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INTRODUCTION
Foreword

We are delighted to have been able to work with Good Values on this report into how charities are going about their Major Gift Fundraising. This is a really important area for our members – in a time of public funding cuts and increased demand for services across the sector, it is vital that charities have as much information as possible to help them as they undertake their fundraising activities.

Reports like this are invaluable for fundraisers: the findings gained from the information gathered by over 80 charities provide key insights into current fundraising practice. It will enable teams to plan their work with confidence as well as help Fundraising Directors work with their Boards and senior management teams on the elements which are needed to achieve a successful programme.

I look forward to seeing how Major Gift fundraising continues to develop and am confident that fundraisers will be able to grow this vital income stream.

Daniel Fluskey
Head of Policy and Research
Institute of Fundraising, 2013

Background to the research

The latest UK Giving Report estimated that the total amount given by the public to charitable causes dropped by 20% in real terms over the past year. As giving from the general public appears to continue to decrease (albeit not to the levels of 2008/9 when the most significant dip in giving was seen), the recent Sunday Times Giving List reported the opposite trend in giving by the wealthy elite, citing a 20% increase over the past year.

As the economic downturn continues to challenge charities across the UK (and globally), there is an even greater opportunity for the country’s wealthiest individuals to make a real difference - and it appears that they may be doing just that. For the first time in 11 years of the Sunday Times Giving List’s history, 2012 saw 100 of the UK’s richest people donating at least 1% of their residual wealth, and like-for-like giving among the top 100 philanthropists showed a £305m increase, rising to £1,772m from £1,467m. The most recent Million Pound Donors Report from Coutts noted a similar trend - 2010/11 saw the highest number of £1m+ donors and donations since the annual study was launched in 2008. In 2010/11, 232 million pound donations were identified in the UK (up from 174 in 2009/10), 69 of which (30%) came from individual donors (rather than corporations, trusts or foundations). Whilst many question the impact that the economic downturn has had on major giving, research from the Center for Philanthropy indicates that it is the mindset of the major donor that may have changed - “since the financial crisis, donors have had fewer funds available for giving, so they are focusing on assessing the mission and effectiveness of charitable organizations to make sure their donations are really making a difference.”

Within this context of perceived growth in philanthropy from the UK’s wealthiest individuals, the climate is right for UK charities to assess their Major Gift fundraising activities to ensure that they are truly maximising their potential. As a result, in Autumn 2012, Good Values’ Big Thinkers round table event for fundraising leaders was focused on Major Gift fundraising. The discussion and debate at the event demonstrated that there is a real lack of knowledge sharing in this field and very little publicly available information. Many Fundraising Directors felt that whilst Major Gift

---

1 UK Giving 2012, CAF/NCVO (2012)
3 The Million Pound Donors report 2012, Coutts/University of Kent (2012)
Fundraising is widely recognised as an important income stream for the majority of charities, there is less focus on building sector knowledge than with other fundraising disciplines. They wanted practical information - for example, how others define, identify and cultivate Major Donors, which fundraising models deliver success, how long it takes to get a programme to reach its potential, and what level of return on investment can be expected.

This discussion built upon Good Values’ experience of working with a wide range of charities on their high value fundraising programmes and confirmed the real need for a practical piece of research examining the status of Major Gift fundraising in the UK today. The result is this report, which builds on the Institute of Fundraising’s Major Donor Giving Research Report (2012) by providing – for the first time – a snapshot of the current Major Gift fundraising marketplace. The focus of this report is major giving by high net worth individuals to UK charities outside of the higher education sector, which is the second most popular destination (after foundations) for Major Gifts\(^5\) and an area that has already been the subject of substantial research, including the 2012 Review of Philanthropy in UK Higher Education\(^6\).

Some of the findings in this report may confirm what some Major Gift fundraising professionals already know, but have not previously had evidence of. There may be some surprises too. We hope that, by drawing together a range of organisations’ experiences and learnings (as well as the detailed numbers), this report will prove a useful tool not only in developing sustainable programmes but also in providing the ammunition that is needed to gain internal senior support for Major Gift fundraising. Whether the need is further investment, a little patience or securing more direct support with making that all-important ask, this report demonstrates the importance of senior level backing for Major Gift fundraising.

**Our aim**

Overall, our aim is to provide Major Gift fundraising professionals with factual and practical evidence on what makes a successful Major Gift fundraising programme – specifically, good practice, key challenges, how success is measured, return on investment and the key learnings. Bringing this information together for the first time represents a step forward in Major Gift fundraising.

**Methodology**

The research encompassed both a quantitative and qualitative element, and was supported throughout by a Steering Group of Major Gift fundraising practitioners (see Appendix A). The quantitative research was distributed to Good Values’ contacts and Institute of Fundraising members via an online survey, which was completed by Major Gift fundraising professionals - typically Fundraising Directors or Heads of Major Gifts teams - from 88 organisations (see Appendix B). Responses were limited to one per organisation. The interim findings from the quantitative research phase were analysed then shared and discussed with the project Steering Group, which informed the development of the qualitative research discussion guide. Fourteen individuals were interviewed for the qualitative research phase; again these were senior Major Gift professionals representing a cross-section of charities in terms of size and cause area (see Appendix C). This report combines the findings from the quantitative and qualitative research alongside learnings and thoughts gathered from the project Steering Group throughout the process.

---

\(^5\) The Million Pound Donors report 2012, Coutts/University of Kent (2012)

IDENTIFYING MAJOR GIFTS AND MAJOR DONORS:

- Seven in ten of the research participants considered a gift of £5,000 or more to be a Major Gift and most would investigate individuals making annual donations of £500 - £1,000 as potential Major Donors. (p9)
- The peer-to-peer approach – utilising networks of senior members of staff/trustees – was viewed as by far the most effective way to identify and engage Major Donors. (p10)

THE MATURITY OF MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING:

- Only 10% of research participants had a fully developed Major Gift fundraising programme and the majority of Major Gift fundraising professionals felt that they are still learning. (p13-14)
- There is significant optimism regarding the future of Major Gift fundraising – 95% of research participants expected to see an increase in income over the next two years. (p15)

MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING IN PRACTICE – ART OR SCIENCE?

- Most Major Gift fundraisers are taking a similar approach to stewarding their donors and prospects. (p18)
- Structures and processes do not remove the ability to be tailored and flexible – taking a systematic approach enables organisations to effectively identify, cultivate and steward donors, as well as monitor progress. (p19)
- Major appeals were viewed as the most fruitful fundraising model for securing Major Gifts, with 91% of respondents whose organisations had used this model describing the approach as successful. (p21)

RESOURCING MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING

- 54% of research participants employed two or less members of staff dedicated to Major Gift fundraising; almost one in ten (9%) did not employ any Major Gift fundraising staff. (p24)
- Recruitment of skilled Major Gift fundraisers was a challenge for many respondents, and there is a particular lack of experienced Major Gift fundraisers for senior level positions. (p25-6)

DELIVERING RESULTS – INCOME AND RETURN ON INVESTMENT

- 29% of the organisations with a programme in place reported annual Major Gift income of over £1m in 2011/12. The highest annual income delivered from any one participating organisation was over £18m. (p28)
- The average Return on Investment for Major Gift fundraising amongst the survey participants was 1:9. (p31)
- The majority of research participants (65%) said it takes from 18 months to three years to build a successful Major Gift fundraising programme. (p34)

ORGANISATIONAL READINESS

- Only 30% of the research participants agreed strongly that they had a clear and compelling Case for Support, despite this being identified by many as a critical success factor. (p37)
- Three quarters of survey participants felt they did not have a large number of people at a senior level to make the ‘ask’ from a peer-to-peer perspective. (p38)
RESULTS
1. IDENTIFYING MAJOR GIFTS AND MAJOR DONORS

The research set out to investigate if there is a common approach to defining and identifying both Major Gifts and Major Donors within the sector.

1.1 What is a Major Gift?

The research confirmed that there is no consistent sector-wide definition of what constitutes a Major Gift; this differs from one organisation to the next. Chart 1.1 shows that 69% of the charities involved in the research were most likely to define a Major Gift as being one of £5,000 or more. A gift of £10,000 would be considered major by 89% of the organisations surveyed.

Chart 1.1: Defining a Major Gift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£500</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (88)

It is worth noting that the online survey offered participants the option to select the value at which a Major Gift would be defined, starting from a value of £5,000. Significantly, as Chart 1.1 shows, 22% of the respondents chose to select an ‘other’ smaller amount of either £1,000 (20%) or £500 (2%).

1.2 What is the difference between a Major Gift and a Major Donor?

Building on the results of the online survey, the qualitative research aimed to explore how organisations identify and differentiate between a ‘Major Gift’ and a ‘Major Donor’. As would be expected, organisations make a distinction between the two. Whilst a gift of £5,000+ is commonly defined as a Major Gift, Major Donors (and prospects) are investigated and identified from gifts at a much lower level.
Whilst the research didn’t reveal a consistent method or point at which charities would investigate a potential Major Donor, a number of interviewees stated that they would earmark any donor giving a one-off gift of £500 upwards, or a cumulative gift of £1,000, for further research. Within some organisations, these individuals would be moved directly to a Major Donor prospect pool, whilst within others they would be tagged specifically within the database.

