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## FOREWORD



We are in an era of dramatic shifts in the way donors prefer to connect with us. We are thrilled that the Blackbaud Institute has partnered with the Association of Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP) to shine a spotlight on the generational shifts in giving within the healthcare industry through The Next Generation of American Healthcare Giving.

Throughout this report, "health" and "healthcare" are broadly defined. Certainly, hospitals, health systems, hospice, and other more traditional settings are included, but so are organizations raising money to cure disease states, and peer-to-peer fundraising for health-related causes. It is important, therefore, that hospital and health care philanthropy professionals read this information through that lens.

In this report, you will find that Gen-Xers and Millennials prefer to think about philanthropy for a cause rather than dedicating themselves to an organization. This is an opportunity ready to be seized by our more traditional organizations. Generational shifts in the way donors think about giving necessitate it. With the rise in digital gifts, in Facebook-delivered campaigns, and other channels displayed throughout this report, we might consider asking ourselves how we tap into these trends. With what organizations should we consider partnerships? How can our work be tied to the causes donors care about? How can we segment our projects into campaigns designed for peer to peer fundraising? How can we attract donors who are not our patients to become involved with and excited about our work?

I hope you find the data within this report informative, and that the information sparks innovation and creativity for us all.

Alice Ayres, President and CEO, Association for Healthcare Philanthropy

## INTRODUCTION

This report is a part of a series of generational giving studies sponsored by the Blackbaud Institute and conducted by Edge Research. The Next Generation of American Giving study has been conducted three times (2010, 2013, and 2018), and we are proud to introduce this first-ever deeper look at healthcare-focused trends. Examining donor behavior through a generational lens provides valuable information about evolving attitudes, beliefs, practices, and donor expectations. We also recommend you read this study as a companion piece to the Blackbaud Institute's 2018 Charitable Giving Report and the 2018 Healthcare Spotlight, which tracks actual fundraising performance over the past year. It's always important to weigh people's stated behavior and intentions, which lie at the heart of this report, against their behavior. Together, these reports shed light on the inner life of donors across the generations and their actual giving behavior.

We offer this study in the hopes that it will help guide your strategic and tactical choices in the world of fundraising. And we offer it with deep gratitude for your passion and persistence in helping to power the many causes that matter.

## Key Findings

## Healthcare Donors

Giving USA reports that about $9 \%$ of all dollars donated sector-wide go to health organizations'. Whereas this number reflects the total dollar amount contributed to charitable organizations (i.e. how much donors have given), the data collected in our study reflects the number of people who self-report giving to those organizations (i.e. how many donors believe they have given).

Our study finds that $34 \%$, or roughly a third of donors surveyed, reported making at least one contribution to a healthcare organization within the last 12 months ${ }^{2}$.

FIGURE 1

## 2017 CONTRIBUTIONS: \$410.02 BILLION BY TYPE OF RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION

in billions of dollars (all figures are rounded)


And according to the 2018 Charitable Giving Report Healthcare Spotlight, overall giving increased $0.6 \%$ and online giving increased $3.3 \%$ year-over-year for healthcare organizations in 2018. In our study, healthcare organizations were one of the most popular types of charity that donors give to, after social service organizations and places of worship.

FIGURE 2
PERCENTAGE OF U.S. DONORS WHO
REPORT GIVING TO A "HEALTH CHARITY"
IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

## 34\%

of US donors, est.
53.7 million donors

These numbers are slightly down from 2013, when $39 \%$ of donors reported giving to health charities. This trend is not unique; most sectors experienced a drop, underscoring an overall dip in the number of people who give across the charitable sector. The total percentage of overall donors among those surveyed shrank from $68 \%$ in 2013 to $61 \%$ in 2018. Even as total dollars donated is growing, the population of givers is contracting.

[^0]FIGURE 3
PERCENTAGE OF SELF-REPORTED DONORS ${ }^{3}$


4V Represent a statistically significant difference between 2013 and 2018 at the 90\% confidence interval.

