ED 313 992   HE 023 099

AUTHOR   Leslie, Larry L.; And Others
TITLE   Progress Report on the National Donor Data Base
                Project. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY   Council for Advancement and Support of Education,
                Washington, D.C.; Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ.,
                Indianapolis. Center for Philanthropy.
PUB DATE   Nov 89
NOTE   57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Association for the Study of Higher Education
                (Atlanta, GA, November 2-5, 1989). Tables at the end
                of the document may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
                Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation
                Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Alumni; *Database Design; Databases; *Donors;
                Educational Finance; Financial Support; *Fund
                Raising; Higher Education; Information Sources;
                National Surveys; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS   *ASHE Annual Meeting; National Donor Data Base
                Project

ABSTRACT
        A progress report on the Center for the Study of
Higher Education (CASE) National Donor Data Base Project is
presented. The project, which began in June 1987, has proceeded in
several phases: (1) data base design; (2) acquisition of data from
participating institutions; (3) development of software to load each
institution's data into the donor data base; (4) development of a
questionnaire to capture data items not available in the data files;
and (5) production of preliminary results from the aggregate of all
institutions in the file. The CASE Donor Data Base is valuable for
many useful research studies because: it is the only extant source of
donor data with a nationwide scope; data are available for all large
donors at many institutions; a study of the giving behavior of
donors/alumni in the institution's home state can be compared with
that of similar individuals residing in surrounding states or states
more remote than surrounding ones; and it is possible to compare the
magnitude of giving for individuals receiving the bachelor's degree
with those receiving professional or other advanced degrees. Seven
appendices provide information on: variables in institutional files;
software vendors sending materials in response to the letter of
inquiry; institutions expressing an interest in CASE donor data base
project but not participating; on missing data percentages for key
variables, institutions A-E; percentage of records containing valid
values for combinations of variables; and data base preliminary
results. The survey form itself is also appended. (SM)

ED313992

Progress Report on the
National Donor Data Base Project

Larry L. Leslie
Kenneth G. Brown
Judy Diane Grace
Jeffrey G. Rapp

Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

November 1989

023 099

ASHE

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting
of the Association for the Study of Higher
Education held at the Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead
in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 1989. This
paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to
be of high quality and of interest to others
concerned with the research of higher education.
It has therefore been selected to be included
in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

3

Introduction

The Center for the Study of Higher Education's first
involvement with the CASE Research Committee was in the spring
and summer of 1986. At that time the Center, with a great deal
of input from Dr. William Pickett, then chairman of the CASE
Research Committee, developed a proposal for a research project.
Two separate but interrelated tasks were proposed for this
initial phase of the CASE research program. The first of these
was to involve the pilot testing of a survey instrument to
collect basic data on fund raising activities; a revised version
of this instrument, based on pilot study findings, was to be used
to collect data from a carefully selected panel of institutions.
Task two was to involve the creation and analysis of a donor data
base. Due to a lack of fiscal resources and concern about
piloting an instrument, this initial proposal was not funded by
the CASE Research Committee.

In June, 1987, a Center proposal to perform a pilot study
regarding development of a donor data base was funded by CASE.
Subsequent, supplementary funding for continuation of this
project was received from the Indiana University-Purdue
University, Center for Philanthropy in June, 1988.

The CASE Donor Data Base project has proceeded in several,
sometimes overlapping, phases. Phase one, the data base design
phase, included selection of the variables for inclusion in the
data base and design of a sampling methodology. Phase two

included acquisition of data from those institutions agreeing to participate in the project. Phase three included the development of software to load each participating institution's data into the donor data base. Phase four included the development of a questionnaire designed to capture data items that were not available in the data files of the participating institutions or had a high percentage of missing values on these files. Note that this phase was not a part of the proposal submitted in June, 1987. The final phase included the production of preliminary results from the aggregate of all institutions in the file. Each of these phases will be discussed in the sections that follow.

Background

Major studies about fund raising are generally categorized into four areas: surveys of trends in levels and sources of funding; economic studies related to policy; studies of costs; and studies of giving behavior, especially related to demographic and psychological variables (Jacobson, in press). The Donor Data Base project falls into this last area.

Recently, these studies have been aided by sophisticated databases and complex computer programs. The most visible and arguably viable approach is donor profiling. Profiling, a concept borrowed directly from marketing research involves describing groups of potential donors by their common characteristics, e.g., income, undergraduate activities, number of children attending alma mater, etc. The end result is a description of a market segment which can be expected to contribute to the college or

university at an expected level (Pray 1981). Such profiles are often used in planning major campaigns and, of course, in targeting annual and special fund solicitation.

Most studies of giving behavior are institutional specific (University of Michigan), or focus on a particular type of institution (liberal arts institutions as in Pickett's work). The Donor Data Base was conceived as a way to identify variables associated with giving on a cross sector and cross institutional type basis, to open up new streams of inquiry about what makes people philanthrophically inclined toward their alma mater.

The conceptual framewr ;k for the study was drawn from the sociological literature, particularly that on reciprocity (Gouldner 1960). Extended to donor behavior vis-a-vis colleges and universities, researchers and practitioners have used sociological and anthropological descriptions (Kraus 1988; Higley 1980; Burnett 1974; Spaeth and Greeley 1970). The theory of reciprocity in this context Payton 1988) suggests that unique conditions or variables in the collegiate environment may influence future alumni giving patterns. Because this behavior can be predicted, fiscal support from alums can be planned for, and, moreover, the environment can be manipulated to influence conditions conducive to giving. A well known example of this, although not generally regarded as provable, is the premise that students who belong to Greek organizations during their undergraduate years are more loyal to the institution and therefore give more as alumni donors. Other researchers have

found that simply communicating a need to alumni about institutional need is sufficient to motivate donors (Leslie, 1986).

Regardless of the literature, it is folk wisdom that something happens during the collegiate experience that does condition alumni toward giving or not giving. And regardless of the variables identified, be they as specific as successful football teams, or as general as what Grace has called "the Boys' Town syndrome," something does happen to influence alumni attitudes toward their alma maters. Identifying those conditions favorable to alumni support has been the focus of much of this strain of literature.

Data Base Design and Sampling Scheme

Because the CASE Donor Data Base was to be compiled from data extracted from institutional files, it was necessary to determine the types of variables available in a typical institution's donor data base. It was determined that the best way to do this was to examine donor data file descriptions, and all members of the CASE Research Committee were asked to supply descriptions for their institution's files. Donor data file descriptions were received from six institutions: Northern Illinois University, Texas Christian University, Tufts University, University of Arizona, University of Miami, and University of San Diego. Based on the common variables available in the donor data files of these institutions, a list of

variables was compiled for possible inclusion in the CASE Donor
Data Base. The variables on this list were supplemented by
several variables which, while not common among all institutions,
were felt to be necessary additions in order for the file to
provide as rich a source of variables as possible for the donor
research community. This original list, produced in August of
1987, contained approximately 160 variables; subsequent
experience with the actual institutional data files and coding
schemes has reduced the number of variables on this list to 137.
The most recent version of this list is in Appendix A.

