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Executive Summary

- Queen’s University’s (Queen’s) online surveys gathered relevant information from 1,471 constituents, achieving a response rate of 30%—an exceptional rate for a public university. Many respondents answered nearly all the survey’s questions, providing a rich compilation of volunteered information.

- Overall, survey respondents have very high regard for Queen’s. More than 90% have a Positive or Very Positive attitude towards the University, including more than 90% of respondents with an internal capacity score of $500,000 or more.\(^1\) Similarly, more than 95% of respondents characterize Queen’s reputation as Excellent or Good. However, younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to indicate Queen’s reputation has declined in recent years. Faculty or staff respondents were also more likely to perceive that Queen’s reputation has declined in recent years.

- Perceptions of Queen’s academic and administrative leadership as well as its advancement program are largely positive. Many respondents expressed in their comments that Queen’s donor relations are “good.” When asked how Queen’s can improve its donor relations, constructive comments addressed reaching out using donors’ preferred communication channels, communicating about where funds were directed and results achieved, ensuring consistent follow-up with donors (particularly after receiving significant gifts or if any commitments are made to them), and engaging with donors personally.

- Just over half of respondents perceive themselves as at least Somewhat Involved with Queen’s and 8% indicated that they feel Very Involved. Respondents who are or have been event volunteers are more likely than others to perceive themselves as at least Somewhat Involved and those who are or have served as Board Members or Alumni Associate Board Members are more likely to consider themselves Very Involved. Those who consider themselves more involved are significantly more likely to consider Queen’s a High or their Highest philanthropic priority, though a substantial portion of respondents who are Not Involved still consider Queen’s a High philanthropic priority.

- Overall, nearly 80% of alumni respondents expect their involvement with alumni activities to remain the same. When asked what alumni activities are of greatest interest, 64% of respondents expressed interest in their class reunions with graduates from the 1950s and 1960s expressing slightly more interest than graduates from the 1970s on. Nearly 40% of alumni respondents also reported interest in faculty, school, department, or division events, and 20% to 25% of respondents expressed interest in regional events, continuing education opportunities, or athletic events.

- Fifty-five percent of respondents reported having direct and personal contact with a Queen’s representative in the year prior to the survey. When segmented by internal capacity score, responses reflect more recent personal contact with high capacity constituents. However,

\(^1\) Internal capacity scores were provided to The Offord Group as part of Queen’s invitation list. They reflect Queen’s best estimate of how much an individual donor is capable of giving to the University. 515 of the 1,471 respondents have an internal capacity score.
several respondents with capacity scores above $50,000 indicated it has been at least one year since they last had direct and personal contact with Queen’s. Many of these constituents had no prospect manager at the time of the survey—a significant factor in maintaining contact with constituents. In total, 262 constituents with internal capacity scores of $25,000 or more did not have a prospect manager at the time of the survey.

- **Among the strategic advancement priorities Queen’s is considering,** respondents most strongly agreed that “strategic investments in research will improve Queen’s national and international standing” and “investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.” They less strongly agreed that “renewing campus buildings is vital for the quality of the Queen’s experience.” Notably, graduates from the 1980s and 1990s agreed more strongly than others that “investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.”
  
  - **Comments about how Queen’s can strengthen itself as a leading Canadian university** reinforced the quantitative feedback, with respondents frequently mentioning: investing more in and promoting innovative research, maintaining excellence in teaching through high-quality recruitment, and ensuring a vibrant student experience.

- **More than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “alumni and donor support enable higher quality education at Queen’s.”**
  
  - **On balance, respondents are more likely to give greater weight to their personal priorities over those of the institution’s** when considering contributing to a campaign. However, 45% of respondents with the highest internal capacity scores would weigh the institution’s priorities above their own when contributing to a campaign—roughly twice the proportion of respondents with no capacity score.

  - If respondents were considering making a significant gift to Queen’s, 34% indicated they would prefer making an endowment gift compared to 25% who would rather make an expendable gift; about 40% were not sure which they would prefer.

- **When asked what motivates them to make a charitable gift, respondents most frequently reported:** the tax deductibility of their gift, perception of the University’s effectiveness and need, their commitment to the University’s mission and values, and family experience.

  - One facet for conveying Queen’s effectiveness is communicating the impact of donations to the University. While most respondents, particularly those who have given significantly over their life-time, agreed that they are receiving sufficient information about the impact of donations made to the University, 35% of respondents had a neutral impression or disagreed.

- **Overall, 9% of respondents consider Queen’s their **Highest** philanthropic priority—a smaller than average proportion compared to other public and private higher education institutions with which Counsel has worked. However, a combined 51% of respondents consider Queen’s a **High** or their **Highest** philanthropic priority, which is larger than typical.
• Respondents with an internal capacity score of $500,000 or greater are more likely to view Queen’s as their High or a High philanthropic priority compared to donors with lower or no internal capacity scores.