“We define a Major Donor by behaviours and attitudes rather than money.”

“Remember the donor’s perception. If you give £2,000 you would regard that as pretty ‘major’ regardless of who you are.”

“Wouldn’t it be more accurate to describe the impact of the gift? If the effect has the potential to transform, then it’s ‘major’.”

Whilst using a benchmark of £500 or £1,000 works for large organisations with substantial databases and prospect pools, this approach could lead to many organisations (particularly the smaller ones) missing out on opportunities, where high net worth individuals giving smaller gifts are not identified or investigated.

“One of our largest Major Donors initially made a one-off donation of £100. Without information from an external contact, we would never have known that he had the potential to give a six figure sum annually.”

1.3 Other than by gift size, how are Major Donors identified?
In addition to gift size, the research participants highlighted a range of similar strategies for identifying Major Donor prospects:

- **Personal networking**: as would be expected, utilising internal personal networks such as those of senior staff and trustees was the first strategy mentioned by all interviewees, and was considered to be the most effective way of identifying prospects.

- **External prospect research companies**: a number of organisations with more advanced programmes had used wealth analytics to identify high net worth individuals. Some warned, however, that there is sometimes a disparity between where the wealth is and those giving at the highest level, so this type of screening does not necessarily reveal the biggest givers.

- **Targeting relevant industry sectors**: one organisation had successfully recruited Major Donors by targeting specific industry sectors with relevance to their cause area. This had been achieved partly as the result of a close working relationship between the Major Gifts and Corporate Fundraising teams.

- **Peer and volunteer identification**: organisations with a core of highly engaged external supporters were introduced to new Major Donors by existing ones. They found that prospects identified in this way had a much higher conversion rate than those approached cold.
Some research participants (particularly those from health causes) described their identification process as a concentric circle model, with those that had directly benefitted from the charity's help as their primary targets, followed by their friends and family, followed by those with no connection to the cause.

Others highlighted the huge importance of meeting prospects face to face.

“There is no substitute for getting out there and meeting people. A name on a list doesn’t make a prospect.”

Interviewees from a number of organisations highlighted the importance of cross-team working within fundraising functions, giving examples of where colleagues in corporate, trusts and individual giving teams had generated fruitful leads.

“Leads and intelligence come from other teams. For example, one potential donor we’re working closely with at the moment has been a real champion for us in terms of getting us Charity of the Year at a major financial company.”

The extent of cross-team working varied greatly, with a very small minority demonstrating real depth - for example, one organisation stated that they wealth scan all individual sponsors of events participants (e.g. those that give sponsorship support to a marathon runner) to identify potential Major Donors, even though these individuals would be ‘one step removed’ from the charity.

Whilst some organisations may take cross-team working as ‘a given’, there was still evidence of organisations missing out on exciting Major Donor prospects as a result of silo working.

1.4 Does everyone have a large prospect pool in their database?
The majority of interviewees from large organisations with big databases of supporters confirmed that they had a good pool of prospects, and were quick to acknowledge that this put them in a strong position for Major Gift fundraising.

“We’re in a very enviable position and I know that. We have an enormous database and are therefore able to identify an enormous pool of wealth through wealth screening.”

As shown in Chart 1.4, however, the quantitative research respondents were more likely to agree than disagree with the statement ‘We have a limited pipeline that has been difficult to build’ (49% compared with 37%).
This confirms that building a prospect pipeline was not easy for the majority of the organisations involved in the research, despite the importance of this.

"It’s like anything really; the more you do, the more success you’ll have. You need to engage as many people as possible. Without that big pool of prospects you’re a bit stuck."

"Investment in professional staff to deliver ‘proper prospect research’ is the core activity that should fuel major giving operations."

Finally, 47% of respondents agreed that they found it difficult to convert prospects into donors.

Key findings:

- Seven in ten organisations would consider a gift of £5,000 or more to be a Major Gift.
- Most charities would investigate all individuals making annual donations of £500 - £1,000 as potential Major Donors.
- The peer-to-peer approach - utilising networks of senior members of staff/Trustees - is by far the most effective way to identify and engage Major Donors.
- 49% of organisations agreed that they have a limited prospect pipeline that has been difficult to build, with 47% finding it difficult to convert prospects to donors.
2. THE MATURITY OF MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING – AND THE FUTURE

2.1 How well developed are organisations' programmes?
Just half of the 88 organisations that participated in the quantitative research had staff specifically dedicated to Major Gift fundraising, suggesting that Major Gift fundraising is not as well developed as some other income streams, such as Trusts, Corporate and Individual Giving. To explore the level to which the organisations had developed their Major Gift fundraising, survey respondents were asked to think about the current status of their programme and prospect pipeline. A set of statements (that had been developed with the project Steering Group) were provided for participants to select which best matched their organisation's situation:

- **No programme in place**
- **Just starting out**: you have identified names and undertaken some research and initial cultivation
- **Building income**: you are starting to see success with a handful of first Major Gifts and have a good knowledge of your prospect pipeline
- **Growing success**: you have a small number of committed donors making significant Major Gifts and a strong prospect pipeline
- **Fully developed**: you have a large number of high net worth donors and prospects delivering significant and sustainable income themselves and through their networks

Chart 2.1a illustrates the responses. It is important to note that whilst guidance was given to the research participants, charities self-defined which category they sat in, so what is a ‘growing success’ in one organisation might be considered ‘fully developed’ in another.

Chart 2.1a: Maturity of Major Gifts programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No programme in place</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just starting out</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building income</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing success</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully developed</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (88)

Only one in ten respondents said that their organisation had a fully developed Major Gift programme, and if those categorised as ‘growing success’ are included, just a third (33%) had a well developed Major Gift programme.
The majority of respondents were from organisations that were in the process of developing Major Gift fundraising and were either ‘just starting out’ (18%) or ‘building income’ (39%). As could be expected, larger charities with more resources were more likely to have a developed Major Gift function than their smaller counterparts. However, whilst this was the overall trend in the data, it should be noted that a significant proportion of larger organisations had not developed their Major Gift fundraising and several smaller organisations had relatively developed programmes. This is illustrated in Chart 2.1b.

Even some charities sitting in the top two income categories defined themselves as ‘just starting out’, demonstrating that not all large organisations have a fully developed Major Gift programme.

It is also worth noting that ‘fully developed’ may not be a static or final categorisation for Major Gift fundraising programmes. A number of respondents highlighted the cyclical nature of Major Gift fundraising and that continued focus, investment and evaluation is needed in order to deliver success over the long term. An example provided was that of an organisation that had a ‘fully developed’ programme when a capital appeal was in place. Once the appeal had reached its target, the organisation found itself back with no programme in place as there had been little post-appeal planning and a new Case for Support was lacking within the organisation.

“The organisation moved out of Appeal but did not have the product ready to translate donors in to long term supporters, so income has fallen off a cliff.”
The majority of interviewees felt that Major Gift fundraising was a growing priority within their organisations; even those with more developed programmes felt that there was considerable room for improvement. One interviewee from an organisation with a well-established and high performing Major Gifts programme felt that in Major Gift fundraising the landscape is always changing and therefore maintaining a ‘fully developed’ programme is difficult.

“**You can have procedures in place, but there’s always something you can do better. Things are always changing.”**

“**Although Major Giving has always been a part of the fundraising mix, it’s only over the past 18-24 months that we have begun to recruit a specialist team to deliver substantial returns.”**

### 2.2 Ambitions for the future – will we see an increase in Major Gift income?

Almost all survey respondents (95%) stated that they expected to see an increase in Major Gift income at their charities in the next two years.

“**We’re expecting a 10% increase and I’m very confident that will happen because everything is in place.”**

Of the four respondents who did not, one felt that the income stream was inappropriate for their organisation, and another had just finished a major campaign and was ‘realistic about opportunities to go back to the same people for renewed support in the near future’. Only two of the 88 respondents who completed the survey felt that external conditions would make Major Gift fundraising less viable.

### 2.3 Will investment in Major Gift fundraising increase?

Whilst almost all respondents expected an increase in income, only 70% expected that their charities would invest increase into Major Gift fundraising. Several of those who did not expect an increase (10 of 26) felt further investment would be unnecessary in the near future because the Major Gift function in their charity was already fully developed or they were waiting to see the impact of investment previously made. Others explained that their charities were hoping to make better use of the resources they already had in place rather than investing further.

Of all survey respondents, only two said that their charities did not plan further investment in Major Gift fundraising because of negative past experiences.

“**“Previous investment has not shown a massive increase.”**

“**We have invested in the past and over 3 years [the function] did not cover its cost.”**
2.4 How does the future for Major Gift fundraising compare to other income streams?
To explore the relative level of confidence in Major Gifts fundraising, survey respondents were asked whether the increase or reduction in investment their charities were planning for Major Gifts was in line with any increase or reduction in investment planned for other income streams.