Concurrent with the data base design phase, an investigation
of commercially available development data systems was performed.
It was felt that one of these systems might provide an efficient
and effective alternative to the Center's development of the
software necessary to map various institution's data into the
CASE Donor Data Base. A list of software vendor names and
addresses was compiled from an article in CASE Currents and from
other individuals having experience in this area. A letter,
which explained the purpose of the research project and requested
information on the systems, was sent to each vendor on the list.
A careful examination of the materials received from these
vendors indicated that none was suitable for use in the project.
A list of the vendors responding to the letter appears in
Appendix B.

A stratified random sampling of individuals was developed
for use in the project; i.e., no corporate, business, foundation

or other entity were in the sampling frame. The sampling frame
was divided into three strata: 1) Large Donors--those donating
$25,000 or more in one year over the past five years, (2) Other
Donors--those donors not in category 1, (3) Non-donors--non-
donors in the institution's donor data file. A random sample of
500 individuals was to be selected from each of these categories
from the data files of each institution participating in the
project. Samples of size 500 have been realized for categories 2
and 3 but not for category 1. In this latter category, we have
usually taken all individuals meeting the criterion; the number
of individuals in this category has ranged from 0 to 131 for the
seven institutions processed thus far.

After the list of variables had been developed from the
various institutions' donor data file descriptions, this list
along with other project materials were reviewed by two
econc ists and a sociologist. In general, these reviewers
thought the variables on the list were those necessary to
accomplish the project's goals; however, each made suggestions
for additions that would make the donor data base a much richer
resource for researchers in this area.

Data Acquisition and Software Development

Software development began in December, 1987, with the
construction of a COBOL file description based on the list of
variables selected earlier. A list of codes for categorical

variables in the data base was the next item developed and these codes were related to the COBOL file description through the variable name by means of a COBOL construct that expedites decision making by association of specific values of variables with variable names in the data base. Codes were developed for titles, gender, ethnicity, athletic participation, fraternities/sororities, position titles and a large number of other categorical variables in the data base. In addition to specific codes for categorical variables, several generic codes were adopted for use in identifying special conditions that may apply to a variable. For example, in the CASE data base if a variable does not exist on the institutional file supplied, that variable's field in the CASE data base will be filled with 8s for that institution.

Following development of the file description and variable codes, work began on program code to map the sample data received from Institution A (IA) into the data base. Only the demographic data for the sampled individuals were received on tape supplied by this institution, the "giving" data for each donor was on a hard copy listing. A separate data entry program had to be developed to enter the giving data into a file which was subsequently merged with the demographic data using the identification number as a key. The sample originally received from IA did not contain non-donors; IA subsequently supplied data on non-donors. However, this file had a format different from that of the donor file supplied earlier and required some changes

to the original program in order to load these data into the donor data base.

All the data received from Institution B (IB) were in hard copy form. At the time of the request for data from IB, they had lost their programmer and could only produce alphabetic listings of their files. A sampling scheme based on alphabetical order was developed by the Center and a sample based on this scheme was produced by IB personnel. A program was written to allow these data to be entered into a data base management system and to be printed out for verification. After verification these data were uploaded to a file on a mainframe computer and a program was written to map data elements from the file to the donor data base.

Data originally received from Institution C did not contain a number of variables indicated by the file description as being in the university's donor file. These variables were critical to research purposes of the donor data base. In correspondence between the development data processing personnel and Center staff, agreement was reached as to the data elements that would be supplied for use in the donor data base project. These data items were subsequently supplied to the Center for every 100th non-donor and all regular donors. A sample of size 500 was drawn from the regular donor file and data on these individuals, along with the data on the 1,102 non-donors, were added to the donor data base. Note that no data were received on large donors; data on these individuals were not maintained in machine readable form

and, thus, were not available for inclusion in the donor data base.

A preliminary examination of the data file supplied by Institution D determined that the data file description did not match the file on the tape. Correspondence with the personnel who supplied the data confirmed this conclusion and the correct file description was sent. Even after the correct file description was implemented, some questions arose regarding the meaning of some of the giving fields on the file; these were cleared up through a phone contact. Data for this institution have been added to the data base.

Institution E's development data processing operation supplied the Center with the identification numbers of individuals on their file in each of the three groups, i.e., large donors, regular donors, and non-donors. Since these were a relatively small number of large donors (131) the decision was made to include all of these individuals in the data base; samples of the identification number were drawn for each of the other two groups and these sample identification numbers were returned to the institution. Subsequently, data on each of the individuals in the samples were supplied to the Center on a set of floppy diskettes. These data have been added to the donor data base.

A sampling procedure similar to the one used for Institution E was used for Institution H; i.e., the institution supplied the Center with identification numbers of individuals in the three

donor categories and the Center sampled these and returned the
sample identification numbers to the institution. Data on the
sampled individuals have not yet been received.

In contrast to the procedure used for Institutions E and H,
Institution F (IF) supplied the Center with data for all
individuals in their donor file. The Center identified the
members of each of the three groups and drew the samples of the
regular donors and non-donors; only two large donors were in the
file supplied. Data on the sampled individuals have been added
to the CASE donor data base. Note that this institution did not
supply the zip codes of individuals, thus limiting the use of
these data for regional studies.

Data have also been received from another university,
Institution G. As was the case with Institution F, Institution G
supplied data on all individuals in their file. A procedure
similar to that used for IF was used to sample and load these
data on the CASE donor data base.

Over the course of the project a number of institutions had
agreed to supply data from their development files for use in the
donor data base. For one reason or another these institutions
were not able to honor their commitment. A list of these
institutions appears in Appendix C.

Missing Values

One of the most vexing problems with any research data base

is the problem of missing data. There are two aspects of this problem that manifest themselves in the CASE donor data base. The first of these is that a variable of interest was not collected by a given institution or simply was not among the variables in the file supplied to the Center. In the second, the variable exists in the file but values are missing for that variable in a number of individual records. Of the two, the latter problem is the most troublesome because of its impact on various types of analyses planned, e.g., regression, cross-tabulation, etc.

In order to assess the missing value problem, several key variables were analyzed for four of the institutions. These variables were zip code, gender, ethnicity, date of birth, marital status, position title code, salary code, indication of deferred giving, most recent degree type, year of most recent degree, and major field of most recent degree. The availability of each of these variables in four of the institutional files processed as well as the percentage of missing values for each of these variables are shown in Appendix D.

All of the institutions have zip codes and the percentage of missing values for this variable is low. This result is not surprising since most development office communication is done through the mail and a zip code is obviously required on any materials sent through the mail. Gender was not supplied by IB (the loss of their data processing person at the time the data were supplied undoubtedly prevented this inclusion) but was

supplied by each of the other three institutions tested in this regard; percentage of missing values for this variable were generally low and ranged from 0% to 15% except for the large donor file for IE which had 44% missing values. Ethnicity was available for only one of the institutions and had a 95% missing value rate for each of the files from this institution. Date of birth was not supplied by IB and was supplied only for non-donors by IA; in general the percentages of missing values were high for IE and IA non-donors, and were relatively low for the IC at 9% for donors and 11% for non-donors. The availability and missing values for the marital status variable mirrored those of date of birth. Only one institution, IA, did not have a position title code variable among those supplied for the CASE data base; however, the percentages of missing values for the other institutions were relatively high, ranging from 21% to 79%. Only one institution, IC, indicated the salary level of the individual; missing value percentages for this variable were 75% for regular donors and 94% for non-donors, both of which are high enough to make this variable virtually of no use for analytical purposes. None of the institutions supplied any variable indicating deferred giving. Information regarding the most recent degree awarded and the year in which it was awarded have highly variable missing values percentages, ranging from 9% to 75%. The variable, major field of study, usually has higher percentages of missing values than do the type of degree or degree date.