• Eighteen percent of respondents reported Queen’s is already in their estate plans and 15% indicated that they will consider adding the University to their plans. Queen’s staff should follow-up with any constituents whose plans they are not already aware of or who may be interested in including the University in their estate plans.

• Eight percent of respondents reported they have made a gift of $100,000 or more to a charitable organization before, though it appears 60 of these have made their largest gifts to an organization other than Queen’s. Cross-referencing respondents’ largest gifts with where they rank Queen’s among their philanthropic priorities identifies 261 respondents who, with sufficient cultivation, may possess capacity to make a major gift ($25K+) to Queen’s.
Online Survey Process

Queen’s University contracted with The Offord Group, a Marts & Lundy firm, to design, deploy, and analyze the responses of an online survey. The objective of the survey was to examine constituent perceptions and attitudes towards Queen’s, better understand what is important to constituents, and to begin identifying a pool of prospective donors willing and able to engage the University philanthropically.

The Office of Advancement approved a concise and purposeful set of questions for the online survey—several of which are similar to those asked in interviews with the University’s top prospective donors.

With an invitation signed by Vice-Principal Karen Bertrand, the survey was deployed on September 17, 2019 to 5,000 constituents. Two email reminders were sent to non-respondents before the survey’s closing on October 2, 2019.

Excluding 93 unreachable records, there were 4,907 successful deliveries by the end of the deployment period. In total, 1,351 constituents completed the survey and 120 partially completed the survey. Dividing the number of complete and partial responses by the number of successfully delivered invitations yields an exceptional 30% response rate. The typical online survey response rate for public universities is in the 10% to 15% range.

Many respondents answered most, but not all, of the survey’s questions. In question 1 (What is your current attitude toward Queen’s?) there were 1,452 respondents or 99% of the number of surveys available for analysis. Question 11 (When was the last time you had direct and personal contact with a Queen’s [representative]?) had 1,405 responses or 97% of the analytical cohort. Question 21 (Do you currently have the University in your estate plans…) had 1,358 respondents or 94% of the analytical cohort. Near the end of the survey, question 23 (What is the largest gift that your household has ever made to a charitable organization?) had 1,354 respondents or 93% of the analytical cohort. 

![Graph showing response rates for different questions](image-url)
Because of the survey drop-out rate (i.e., the number of respondents diminishes as one moves through the survey) and the fact that there are different numbers of responses to each question, the percentages cited in the Executive Summary and Online Survey Responses sections indicate the share of responses to the particular question.

Respondent Characteristics

The pool of invited constituents was thoughtfully crafted by the Office of Advancement. It included 5,000 donors and prospective donors who were selected because they:

- have given at least $2,500 in their lifetime;
- are an alumnus/a; or
- are a major gift, GP, or annual gift prospect.

The invitation pool did not include individuals being interviewed.

Because the invitation pool has characteristics that are different from Queen’s entire constituency, the survey’s responses do not statistically represent the attitudes and opinions of the entire constituent population.

To more fully understand the characteristics of respondent pool, Counsel examined segment breakdowns and invitation response rates.

For example, the chart below indicates the breakdown of responses based on life-time giving, where it is evident—though not surprising—the distribution of respondents is skewed towards those who have given less to Queen’s over their lifetime.

The chart below, however, represents the response rates for each segment (in dark blue) against the overall response rate (the red line). It indicates constituents who have given more to Queen’s over their lifetime were more likely to respond to the survey and are somewhat over-represented in the respondent pool compared to the invitation list—a helpful result for taking into consideration the perspectives of those who have been significant philanthropic supporters of Queen’s.
Queen’s also provided Internal Capacity ratings—an estimate of how much constituents are able to give to Queen’s—where possible. Similar to what is illustrated above, constituents with higher capacity to give make up only a small portion of the respondent pool and those with the highest capacity to give were more likely to respond to the survey.

More information about the characteristics of the respondent pool are included in Appendix A. Some other notable differences include:

- Parents were more likely to respond than non-parents (35.4% vs 28.0%);
- Faculty and Staff were more likely to respond than other invitees (41.0% vs 29.4%);
- Former Board Members were more likely to respond than other invitees (50.5% vs 29.5%);
- Managed Prospects were more likely to respond than those with no prospect manager (35.8% vs 28.9%);
- Graduates from the 1950s-1970s were more likely to respond than graduates from the 1980s to 2000s;
- Respondents are most often in their 60s and constituents in their 70s and 80s were more likely than those in their 30s through 50s to respond.
Reporting Methodology

This report presents summary data from the online survey question-by-question and draws on additional data sources where appropriate. A file of all responses to the survey will be provided to Queen’s separately.