## Demographics

Healthcare donors are demographically similar to total donors in terms of gender, age, education, and income. Generational groups also mirror national trends, with Boomers representing a significant population of donors. As the data reveals, Gen-Xers and Millennials, while a significant force in giving, have yet to reach their prime giving years, like Boomers and Matures.

However, Gen-Xers' overall giving patterns show signs that they could warrant more attention. Generation X has surpassed Matures in total giving (though Matures still give more than Gen X-ers per capita). And, more than $20 \%$ of Gen-Xers say they expect to increase their giving in the coming year, which is almost twice as many as Boomers ( $9 \%$ say will increase) or Matures (9\%). According to Pew Research, the overall population of Gen-Xers is forecasted to exceed that of Boomers sometime in 2028, signaling that the 'Age of $X$ ' in philanthropy may be as little as a decade away ${ }^{4}$.

FIGURE 4
HEALTHCARE DONORS BY GENERATIONAL GROUPS


Key differences in healthcare donors come into play in geography. Donors who live in the Northeast are more likely to give to healthcare charities, with $23 \%$ of healthcare donors living in the Northeast compared to $18 \%$ of all donors; whereas in the South, healthcare donors are under-represented ( $31 \%$ of healthcare donors live in the South, compared to $36 \%$ of donors overall).

FIGURE 5

## GEOGRAPHY



Represent a statistically significant difference between 2013 and 2018 at the 90\% confidence interval.
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## Donor Behavior

In 2018, healthcare donors gave to roughly six organizations per year. By comparison, the average donor gave to about four organizations per year. Additionally, the total amount that healthcare donors gave to charity was higher than the average donor. In 2018, healthcare donors reported giving \$1,001 per year to all nonprofit organizations, compared to the average donor, who gave $\$ 918$. While the total amount that healthcare donors give to charity is directionally higher than donors overall, it suggests that they may give slightly less to each organization, as their gifts are spread across more organizations, on average.

FIGURE 6
AVERAGE GIVING IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

|  | HC DONORS | TOTAL DONORS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average donation <br> amount to all nonprofit <br> organizations | $\$ 1001$ | $\$ 918$ |
| Average number of <br> charities supported | 6.11 | 4.32 |

FIGURE 7
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHARITIES SUPPORTED BY GENERATION


The n -size for Gen Z is very small at $\mathrm{n}=35$

Mirroring total donor behavior, Mature healthcare donors give to the largest number of charities. On average, they donate to 9.62 organizations, which far surpasses the average Mature donor, who gives to 6.31 organizations. The gap between Matures and other generations is greater among healthcare donors than among total donors.


## Donor Attitudes and Values

## Top Giving Priorities

When asked to prioritize their overall giving, donors in every generational group listed health among their top priorities. Generation X was the most likely to list health as the top priority cause. This is promising for healthcare organizations, as Gen X is on deck to become the next major giving generation after Boomers pass the torch.


FIGURE 8
TOP OVERALL GIVING PRIORITIES AMONG ALL DONORS

|  |  | MOST FREQUENT GIVING CHOICES BY GENERATION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GEN Z | MILLENNIALS | GEN X | BOOMERS | MATURES |
| Children | Worship* | Health* | Local Social Service | Worship* |
| Animal | Children | Local Social Service | Worship* | Local Social Service |
| Health | Local Social Service | Animal | Health | Emergency Relief |
| Worship* | Health | Children | Emergency Relief | Health |
| Local Social Service | Animal | Emergency Relief | Children | Children |
| Military | Emergency Relief | Worship | Military | Military |
| Emergency Relief | Youth Development | Military | Animal | Formal Education |

* Asterisk indicates most dollars when asked to prioritize.

FIGURE 9
HOW HEALTHCARE DONORS WOULD DIVIDE UP THEIR GIVING IF THEY HAD \$100


Overall, healthcare donors prioritize health charities over other organizations they support. When asked how they would divide a hypothetical \$100 among the types of charities they support, healthcare donors would give approximately a third of their total dollars to health care, or $\$ 33$, on average.