Perhaps of more importance to analysis, especially
multivariate analysis, is the percentage of records in a given
sample file that have valid values for a set of core variables.
If the percentage is low, the use of that sample in an analysis
is constrained. In order to measure this aspect of the data
base, an incremental approach was utilized. In this approach a
number of variables were selected as the core variables and the
percentage of records containing valid values for all core
variables, simultaneously, was calculated. Variables with the
lowest percentages of missing values in each institutional
subfile were usually selected to form this set of core variables.
After calculating the percentage for the core variables, other
variables were added to the list and the analysis was repeated
using this augmented list. As will be shown in the discussions
below, the number of core variables used in each institutional
analysis was small and the percentages fall sharply when other
variables were added. Appendix E contains the results of all
analyses attempted.

Since IB University supplied data only for regular donors,
this was the only subfile that could be analyzed for this
institution. Core variables in this analysis included zip code,
most recent degree year, and position title code. Approximately
60% of the records in this file contained valid values for all
three of these variables. No other variables, except major field
of study for most recent degree (62% missing values), were
available for testing for this institution.

All three subfiles were supplied by IA but the variable list

for non-donors contained some variables not available in the two donor files for this institution. Zip code, gender and most recent degree year were the variables tested for completeness in the regular- and large-donor files; the percentages of records containing valid values for all three of these variables were approximately 66% and 55%, respectively, in these two files. For the non-donors, date of birth and marital status were added to the three core variables; only 24% of the records in this file contained valid values for all five of these variables.

Institution E's regular donor file had 72% of the records with valid values for the variable combination of zip code, gender, position title code, and most recent degree year. When marital status was added to this core variable list, the completeness percentage dropped to 6%. Using the same core variables on the large donor file produced a completeness rate of 25%; adding marital status to the core variables for this file produced a 20% completeness rate. Testing only the core variables in the non-donor file yielded a 59% completeness rate.

Core variables used in the Institution C tests for completeness were zip code, gender, date of birth, marital status and most recent degree year. This combination produced a completeness rate of 84% for the regular donors and 77% for the non-donors. Adding the variable position title code to the core variables reduced these respective rates to 50% and 19%.

Note that the lists of core variables that have acceptable percentages of completeness would not produce very meaningful

multivariate analyses. When even one variable is added to these lists, the percentages drop to unacceptable levels. The ramifications of these observations will be discussed below.

What Was Learned

One of the first lessons learned from the project dealt with the sampling of the three groups, i.e., regular-donors, large-donors, and non-donors. It was originally proposed that participating institutions draw their own samples from each of these donor classes based on criteria supplied by the University of Arizona Center. This procedure did not work out well, for a number of reasons, and may have discouraged several of the smaller institutions from participating in the project. As a result, the sampling procedure was changed relatively early in the project. In its revised form, institutions were asked to follow one of two alternate procedures. In the first of these, an institution was asked to supply the Center with the requested variables for all individuals in their file and the Center would draw the samples from the file supplied. The alternate procedure was to supply only the identification numbers of individuals in each of the donor groups: the Center would sample these three groups of identification numbers and return these sets of numbers to the institution which would then supply the Cent r with data on those selected individuals. Of those institutions supplying data only one did its own sampling; of the others, one used a

sampling scheme designed specifically to overcome a data processing problem, four supplied their entire file for the Center to sample, and two supplied data based on Center drawn samples from identification number files.

Another problem is the cost to an institution of supplying data for inclusion in the CASE donor data base. This cost may have been a factor in the decision of several institutions not to participate in the project. One institution, which is billed separately for computer programming cost and for each data processing run, estimated that it would cost more than $2,000 to supply data for the project. Given the tight budgets of most college or university development offices, the cost of supplying data for the project may be prohibitive. For those development offices with their own data processing staff, these costs are measured in terms of foregone opportunities to work on other software development projects. The costs of participation in the project, however measured, are substantial and those institutions that did participate must be commended for doing so.

There is also a problem with the sample of institutions participating in the project. Based on the most recent Carnegie classification of the eight participating institutions, five are research universities and three are doctoral granting universities. Although the geographical distribution seems reasonable, the sample is biased toward the largest and most prestigious institutions. In order to obtain a sample that is representative, the sampling frame needs to be expanded to

include other types of institutions, e.g., comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, and two year colleges. Getting the cooperation of institutions of these types will probably require some financial incentive; the data processing staff at these institutions are likely to be small, perhaps only one person, and are likely to be completely committed to routine day-to-day activities.

Another lesson learned is that files maintained for one purpose are not easily adaptable for another purpose. In this case the development data bases maintained by institutions do a good job of keeping track of alumni and donor addresses and alumni graduation dates; they also do a good job of maintaining giving records. Both of these are obviously necessary if a development office is to perform its functions in an efficient and effective manner. However, other data items, e.g., date of birth, gender and other personal variables seem to be kept in a haphazard manner. In some cases the lack of these data items is understandable; a development office would not want to press non-alumni individuals too hard for these data for fear of alienating donors. On the other hand, for alumni, these data should be available in a student's record and not transferring these data to an individual's record in the development file is an oversight. Whatever the reason for the lack of these demographic data items in the files examined thus far, the high percentage of missing values for key variables negatively impacts the use of the CASE donor data base for research purposes.

It seems clear that the high percentage of missing values for key demographic variables, especially in a multivariate context, severely limits the usefulness of the data base. In an attempt to overcome this limitation, the Center developed a questionnaire designed to capture key demographic and other data items necessary for a rich and complete donor data base for research purposes. A preliminary version of the questionnaire was circulated among a number of individuals and their comments were incorporated in a draft questionnaire (see Appendix F). The draft was then sent to all members of the CASE Research Committee. and the comments and suggestions of these individuals were solicited.

A number of individuals were contacted, mostly in an informal manner, and asked if their institution would be willing to use the questionnaire to survey a couple of their donors and non-donors. For a variety of reasons, none of the institutions contacted was willing to sponsor such a survey.

Another shortcoming of the donor data base is the period of time for which giving data are available for the various institutions on the data base. It was originally planned to include giving data for the most recent five years for each institution on the data base. However, some of the institutions supplied their data in late 1987 while the rest supplied their data at various times in early 1988. Thus, for some institutions the data base contains a partial year's data for 1987 and the rest contain a partial year's data for 1988. To further

complicate this problem, one of the institutions keeps yearly giving totals for the most recent two years plus the current year. As a result of this state of affairs, the intersection of all of the institution's yearly giving totals contains only the giving totals for the year 1986; stated another way, 1986 is the only year for which giving totals are available for all the institutions on the data base. A related problem involves the comparability of the total giving amounts in each individual's record on the data base. The number of years for which these totals have been accumulated varies from one institution to another with no two institutions having accumulated these totals for the same number of years. Thus, this data item in the data base is of limited use and certainly cannot be used for comparative purposes. Another limitation of the giving data on the data base is that gifts-in-kind are identified separately by some of the institutions and are not so identified by others. This could cause comparability problems with respect to total giving by individuals.