For the majority (60%), the planned investment was in line with that planned for other income streams, implying that the investment reflected increased expenditure in fundraising as a whole. However, almost a third (30%) of survey respondents said that, relative to other income streams, their charities were planning to invest heavily in Major Gifts fundraising over the next two years. Only 7% said that their charities were planning to scale back their investment in Major Gifts fundraising compared with other income streams. This suggests that confidence in Major Gifts fundraising is relatively high.

All of those we spoke to in the qualitative phase of the research were optimistic about how Major Gift fundraising would perform at their organisations in the future. Even those with small teams and limited resources were confident that they would attract more Major Gift income at their organisations in the future.

“I am absolutely determined that it will perform better and I know we can do it.”

2.5 Can we replicate the success that has been seen in the US?
Several interviewees felt that there was a perception that Major Gift fundraising would be successful in the UK because it has been in North America. This assumption, however, was considered to be misguided because of underlying differences between the countries in terms of public attitude. For example, whilst it is more acceptable in the US, talking about money is ‘not something we do’ in the UK, and therefore organisations need to be creative and subtle in their approach. In addition, it was felt that wealthy people in the UK were generally less willing to give to charitable causes and the tax legislation in the UK is less favourable to Major Donors than in the US.

“Everyone looks to America where there are a lot of successful Major Gift fundraising programmes. But that’s in a very different culture and political set-up. I think we have quite a way to go. There are still a lot of people who are very wealthy, and I don’t think it’s in their mentality to think it’s their real duty to give, or really enjoy giving more of their money to charities. There’s a lot of research to say that, relatively speaking, people with less money give a higher percentage of what they have. Which is an interesting challenge because how do we tap into that? How do we change people’s mentality?”
2.6 Will charities ‘flood the market’ as competition grows?

As investment in Major Gift fundraising grows, so too will the level of competition between organisations attempting to secure funds from a relatively small pool of wealthy individuals. There were differing perspectives on the impact this might have on Major Gift fundraising in the future, ranging from those that saw it as a negative...

“Everyone and their dog thinks that the multi-millionaires will be the saviour of the voluntary sector. So you have to stand out from the crowd.”

... to those who saw a real opportunity...

“The size of ‘the cake’ can significantly grow. All of us will benefit from increased professionalism in Major Donor fundraising. More Major Donors will give if they feel the sector can look after them.”

Key findings:

- Only 10% of research participants had a fully developed Major Gift fundraising programme.
- Whilst some participating organisations had more developed programmes than others, the majority of Major Gift fundraising professionals felt that they were still learning.
- Larger organisations were more likely than smaller ones to have well-established programmes, but size does not guarantee experience. A number of smaller organisations also had advanced Major Gift fundraising programmes and some of the largest organisations were only just starting out.
- There is significant optimism regarding the future of Major Gift fundraising with almost all respondents (95%) expecting to see an increase in income over the next two years.
- High levels of confidence in Major Gift fundraising were backed up by intentions to invest in the income stream for the vast majority.
3. MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING IN PRACTICE – ART OR SCIENCE?

3.1 How are Major Donors cultivated and managed – is there a typical journey?
Whilst some of the organisations represented in the research followed the same basic process of engagement for potential Major Donors, the resounding opinion amongst interviewees was that a ‘typical journey’ for a Major Donor does not exist and that this should be recognised as an important characteristic of Major Gift fundraising.

“We do whatever is appropriate for them – that’s the point in Major Gift fundraising.”

Whilst it may not be possible to define a typical journey for a Major Donor, it was clear that many of those delivering success in Major Gift fundraising would draw up a bespoke Development Plan for each individual, including detailed personal information, wealth and assets, interests, guidance on how they should be communicated with and cultivated, and potential financial goals. This was standard practice in a number of organisations, who stated that this enabled them to treat the prospect or donor as an individual, giving a structure to the process without rigidity.

3.2 How are organisations achieving the ‘personal touch’?
It is widely accepted that Major Donors must be treated as individuals, and that making each donor feel ‘special’ and highly valued sits at the heart of any successful Major Gift programme. The research examined how charities achieve this, but revealed that whilst most organisations feel that they are doing something special for their donors, the approach taken is in fact very similar across the sector. Most respondents highlighted the importance of:

- **Personalised communication**: once an individual has been identified as a potential Major Donor, standard communication is replaced with personalised communication which is tailored to that individual’s needs. The level of personalisation tends to increase with the value of the potential gift. For example, those giving between £1,000 and £5,000 might receive personalised versions of standard communication, but for those giving more, organisations invested significant time into building strong relationships.

- **“A sense of being on the inside track”**: communication with Major Donors is designed to make them feel like ‘part of the charity’ rather than an outsider. This is in order to encourage donor loyalty and increase individuals’ emotive connections with the charity and, therefore, their propensity to donate.

- **Building a personal relationship**: meeting donors face-to-face where possible, gathering personal information to truly understand their motives, and build a rapport.

“It’s all about getting as much information as possible. I don’t even talk that much about the charity at that stage – it’s all about them. It can be anything that creates a bond. If you find out they keep Burmese cats then that might be relevant. It can be anything at all.”
3.3 Art or science?
As with other areas of fundraising, there is an interesting debate about the level to which Major Gift fundraising is an ‘art’, whereby those that have a natural ability to build strong personal relationships will see the most success, or a ‘science’ that is backed up with robust systems and processes. The Major Gift professionals interviewed had a range of differing opinions on this:

“It’s very difficult to put science behind it. It’s more of an art than a science. They are a mixed bag and you can’t treat one Major Donor like another.”

“We take our Major Donor prospects through a clear seven-step cultivation cycle that enables us to measure our success and drive results.”

What can be drawn from the research findings is that Major Gift fundraising works best when both elements are combined. The majority of the interviewees advocated a flexible approach to Major Gift fundraising and as such they were wary of standardising their approach too much. Most, however, were conscious of the need for a cohesive overall strategy. One interviewee explained how a lack of consistency had been holding them back.

“What we have here are tremendous opportunities in terms of prospects and leads but a lack of any sort of consistency regarding programme development or how we take those leads and turn them into money. It’s been very much on a one-off basis. We’re now trying to build consistency and stability into what we do.”

It can be concluded that natural relationship building skills come to the fore when combined with a solid foundation of systems and processes. A systematic approach enables organisations to truly see success with Major Gift fundraising, ensuring that the expertise sits within the organisation and not solely with one or two highly-skilled individuals. This minimises risk for the organisation should a senior Major Gift Fundraiser leave.

3.4 Models of Major Gift fundraising used
In order to explore how organisations typically raise funds from Major Donors, survey respondents were asked whether their organisation had used the following fundraising models and, if they had used a model, how successful it had been.

- **General programme**: Individual donors with a personalised approach
- **Circle of friends**: A small informal Major Giving network
- **Fundraising board**: A volunteer group with shared and individual appeal targets
- **Mid-level donor club**: A network of lower level givers
- **Major appeal**: E.g. capital, revenue, flagship

Chart 3.4a shows the results.
Respondents were most likely to say that their organisation had approached Major Gift fundraising using a general programme without applying a specific model. It is likely that this was because many organisations would combine a general programme with a more targeted model. All the other models mentioned had been used by around half (45% to 48%) of the organisations involved.

Each of the fundraising models had been used by organisations to varying levels of success. The model most likely to be considered successful by those who had used it was a Major appeal; of the 41 organisations that had used a major appeal to attract Major Gifts, 28 (68%) said it had been either very (29%) or fairly (39%) successful.

“We used a capital appeal to drive our Major Donor programme and to give it a focus. Within two years we had raised over £7m.”

A number of those responding to the survey had only recently launched programmes using one or more of the various models, making it difficult for them to comment on the success of the approach. As a result, data was re-based to those that had used each model and felt able to share an opinion about its success. Taking this approach shows a clearer picture in terms of model success (Chart 3.4b) although results must be treated with caution because of low base sizes.
Major appeals were most likely to be described as ‘very successful’, followed by Fundraising boards. More than nine in ten of those from organisations who had used the Major appeals or Circle of friends approach viewed them as successful (either ‘very’ or ‘fairly’), followed by Mid-level donor clubs, which had worked for eight in ten respondents, and the Fundraising board model (seven in ten).

The qualitative research investigated why organisations had seen success with certain models, and what had held them back or prevented certain approaches from delivering results. Many interviewees talked about a lack of ‘organisational readiness’ and felt that each of the models can work very well, provided that the right approach is selected at the right time.

By their very nature, Major appeals are cross-organisational, securing a level of internal buy-in that can be difficult to secure for an initiative that is more ‘fundraising-led’. Major appeals tend to have senior support, a clear and compelling Case for Support, and are integrated across an organisation at all levels. It was for these reasons that some interviewees felt they had seen real success with the Major appeals model.