FIGURE 10

| GEN Z | MILLENNIALS | GEN X | boomers | MATURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \＄38．96 | \＄40．17 | \＄37．00 | \＄32．82 | \＄22．66 V |
| White | BLACK |  | ANIC | OTHER |
| \＄31．20 | \＄27．89 |  | 61 | \＄41．58 |

－Represent a statistically significant difference between subgroups at the $90 \%$ confidence interval．

The amount donors would give to healthcare charities if they had \＄100 was highest among Hispanic donors，who demonstrated a clear interest in this organization type and cause．

By comparison，this trend was lower among Mature healthcare donors，who tend to split their donations across many groups，and as a result，say they would donate less than younger generations to healthcare charities，on average．

And，among healthcare donors，there remains a high degree of crossover with other causes．Those who donate to healthcare organizations are also more likely to donate to local service organizations， children＇s charities，places of worship，and emergency relief．


FIGURE 11
CHARITABLE VERTICALS CHART

|  | TOTAL DONORS | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{HC} \\ \text { DONORS } \end{gathered}$ | GEN Z | HC DONOR GENERATIONAL BREAKDOWN |  |  | MATURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | MILLENNIALS | GEN X | BOOMERS |  |
| Health Charities | 34\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ |
| Local social service organizations | 38\％ | 40\％ | 27\％ | 28\％ | 37\％ | 42\％ | 53\％ 』 |
| Children＇s charities | 30\％ | 40\％ － | 41\％ | 42\％ | 33\％ | 39\％ | 45\％ |
| Place of worship | 38\％ | 38\％ | 21\％ | 34\％ | 31\％ | 38\％ | 57\％ |
| Emergency relief efforts | 29\％ | 35\％ － | 29\％ | 26\％ | 28\％ | 37\％ | 48\％ － |
| Animal protection organizations | 26\％ | 30\％ | 30\％ | 27\％ | 34\％ | 31\％ | 27\％ |
| Military troops and／or veterans | 22\％ | 28\％ | 32\％ | 9\％「 | 26\％ | 33\％ | 36\％ |
| Formal education | 18\％ | 23\％ | 19\％ | 19\％ | 28\％ | 19\％ | 31\％$\triangle$ |
| Environmental or nature conservation organizations | 14\％ | 21\％ \ | 24\％ | 12\％ | 17\％ | 20\％ | 33\％$\triangle$ |
| Youth development | 15\％ | 18\％ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 23\％ | 13\％ | 20\％ |
| Fire，police and emergency rescue organizations | 12\％ | 15\％ | 6\％ | 7\％ | 24\％ | 12\％ | 20\％ － |
| Organizations that help the elderly | 11\％ | 15\％ － | 19\％ | 6\％『 | 9\％ | 15\％ | 27\％ |
| Arts organizations | 11\％ | 14\％ | 14\％ | 9\％ | 5\％V | 16\％ | 24\％ |
| Human rights and international development | 9\％ | 12\％ | 22\％ | 12\％ | 10\％ | 10\％ | 15\％ |
| Advocacy organizations | 8\％ | 10\％ | 9\％ | 5\％ | 8\％ | 8\％ | 20\％ |
| Organizations that fight hate，prejudice，and inequality | 9\％ | 9\％ | 15\％ | 5\％ | 4\％ | 8\％ | 18\％ |
| Election campaigns | 9\％ | 9\％ | 4\％ | 3\％ | 5\％ | 9\％ | 18\％ |
| Victims of crime or abuse organizations | 6\％ | 7\％ | 21\％$\triangle$ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 4\％『 | 9\％ |
| Immigrants and／or refugee rights | 5\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 9\％ | 1\％V | 5\％ | 6\％ |
| Trade union（s） | 2\％ | 2\％ | 4\％ | 3\％ | 3\％ | 1\％ | 2\％ |

$\mathbf{\Delta}$ Shows statistical difference between HC and Total donors and generational subgroups at a $90 \%$ confidence interval．

## Social Engagement

Healthcare donors appear more social than the average donor, as they are more likely to donate for an occasion or in honor of someone, sponsor someone or participate in a peer-to-peer event, and promote organizations online. They are also more likely to support an organization when a friend or family member asks.