There seems to be a rather small number of large donors on the computerized files supplied by the various institutions participating in the donor data base project. This may indicate that the giving records of this type of donor are kept on files, either computerized or hand written, that are separate from the files from which the records supplied to the Center were extracted. If this is the case, any inferences drawn from the results of statistical analyses would be erroneous, even if the

sample of institutions was acceptable.

Another source of error in giving estimates may be due to the extent to which the donations of individuals to various subunits of the university, i. e., colleges, departments, etc., are included in the giving records supplied the Center. If donations to some of these units are not processed by the development office, the giving amounts recorded in the donor data base will obviously be in error.

Analysis of Giving Data

An examination of the table entitled Variables in Institutional Files in Appendix A shows that there are few variables that are common to all the institutions participating in the study. One class of variables that was supplied by all institutions were those relating to individual giving. However a close examination of the years for which the data are available for each institution shows that 1986 is the only year in which giving data are available for all institutions. One reason for this state of affairs relates to the year in which data were supplied to the Center for processing. Two of the institutions supplied data in late 1987 and thus supplied only partial giving data for that year. Institution F supplied data in 1989 and its data includes only partial giving histories for donors on its file for that year. Institution C

supplied giving history data for the years 1986 to 1988; this institution only keeps yearly donor totals for the most recent two years plus the current year's total. Thus the analysis of giving across all institutions was essentially limited by the data available from Institution C. Since only three institutions supplied data on gifts-in-kind, analysis of separate giving funds was not performed and the analysis was restricted to analysis of total contributions. Preliminary results from the proc sing of institutional data show several interesting patterns. The reader is cautioned that the results reported below are not based a random sample of institutions and, thus, may not be representative of donor behavior in general.

Large Donors

Only four of the seven institutions provided giving data on donors in the Large Donor category. Of these four, three were independent (IA, IB, and IE) and one was public (IG). The average total contributions for 1986 was $135,259; note that the magnitude of this result is largely attributable to one institution having 131 donors in this category averaging $2..,374 per donor (see Appendix G, Table 1). In contrast, the other two independent institutions had more modest averages of $45,443 and $71,727, respectively. The lone public institution is easy to identify as it only averaged $2,013 per donor. One

would expect this pattern since the independent institutions rely more heavily on donations to meet current expenditures and usually work harder at fund raising than do the public institutions which have their current expenditures largely funded from state appropriations.

Male donors in this category gave nearly twice as much, on average, as females in this year ($51,329 to $24,582). However, for Institution A, females gave more than males ($45,722 to $44,938). The large number of donors with missing values for the gender variable makes conclusions in this regard speculative at best.

An examination of giving by decade of graduation for all institutions combined seems to show a life cycle pattern of giving. Individuals well past retirement age (those having graduated in the 1920s or 1930s) donate larger amounts, on average, than those just about to retire or in their early retirement years (those having graduated in the 1940s). Those who graduated in the 1950s and at the peak of their earning power tend to give more than those graduating in the immediately preceding decade. Average giving for those graduating in more recent decades drops off from the relative peak attained by those graduating in the 1950s. Again, the large number of individuals with missing values for decade of graduation makes any conclusions regarding these results speculative.

Regular Donors

Average giving per donor for all institutions was $285 in 1986 with institutional averages in this regard ranging from $13 to $814 (see Appendix G, Table 2). It is relatively easy to identify the public institutions in the study as they all have two digit averages as compared to the three digit averages of the independents. As was the case with the large donors, male donors in the regular donor category gave more ($309), on average, than females ($192). Note that the differential here was approximately 3 to 2 as compared to the 2 to 1 differential shown for the large donors. As before, missing values undoubtedly impact these results.

When average giving by decade of graduation is examined for 1986, a much more cle.r-cut pattern emerges for this category of donor than that shown for large donors. Average giving per donor for 1986 for the regular donors increases almost steadily from $52 per 1980s graduate to $849 per graduate in the 1930s and then decreases slightly to $668 per graduate in the 1920s. Missing values create a problem for this analysis but are not quite as severe a problem here as they were for the other analyses discussed above.

Non-Donors

Non-donor demographics are shown in Table 3 in Appendix G.

Note that approximately 4% of the individual records have missing values for the gender variable across all institutions. One institution did not supply values for gender. This percentage is low when compared with the 27% missing values for gender in the regular donor files and 29% missing in the large donor files.

Approximately 11% of the non-donor records have missing values for the decade of graduation variable for all institutions. The regular donor and large donor files have 26% and 62%, respectively, missing values for this variable.

Conclusions/Implications

Despite the problems missing values present for multivariate analyses, the CASE Donor Data Base can be of value for a number of useful research studies. First, the data base is the only extant source of donor data with a nationwide scope. This will allow "first cut" national donor profiles to be constructed and analyzed. Second, data are available for all large donors at a number of institutions. Aggregations of these data will allow preliminary profiles of this category of donor to be constructed and analyzed. Third, data on graduation date and field of study are generally good for relatively recent graduates. Profiles of the giving behavior of graduates over the last 7 to 10 years would provide information on this group of individuals that is not available from any other source.

Fourth, data on the dollar value of gifts-in-kind donations is available for three of the institutions participating in the project. These data should allow preliminary analyses of the types of individuals making this category of donation and the magnitude of this type of giving. Fifth, a study of the giving behavior of donors/alumni in the institution's home state can be compared with that of similar individuals residing in surrounding states or residing in states more remote than the surrounding states. Sixth, it is possible to compare the magnitude of giving for individuals receiving the bachelor's degree with individuals receiving professional or other advanced degrees. Of special interest in this regard would be comparison of the magnitude of giving for individuals receiving law or medical degrees with that of individuals receiving other advanced degrees. Thus, while the results of the studies suggested above could be generalized only to a limited population of institutions, these studies would show the usefulness of a national donor data base and possibly lead to funding of a project designed to capture a more complete set of donor data than can be gathered directly from institutional files.

[EOD]

APPENDIX A

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Variables in Institutional Files

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
UNIVERSITY-CODE	006	003	004	012	011	002	013
SSN-ID	ID	ID	ID	ID	ID	SSN	ID
STATE-COUNTRY	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
ZIPCODE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
TELE-AREA-CODE	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
TITLE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
GENDER	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ETHNICITY	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
BIRTHDATE	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
BIRTH-MONTH	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
BIRTH-DAY	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
BIRTH-YEAR	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MARITAL-STATUS	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
ATHLETICS-PARTIC	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
NUMBER-CHILDREN	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
FRAT-SORIT-FLAG	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
FRAT-SORIT-MEMBER	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
PROF-CODE	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
POSIT-TITL-CODE	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
SALARY-CODE	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
DEATH-DATE-FLAG	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
DEATH-DATE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
DEATH-DATE-MONTH	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
DEATH-DATE-DAY	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
DEATH-DATE-YEAR	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
SPOUSE-ID-CODE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
SPOUSE-ALUM-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
DONOR-TYPE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
DONOR-CODE-CAT	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
GIVING-CLUB-MEMBER	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
SOLICIT-CODE	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
DEFERRED-GIVING-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
DEFERRED-GIVING	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
ACADEMIC-AWARDS	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
STUDENT-ACTIVITIES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
HONORS-STUDENT	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
TRUSTEE-STATUS-FLAG	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
TRUSTEE-STATUS	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
ALUMNI-ASSN-MEM	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
ALUMNI-TYPE-MEM	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
MATCHED-GIFT	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
MOST-REC-DEG1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
MOST-REC-DEG1-MAJOR	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
MOST-REC-DEG1-YEAR	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEXT-REC-DEG2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
NEXT-REC-DEG2-MAJOR	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
NEXT-REC-DEG2-YEAR	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
NEXT-REC-DEG3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
NEXT-REC-DEG3-MAJOR	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
NEXT-REC-DEG3-YEAR	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
SCHOOL-COLLEGE-CODE	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
OTHER-COLLEGE-ATTENDED	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
OTHER-COLLEGE-DEGREE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES

Variables in Institutional Files (Cont.)