Supporting the findings from the quantitative research (where 68% of participants had found Fundraising boards to be a successful model), a number of interviewees spoke very highly of Fundraising boards.

“Our volunteer Fundraising Boards provide the focus for our Major Gift strategy.”
Those who had seen less success generally felt that they had tried to introduce a board at the wrong time for their organisation, and without the right support structures in place.

“We tried to set up a Fundraising board a couple of years ago but the organisation wasn’t quite ready. We didn’t invest enough to ensure its success and we didn’t have the right Case for Support.”

Looking at Circle of Friends, there were mixed views on this model within the qualitative research. One organisation had seen significant success and moving forwards was planning to invest all its Major Gift energy and effort into delivering substantial results from this approach. Another organisation described how they felt that the model was working at a lower level than they had anticipated, and that they felt they needed to do a lot more work in order to truly maximise the return.

Often where an interviewee described why a particular model had failed to deliver, it was because they hadn’t had the structure or senior management support to drive their approach through.

“You can’t do it on your own. You need the structure, and you absolutely need the [Senior Management Team] and trustees on your side. It isn’t a magic trick... the whole organisation needs to be ready.”

The challenges of securing senior support and achieving ‘organisational readiness’ are explored further in Section 6.

The research suggested that each of the key Major Gift fundraising models can work for many organisations, provided that the right approach is utilised, at the right time. Taking a portfolio approach and combining the strategies that work best for the organisation at any one point in time will deliver the best results.

Other Major Gift fundraising strategies adopted by charities involved in the research included:

- ‘Clubs’ or ‘patron circles’ for people who give at a certain level (e.g. five figures) to foster a sense of ownership amongst donors.
- An ‘Annual lecture’ model to attract potential new donors and thank current donors.
- Peer-to-peer (e.g. current donors hosting events) to attract potential donors via small dinner parties, cocktail evenings, etc., demonstrating the benefits of supporting an organisation.
- Cultivation events showcasing the work of the charity to convert prospects into donors.
Key findings:

- Whilst all Major Gift fundraisers are looking to differentiate their organisation and their quality of stewardship, most are taking a similar approach to communicating with, and building relationships with, their donors and prospects.

- A successful and sustainable Major Gift programme relies on a systematic approach. Processes can remain flexible to allow for each donor to have a tailored and personalised experience, but ensure that sustainability and success in Major Gift fundraising outlives any one or number of individual fundraisers.

- 91% of respondents who had used the Major appeals model described it as a successful method of Major Gift fundraising whilst almost half of the organisations had seen success with each of the main Major Gift fundraising models.
4. RESOURCING MAJOR GIFT FUNDRAISING

4.1 What level of resource are organisations dedicating to Major Gift fundraising?
The research demonstrated that the size of Major Gift fundraising teams varies considerably from
one organisation to the next. As illustrated in Chart 4.1a, some of the organisations involved in the
research had no Major Gift team at all, whilst others had several employees dedicated to this area
of fundraising. As could be expected, this is largely dependent on the size of the organisation and
the extent to which a Major Gift programme is developed.

Chart 4.1a: Size of Major Gift teams (including support staff)

One in ten (9%) of those who completed the survey said that their organisations had no Major Gift
staff at all. Of the organisations that did have dedicated resources, 66% said they had no more than
four Major Gift staff within their organisation. Chart 4.1b illustrates the size of Major Gift
fundraising teams broken down by organisational income and shows (as could be expected) that
the size of Major Gift teams increases with the size of the charity.

Chart 4.1b: Size of Major Gift team (including support staff) by organisation total voluntary income

Base: All respondents (88)
Some organisations had employees responsible for fundraising from Major Donors combined with other responsibilities (often Trust fundraising) meaning that Major Gift fundraising accounted for a proportion of their work only, which explains the use of decimal numbers in the charts. In organisations that had staff members with Major Gift responsibilities, around 20% of the Major Gift teams were support staff (such as Prospect Researchers and administrative roles) and all others were fundraisers.

For the majority of interviewees, one of the key barriers to success in Major Gift fundraising in their organisations was a lack of human resources. Speaking from an organisation which has only 40% of one post dedicated to Major Gifts fundraising, one interviewee felt that organisations tend to direct investment to areas where a return might be realised more quickly. This limits the resources available for Major Gift fundraising and, therefore, the success of any programme in place.

“Investment goes to the easier pickings – the quick wins. It was never front and foremost of the strategy. We don’t have the money to invest in cultivation. But it’s a long game. Unless you’ve got the money to play it you’ll always be at square one. You have to speculate to accumulate.”

4.2 How easy is it to recruit and retain skilled Major Gift Fundraisers?

The research aimed to investigate the belief within the sector that skilled Major Gift Fundraisers are difficult to find, and then to retain. Chart 4.2 shows survey respondents’ level of agreement with two statements about recruitment.

Chart 4.2: Agreement with statements about recruitment of Major Gift fundraising staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been able to recruit experienced, skilled staff (66)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been able to retain experienced, skilled staff in post (59)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All those who answered question
(Note - respondents were given the opportunity to say that any statement in this section was not relevant to their organisation and those who did were excluded from the base of the percentages shown)

Whilst half (53%) of respondents said they had been able to recruit experienced and skilled staff, only 15% agreed strongly with this statement and a third (32%) disagreed. This implies that filling Major Gift fundraising posts can be difficult for some organisations. This finding was validated by the qualitative research which highlighted that recruitment was an issue for many.
Respondents found retention of skilled staff less problematic than recruiting them, with 66% agreeing that they had been able to retain skilled staff.

A number of interviewees stated that it was reasonably easy to find good Major Gifts fundraisers at a junior or middle manager level, but recruitment became very difficult when trying to fill more senior posts. One felt that this is because there are so few opportunities to work at a senior level in the UK and, therefore, the pool of people with the relevant experience is very small. Because organisations do not invest in Major Gifts fundraising, the development opportunities for staff are more limited (such as training, progression). This reduces the likelihood of attracting experienced staff and, therefore, the success of any programme. If a programme is not successful, an organisation will be less likely to invest in it – it’s ‘chicken and egg’.

Another interviewee had a similar explanation for the lack of experienced staff available, and believed that disproportionate demand had enabled some Major Gift fundraisers to move ‘up the ladder’ too quickly. As a result of fast progression, these fundraisers may not have managed programmes through the full fundraising cycle and therefore not have acquired all the necessary learnings and level of in-depth understanding.

Those who had successfully recruited experienced fundraisers into Major Gift roles promoted the use of personal networks and the networks of others in the organisation as a means of finding them. In general, it was felt that this was a more cost-effective way to find people than other recruitment channels, such as agencies. An interviewee who had been struggling to recruit into a senior role for some time had decided not to advertise the role anymore, but to rely solely on word of mouth and personal contacts:

“Because there are so few people out there, people are able to move on to their next, more senior role before they’ve even been through a whole fundraising cycle. So they’re not as experienced as they might be otherwise.”

Where more junior roles were concerned, another recruitment strategy that proved successful for more than one interviewee was recruiting ‘from the field’. Whilst operational staff did not have direct fundraising experience, their personal experience of working with beneficiaries meant they were able to make the case for supporting an organisation in an exceptionally compelling and passionate way. Whilst it was considered preferable to have some fundraising experience, people skills were felt to be most important attribute in a Major Gift fundraising role:

“I'll use my networks, keep my eyes open and hope to have a fortuitous conversation. I'm not going to waste resources on advertising anymore.”
Although it is clear that there is strong competition to attract skilled Major Gift fundraisers, amongst the charities involved in this research, with just one exception, there was no evidence of financial incentives or bonus schemes being used to do so. Major Gift fundraisers were being paid equivalent salaries to those working in other fundraising streams, although an interviewee did suggest that there is a perception that Major Gift fundraisers are paid more because they can move through positions and into senior roles very quickly. The majority of interviewees were strongly against the idea of using financial bonuses as they felt it was unethical.

“We wouldn’t offer financial bonuses because it would be in breach of our ethical fundraising policies.”

Key findings:

- 54% of the responding organisations employed two or less members of staff dedicated to Major Gift fundraising.
- Those with Major Gift responsibilities felt that the income stream would be much more lucrative if their organisations were able to invest in larger Major Gift teams.
- Recruitment of skilled Major Gift fundraisers was a challenge for many respondents, with some citing a particular lack of experienced Major Gift fundraisers for senior level positions.
- Major Gift fundraisers tended to be paid on a par with counterparts from other fundraising disciplines.

“We have to have good people skills and be able to talk to donors. I’ve recruited from other industries before. As long as someone has those skills they can be successful.”
5. DELIVERING RESULTS – INCOME AND RETURN ON INVESTMENT

5.1 What levels of income are organisations achieving?
Those who completed the online survey were asked to provide information on the level of recorded Major Gifts income their organisations had received during the financial years 2010/11 and 2011/12. Whilst some respondents provided accurate data as recorded in their organisation’s accounts, others estimated what had been received. For this reason the data reported is an indication of Major Gifts income only.