FIGURE 12

## METHODS OF SUPPORT IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

|  | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| DONORS |  | (DONORS

- Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the $90 \%$ confidence interval.

When healthcare donors show their support, they are most likely to donate goods or items, as 69\% of healthcare donors reported. Other popular means of showing support include donating time/ volunteering, attending an event, and giving money for occasions like birthdays or tributes.

FIGURE 13
INVOLVEMENT IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

|  | TOTAL DONORS | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{HC} \\ \text { DONORS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visited their website | 30\% | 33\% |
| Volunteered | 29\% | 28\% |
| Received emails and/or e-newsletters from the organization/group | 26\% | 29\% |
| Made a donation in honor of, in memory of, or as a tribute to someone | 20\% | 27\% |
| Bought products that support them | 19\% | 19\% |
| Supported friends who are raising money for the organization (walk/run/challenge/ etc.) | 19\% | 27\% |
| Reviewed information the organization sends about its cause or issue | 19\% | 23\% |
| Attended and/or hosted events | 15\% | 17\% |
| Followed them on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube or another social networking site | 15\% | 15\% |
| Signed petitions, sent emails or letters to a politician about an issue of public concern | 14\% | 16\% |
| Donated through a monthly giving program | 13\% | 14\% |
| Used their labels, cards, etc. | 11\% | 17\% $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| Participated in walk/run/challenge | 10\% | 15\% |

FIGURE 14
MORE LIKELY TO DONATE WHEN A FRIEND OR FAMILY MEMBER ASKS


Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the $90 \%$ confidence interval.
There is overlap between how healthcare donors prefer to support organizations, and how they more broadly engage with these organizations. Healthcare donors are most likely to involve themselves by visiting an organization's website, volunteering, or receiving emails and/or newsletters from an organization. Compared to the average donor, healthcare donors are significantly more likely to donate in honor of, in memory of, or in tribute to someone. They are also particularly more likely to donate to a cause supported by a friend who is raising money, and to review the information an organization sends out about its cause.

## Peer-to-Peer Fundraising

Peer-to-peer fundraising-including the runs, walk-a-thons, and bike-a-thons that are especially popular in the health sector-draws upon all generations, but in different ways. Continuing their trend of socially-driven giving, healthcare donors are more likely than donors overall to participate or sponsor someone in peer-to-peer events. As Figure 15 below suggests, the actual walkers, bikers, etc. are more likely to be Gen X or younger. Similarly, Gen-Xers and Millennials are slightly more likely than other generations to sponsor said athletes. This signals that organizations are managing to retain some peer-to-peer event donors, particularly those of younger professionals like Millennials and X-ers. Making the most of an investment in peer-to-peer fundraising requires a strong focus on welcoming and nurturing these donors.

FIGURE 15
PARTICIPATED VS. SPONSORED AN INDIVIDUAL IN A WALK, RUN, OR RIDE EVENT


FIGURE 16
METHODS OF SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

Participated in a walk, run, or similar activity
16\% Total Donors
$-22 \% ~ H e a l t h c a r e ~ D o n o r s ~$

Sponsored someone in a walk, run, or similar activity
19\% 28\% 」

Healthcare Donors

- $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$ Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the 90\% confidence interval.



## Preferred Information Sources

Six-in-ten (59\%) healthcare donors actively research how an organization spends its money and achieves its mission before donating, slightly higher than donors overall (56\%). Among all donors, the main source of due diligence information is an organization's website, followed by online searches, charity review sites (popular with healthcare donors), and information in the news. These information sources may be serving as 'proxy indicators' that indirectly point to an organization's financial stewardship.

FIGURE 17
WHERE HEALTHCARE DONORS GET THEIR INFORMATION ABOUT CHARITIES
(among those who say they actively research how organizations spend their money)


## Transaction and Engagement Channels

As giving and engagement channels continue to proliferate, donors and fundraisers alike are having a harder job staying connected, leaving fundraisers struggling to measure the real impact of their efforts. Overall, healthcare donors use a significantly higher number of platforms than the average donor.