Constituent Data

In addition to individuals’ responses to the survey, Queen’s shared some constituent data from its database. This constituent data was occasionally used for segmentation and analysis.

Benchmarking

To provide a more meaningful analysis, responses to select questions are compared to responses from an archive of similar surveys conducted for higher education clients.

Open Text Questions

The survey included three open-ended questions. In order to understand expressed sentiments at a high level, Counsel used text analytics to discover frequently occurring themes amongst the responses. These themes are expressed visually through word clouds. In the word cloud, the size of each word indicates its frequency.

A supplementary file accompanying this report contains all the responses to open-ended questions. The Offord Group highly recommends that a Queen’s staff member read through the responses to learn more about survey participants’ perspectives.
Survey Responses

What is your current attitude towards Queen’s University?

Overall, respondents have a positive attitude towards Queen’s. Fifty percent reported having a Very Positive view, and 43% reported a Positive view.

Combined, Queen’s had more respondents with a positive attitude towards the University compared to the typical private and public higher education institutions Counsel has worked with, though private higher education institutions typically have more constituents with Very Positive attitudes toward the University.
In the chart above, Queen’s Internal Capacity scores were used to segment responses. Notably, respondents with a higher internal capacity score are more likely to have a *Very Positive* attitude towards Queen’s. Still, a few respondents with internal capacity scores greater than $100,000 hold *Negative* or *Neutral* views of Queen’s and are worth investigating further.

**Overall, how do you characterize Queen’s University’s reputation at this time?**

Similarly, more than 95% of respondents characterize Queen’s reputation as *Excellent* or *Good*. 
Segmenting perceptions by respondent tags in Queen’s database shows there are few differences in perceptions of Queen’s reputation among parents, grad alum, and undergrad alum. A slightly smaller proportion of Former Board members view Queen’s reputation as Excellent and only 37% of Faculty or Staff respondents view Queen’s reputation as Excellent.

**From your perspective, how has the University’s reputation changed in recent years?**

While nearly half of respondents perceive the University’s reputation has stayed the same in recent years, many indicated Queen’s reputation has shifted in their eyes. Thirty-five percent of respondents indicated it has improved and 19% perceive it has declined.
Younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to perceive Queen’s reputation has declined in recent years, though respondents in their 30s were equally likely to perceive Queen’s reputation to have improved.

Faculty or staff respondents were more likely than others to perceive Queen’s reputation has declined in recent years.
What is your level of confidence in the academic and administrative leadership of the University (Principals, Vice Principals, and Deans)?

Seventy-four percent of respondents have a Positive or Very Positive perception of Queen’s academic and administrative leadership; only 2% have a Negative or Very Negative perception.

What is your overall assessment of Queen’s University’s advancement program (alumni, fundraising, and community engagement), including its leadership, staff, and volunteers?

Queen’s advancement program is also perceived positively by nearly three-quarters of respondents. Three percent have a negative perception of the program.
How would you characterize your perception of the last fundraising campaign and the projects that were funded?

Fifty-one percent of respondents perceive Queen’s last fundraising campaign and the projects funded positively or very positively. Nearly half of respondents have neutral perceptions or didn’t know how they would characterize the last campaign and its project. Only 1% of respondents viewed it negatively.

What is your current level of involvement with Queen’s?

The majority of respondents are at least Somewhat Involved with Queen’s, and 8% of respondents reported they are Very Involved.
The level of involvement reported by Queen’s survey respondents more closely resembles that seen at private higher education institutions than public higher education institutions Counsel has worked with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Not Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Very Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Capacities of Involvement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Volunteer Positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Queen's Events attended</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Who are Queen's faculty or staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Who are Former Board Members</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lifetime Giving (Credit)</td>
<td>$18,041</td>
<td>$63,803</td>
<td>$308,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, respondents who identify as Very Involved: reported more capacities of involvement (based on the proceeding question); have volunteered more frequently and attended more events; are more likely to be Queen’s faculty, staff, or former board members; and have given significantly more over their lifetime.
Perceived levels of involvement are correlated with where Queen’s ranks among respondents’ philanthropic priorities. Respondents who indicated that they are *Very Involved* are more likely to rank Queen’s as their *Highest* or a *High* philanthropic priority, whereas those who indicated that they are *Not Involved* are less likely to view Queen’s as a *High* or their *Highest* philanthropic priority. However, a respondent’s level of involvement is not the only determinant for where Queen’s ranks among their philanthropic priorities—38% of respondents who reported they are *Not Involved* with Queen’s still view the University as a *High* or their *Highest* philanthropic priority.