Survey respondents reported that their organisations had received a combined total of £250m in Major Gifts income during the past two financial years (£120m in 2010/11 and £130m in 2011/12). As illustrated in Table 5.1a, 40% of those with a programme in place stated that they had raised between £100,001 and £500,000 in 2011/12, and 29% reported income in excess of £1m. To give a sense of the potential scale and scope of Major Gift fundraising, one organisation reported an annual Major Gift income of over £18m.

Chart 5.1a: Reported Major Gifts income (2011/12)

These figures demonstrate that Major Gift fundraising at most organisations is still at a relatively ‘low base’ (when compared with other income streams), even in those organisations where it is deemed to be successful. Table 5.1b shows the average Major Gift income according to charity size.

Table 5.1b Average Major Gifts income by total charity voluntary income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income band</th>
<th>Average Major Gifts income (2011/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than £1m</td>
<td>£234,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1m - £2.5m</td>
<td>£247,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2.6m - £5m</td>
<td>£241,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5.1m - £10m</td>
<td>£762,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10.1- £25m</td>
<td>£1,882,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25.1m - £50m</td>
<td>£1,778,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50.1m - £100m</td>
<td>£5,645,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than £100m</td>
<td>£5,565,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 79 (data excludes organisations with ‘no programme in place’)

These figures demonstrate that Major Gift fundraising at most organisations is still at a relatively ‘low base’ (when compared with other income streams), even in those organisations where it is deemed to be successful. Table 5.1b shows the average Major Gift income according to charity size.
In terms of gift size, there were very few examples of charities reporting single gifts of £1m+. This reflects broader market research, such as the Coutts Million Pound Donors Report (2012) which identified 130 different million pound donors in the UK, the vast majority of which (70%) were corporations or individuals giving through a personal vehicle such as a trust or foundation. The remaining 30% represents just 39 high net worth individuals that were identified as giving direct gifts of £1m+. Whilst Coutts acknowledge that their research will under-represent Major Donors at this level (as some prefer to remain anonymous), it gives an indication of the small number of high net worth individuals in the UK today who are giving single gifts at the level of £1m+. The report also notes that the types of organisations tending to receive multiple £1m gifts are primarily well-known universities or national arts and cultural organisations and that “the only organisations in need of ‘two hands’ to count their million pound donations are the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.”

5.2 How the maturity of a programme affects income
Chart 5.2 shows the average Major Gifts income raised in the financial year 2011/12 according to the maturity stage of organisations’ Major Gift fundraising programmes.

Chart 5.2: Average Major Gifts income (2011/12) by maturity stage of programme

![Chart 5.2](image)

Base: All who gave a valid response (87)

It is possible that the pattern in the data shown is merely a reflection of the fact that the larger charities in the sample were more likely to have a ‘fully developed’ programme. However, when this was investigated further by looking at specific income bands, the same trend emerged - those charities with more developed Major Gifts programmes reported raising more.

5.3 How is Major Gift fundraising performing in comparison to other income streams?
Survey respondents were asked to compare the performance of Major Gift fundraising during the financial years 2010/11 and 2011/12 to the total income of their charities and say whether the income stream had performed better or worse. Results are shown in Chart 5.3.
Whilst a significant proportion (41%) said Major Gifts income had performed at the same level as overall income, respondents were much more likely to say that Major Gifts fundraising had performed better or significantly better than overall income than worse or significantly worse (41% compared with 19%). One in ten (9%) said that Major Gift income had performed significantly better than overall income during the period concerned. It is unclear, however, whether the apparent positive performance of Major Gifts fundraising is as a result of increased fundraising efforts within charities or of increased propensity for donors to give Major Gifts. This requires further exploration.

5.4 How much are organisations investing in Major Gift fundraising?
In total, the charities represented in the survey sample invested almost £28.5 million in the financial years 2010/11 and 2011/12 combined (13.2 million in 2010/11 and 15.3 in 2011/12) in Major Gift fundraising. As could be expected, and as shown in Chart 5.4, larger charities spent more than smaller charities. Note that the chart shows data for the financial year 2011/12 only.

Chart 5.4: Average investment in Major Gift fundraising by size of charity (2011/12)
The qualitative research confirmed that whilst some other costs were incurred (e.g. printing, cultivation events, prospect research), the main investment for organisations was in staff salaries and associated costs.

**5.5 What is the return on investment?**

When asked how they primarily define success of their Major Gifts fundraising efforts, 13% of survey respondents cited return on investment (ROI). Interestingly, some stated that income might be used as the key indicator of success during the early stages of programme development, and that once the function is more established, the measure of success may focus more on ROI.

"I think this probably shifts over time from income (the initial proof of concept) to ROI once the operation is established."

Table 5.5 demonstrates that Major Gift fundraising achieves very strong ROI ratios, both for all charities represented in the survey sample and for charities in each income band. However, as sample sizes within bands are small and there was no way of verifying reported cost or income data, this finding should be treated with caution.

**Table 5.5 Return on investment by income band (total voluntary income)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income band</th>
<th>Total Major Gifts income across sample (2011/12)</th>
<th>Total Major Gifts costs across sample (2011/12)</th>
<th>Approximate ROI (2011/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All bands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than £1m</td>
<td>£2,533,702</td>
<td>£317,963</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1m - £2.5m</td>
<td>£2,722,600</td>
<td>£293,641</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2.6m - £5m</td>
<td>£2,428,371</td>
<td>£652,694</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5.1m - £10m</td>
<td>£6,985,892</td>
<td>£807,395</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10.1m - £25m</td>
<td>£30,119,632</td>
<td>£3,460,008</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25.1m - £50m</td>
<td>£17,783,254</td>
<td>£2,034,923</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50.1m - £100m</td>
<td>£22,581,581</td>
<td>£2,265,440</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than £100m</td>
<td>£44,521,000</td>
<td>£5,437,000</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All who gave sufficient information for a valid ROI to be calculated (67).

**5.6 Impact of programme maturity on return on investment**

Chart 5.6 shows how the maturity of a programme affects the return of investment.
The data implies that there is a clear pattern in terms of the journey charities follow in order to reap the benefits of investment in Major Gift fundraising:

1. At the initial stages of programme development when either no programme is in place at all or charities are ‘just starting out’, ROI is high. This is likely to be because costs are relatively low (because there is little fundraising activity) and a small number of Major Gifts are received with little cultivation.

2. As charities note their success with relatively little investment, they decide to build their Major Gift function. They recruit staff, investigate their database (perhaps internally or via external wealth screening) and develop a cultivation strategy. As a result, they enter the ‘building income’ phase and the increased costs associated with developing programmes in this way pushes down the ROI for that period.

3. Organisations typically hit their lowest levels of ROI as they are ‘building income’. They have invested in recruiting major gift staff, the pipeline is starting to build, and gifts will soon follow. They are on the cusp of delivering real results. This is a crucial time for the organisation to ‘hold their nerve’.

4. With a process in place, highly skilled staff and a strong pipeline, charities enter the ‘growing success phase’ and start to see significant income and as a result the ROI starts to improve.

5. Once charities have a fully developed Major Gifts programme, the level of investment required remains relatively constant. Therefore any increase in income is reflected in a more healthy ROI ratio.
This research has revealed a significantly higher return on investment than reported in the Institute of Fundraising’s recent research into fundraising ratios (Fundratios – Charity Fundraising Comparison 2010) which showed a return of 1:2.9 in Major Gift fundraising. This could be due to a number of factors, including sample size (the IoF research had 29 participating organisations), more challenging economic circumstances in 2009/10, and continued growth and success of Major Gift fundraising.

5.7 Recording Major Gift income
As with all areas of fundraising, there is inevitable crossover with other functions, and an associated debate about where and how Major Gift income is generally solicited and recorded from an organisational perspective. With a number of organisations now grouping various ‘high value’ fundraising streams together (such as Trusts, Major Gifts and Corporate), it is not always the case that Major Gifts are directly recorded to a clear income line, which possibly means that the actual value of Major Gift fundraising is significantly higher than is shown in organisational income reports. To investigate this, survey respondents were asked to report the income they had received from high net worth individuals across two categories; income accounted for under Major Gift budgets, and income accounted for under Trusts, Events or Corporate budgets.

Across the survey sample, 74% of the income from high net worth individuals raised during the financial year 2011/12 had been accounted for in Major Gift budgets. This provides an interesting insight into the full impact of Major Gift fundraising.

As shown in table 5.7, with the exception of the smallest charities (which may be less likely to have a Major Gifts budget in which to record income), charity size does not seem to affect the extent to which income is recorded in Major Gifts budgets. Within bands, however, there is huge variation, with some charities from all bands recording 100% of their income from high net worth individuals in Major Gifts budgets, but others recording as little as 7%.