At the same time, from 2010 to 2018 reported use of direct mail by donors overall fell from $49 \%$ of
donors to $23 \%$. What is worrying about direct mail's precipitous decline is that there does not appear to be a concomitant increase in overall online giving over the last five years. In terms of dollars, online giving is making steady gains, though it does not appear to be filling the void left by direct mail's decline. See Figure 18 below.

FIGURE 18


## Giving Channels

Healthcare donors, however, are more likely than donors overall to respond to mail appeals. (See Figure 19 below.) Every astute fundraiser will note that at this point, direct mail brings in eight or nine times more money than email each year. According to the 2018 Charitable Giving Report Healthcare Spotlight, online giving represented only about $5 \%$ of all donations to healthcare organizations in the past year.

FIGURE 19
GIVING METHODS USED IN THE LAST 2 YEARS

|  | TOTAL DONORS | HC DONORS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Added a donation at checkout | 40\% | 49\% |
| Made a donation online through an organization's website | 37\% | 41\% |
| Made a donation in honor of, in memory of, or as a tribute to someone | 25\% | 34\% |
| Responded to a postal mailing with a donation | 23\% | 33\% |
| Made a purchase where a portion of the proceeds helped the organization/cause | 28\% | 31\% |
| Made a donation or pledge at a fundraising event | 22\% | 26\% |
| Made a donation to someone on the street or other public place who represented an organization/cause | 18\% | 20\% |
| Responded to an email appeal with a donation | 14\% | 18\% |
| Donated through a monthly giving program | 17\% | 17\% |
| Made a donation through Facebook or another social networking site | 11\% | 14\% |
| Made a donation through a crowdfunding or crowdfundraising site | 11\% | 11\% |
| Responded to an appeal on a Giving Day | 8\% | 9\% |
| Donated through a charitable giving annuity, bequest in your will, or planned donation | 7\% | 9\% |
| Responded to a phone call with a donation | 7\% | 9\% |
| Made a donation to someone who came to your door who represented an organization/cause | 7\% | 8\% |
| Responded to a television or radio advertisement with a donation | 6\% | 7\% |
| Made a donation via a text message/SMS | 5\% | 6\% |
| Donated through a giving circle | 4\% | 4\% |
| Clicked on an online advertisement and made a donation | 3\% | 4\% |
| Made a donation of stocks, bonds, or property | 3\% | 3\% |
| Made a donation through a Donor Advised Fund | 2\% | 3\% |
| AVERAGE NUMBERS OF CHANNELS | 3.0 | 3.6 A |

$\Delta \boldsymbol{V}$ Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the $90 \%$ confidence interval.

Nonetheless, direct mail's continued decline means that it is incumbent upon healthcare fundraisers to keep an eye on the future and ensure that they are continuing to evolve their practices to meet donors where they are. Healthcare donors are also more likely than donors overall to respond to email appeals. They are more likely to have made a donation through an organization's website, and they are more likely to promote organizations or causes online (see Figure 19 above.) Additionally, they are more likely to say they
look at charity review sites before giving. All of these behaviors tell us that healthcare donors are very much present online, and fundraisers need to provide them with a seamless experience through digital channels as the digital transformation of communication continues to progress.

Healthcare donors are also notably more likely to add a donation at checkout and to donate in tribute to someone. Some of these methods proved
particularly popular among older generations. 50\% of Mature healthcare donors donated in tribute to someone, compared to $34 \%$ of all healthcare donors and $25 \%$ of total donors. Similarly, $63 \%$ of Mature healthcare donors directly responded to mail appeals, compared to $33 \%$ of all healthcare donors and $23 \%$ of all donors. Clearly, mature healthcare donors show heightened willingness to donate in response to mail or in tribute to others.

In addition, healthcare donors are more likely to use a greater number of giving channels. On average, they used 3.6 different methods of giving over the last 2 years, whereas the average donor relied on 3 giving methods in the same time span.

## Crowdfunding

A third of healthcare donors have participated in crowdfunding efforts, mirroring the average donor.