**In what capacity are or have you been involved with Queen’s? (Check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended official alumni event</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event volunteer</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Council member</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter volunteer</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University Alumni Association Board member</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked in what capacity they have been involved with Queen’s, respondents most frequently indicated that they have been donors and/or attended official alumni events. Twenty-one percent of respondents selected “Other” and, when asked to specify their response, mentioned: staff or faculty roles, serving on advisory boards and committees, being guest speakers or lecturers, supporting fundraising, and others.
Cross-tabulating the capacities in which donors are or have been involved with their perception of current involvement suggests past or present event volunteers are most likely to view themselves as at least Somewhat Involved currently. Respondents who are or have been board members or Alumni Association Board Members were most likely to see themselves as currently Very Involved.

**Alumni Only: Do you think you will be more or less involved in alumni activities in the years ahead?**

Alumni were asked whether they anticipate being more or less involved in alumni activities in the years ahead and more than three-quarters anticipate no changes to their current levels of involvement.
Alumni Only: Which of the following alumni opportunities are of greatest interest to you? (Select up to 3)

When asked what alumni activities are of greatest interest, alumni respondents most frequently reported interest in their class reunions. Nearly 40% of alumni respondents also reported interest in faculty, school, department, or division events. Thirteen percent of respondents selected “Other” and, when asked to specify their response, mentioned: guest lecturing, alumni travel, and fundraising.

Segmenting data by respondents’ primary school affiliation reveals notable distinctions in areas of interest. Respondents affiliated with Arts & Science are significantly less likely than other respondents to express interest in class reunions (though class reunions remain the top opportunity of interest). Respondents affiliated with English and Applied Science, Business, and Medicine are more likely than other respondents to express interest in class reunions. Respondents affiliated with Law and Graduate Studies reported much greater interest in faculty or school events. And Physical Education-affiliated respondents were significantly more likely to express interest in athletic events and club or team reunions.
Respondents who first graduated in the 1950s and 1960s expressed interest in class reunions slightly more often than graduates from the 1970s on. Graduates from the 1950s were also least likely to express interest in faculty, school, department, or division events. Faculty events were of most interest among respondents who first graduated from Queen’s in the 1990s.

Differences by age share similarities with respondents’ first grad decade, though some differences are more prominent. In particular, interest in faculty, school, department, and division events is higher among younger respondents than older ones—perhaps a reflection of how Queen’s has evolved over time. Interest in continuing education opportunities and career services is higher among alumni in their 30s, though there is also a small increase in interest for continuing education.
opportunities among respondents in their 60s compared to respondents in their 40s to 50s or 70s to 90s.

When was the last time you had direct and personal contact with a Queen’s University administrator, faculty member, or staff member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the last 6 months</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months but less than 1 year</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 year but less than 2 years</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 years but less than 5 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five years or more</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Not Sure</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,405

Forty-two percent of respondents reported they have had direct and personal contact with a Queen’s administrator, faculty member, or staff member within the last six months.
Respondents with an internal capacity score greater than $100,000 are more likely to have had recent contact with a Queen’s representative, though 13 respondents with capacity scores above $100,000 indicated that it has been at least one year since they last had direct and personal contact with Queen’s. A deeper look reveals 21 respondents with an internal capacity score greater than $50,000 who consider Queen’s a High or their Highest priority have not had direct personal contact with a Queen’s representative in more than one year.

Many of these constituents had no prospect manager at the time of the survey—a significant factor in maintaining contact with constituents. As shown below, respondents with a prospect manager were more than twice as likely as prospects without a manager to have had direct and personal contact with a Queen’s representative in the six months prior to completing the survey.
In total, 262 prospects with internal capacity scores do not yet have a prospect manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Capacity Score</th>
<th>No Prospect Manager</th>
<th>Managed Prospect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500K or more (n=23)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K or $250K (n=61)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K (n=157)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25K (n=274)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No capacity score (n=980)</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past two years, which of the following Queen’s representatives have you interacted with? *(Please check all that apply)*

Respondents most often reported they have met with a Faculty Member or Dean over the past two years. About one quarter of respondents reported interacting with a Development Officer in the last two years and 20% have interacted with a Campaign Volunteer/Chair. Respondents were least likely to report interacting with Queen’s Chancellor, Senior Management, and Queen’s VP Advancement.
As one would expect, the average lifetime giving for respondents who interacted with different representatives varied. The average respondent who met with the Chancellor, a Principal, VP Advancement, or other Queen’s Senior Management has given substantially more to Queen’s than the average respondent interacting with a Campaign Volunteer/Chair, Alumni Officer, or Faculty Member.
As Queen’s looks to the future, please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

To gain a better understanding of what constituents believe Queen’s should prioritize in its strategic planning, respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of strategic priorities Queen’s is considering. Overall, there was widespread agreement with each of the statements.