Table 5.7 Percentage of income from high net worth individuals recorded in Major Gifts budgets by income band (total voluntary income)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income band</th>
<th>Percentage recorded in Major Gifts budgets – overall average</th>
<th>Percentage recorded in Major Gifts budgets – lowest per band</th>
<th>Percentage recorded in Major Gifts budgets – highest per band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than £1m</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1m - £2.5m</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2.6m - £5m</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5.1m - £10m</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10.1- £25m</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25.1m - £50m</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50.1m - £100m</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than £100m</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who gave a valid response (77)
5.8 How long does it take to deliver results?

To gauge how realistic charities are in terms of how long it takes to generate significant Major Gift income, survey respondents were asked how long they think it takes to build a ‘successful Major Gift fundraising programme’. The results are shown in Chart 5.8.

Chart 5.8: Length of time to build a ‘successful Major Gift fundraising’ programme

Only a very small proportion of respondents (2%) believed that it was possible to build a successful Major Gifts programme in less than a year, and almost one in five (18%) said that doing so takes at least three years. The vast majority (65%) suggested that it would take anything from 18 months to three years to deliver a successful programme.

“If starting from a position of no major donors, I would think with the right structures, volunteers and committees in place, two years would be a reasonable time to start to see real progress.”

Whilst others highlighted the continuous nature of the programme development:

“Even after 6 years it feels as we’re still on a journey”
5.9 Other benefits and impacts of Major Gift fundraising

The research aimed to explore additional benefits that Major Gift fundraising had delivered for organisations. Whilst it could be argued that these benefits are not unique to Major Gift fundraising, it is worth noting that participants particularly highlighted:

- **Focus on planning and impact measurement** - It was felt that as high net worth individuals are particularly interested in understanding what difference their gift makes to a charity and its beneficiaries, some organisations have learned to plan and design their projects more effectively, with measurable outcomes. As a result, organisations increase their understanding of impact and how it can be measured. Several interviewees mentioned that a focus on Major Gift fundraising had prompted their organisation to introduce new monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and, therefore, increase its understanding of the difference it makes and how it uses any funding it receives.

- **Proactive involvement of trustees** - As highlighted in Sections 1 and 6, Trustees can play an important role in Major Gift fundraising by utilising their personal and professional networks to identify prospects. Where organisations had seen this work well, this high level of involvement prompted Trustees to become more integrated into their organisation’s work and, therefore, become more proactive and passionate members of the team. It was mentioned that this not only affected the success of Major Gift programmes, but it had a significant impact on charities more generally.

- **Additional input into strategy / skills in kind** - Major Donors are usually highly skilled and experienced individuals who can make a useful contribution to organisations. Whether this is in terms of strategic thinking or a specific area (marketing/finance/fundraising), their outside perspective and distance from any internal politics or priorities can help push organisations into new and exciting directions. Whilst this can be hugely beneficial, more than one of the fundraisers we spoke to emphasised that acquiring skills can present challenges as well as opportunities.

- **Cross-organisational working** - Whilst Major Gift fundraising is often the responsibility of just a few staff, in practice, identifying prospects and then converting them into Major Donors can require the involvement of a number of individuals from across an organisation. This ‘shared goal’ can encourage more effective cross-function working practices.

“Although gaining strategic input from our Major Donors can be positive, we have also lost Major Donors when we haven’t followed their advice. I’d stick to stewarding their gifts not their advice”

5.10 What does success look like?

When asked how they primarily define the success of their Major Gift fundraising efforts, 90% of respondents’ definitions related to income in some way (e.g. gross, net or ROI). If income raised is the key indicator of success, the 9% increase in Major Gift income across the sample between the financial years 2010/11 and 2011/12 implies that the income stream is becoming more successful over time. This increase in Major Gifts income, however, could merely be a reflection of a general rise in charities’ income across our sample.

Given the length of time that it takes to build a successful Major Gift fundraising programme, the research also sought to establish how organisations and Major Gift fundraising professionals measure their success whilst they are building their programmes to help ensure they are ‘on track’.
The research revealed that many organisations utilise a range of non-financial key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure success on an ongoing basis.

In some cases, organisations had a clear cultivation process consisting of a number of ‘steps’ and so success was measured against the number of donors being moved through the process. In other organisations a specific process wasn’t cited but typical KPIs included:

- Strength and size of prospect pipeline
- Number of contact points with prospects and donors (e.g. communications, face-to-face meetings, attendance at events, project visits)
- Conversion rates (e.g. event attendee converted to prospect)
- Number of proposals sent out (and success rate)
- Loyalty of donors (repeat gifts).

“Net income is important but as our major donor team is quite new to the charity, the number of warm prospects in our pipeline is currently a very important KPI.”

A small number of organisations mentioned that they would also seek feedback on their performance from their Major Donors.

Key findings:

- 32% of the organisations with a programme in place reported annual Major Gift income of over £1m in 2011/12. The highest annual income delivered from any one participating organisation was over £18m.

- The reported ROI for Major Gift fundraising is excellent, at an average of 1:9.

- Major Gift income is under-reported. On average, organisations estimated that they record 75% of their Major Gifts income to the dedicated budget line, whilst the remainder is credited to other income streams.

- 82% of respondents felt that it can take anything up to three years to build a successful Major Gift fundraising programme. During that time it is important to have key performance indicators outside of income/ROI that demonstrate the progress being made.
6. ORGANISATIONAL READINESS AND SUPPORT

6.1 How important is the Case for Support?
Almost all research participants felt that having a clear Case for Support is absolutely crucial if a Major Gift fundraising programme is to be a success. Those who felt their organisation did not have a clear ask said this made their job much more difficult, whilst those that had focused resources in this area were seeing real success.

“We don’t have our ducks in a row. Without that it’s difficult to build a compelling case for support.”

“One of the most critical appointments to our team was a fundraiser who focuses purely on developing the case for support - coordinating project boards, liaising with key people across the organisation - and accessing new projects early so that we can fundraise against them.”

As shown in Chart 6.1, just 30% of survey respondents strongly agreed that their organisation had a clear and tangible Case for Support. Of the remainder, 37% slightly agreed with this statement or disagreed slightly (14%) or strongly (13%). In addition, almost a third of respondents (31%) agreed with the statement ‘My organisation doesn’t have a clear vision and strategy I can fundraise against’, demonstrating real scope for improvement.

Chart 6.1: Agreement with statements about charities’ case for support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has a clear, tangible case for support to engage donors</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation doesn’t have a clear vision and strategy which I can fundraise against</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All those who felt statement was relevant

6.2 Does impact measurement matter?
Interestingly, whilst the challenges of impact measurement are discussed widely across the sector, there was very little mention within both the quantitative and qualitative research of the importance of impact measurement to Major Donors. As highlighted in Section 5.9, some stated that improved impact measurement had been an internal benefit of Major Gift fundraising, but very few participants highlighted this as a specific challenge or a major focus of their team. This doesn’t mean that impact measurement is not important to Major Donors or Major Gift fundraisers, but is an important note to highlight.
6.3 Do Major Gift fundraisers feel that their field is understood by senior stakeholders?

A common theme that arose from the research was the need to educate staff and volunteers within organisations about the long-term nature of Major Gift fundraising; as it takes time to cultivate potential donors, ‘quick wins’ are few and far between.

“**You need to educate Trustees and senior management teams so they understand that Major Gifts fundraising is not a quick win. Money isn’t going to start flying through the door in the first six months.”**

Unrealistic expectations in an organisation can be damaging to morale but can also obstruct fundraising efforts. One interviewee described how she felt that she needed to ‘continually justify my existence’ by putting on ‘noisy events’ that served as evidence that she was ‘doing something with her time’. Whilst events helped to build the organisation’s pipeline, having to continually organise them left very little time for cultivation. This meant that potentially large gifts were lost.

To gauge a full sense of the level of organisational backing for Major Gift fundraising, survey respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with the statements in Chart 6.2.

**Chart 6.2: Agreement with statements about organisational backing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation’s CEO and Senior Management Team has given strong support</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fundraising from High Net Worth individuals (84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation’s trustee board gives strong support to fundraising from</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Net Worth individuals (84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation’s lack of ambition inhibits my ability to secure</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformational gifts (84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I struggle to get my organisation’s support to develop and deliver</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate projects (83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a large number of internal people (trustees, senior staff,</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations staff) able and willing to make the ask (83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a large number of external people (donors, other ambassadors)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able and willing to make the ask (82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All those who felt statement was relevant

Whilst respondents tended to agree that they had strong support from their organisations’ internal senior staff (CEO and Senior Management Team), they were less likely to feel well supported by Trustees. Less than half (40%) agreed with the statement ‘My organisation’s Trustee Board gives strong support to fundraising from high net worth individuals’.
This demonstrates further scope for involving Trustees more in Major Gift fundraising, or educating them further to get them ‘on board’ to a greater extent.

Related to the above, Major Gift fundraisers tended to feel that the pool of people available to make the ask is small; only a quarter (23%) agreed with the statement ‘We have a large number of internal people (inc. trustees) available to make the ask’ and an even smaller proportion (23%) agreed with the statement ‘We have a large number of external people (donors and other ambassadors) willing to make the ask’. With further training or a concerted effort to involve people from other areas of the organisation and external contacts, the size of this pool could be increased.