FIGURE 20
PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE GIVEN VIA CROWDFUNDING


Among those who donated to a crowdfunding site, healthcare donors were most likely to direct their donations to a friend, family member, or colleague. Whereas $60 \%$ of all donors donated to friends or family, $70 \%$ of all healthcare donors did so. This reinforces existing trends where crowdfunding appears to be morphing into a close cousin of peer-to-peer fundraising. Within crowdfunding, other popular donation recipients included gifts to nonprofit organizations, and gifts to individuals that the donor did not know.


## WHERE DONORS DIRECT THEIR

 CROWDFUNDING DONATION|  | TOTAL | HC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Friend, family member, or colleague | $60 \%$ | $70 \% \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| A person I do not know | $28 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Nonprofit organization | $24 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Special project | $15 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| New product or service | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Startup company | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

[^2]
## Planned Giving

Compared to the average donor, healthcare donors are significantly more likely to have a will or estate plan. Roughly half of all healthcare donors have one in place, compared to $42 \%$ of all donors. While healthcare donors are more likely to have a will or estate plan, very few have made a planned gift or inquired about doing so.

FIGURE 22


No Will/Estate Plan

FIGURE 23
LIKELY TO CONSIDER PLANNED GIFTS IN
WILLS AND ESTATES


FIGURE 24
STEPS TAKEN TOWARD PLANNED GIVING
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{lcc}\hline & \text { TOTAL } \\
\text { DONORS }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{c}HC <br>

DONORS\end{array}\right]\)| Made a planned gift to charitable <br> organization | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Inquired about a planned giving with <br> charitable organization | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Inquired about a planned giving with <br> financial analyst, estate planner, or lawyer | $8 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Have never inquired about planned giving | $51 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| Have never heard of planned gifts | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Not sure | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

Akin to the average donor, roughly half of all healthcare donors have never inquired about planned giving, and $14 \%$ have never heard of planned gifts. Only $10 \%$ of healthcare donors have ever made a planned gift to a charitable organization, and $11 \%$ have inquired about planned giving with a financial analyst, estate planner, or lawyer.

Among those uninformed about planned giving, $14 \%$ of healthcare donors said they would consider donating after learning what planned giving is. Among this group 4\% said that they would definitely consider it.

## Workplace Giving

Healthcare donors have participated in workplace giving in higher numbers than donors overall. Roughly half say they have participated in a workplace fundraiser, team event, or volunteered through their workplace.

On average, healthcare donors have an active desire for volunteer and giving opportunities through their workplace, with potential for increased participation.

## PERCENTAGE OF WORKING DONORS WHO ARE INTERESTED OR WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN WORKPLACE GIVING

| AMONG EMPLOYED DONORS | TOTAL DONORS |  | HC DONORS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PARTICIPATED | INTERESTED | PARTICIPATED | INTERESTED |
| Participate in a workplace fundraiser | 42\% | 27\% | 51\% | 22\% |
| Volunteer through your workplace | 40\% | 31\% | 47\% $\boldsymbol{\triangle}$ | 28\% |
| Make a one-time donation through your workplace | 39\% | 28\% | 43\% | 27\% |
| Participate in a workplace walk, run, challenge, or team event | 37\% | 33\% | 46\% $\triangle$ | 28\% |
| Make a donation where your employer matched the gift | 32\% | 45\% | 37\% | 44\% |
| Make a donation through payroll deduction | 31\% | 19\% | 34\% | 18\% |

$\Delta$ Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the $90 \%$ confidence interval.


## Recommendations

Here are some of our main takeaways from this research. These recommendations are informed by our experience as fundraisers and researchers and by other research in the sector.