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
ANNUAL-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
ANNUAL-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	1988	1988	1988	1989	1988
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR	1987	1987	1987	1987	1987	1988	1987
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	1986	1986	1986	1986	1986	1987	1986
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	1985	1985	NO	1985	1985	1986	1985
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	1984	1984	NO	1984	1984	1985	1984
ANNUAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	1983	1983	NO	NO	NO	1984	1983
ANNUAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
ANNUAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED
ANNUAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	5	5	3	5	5	4	5
ANNUAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
ANNUAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED
CAPITAL-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
CAPITAL-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	1989	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR	NO	1987	NO	NO	NO	1988	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	NO	1986	NO	NO	NO	1987	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	NO	1985	NO	NO	NO	1986	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	NO	1984	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
CAPITAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	NO	1983	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
CAPITAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
CAPITAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO
CAPITAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	NO	5	NO	NO	NO	4	NO
CAPITAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	NO	N.A.	NO	NO	NO	N.A.	NO
CAPITAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
ATHLETIC-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	1988	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-LST-YR	1987	NO	1987	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	1986	NO	1986	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	1985	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	1984	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	1983	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	CALCULATED	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	5	NO	3	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	N.A.	NO	N.A.	NO	NO	NO	NO
ATHLETIC-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	CALCULATED	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-LST-YR	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MEDICAL-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
SPEC-1-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	1988	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-LST-YR	NO	NO	1987	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	1986	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	NO	NO	3	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	NO	NO	N.A.	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-1-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-POTENTIAL	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	1988	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-LST-YR	NO	NO	1987	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	1986	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	NO	NO	3	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-PLEDGE-AMT	NO	NO	N.A.	NO	NO	NO	NO
SPEC-2-FD-LST-GIFT-DATE	NO	NO	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	NO

VARIABLE NAME	INSTITUTION A	INSTITUTION B	INSTITUTION C	INSTITUTION D	INSTITUTION E	INSTITUTION F	INSTITUTION G
GIFT-INKIND-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	NO	NO	1988	.989	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-LST-YR	1987	NO	NO	NO	1987	1388	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	1986	NO	NO	NO	1986	987	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	1985	NO	NO	NO	1985	1986	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	1984	NO	NO	NO	1984	NO	NO
GIFT-INKIND-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	1983	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
GIFT-INKIND-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
GIFT-INKIND-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	NO
GIFT-INKIND-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	5	NO	NO	NO	5	4	NO
GIFT-INKIND-PLEDGE-AMT	N.A.	NO	NO	NO	N.A.	N.A.	NO
GIFT-INKIND-LST-GIFT-DATE	CALCULATED	NO	NO	NO	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	NO
TOT-CONTRIB-FLAG	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-CUR-YR	NO	NO	1988	1988	1988	1989	1988
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-LST-YR	1987	1987	1987	1987	1987	1988	1987
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-2-YRS-AGO	1986	1986	1986	1986	1986	1987	1986
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-3-YRS-AGO	1985	1985	NO	1985	1985	1986	1985
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-4-YRS-AGO	1984	1984	NO	1984	1984	1985	1984
TOT-CONTRIB-AMT-5-YRS-AGO	1983	1983	NO	NO	NO	1984	1983
TOT-CONTRIB-TOTAL-ALL-YRS	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
TOT-CONTRIB-TOTAL-N-P-YRS	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED
TOT-CONTRIB-N-PREV-YRS-EQ	5	5	3	5	5	4	5
TOT-CONTRIB-PLEDGE-AMT	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOT-CONTRIB-LST-GIFT-DATE	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED
TYPE-GIFTS-IN-KIND-RECENT	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOT-PLDGE-AMT-ALL-CURRENT	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
CONSECUTIVE-YRS-GIVING	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED	CALCULATED

Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

35

APPENDIX B

Software Vendors Sending Materials
in Response to the Letter of Inquiry

1. American Management Systems, Inc.

2. APT Computer Solutions, Inc.

3. Blackbaud Microsystems, Inc.

4. Business Systems Resouces, Inc. (BSR)

5. The Camis Co., Inc.

6. CARS Information Systems Corp.

7. Computer Management and Development Services, Inc.

8. Development Strategies, Inc.

9. FRA, Inc.

10. Information Associates

11. Karico Systems, Inc.

12. Master Software Corp.

13. McDonnell Douglas Computer Systems Co.

14. The POISE Co., Inc.

15. Quodata Corp.

16. Western American Computing Corp.

17. The Williamson Group

18. Zoller Data Systems

APPENDIX C

Institutions Expressing an Interest in CASE Donor Data Base
Project But Not Yet Participating

1. Case Western University

2. Ohio State University

3. Kalamazoo College

4. University of Santa Clara

5. University of Maryland

6. Columbia University

7. University of Michigan

8. University of Rochester

9. University of San Diego

10. Drew University

11. University of New Mexico

APPENDIX D

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution A

	Regular Donors	Large Donors	Non Donors
Number of Records	500	65	500

Variable Name	Percent Missing		
Zipcode	0	0	0
Gender	12	11	15
Ethnicity	N/A	N/A	N/A
Birthdate	N/A	N/A	69
Marital Status	N/A	N/A	46
Position Title Code	N/A	N/A	N/A
Salary Code	N/A	N/A	N/A
Deferred Giving	N/A	N/A	N/A
Most Recent Degree1	39	60	N/A
Most Recent Degree1-Major	N/A	N/A	N/A
Most Recent Degree1-Year	33	45	42
Next Most Recent Degree2	92	97	N/A
Next Recent Degree2-Major	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Recent Degree2-Year	92	95	N/A
Next Most Recent Degree3	99	100	N/A
Next Recent Degree3-Major	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Recent Degree3-Year	99.6	100	N/A

Note: N/A indicates data item not available or not supplied.

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution B

	Regular Donors	Large Donors	Non Donors
Number of Records	478	0	0

Variable Name	Percent Missing
Zipcode	.8
Gender	N/A
Ethnicity	N/A
Birthdate	N/A
Marital Status	N/A
Position Title Code	40
Salary Code	N/A
Deferred Giving	N/A
Most Recent Degree1	3
Most Recent Degree1-Major	62
Most Recent Degree1-Year	3
Next Most Recent Degree2	89
Next Recent Degree2-Major	94
Next Recent Degree2-Year	89
Next Most Recent Degree3	99
Next Recent Degree3-Major	99
Next Recent Degree3-Year	99

Note: N/A indicates data not available or not supplied.

