28 people are a lot to track down.

Fine as is:

No problems

Very easy to do. I really enjoyed it. I even signed 2 new people in our department up.

Everything was okay.

It was easy this year considering the above (tried to follow up with employees after their pledge cards were delivered, but as faculty members they were not in their offices a lot!)

I think you have done all you can - it is difficult to get people to return the form, especially when many teach in other buildings. I wish I could think of more ways to get them to turn it in.

I can't think of anything!

Thanks for all that you do!

Other:

People who generally give return their pledge cards in a timely fashion. Only one individual refused to contribute to United Way.

No thoughts on this.

Can't think of anything right now.

The most "flak" I received was still over the Planned Parenthood controversy. The two individuals who did not contribute cited that as their reason for not contributing. This is the same reason I was reluctant to serve as Key Captain. I was and still am not happy with the restrictions placed on Planned Parenthood's portion. It has only been the last three years that I have, again, started to give to United Way. I direct my contribution to a different agency. I contribute directly to Planned Parenthood to avoid having restrictions placed on my contribution towards women's right to all aspects of health care.
I thought cream cheese came with the bagels - but it didn't. I had to buy the cream cheese myself.

Bagels went over well!

Nothing!

Always difficult to field the questions and criticisms from the perceived pressure to give to U.W. I have tried to reiterate that this is a genuine effort on RIT's part to contribute to the community.

After accepting to be Key Captain my job related and personal obligations increased and I was not able to devote as much time or concentration on the campaign as I would have liked.

Keep us informed (you have done this very well in the past). My people are always interested in who won the drawings!!

Give it to someone else.

Seems to me that there is too much information given in the folders. Makes the job seem overwhelming and more than it is. Less information would be easier to get through, and might encourage contact with liaison on U.W. committee.