Among strategic priorities Queen’s might focus on in its next campaign, respondents most strongly agreed that “strategic investments in research will improve Queen’s national and international standing” and “investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.” They less strongly agreed that “renewing campus buildings is vital for the quality of the Queen’s experience.”

An important indicator for any public university, more than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “alumni and donor support enable higher quality education at Queen’s.” Still, more than a quarter of respondents indicated that they were neutral or disagreed that “alumni leadership and giving drive Queen’s reputation,”.

There are some differences in how respondents weigh strategic priorities based on when they first graduated from Queen’s. The table below presents average ratings based on a scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. It uses a heatmap to indicate where ratings are relatively high (shaded darker) or low (shaded lighter).
Notably, respondents who graduated from Queen’s in the 1980s or 1990s agree more strongly than other constituents that “investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.” Though few in number, respondents who graduated in the 2000s agree more strongly than others that “strategic investments in research will improve Queen’s national and international standing” and “alumni and donor support enable higher quality education at Queen’s.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1950s (n=104)</th>
<th>1960s (n=267)</th>
<th>1970s (n=413)</th>
<th>1980s (n=303)</th>
<th>1990s (n=156)</th>
<th>2000s (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic investments in research will improve Queen's national and international standing.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and donor support enable higher quality education at Queen's.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Queen's endowment will support academic excellence in a sustainable way.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewing campus buildings is vital for the quality of the Queen's experience.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni leadership and giving drive Queen's reputation.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can Queen’s do to strengthen itself as a leading Canadian university?

Several themes emerge in respondents’ comments about how Queen’s can strengthen itself as a leading Canadian university, including: investing more in and promoting innovative research, maintaining excellence in teaching through high-quality recruitment, and ensuring a vibrant student experience. The “word cloud” below presents common words used in respondents’ comments where the size of a word reflects how frequently it was used. Queen’s staff should also review the Supplementary Comments Report for a full set of respondents’ comments.
Based on your experience as a donor, how can Queen’s improve its donor relations?

When asked how Queen’s can improve its donor relations, many respondents expressed they are “happy” with the University’s efforts or that Queen’s donor relations are “good.” Constructive comments concerned contacting donors using their preferred communications method, communicating where funds were directed and results achieved, ensuring consistent follow-up with donors (particularly after receiving significant gifts or if any commitments are made to them), and engaging with donors personally. The “word cloud” below presents a snapshot of common words used in respondents’ comments where the size of a word reflects how frequently it was used. Again, a full set of respondents’ comments is available in the Supplementary Comments Report.
In general, which of the following do you personally find motivating as you consider making a charitable gift?

Respondents most frequently reported being motivated to make charitable gifts based on: the tax deductibility of their gift, perception of the University’s effectiveness and need, their commitment to the University’s mission and values, and family experience.

Respondents infrequently reported being motivated by telephone solicitations, volunteering for the University, and the University’s relationship to their local community.
Some motivators are more or less frequently identified by respondents of different ages. There is a steady drop in the proportion of respondents who consider information mailed to them a motivator when comparing older to younger respondents. Respondents in their 80s are more likely than others to identify their perception of the University’s needs as a motivator in their giving. And respondents in their 50s—including 77% of those in their 50s whom Queen’s has identified as a parent of a student—are more likely than others to identify family experience as a motivator when considering a charitable gift.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that you are receiving sufficient information about the impact of donations made to the University?
Overall, most respondents *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* they are receiving sufficient information about the impact of donations made to the University, though 35% have a neutral perspective or disagree.

Differences are present across lifetime giving, where those who have contributed more to Queen’s over their lifetime are more likely to agree they are receiving sufficient information about the impact of donations made to the University. Still, nearly a quarter of respondents who have given at least $100,000 over their lifetime did not agree to some extent.

**Where does Queen’s rank among your philanthropic priorities?**

Fifty-one percent of respondents consider Queen’s their *Highest* or a *High* philanthropic priority.
Compared to the average private and public higher education institutions Counsel has worked with, Queen’s had a larger than average proportion of respondents rank it as either a High or their Highest priority, though a smaller than average proportion consider it their Highest priority.

Respondents with an internal capacity score of $500,000 or more are more likely to view Queen’s as their Highest or a High philanthropic priority compared to donors with lower capacity.
Across respondents, 67% of those who have a prospect manager consider Queen’s a High or their Highest philanthropic priority compared to 46% of those who do not.

**Has Queen’s become a higher or lower philanthropic priority to you over the last five years?**

Two-thirds of respondents indicated that Queen’s has neither become a lower nor higher philanthropic priority for them over the last five years, though 17% of respondents reported Queen’s has become a lower priority in comparison to 14% who reported Queen’s becoming a higher priority.
While 58% of managed prospects reported no change in the extent to which Queen’s is a philanthropic priority, they are more likely to have made Queen’s a higher priority in recent years than respondents with no prospect manager.