42

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages
Institution C

	Regular Donors	Large Donors	Non Donors
Number of Records	. 500	0	1102

Variable Name	Percent Missing		
Zipcode	.2	N/A	2
Gender	0	N/A	0
Ethnicity	95	N/A	95
Birthdate	9	N/A	11
Marital Status	7	N/A	17
Position Title Code	46	N/A	79
Salary Code	75	N/A	94
Deferred Giving	N/A	N/A	N/A
Most Recent Degree1	.6	N/A	.2
Most Recent Degree1-Major	28	N/A	28
Most Recent Degree1-Year	3	N/A	5
Next Most Recent Degree2	85	N/A	85
Next Recent Degree2-Major	87	N/A	85
Next Recent Degree2-Year	84	N/A	84
Next Most Recent Degree3	98	N/A	99
Next Recent Degree3-Major	98	N/A	99
Next Recent Degree3-Year	98	N/A	99

Note: N/A indicates data item not available or not supplied.

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Missing Data Percentages for Key Variables
Institution E

	Regular Donors	Large Donors	Non Donors
Number of Records	548	131	495

Variable Name	Percent Missing		
Zipcode	5	31	21
Gender	14	44	1
Ethnicity	N/A	N/A	N/A
Birthdate	98	63	99
Marital Status	88	49	99
Position Title Code	21	58	23
Salary Code	N/A	N/A	N/A
Deferred Giving	N/A	N/A	N/A
Most Recent Degree1	20	73	0
Most Recent Degree1-Major	20	73	0
Most Recent Degree1-Year	21	75	1
Next Most Recent Degree2	84	89	87
Next Recent Degree2-Major	84	89	87
Next Recent Degree2-Year	84	89	87
Next Most Recent Degree3	98	97	99
Next Recent Degree3-Major	98	97	99
Next Recent Degree3-Year	98	97	99

Note: N/A indicates data item not available.

APPENDIX E

CASE Donor Data Base Project
Percentage of Records Containing Valid
Values for Combinations of Variables

Institution/File	Percentage of Records	Variable List
Tufts University		
Regular Donors	59.4	Zipcode, Most Recent Degree Year, Position Title Code
Texas Christian University		
Regular Donors	66.4	Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year
Large Donors	55.4	Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year
Non-Donors	23.8	Zipcode, Gender, Most Recent Degree Year, Birthdate, Marital Status
California Institute of Technology		
Regular Donors (1)	72.1	Zipcode, Gender, Position Title Code, Most Recent Degree Year
Regular Donors (2)	6.2	Zipcode, Gender, Position Title Code, Most Recent Degree Year, Marital Status
Large Donors (1)	25.2	Same variables as Regular Donors (1)
Large Donors (2)	19.8	Same variables as Regular Donors (2)
Non-Donors	59.0	Same as Regular Donors (1)
University of Arizona		
Regular Donors (3)	83.8	Zipcode, Gender, Birthdate, Marital Status, Most Recent Degree Year.
Regular Donors (4)	50.4	Same variables as Regular Donors (3) plus Position Title Code
Non-Donors (1)	76.6	Same variables as Regular Donors (3)
Non-Donors (2)	18.7	Same variables as Regular Donors (4)

APPENDIX F

The CU Study to Enhance Fund-Raising Effectiveness
Office of University Relations and Development
College University

Information given will be for statistical purpses only.
The confidence of the respondent will be respected.

DIRECTIONS

Your responses will be read by an optical mark reader. Your careful observance of these few simple rules will be most appreciated.

- Use only black lead pencil (No. 2 is ideal)
- Make heavy black circles around your answers
- Erase cleanly any answer your wish to change.

PLEASE PRINT (one letter or number per space)

Birth Year __ __

ZIP Code __ __ __ __ __

Phone __ __ __ - __ __ __ - __ __ __ __

Social Security Number: (Circle the appropriate numbers)

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

While you were at the College: (Note: Circle only one response per column.)

1. Degree(s) earned:

	1st Degree	2nd Degree	3rd Degree
None	1	2	3
Bachelors	1	2	3
Masters	1	2	3
Doctorate	1	2	3
Other	1	2	3

2. Below is a list of different major fields grouped into general categories. Circle only one answer to indicate your field of study for each degree earned at the college.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

	1	2	3
Art, fine and applied	1	2	3
English (language and literature)	1	2	3
History	1	2	3
Journalism	1	2	3
Language and Literature (except English)	1	2	3
Music	1	2	3
Philosophy	1	2	3
Speech	1	2	3
Theater or Drama	1	2	3
Theology or Religion	1	2	3
Other Arts and Humanities	1	2	3

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE

	1	2	3
Biology (general)	1	2	3
Biochemistry or Biophysics	1	2	3
Botany	1	2	3
Marine (Life) Science	1	2	3
Microbiology or Bacteriology	1	2	3
Zoology	1	2	3
Other Biological Science	1	2	3

BUSINESS

	1	2	3
Accounting	1	2	3
Business Admin. (general)	1	2	3
Finance	1	2	3
Marketing	1	2	3
Management	1	2	3
Secretarial Studies	1	2	3
Other Business	1	2	3

EDUCATION

	1	2	3
Business Education	1	2	3
Elementary Education	1	2	3
Music or Art Education	1	2	3
Physical Education or Recreation	1	2	3
Secondary Education	1	2	3
Special Education	1	2	3
Other Education	1	2	3

ENGINEERING

	1	2	3
Aeronautical or Astronautical Eng.	1	2	3
Civil Engineering	1	2	3
Chemical Engineering	1	2	3
Electrical or Electronic Engineering	1	2	3
Industrial Engineering	1	2	3
Mechanical Engineering	1	2	3
Other Engineering	1	2	3
Law	1	2	3
Medicine	1	2	3
Dentistry	1	2	3
Pharmacy	1	2	3

PHYSICAL SCIENCE

	1	2	3
Astronomy	1	2	3
Atmospheric Science (incl. Meteorology)	1	2	3
Chemistry	1	2	3
Earth Science	1	2	3
Marine Science (incl. Oceanography)	1	2	3
Mathematics	1	2	3
Physics	1	2	3
Statistics	1	2	3
Other Physical Science	1	2	3

PROFESSIONAL

	1	2	3
Architecture or Urban Planning	1	2	3
Home Economics	1	2	3
Health Technology (medical, dental, laboratory)	1	2	3
Library or Archival Science	1	2	3
Nursing	1	2	3
Pharmacy	1	2	3
Predental, Premedicine, Preveterinary	1	2	3
Therapy (occupational, physical, speech)	1	2	3
Other professional	1	2	3

SOCIAL SCIENCE

	1	2	3
Anthropology	1	2	3
Economics	1	2	3
Ethnic Studies	1	2	3
Geography	1	2	3
Political Science (gov't., international relations)	1	2	3
Psychology	1	2	3
Social Work	1	2	3
Sociology	1	2	3
Women's Studies	1	2	3
Other Social Science	1	2	3

TECHNICAL

	1	2	3
Building Trades	1	2	3
Data Processing or Computer Programming	1	2	3
Drafting or Design	1	2	3
Electronics	1	2	3
Mechanics	1	2	3
Other Technical	1	2	3

OTHER FIELDS

	1	2
Agriculture	1	2
Communications (radio, TV, etc)	1	2
Computer Science	1	2
Forestry	1	2
Law Enforcement	1	2
Military Science	1	2
Other field	1	2
Undecided	1	2