In terms of supporting creativity in Major Gift fundraising roles, a significant minority (33%) of respondents agreed that they struggle to get their organisation’s support to develop appropriate projects, and the same proportion agreed that their organisation’s lack of ambition inhibits their ability to secure transformational gifts.

One highly experienced interviewee explained that full buy-in from across an organisation had been fundamental to the success they had had in the past. To achieve this at their current organisation, they undertook a programme of Major Gift fundraising training with all fundraising staff, the SMT and trustees when they started in their current role. Educating staff in the basics of Major Gift fundraising proved to be a very successful approach.

Some interviewees also felt that organisations don’t always understand that there is no such thing as a typical Major Donor, that the approach needs to be flexible, and that Major Gift fundraising isn’t about a quick win.
“There's a sense that Major Gift fundraising isn't too resource intensive, that you just need to invest in the staff and then you can tap into all these wealthy people. People think that it's easier than it is. It's not that easy, especially if you're a small charity that doesn't have a huge database.”

Key findings:

- A clear and compelling Case for Support sits at the heart of a successful Major Gift fundraising programme, yet only 30% of the research participants felt that they had this.

- Less than half of the research participants (41%) felt that their organisation's Trustee Board gave strong support to fundraising from high net worth individuals.

- Just as senior level networks are important, so too is the ability for senior people to make the 'ask' from a peer-to-peer perspective. Only a quarter of survey participants felt that they had enough people at a senior level to do this.
CONCLUSION
7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

7.1 What Chief Executives and Trustees need to know...

Every Chief Executive and Trustee is a Major Gift fundraiser – the research confirmed the crucial role that senior level executives play in Major Gift fundraising – from introducing networks to making ‘the ask’, internal leadership needs to be there every step of the way to steward Major Donors through the process. Without the networks and a peer-to-peer approach, Major Gift fundraisers will be limited in what they can achieve.

Organisational readiness and the right level of investment is critical – the research highlighted that many Major Gift professionals feel they could achieve more if they had the full backing of their organisation and the appropriate level of investment in their function.

It takes time to build a successful Major Gift programme – the majority of participating organisations felt that it takes anything from 18 months to three years to fully develop a Major Gift fundraising programme. During this time, robust KPIs to measure progress and a little patience are required before the return on investment will be realised.

7.2 What fundraising leaders and Major Gift practitioners need to know...

Structures and process do not remove the ability to be tailored and flexible – taking a systematic approach enables organisations to effectively identify Major Donors, follow a clear process for donor cultivation and recognition, and to effectively monitor progress and measure success. The research verified that processes do not prevent Major Gift fundraisers from giving each individual a tailored and personalised experience, but implied that art and science can ‘meet in the middle’ to ensure sustainable success that outlives any one or number of individual fundraisers.

A portfolio approach to Major Gift fundraising is key – the research highlighted that whilst major appeals are judged to have seen the best results by research participants, many organisations had seen success with each of the main fundraising models. Generally organisations had been disappointed when they adopted a model that their organisation wasn’t ready to deliver.

A clear and compelling Case for Support is essential – throughout the quantitative and qualitative phases of the research, respondents highlighted the need for a strong Case for Support. For many who had seen fundraising models fail, it was as a result of not having this in place.

Major Gift fundraising can be cyclical and needs continued investment and energy – Major Gift fundraising models (such as Major appeals, Circle of Friends or Fundraising boards) may have a ‘shelf life’ – often of three-to-five years. Without careful planning, organisations can find themselves at the end of a Major Gift campaign with very little in place to ensure income is sustained.

Return on investment is high, at a sector average of 1:9 – with highly skilled staff and a robust programme in place, Major Gift fundraising can deliver excellent return on investment.
7.3 What the sector needs to know...

**Major Gift fundraising can work for charities of all shapes and sizes** - the research demonstrated that charities across the sector from a range of cause areas and income bands have made Major Gift fundraising work for them. Contrary to the assumption that smaller organisations ‘do it best’ because they can be more tailored and personal, or the assumption that larger organisation raise more because they have more investment behind them, the research demonstrated that right across the sector, organisations are delivering results through Major Gift fundraising.

**There is a lack of Major Gift fundraising professionals, particularly at a senior level** - recruiting and retaining the right staff is crucial but the research suggested that there may be an issue in the sector with available Major Gift expertise, particularly at a senior level. This demonstrates the need for continued investment in the training and development of fundraisers. In addition, there may be a need for further research examining Major Gift fundraising from a different perspective – whilst the focus on understanding the donor is crucial, perhaps the sector needs to understand more about the required skills, motivations and attitudes that make a successful and professional Major Donor fundraiser.

**The future for Major Gift fundraising looks bright** – almost all of the organisations that participated in the research see growth in Major Gift income when they look to the future. Whilst Major Donors may not be the ‘holy grail’ for all the financial challenges the sector is currently facing, it is certainly an area that will see substantial growth. Most organisations are planning to invest more in Major Gift fundraising, and are expecting to see high returns moving forwards.
8. ABOUT THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

8.1 The survey
The research specifically targeted a diverse range of charities in terms of organisation size and cause, with one response per organisation allowed. A total of 88 fundraising professionals completed the online survey (see Appendix B for a full list of participating charities). The roles of those who completed the survey varied, but consisted primarily of those in senior roles such as Directors of Fundraising and Heads of Major Gift departments.

8.2 Size of participating organisations (by total voluntary income)
As shown in Chart 8.2, a cross-section of charities in terms of income level were represented in the survey sample. A slightly larger number of smaller charities were involved than larger ones, reflecting the overall composition of the sector.

Chart 8.2: Charity size (total voluntary income)

8.3 Charitable cause
The cause areas represented by charities within the sample also covered a wide spectrum. Whilst the majority (53 out of the total 88) were within the ‘health’ or ‘social care’ fields, the sample also included charities from the ‘environment’, ‘employment and training’ and ‘arts and culture’ fields, as well as representatives from a total of 14 international charities. Given the diverse range of activities that fall into ‘health’ and ‘social care’, it is to be expected that this would represent the majority within the sample.
8.4 Respondents’ roles within their organisation

Those at a senior level with the greatest knowledge of Major Gift fundraising within each organisation were targeted for the online survey. As shown in Chart 1.4, almost half (46%) of the individuals that completed the survey were in a role specifically dedicated to Major Gift fundraising. For the remaining organisations, Major Gifts was the responsibility of someone with a wider role; most often this was at a senior level, such as Chief Executive or Director of Fundraising.

Chart 8.4: Respondent roles within organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Fundraising</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Major Gifts</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gifts Fundraiser (2 years+)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not Major Gift specific)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Major Gifts specific)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gifts Officer (less than 2 years)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (88)

8.5 Qualitative research

Representatives from 14 charities were interviewed by telephone as part of the qualitative research element and again, these were Directors of Fundraising and Heads of Major Gifts departments. As with the quantitative phase, the sample was deliberately diverse in terms of organisation size and cause. A full list of the organisations interviewed is provided in Appendix C.
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Good Values
The Good Values team has decades of experience in working at a senior level with a wide range of charities and cultural organisations in the UK – as well as advising and supporting companies across the world with their corporate responsibility (CR) and community strategies. Our work includes fundraising consultancy, brand development, campaign innovation, measurement and evaluation frameworks, and organisational development such as training, mentoring and long-term support.

If you have any comments to add to this research or would like Good Values to take you through the findings in more depth, please contact us:

Good Values | 1 Berkeley Street, London, W1J 8DJ | www.goodvalues.co.uk
+44(0) 20 7071 5063 | paulg@goodvalues.co.uk | jacquie@goodvalues.co.uk

The Institute of Fundraising
The Institute of Fundraising (registered charity in England and Wales (no.1079573) and Scotland (no. SC038971) is a membership organisation with over 5,200 Individual members and more than 340 Organisational members. Its mission is to support fundraisers, through leadership, representation, standards setting and education, to deliver excellent fundraising. Members are supported through training, networking, the dissemination of best practice and representation on issues that affect the fundraising environment.

For more information about the Institute of Fundraising please visit www.institute-of-fundraising.org.uk
Appendix A: With thanks to the project Steering Group:

Kath Abrahams, Director of Engagement & Income Generation, Breakthrough Breast Cancer
Kath Abrahams is Director of Fundraising at Breakthrough Breast Cancer. She joined Breakthrough from the NSPCC where she was Development Director responsible for corporate fundraising, major giving, community & events. She was previously Campaign Manager on the NSPCC’s FULL STOP Campaign. Kath chairs the Institute of Fundraising’s Learning and Development committee and is a trustee of Freedom from Torture. Before joining the voluntary sector, Kath was General Manager at London’s Bloomsbury Theatre.