**When contributing to a fundraising campaign, how important are the institution’s priorities compared to your personal interests?**

On balance, respondents were more likely to give greater weight to their personal priorities over those of the institution’s when contributing to a campaign. Nineteen percent of respondents indicated the institution’s priorities matter more than their personal priorities to some extent.
One interesting observation is that 45% (10) of respondents with the highest internal capacity scores would weigh the institution’s priorities above their own when contributing to a campaign—roughly twice the proportion of respondents with no capacity score. Still, many high capacity prospects consider both sets of priorities equally important.

**Do you currently have the University in your estate plans, or would you consider doing so at some point in the future?**

Eighteen percent of respondents reported Queen’s is already in their estate plans and 15% indicated that they will consider adding the University to their plans.
If you were to consider making a significant gift to Queen’s, would you prefer making an expendable gift for immediate use or an endowment gift?

- Endowment: 34%
- Expendable: 25%
- Don't Know/Not Sure: 41%

n = 1,328

If respondents were considering making a significant gift to Queen’s, 34% indicated they would prefer making an endowment gift compared to 25% who would rather make an expendable gift. Forty-one percent of respondents indicated they did not know or were not sure whether they would prefer making an endowment or expendable gift.

What is the largest gift your household has ever made to a charitable organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not make charitable gifts</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $4,999</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,354
Eight percent (112) of respondents reported they have made a gift of $100,000 or more to a charitable organization before.

Cross-tabulating respondents’ self-reported largest charitable gift with their largest gift given to Queen’s identifies 505 respondents (highlighted in the yellow-coloured cells) who have made their largest gift to an organization other than Queen’s. This includes 60 respondents who have made gifts of $100,000 or more to another organization and 105 respondents who have made gifts of $25,000 - $99,000 to another organization.

Cross-tabulating responses to question 18 (Where does Queen’s rank among your philanthropic priorities?) and question 23 (What is the largest contribution that your household has ever made to a charitable organization?) also reveals respondents with a precedent for making large contributions and their inclination to give to the University. The yellow-coloured cells in the table below highlight 244 prospects who, with sufficient cultivation, likely possess capacity to make a major gift to Queen’s. The blue-coloured cells indicate 223 respondents who, with sufficient cultivation, might be able to play a leadership role in the University’s annual fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household’s Largest Charitable Gift</th>
<th>Queen’s Rank Among Charitable Organizations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>Highest: 26, High: 45, Average: 21, Low: 14, Not one of my priorities: 6, Prefer not to answer: 0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-99,999</td>
<td>Highest: 14, High: 73, Average: 45, Low: 17, Not one of my priorities: 6, Prefer not to answer: 4</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$24,999</td>
<td>Highest: 18, High: 86, Average: 70, Low: 22, Not one of my priorities: 5, Prefer not to answer: 3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-9,999</td>
<td>Highest: 10, High: 83, Average: 59, Low: 22, Not one of my priorities: 9, Prefer not to answer: 4</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$4,999</td>
<td>Highest: 26, High: 145, Average: 120, Low: 32, Not one of my priorities: 20, Prefer not to answer: 10</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
<td>Highest: 13, High: 71, Average: 49, Low: 11, Not one of my priorities: 6, Prefer not to answer: 8</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not make charitable gifts</td>
<td>Highest: 1, High: 1, Average: 0, Low: 0, Not one of my priorities: 0, Prefer not to answer: 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>Highest: 8, High: 65, Average: 58, Low: 25, Not one of my priorities: 10, Prefer not to answer: 13</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116, 569, 422, 143, 62, 42</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In closing, are there any other matters or issues you think the leadership of Queen’s University should know about as it plans for the future?

Final comments from respondents addressed a variety of matters for Queen’s to be aware of. Some themes include: striving for excellence in teaching and student outcomes; maintaining strong connections with alumni; concerns about Queen’s reputation diminishing and a desire to see it strengthened domestically and internationally; supporting diversity and inclusion; appreciation for Queen’s efforts in mental health; and taking on a leading role in research and studies related to climate change. The “word cloud” below presents common words used in respondents’ comments where the size of a word reflects how frequently it was used. All comments in response to this question are available in the Supplementary Comments Report.
Dear SALUTATION,

We would like to request your input on a critical undertaking for Queen’s University.

Specifically, we would appreciate if you would participate in a short survey administered on behalf of Queen’s by The Offord Group, a Marts & Lundy Firm. The survey asks for your perspective about Queen’s University’s future and priorities, and how you view your relationship with the University. Your input will help inform future plans.