48

3. **Year of Degree:**
(circle the appropriate numbers)

```
                3rd Degree
        2nd Degree  |
1st Degree |        |
    |      |        |
   0 0    0 0      0 0
   1 1    1 1      1 1
   2 2    2 2      2 2
   3 3    3 3      3 3
   4 4    4 4      4 4
   5 5    5 5      5 5
   6 6    6 6      6 6
   7 7    7 7      7 7
   8 8    8 8      8 8
   9 9    9 9      9 9
```

Which of the following best describes your:
(Mark only one circle for each question)

	Most Pleasant	Unpleasant	Pleasant	Most Pleasant
4. overall experience at the College?	O	O	O	O
5. academic experience?	O	O	O	O
6. personal/social life experience?	O	O	O	O
7. experience with college teachers?	O	O	O	O

8. What was your **primary** residence while at the College? (Mark only one)

Dorm	O
Fraternity/Sorority	O
Other Campus Housing	O
With Family/Relations	O
Other	O

9. Were you primarily a:

Full-time student	O
Part-time student	O

10. What was your undergraduate college grade average?

D O	C- O	B- O	A- O
D+ O	C O	B O	A O
	C+ O	B+ O	

11. What was your high school grade average?

D O	C- O	B- O	A- O
D+ O	C O	B O	A O
	C+ O	B+ O	

12. Were you: (Mark all that apply)

a fraternity/sorority member?	O
active in student activities?	O
involved in inter-collegiate activities?	O
an honors student?	O
a recipient of other college awards?	O
a recipient of a college scholarship?	O
Academic	O
Athletic	O
Other	O
a recipient of other student aid?	O
Grant	O
Loan	O
Other	O

In your opinion: (Circle only one number)

13. The College does a good job of producing a well-rounded student, one whose physical, social, and intellectual potentials are cultivated.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1

14. The College does a good job of preparing students for useful careers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1

15. The college does a good job at assisting students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence to examine those beliefs critically.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1

At the time you entered the College.

16. How many miles was it to your permanent home?

5 or less	O
6 - 50	O
51 - 100	O
101 - 500	O
over 500	O

Regarding other colleges you may have attended:

	Yes	No
17. Have you attended another college?	O	O
18. Have you earned a degree from another college?	O	O
a. Was this degree earned later?	O	O
19. Do you contribute to that college?	O	O

Regarding your personal characteristics:

20: Your sex:

Male	O
Female	O

21. Marital status: (Mark one or two responses)

Married	O	Single	O
Widowed	O	Divorced	O

22. Ethnicity:

Caucasian	O	Black	O
Hispanic	O	Other	O

23. How many children do you have?

Zero	O	3 - 4	O
1 - 2	O	5 or more	O

a. Are any of these children or your spouse presently enrolled at the College?

Yes	O	No	O

b. Has a child been enrolled at the College in the past?

Yes	O	No	O

24. If you are married or widowed, is/or was your spouse an alumnus of the College?

Yes	O	No	O

25. Mark at most three responses, one each column:

NOTE: If your spouse is deceased, please indicate his or her last occupation.

D   Deceased Spouse Occupation
S   Spouse's Occupation
Y   Your Occupation

Accountant or actuary	Y S D	Military service (career)	Y S D
Actor or entertainer	Y S D	Musician (performer, composer)	Y S D
Architect or urban planner	Y S D	Nurse	Y S D
Artist	Y S D	Optometrist	Y S D
Business (clerical)	Y S D	Pharmacist	Y S D
Business executive (management, administrator)	Y S D	Physician	Y S D
		School counselor	Y S D
Business owner or proprietor	Y S D	School principal	
Business salesperson or buyer	Y S D	or superintendent	Y S D
Clergyman (minister, priest)	Y S D	Scientific researcher	Y S D
Clergy (other religious)	Y S D	Social, welfare	
Clinical psychologist	Y S D	or recreation worker	Y S D
College teacher	Y S D	Statistician	Y S D
Computer programmer or analyst	Y S D	Therapist (physical, occupational, speech)	Y S D
Conservationist or forester	Y S D		
Dentist (including orthodontist)	Y S D		
Dietician or home economist	Y S D	Teacher or administrator (elementary)	Y S D
Engineer	Y S D		
Farmer or rancher	Y S D	Teacher or administrator (secondary)	Y S D
Foreign service worker (including diplomat)	Y S D	Veterinarian	Y S D
Homemaker	Y S D	Writer or journalist	Y S D
		Skilled trades	Y S D
Interior decorator (including designer)	Y S D	Other	Y S D
		Undecided	Y S D
Interpreter (translator)	Y S D	Laborer (unskilled)	Y S D
Lab technician or hygienist	Y S D	Semi-skilled worker	Y S D
Law enforcement officer	Y S D	Other occupation	Y S D
Lawyer (attorney) or judge	Y S D	Unemployed	Y S D

26. Your annual salary/earnings
$_____

Spouse's annual salary/earnings
$_____

(Note: Income is salary/earnings plus other income.)

Your annual Income
$_____

Spouse's annual Income
$_____

27. Are you responding to this questionnaire as a

Private individual	O
Corporation	O

28. Which of the following best describes the economic condition of the county of your residence?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. Presently	O	O	O	O
b. 2 - 5 years ago	O	O	O	O
c. Expected, 2 - 5 years ahead	O	O	O	O

29. Are you or have you been an employee of the College while you were a student?

Yes   O   No   O

While not a student

Yes   O   No   O

30. Are the contributions you make to the College your own? or

Yes   O   No   O

Joint with spouse

Yes   O   No   O

31. How many miles is it from your present home to the College?

5 or less	O	101 - 500	O
6 - 50	O	over 500	O
51 - 100	O		

Regarding your donor behavior to the College:

32. What is the principal means by which the College contacts you to solicit financial support?

Phone	O	Letter	O
Visit	O	Other	O

33. What is the most effective means for a college to contact you for this support?

Phone	O	Letter	O
Visit	O	Other	O

34. What is your perception of the college's financial need?

Unaware	O	Substantial	O
None	O	Critical	O
Modest	O		

Regarding your relationship with the College since graduation:

35. Have you

a. been an alumni association member?

Yes   O   No   O

b. been a member of a "giving club"?

Yes   O   No   O

c. been awarded an honorary degree?

Yes   O   No   O

d. been honored in some other way?

Yes   O   No   O

e. been actively involved in some other way?

Yes   O   No   O

f. been a trustee?

Yes   O   No   O

General

36. What factor(s) do you consider to be the most important in explaining your support for the College?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

37. Other comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please fold the questionnaire so that the return address appears on the outside and place in the mail. Thank you!