“I think [the report] is very helpful and interesting... it gives some valuable points for Fundraising Directors to share with Boards and CEOs either to persuade them that Major Giving is a viable form of fundraising and to help them understand the long nature of the game, or conversely to show them why it’s not viable for their organisation as an income generator at this point. It also helps senior leaders understand what needs to be in place for this form of fundraising to really fly”

Jonathan Badger, Head of Philanthropy, Breakthrough Breast Cancer
Jonathan joined Breakthrough (unusual in that it was founded on major gift fundraising over 20 years ago) in 2012 after 10 years as Associate Director in Cambridge University’s Development Office, as one of the team that devised and delivered Europe’s first £-billion campaign, working with external volunteer boards to deliver 6-, 7- and 8-figures gifts from companies, foundation and high net-worth individuals. The 800th Anniversary Campaign raised nearly £1.4 billion by 2011. Jonathan spent the 15 years prior to this fundraising for a variety of organisations, including the Mental Health Foundation, the Victoria & Albert Museum and the Tavistock Clinic Foundation.

“This is a really good piece of work, not just an illustration of a sector finally waking-up to the potential that Major Giving offers, but an invaluable, practical toolkit for anyone wanting to invest time and effort in this area of fundraising. I think those involved in making any decisions (Trustees, Directors, CEOs) about where and how their organisations invest in fundraising should take time to read and digest this.”

Russell Delew, Director, Major Giving & Appeals, Cancer Research UK
Russell leads Cancer Research UK’s Major Giving & Appeals department which is targeted with raising over £150m for The Francis Crick Institute (Create The Change), £10m towards the development of Personalised Medicine (Catalyst Club), £10m for a new Manchester Cancer Research Centre and further funds towards CR-UK’s general research portfolio. Russell has worked within Major Gift Fundraising for over 15 years including Great Ormond Street Hospital Children’s’ Charity and the NSPCC.

“The opportunity to engage with donors to help them achieve their philanthropic ambitions and make a major impact within our organisations has never been better. If we get this right, we can change the landscape of giving in the UK forever.”
Brendan Eley, Chief Executive, the Healing Foundation
Brendan has been with the Healing Foundation for 12 years, first as Appeal Director and for the last 7 years as Chief Executive. He has been in fundraising for 20 years including roles at the Mary Rose Trust, Cancer Research Campaign and the RNLI. The UK’s leading disfigurement research charity, the Healing Foundation fundraises exclusively through high net wealth networks. This has included a number of seven-figure gifts sourced through peer to peer approaches led by Sir Stuart Rose, Sir Martin Sorrell and others. Over £1.5m is raised each year, on a staff of only two full-time fundraisers.

“This report is essential reading for any fundraiser, Chief Executive or Trustee involved in, or contemplating, a major donor programme. A cost-effective, rewarding and sustainable source of income, expectations can often run high. The health warnings provided herein – its long term nature, the institutional investment required and the precarious nature of this income source – are well made but do not detract from the rewards and enjoyment of this ultimate ‘relationship fundraising’ model.”

Alastair Graham, Director of Fundraising & Marketing, The National Autistic Society
Alastair has been Director of Fundraising & Marketing at The National Autistic Society since October 2010, responsible for the charity’s voluntary income generation, marketing, brand and communications, data services, supporter care and membership. He joined the NAS from World Horse Welfare, where he was Director of Fundraising, and prior to that established and led the Trust & Major Donor Fundraising team at Breakthrough Breast Cancer for seven years. Alastair has been a Trustee of Hackney Quest and Zimbabwe Rural Schools Development Programme.

“I believe that major donor fundraising is at its best when we build authentic bonds, authentic partnerships, authentic friendships with our most influential supporters. Whilst rigour in planning and delivering ought to be constant companions of a fundraiser, we must also recognise when notions of ‘cultivation’ and ‘solicitation’ become incongruous with a mature partnership of equals, united by a shared vision.”

Paul Jackson-Clark, Director of Fundraising, Parkinson’s UK
Paul has been Director of Fundraising at Parkinson’s UK since 2009 and has worked in the voluntary sector for 20 years. Paul has led fundraising at Parkinson’s UK through a period of significant growth and the charity is on track to have doubled voluntary income in four years.

“This report provide a useful mirror to put up to your own major gifts fundraising and ask how well do we really compare and what do we need to change for the better?”
Hugo Middlemas, Director of Fundraising, Leonard Cheshire Disability
Hugo joined Leonard Cheshire Disability in May 2011 following director roles at Parkinson’s UK and most recently Guy’s and St Thomas’ NHS Foundation Trust and Charity. Hugo has a track record in delivering major voluntary income growth for charities and leading complex organisational change to increase charitable impact. He has extensive experience across all fundraising methods as well as a track record of creating national media campaigns to advance the aims and profile of charities.

“A very helpful piece of research that gives mainstream charities a useful guide to approaches to major gift fundraising – particularly those that are considering investing in this discipline for the first time. The information on what charities can expect from an investment, both in net income and lead time for results, will I am sure be particularly useful for Trustees and executive leadership of charities.”

Catherine Miles, Fundraising Director, Anthony Nolan
Catherine has been a professional fundraiser for 18 years. After roles at CPRE and Mencap, she spent 6 years at Shelter as Head of Major Gifts and Deputy Director of Fundraising, leading on a major Appeal. Catherine joined Anthony Nolan in 2009 as Fundraising Director. At Anthony Nolan the team of 31 fundraisers has grown income to over £7.5m, established a regular giving base from scratch, delivered the charity’s largest ever corporate partnerships and trust grants and won the Official Charity adoption for the 2014 Virgin Money London Marathon. Catherine blogs for the Institute of Fundraising and is a member of the AMREF UK Fundraising Committee.

“The most important success factor I’ve found in Major Gifts fundraising is the ability of an organisation’s volunteer leaders, senior staff and Major Gifts fundraisers to build genuine rapport with Major Gifts prospects. Building a relationship and understanding the donor’s motivations, interests and what they want to achieve from their philanthropy - and being able to assess how the charity can respond to them - is essential for any Major Gifts programme.”

Louise Parkes, Fundraising Director, British Heart Foundation
Louise joined the British Heart Foundation in April 2011, following two years as Director of Fundraising at Shelter. Before joining Shelter, Louise was head of corporate, trusts, events, celebrities and regional fundraising at Help the Aged. Her experience also includes roles with Cancer Research Campaign and the National Deaf Children’s Society.

“The report provides a useful snap shot of the market place currently, with a good sample size across a range of charity sizes and causes. It could be a useful tool for major gift fundraisers to support a case for investment, validate current activities and benchmark across the sector.”
Jackie Phillips, Senior Philanthropy Executive, Macmillan Cancer Support
Jackie has worked for Macmillan Cancer Support for 2 years, and has been in the voluntary sector since 1998. She specialises in major donor and high value fundraising for both charities and higher education. Previous roles include spells at Kings College London and Shelter.

“This report successfully highlights the key factors in developing and sustaining a successful major gifts programme. It serves to provide focus and will be a useful guide to practitioners, their senior teams and volunteers.”
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Action for Children
Action for ME
Action on Hearing Loss
AICR
Alzheimer's Society
Anthony Nolan
Asthma UK
Barnardos
Beating Bowel Cancer
Bliss
Book Aid International
Breakthrough Breast Cancer
Breast Cancer Care
British Heart Foundation
British Lung Foundation
British Red Cross
CAFOD
Cancer Research UK
Cardiff Third Sector Council
Carers Trust
Christian Aid
Claire House
CLIC Sargent
Crisis
Denard
Dogs for the Disabled
EAPG
Find your feet
Freedom from Torture
Friends of Westonbirt Arboretum
Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Charity
Guide Dogs
Handicap International UK
Hope and Homes for Children
Jewish Care
Kidney Research UK
Leonard Cheshire Disability
London Children's Museum
London Philharmonic Orchestra
Macmillan Cancer Support
Maggie's Cancer Caring Centres
Marie Curie Cancer Care
Medical Aid for Palestinians
Mencap
Meningitis Trust
Merlin
Mind
Missing People
Motor Neurone Disease Association
MS Society
Muscular Dystrophy Campaign
National Autistic Society
National Children's Bureau
National Osteoporosis Society
National Star Foundation
Oxfam
Parkinson's UK
Peabody
Personal Finance Education Group
Prostate Cancer UK
Refugee Action
RNIB
RNLI
Samaritans
Save the Children
Scope
Smile Train
Spinal Research
St Nicholas Hospice Care
The Challenge Network
The Children's Society
the encephalitis society
The Geffrye, Museum of the Home
The Healing Foundation
The Mayhew Animal Home
The Outward Bound Trust
The Prince's Initiative for Mature Enterprise
The Prince's Trust
Treloar's
Ulysses Trust
UNICEF UK
Wales Millennium Centre
WaterAid
Woodland Trust
World Vision
YMCA England
YouthNet
ZSL
Appendix C: Qualitative research

Our thanks go to the following organisations:

Action on Hearing Loss
British Lung Foundation
British Red Cross
Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Charity
Keech Hospice Care
Marie Curie Cancer Care
Mind
National Osteoporosis Society
Oxfam
RNIB
Scope
Sense
Shelter
UNICEF UK