The survey should take no more than 10 to 15 minutes to complete, and we request that you please respond by Sunday, September 29th.

Click Here to Start the Survey

This is a confidential but not anonymous survey. Queen’s University will use the information you provide for internal planning purposes only.

Thank you in advance for your input, and for your continued engagement with Queen’s.

Sincerely,

SIGNATURE

Karen Bertrand , Artsci ’94
Vice-Principal (Advancement)
Thank you for clicking on the link to this survey.

The questions in this survey were designed for a range of constituents. If you are not able to answer a question, you can skip it.

Your survey will not be regarded as complete until you click on the "submit" button (if you are responding from a tablet or computer) or the right-facing arrow at the bottom of the screen (if you are responding using a cell phone) after the last question. At all other points, you can move forward and backward to edit questions.

The deadline to complete the survey is Sunday, September 29th. If you have questions or difficulty completing the survey, please contact Mark McLean at mclean@martsandlundy.com.

1. **What is your current attitude towards Queen’s University?**
   - Very Positive
   - Positive
   - Neutral
   - Negative
   - Very Negative
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure

2. **Overall, how do you characterize Queen’s University’s reputation at this time?**
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

3. **From your perspective, how has the University’s reputation changed in recent years?**
   - Significantly Improved
   - Improved
   - No Change
   - Declined
   - Significantly Declined

4. **What is your level of confidence in the academic and administrative leadership of the University (Principals, Vice Principals, and Deans)?**
   - Very Positive
   - Positive
   - Neutral
   - Negative
   - Very Negative
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure
5. **What is your overall assessment of Queen’s University’s advancement program (alumni, fundraising, and community engagement), including its leadership, staff, and volunteers?**
   - Very Positive
   - Positive
   - Neutral
   - Negative
   - Very Negative
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure

6. **How would you characterize your perception of the last fundraising campaign and the projects that were funded?**
   - Very Positive
   - Positive
   - Neutral
   - Negative
   - Very Negative
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure

7. **What is your current level of involvement with Queen’s?**
   - Very Involved
   - Somewhat Involved
   - Not Involved

8. **(Only ask alumni) Do you think you will be more or less involved in alumni activities in the years ahead?**
   - More Involved
   - No change
   - Less Involved

9. **(Only ask alumni) Which of the following alumni opportunities are of greatest interest to you? (Select up to 3)**
   - Athletic events
   - Career services
   - Class reunions
   - Club or team reunions
   - Continuing education opportunities
   - Faculty, School, Department, or Division events
   - Regional events
   - Other (please specify) ________________
10. **In what capacity are or have you been involved with Queen’s? (Check all that apply)**
   - [ ] Attended official alumni event
   - [ ] Board member
   - [ ] University Council member
   - [ ] Donor
   - [ ] Queen’s University Alumni Association Board member
   - [ ] Chapter volunteer
   - [ ] Event volunteer
   - [ ] Parent
   - [ ] Other (please specify) ___________________
   - [ ] None of the above

11. **When was the last time you had direct and personal contact with a Queen’s University administrator, faculty member, or staff member?**
   - [ ] Within the last 6 months
   - [ ] More than 6 months but less than 1 year
   - [ ] At least 1 year but less than 2 years
   - [ ] At least 2 years but less than 5 years
   - [ ] Five years or more
   - [ ] Never
   - [ ] Don’t Know/Not Sure

12. **In the past two years, which of the following Queen’s representatives have you interacted with? (Please check all that apply)**
   - [ ] Principal
   - [ ] Chancellor
   - [ ] Dean
   - [ ] Faculty member
   - [ ] Campaign Volunteer/Chair
   - [ ] Senior Management
   - [ ] VP Advancement
   - [ ] Development Officer
   - [ ] Alumni Officer
   - [ ] Faculty Based Development Staff
   - [ ] Other (please specify): ___________________
   - [ ] I have not interacted with a Queen’s representative in the past two years.
As Queen’s looks to the future, please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

**RANDOMIZED ROW ORDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and donor support enable higher quality education at Queen’s.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni leadership and giving drive Queen’s reputation.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Queen’s endowment will support academic excellence in a sustainable way.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in student experience is vital for the Queen’s community.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewing campus buildings is vital for the quality of the Queen’s experience.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic investments in research will improve Queen’s national and international standing.</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can Queen’s do to strengthen itself as a leading Canadian university?

____________________________

____________________________

____________________________
15. Based on your experience as a donor, how can Queen’s improve its donor relations?

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

16. In general, which of the following do you personally find motivating as you consider making a charitable gift to Queen’s? (Check all that apply.)