Focus on the generations that matter today. Boomers have at least another decade or so at the top of the pyramid, and Generation $X$ is not too far behind. As noted above, Gen-Xers have said that healthcare organizations are their top priority cause. Let go of near-term expectations for Millennial or Gen Z giving. As with every generation before, Millennials, for the foreseeable future, will preoccupy themselves with making a living, raising children, and finding some measure of security in a profoundly insecure world. Consider your investment in building relationships with Millennial to be experimental and likelier to produce long term-as opposed to immediate-benefits.
(2) Redouble your focus on the fundamentals. Fundraising is not mining or hunting; it's farming. You are in a relationship with your donors and understanding their needs and expectations has never been more important.
(3) Explore how relationships are central to healthcare giving.
Compared to the average donor, healthcare donors are significantly more likely to donate to a friend's peer-to-peer event or give in tribute to others. While considering your relationship to a donor, actively examine how your donors relate to organizations and causes, too.

## (4) Get serious about retention.

There are few subjects that receive more lip service and less meaningful attention than retaining donors from one year to the next. The 2018 Charitable Giving Report finds that first year retention continues to be abysmal: measuring between $22 \%$ and $29 \%$, depending on how the donor chooses to give. With a shrinking donor population and growing uncertainty about the stability of primary donation channels, this is the time to get serious about keeping the donors you have.

Get your house in order.
Evidence is growing that internal organizational issues-including unsupportive culture, silos, lack of resources, access to actionable data, and other factors-are having a significant impact on fundraising effectiveness ${ }^{5}$. Ignoring internal issues is not a luxury any organization can afford. And in the incredibly data-rich world of today, there is no good reason why any fundraiser should be flying blind. And yet too many report that they do.
(6) Stay agile.

Be prepared to change and adapt when you can. And when you cannot, stay zen. View projections with humility; there are too many unknown variables to make completely bankable predictions. See recommendation number three above.

## 7 Commit to testing.

You know that thing you tried a few years ago that bombed? Maybe try it again. Channel behavior is in flux. Don't assume past tactics will continue to work.
(8) Listen to your donors.

Relationship fundraising is a two-way street. If you want to retain and upgrade donors, it will be more than a matter of broadcasting content. Learn to listen by using multichannel surveys, focus groups, customer service, and other tools for hearing from your donors on a regular basis. As channel behavior continues to evolve among healthcare donors, you must stay tuned in to your donors' preferences to reach them where they are today, not where they were in the past.

[^3]
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## About This Study

Commissioned by the Blackbaud Institute, Edge Research conducted an online survey of 1,339 U.S. donors in January 2018. A non-probability sample of adults aged 18+ was drawn from a national survey panel of over two million households. The deployed and incoming sample was controlled to be U.S. Census representative, and qualifying participants reported that they had made a monetary donation to at least one nonprofit organization/charitable cause within the last 12 months (excluding trade unions, children's schools, alma maters, and places of worship). This report is an analysis of 451 "Healthcare Donors," who are defined as American donors who said they gave to "health charities" in the last 12 months.


## About The Blackbaud Institute for Philanthropic Impact
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[^4]
[^0]:    1 Giving USA follows the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) system to classify most types of charitable organizations on the recipient side of giving. Giving USA includes the following NTEE categories in its health subsector: E-Health care; F-Mental health \& crisis intervention; G-Diseases, disorders, \& medical disciplines; H-Medical research. www.givingusa.org

    2 "Donors" in this study are defined as participants who self-reported making a monetary donation to at least one nonprofit organization/charitable cause within the last 12 months (excluding trade unions, children's schools, alma maters, and places of worship). This report is an analysis of 451 "Healthcare Donors," who are defined as American donors who said they gave to "health charities" in the last 12 months.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The total donor findings were derived from a survey of the general population that was then screened for donors. Donors are defined as adults $18+$ who report donating to a charitable cause in the last 12 months (beyond school, place of worship, union).

    4 "Millennials Projected to Overtake Baby Boomers as America's Largest Generation," Pew Research Center, 2018.

[^2]:    $\Delta \nabla$
    Represent a statistically significant difference between Total and HC donors at the $90 \%$ confidence interval.

[^3]:    5 Inside Out Fundraising: How to Create a Culture of Philanthropy By Treating Systems Instead of Symptoms, Sea Change Strategies, 2017. npExperts: Fundraising Matters, Blackbaud Institute for Philanthropic Impact, 2017.
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