APPENDIX G

Table 1

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
AVERAGE GIFT per LARGE DONOR -- 1986

	INSTITUTION A		INSTITUTION B		INSTITUTION C		INSTITUTION D		INSTITUTION E		INSTITUTION F		INSTITUTION G		INSTITUTION ALL	
	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS - 1986	$45,443	65					$71,927	8	$223,374	131	$0	2	$2,013	36	$135,259	242
GIVING BY GENDER:																
MISSING VALUES	$47,614	7					$149,024	3	$419,644	58	$0	2			$358,853	70
MALE	$44,938	40					$32,626	2	$78,647	59			$2,487	27	$51,329	128
FEMALE	$45,722	18					$21,031	3	$7,480	9			$589	9	$24,582	39
OTHER									$16,830	5					$16,830	5
GIVING BY DECADE OF GRADUATION																
1900 - 1909																
1910 - 1919																
1920 - 1929	$14,631	4							$419.015	3			$2,750	4	$120,597	11
1930 - 1939	$117,600	5							$3' 45	13			$938	4	$45,656	22
1940 - 1949	$15,068	9							$,90	8			$1,327	6	$10,552	23
1950 - 1959	$67,743	9							$61,872	7			$1,839	4	$52,507	20
1960 - 1969	$55,100	1					$4,519	1					$4,210	4	$9,557	8
1970 - 1979	$17,665	7					$33,143	1	$0	2					$19,600	8
1980 - 1989	$12,500	1													$12,500	1
MISSING VALUES	$47,266	29					$89,626	6	$27' 786	98	$0	2	$1,825	14	$193,712	149
GIVING BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR																
1900 - 1909									$171,629	10			$3,333	3	$132,791	13
1910 - 1919									$54,050	21			$2,199	8	$39,746	29
1920 - 1929									$88,226	8			$692	5	$54,559	13
1930 - 1939									$700	5			$1,714	4	$2,039	9
1940 - 1949									$5,000	1					$5,000	1
1950 - 1959																
1960 - 1969																
1970 - 1979																
1980 - 1989																
MISSING VALUES	$45,443	65					$71,927	8	$297,271	86	$0	2	$1,659	16	$164,526	177

53

Table 2

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
AVERAGE GIFT per REGULAR DONOR -- 1986

	INSTITUTION A		INSTITUTION B		INSTITUTION C		:NSTITUTION D		INSTITUTION E		INSTITUTION F		INSTITUTION G		INSTITUTION ALL	
	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N	DOLLARS	N
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS - 1986	$814	500	$109	478	$14	500	$307	528	$656	548	$13	500	$35	500	$285	3554
GIVING BY GENDER:																
MISSING VALUES	$1,307	58	$109	478			$354	238	$661	75	$25	95			$283	944
MALE	$827	26.			$17	324	$339	198	$509	435	$15	192	$50	298	$309	1707
FEMALE	$639	182			$7	176	$91	92	$1,961	19	$5	213	$12	185	$192	867
OTHER									$2,687	19			$13	17	$1,424	36
GIVING BY DECADE OF GRADUATION																
1900 - 1909																
1910 - 1919																
1920 - 1929	$3,916	7	$208	3	$14	7			$170	11	$2	8	$6	9	$668	45
1930 - 1939	$2,039	28	$294	16	$25	23	$105	3	$1,305	47	$3	11	$38	19	$849	147
1940 - 1949	$928	35	$437	29	$23	39	$392	11	$1,434	80	$1	12	$17	32	$696	238
1950 - 1959	$474	46	$169	50	$13	71	$320	21	$175	60	$50	25	$49	65	$156	338
1960 - 1969	$1,203	49	$151	62	$19	113	$196	77	$222	83	$7	72	$54	76	$204	532
1970 - 1979	$400	85	$72	78	$10	154	$169	159	$83	91	$9	160	$28	103	$97	831
1980 - 1989	$69	82	$85	104	$9	76	$1,257	7	$16	60	$4	109	$6	63	$52	501
MISSING VALUES	$1,013	167	$14	136	$2	17	$400	250	$1,242	116	$24	103	$41	123	$459	922
GIVING BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR																
1900 - 1909					$37	21			$2,775	4	$2	4	$22	18	$262	47
1910 - 1919					$8	32	$0	1	$6,010	2	$12	14	$31	25	$179	74
1920 - 1929					$16	47	$675	5	$10,361	3	$8	17	$20	53	$292	125
1930 - 1939					$25	88	$308	14			$35	42	$88	67	$66	211
1940 - 1949					$11	140	$173	58			$8	117	$15	88	$34	403
1950 - 1959					$9	108	$57	17			$7	113	$26	89	$15	327
1960 - 1969					$4	19					$5	41	$3	28	$4	88
1970 - 1979																
1980 - 1989																
MISSING VALUES	$814	500	$109	470	$6	45	$331	433	$860	539	$17	152	$41	132	$402	2279

55

Compiled and calculated by The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona

Table 3

C A S E -- DATA BASE PRELIMINARY RESULTS
NON-DONOR DEMOGRAPHICS
(MISSING VALUES INCLUDED)

	INSTITUTION A		INSTITUTION B		INSTITUTION C		INSTITUTION D		INSTITUTION E		INSTITUTION F		INSTITUTION G		INSTITUTION ALL	
	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N	PERCENT	N
BY GENDER:																
MISSING VALUES	14.8%	74					.2%	1	1.2%	6	11.8%	59	.4%	2	3.9%	142
MALE	39.4%	197			55.4%	611	66.4%	332	92.9%	460	38.0%	190	55.0%	275	57.4%	2065
FEMALE	45.8%	229			44.6%	491	33.4%	167	5.9%	29	50.2%	251	44.6%	223	38.6%	1390
OTHER																
BY DECADE OF GRADUATION																
1900 - 1909																
1910 - 1919																
1920 - 1929	1.2%	6			.4%	4	1.2%	6	.8%	4	1.4%	7	1.0%	5	.9%	32
1930 - 1939	2.4%	12			1.9%	21	3.2%	16	1.8%	9	.8%	4	3.2%	16	2.2%	78
1940 - 1949	9.0%	45			3.0%	33	8.2%	41	11.5%	57	1.2%	6	4.6%	23	5.7%	205
1950 - 1959	5.8%	29			6.6%	73	9.0%	45	9.9%	49	2.2%	11	9.2%	46	7.0%	253
1960 - 1969	9.8%	49			17.0%	187	13.4%	67	15.6%	77	10.2%	51	16.2%	81	14.2%	512
1970 - 1979	13.4%	67			26.0%	287	24.4%	122	23.4%	116	37.0%	185	28.2%	141	25.5%	918
1980 - 1989	14.8%	74			39.2%	432	34.0%	170	35.6%	176	40.2%	201	32.0%	160	33.7%	1213
MISSING VALUES	43.6%	218			5.9%	65	6.6%	33	1.4%	7	7.0%	35	5.6%	28	10.7%	386
BY DECADE OF BIRTH YEAR																
1900 - 1909	.4%	2			1.1%	12	.6%	3			.4%	2	2.2%	11	.8%	30
1910 - 1919	1.0%	5			2.7%	30	.6%	3	.2%	1	.8%	4	4.0%	20	1.8%	63
1920 - 1929	·1.6%	8			4.9%	54	3.4%	17			2.4%	12	8.0%	40	3.6%	131
1930 - 1939	3.4%	17			7.7%	85	1.4%	7			6.8%	34	11.4%	57	5.6%	200
1940 - 1949	7.6%	38			22.9%	252	4.4%	22			24.0%	120	20.4%	102	14.8%	534
1950 - 1959	8.6%	43			33.1%	365	15.8%	79			32.4%	162	32.2%	161	22.5%	810
1960 - 1969	8.0%	40			15.7%	173	18.0%	90			16.4%	82	15.4%	77	12.8%	462
1970 - 1979																
1980 - 1989							.2%	1							.0%	1
MISSING VALUES	69.4%	347			11.9%	131	55.6%	278	9?.?%	494	16.8%	84	6.4%	32	38.0%	1366