RANDOMIZED RESPONSE ORDER

☐ Information that is mailed to me
☐ Volunteering for the University
☐ Relationship with the University’s leadership
☐ Personal meetings with representative of the University
☐ Telephone solicitation
☐ Commitment to the University’s mission and values
☐ Visit to the University
☐ Family experience
☐ Perception of the University’s effectiveness
☐ The University's relationship with my local community
☐ Events and programming
☐ Perception of the University's needs
☐ Urgency of the University's needs
☐ Tax deductibility of my gift

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree that you are receiving sufficient information about the impact of donations made to the University?

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strong Disagree
☐ Don’t Know/Not Sure

18. Where does Queen’s rank among your philanthropic priorities?

☐ Highest
☐ High
☐ Average
☐ Low
☐ Not a Priority
☐ Prefer Not to Answer
19. Has Queen’s become a higher or lower philanthropic priority to you over the last 5 years?
   - Higher priority
   - No change
   - Lower priority
   - Prefer not to answer

20. When contributing to a fundraising campaign, how important are the institution’s priorities compared to your personal interests?

   The institution’s priorities -------------- My personal priorities (Rating Scale 1 to 5)
   matter most to me                     matter most to me

21. Do you currently have the University in your estate plans, or would you consider doing so at some point in the future?
   - The University is already in my estate plans
   - I will consider adding the University to my estate plans
   - I do not see a place for the University in my estate plans
   - I don’t have an estate plan
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure
   - Prefer not to answer

22. *Expendable gifts* are contributions for immediate use in an area specified by the donor or organization.

   In comparison, *endowment gifts* are invested and their generated investment income is used to fund an area agreed upon by the donor and organization. The principal of the initial gift is never touched but continues to generate income in perpetuity.

   If you were to consider making a significant gift to Queen’s, would you prefer making an expendable gift for immediate use or an endowment gift?
   - Expendable
   - Endowment
   - Don’t Know/Not Sure

23. What is the largest gift your household has ever made to a charitable organization?
   - Less than $1,000
   - $1,000-$4,999
   - $5,000-$9,999
   - $10,000-$24,999
   - $25,000-$99,999
   - $100,000 or more
   - I do not make charitable gifts
   - Prefer not to answer
24. In closing, are there any other matters or issues you think the leadership of Queen’s University should know about as it plans for the future?

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________
B: Respondent Characteristics

Gender

More than 70% of the respondents are identified as “Male” in Queen’s database, though response rates between males and females were consistent.

Undergraduate Alumni

More than 80% of respondents are undergraduate alumni. Undergraduate alumni were slightly more likely to respond to the survey than those who are not undergraduate alumni.

Graduate Alumni

Thirty percent of respondents are graduate alumni. There were no significant differences in response rates between graduate alumni and other invitees.
Parents

Parents make up 27% of the respondent pool and parents were more likely than other invitees to respond to the survey.

Faculty or Staff

Invitees tagged as faculty or staff were significantly more likely to respond to the survey, though they only make up 5% of the respondent pool.
**Former Board Members**

Former board members were significantly more likely to respond to the survey than other invitees, though they only make up 2% of the respondent pool.

![Chart showing respondent pool and response rate by board membership.]

**Managed Prospects**

Prospects assigned a prospect manager were slightly more likely to respond compared to respondents who are not assigned a prospect manager. Managed prospects represent 16% of the respondent pool.

![Chart showing respondent pool and response rate by prospect management.]

**Prospect Stage**

The majority of respondents are not tagged with a relationship stage, and many are only at the discovery stage.

![Chart showing respondent pool and response rate by stage.]
That said, invitees in the relationship building, solicitation, or stewardship stages were more likely than other invitees to respond.

First Graduation Decade

The respondent pool is normally distributed across the decades in which respondents first graduated with most first graduating in the 1970s and 1980s.
Respondents who first graduated in the 1960s were most likely to respond and generally respondents who first graduated between the 1950s and 1970s were more likely to respond than those who first graduated between the 1980s and 2000s.

**Response Rate by First Grad Decade**

Age

The respondent pool is also normally distributed with respondents in their 60s.

Response rates by age show respondents in their 20s, 70s, and 80s were more likely than others to respond. Respondents in their 30s to 50s were less likely to respond.
Primary School
Invitees are tagged to a primary school in Queen’s database. Most respondents are affiliated with Arts & Sciences, Engineering & Applied Sciences, Business, Medicine, or Law. This is generally consistent with the invitation list.

Invitees primarily affiliated with smaller schools were often more likely to respond than invitees from some of the larger schools—notably the schools of Business, Medicine, and Law.

Country of Residence
Almost all invitees had a mailing address in Queen’s database with most living in Canada. Invitees with addresses in the United States or in another country were less likely to respond than those with Canadian addresses. Invitees with no address were significantly less likely to respond.