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## Executive Summary

This presentation will cover how you can use tools to find prospects who have demonstrated a meaningful affinity.

- We will show you step-by-step how to calculate a Recency, Frequency, and Monetary (RFM) Score to generate your strongest prospects.
- We will explain how you can apply RFM to event attendance, membership, ticket sales, etc.
- We will demonstrate how layering on RFM scores with wealth screening will help you to identify the strongest affiliated prospects with a strong capacity and are giving to like organizations.

Our client partner, Ashley from Hagerstown Community College (HCC), will share her experience with RFM scores and the transformational outcomes.

## Understanding RFM Scores

## Unlocking Opportunity from the Data



## Executive Summary

## RECENCY <br> Last Gift Date



## RFM Score Rationale

There are multiple ways a donor can obtain a high RFM score:

- Largest all-time donors
- Loyal donors who have consistently given
- New donors, if they make a large first gift



## The RFM Process



## Calculating RFM Scores

## Getting Started: Key RFM Fields

When performing an RFM analysis, it is helpful to keep in mind the key data points we need for each donor.

| Donor ID\# | Last Gift Date | Number of <br> Gifts | Total Giving |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $11 / 5 / 1992$ | 5 | $\$ 90.00$ |
| 100 | $11 / 24 / 2006$ | 22 | $\$ 2,183.00$ |
| 1000 | $12 / 31 / 1999$ | 2 | $\$ 46.00$ |
| 10000 | $12 / 31 / 2011$ | 5 | $\$ 1,173.00$ |
| 10001 | $5 / 12 / 2010$ | 1 | $\$ 5.00$ |
| 10002 | $6 / 25 / 2008$ | 4 | $\$ 149.00$ |
| 10003 | $6 / 11 / 2010$ | 1 | $\$ 3.00$ |
| 10004 | $5 / 30 / 2008$ | 6 | $\$ 23,474.00$ |
| 10005 | $3 / 7 / 2012$ | 2 | $\$ 16.00$ |
| 10006 | $9 / 10 / 2014$ | 6 | $\$ 21,463.00$ |
| 10007 | $6 / 26 / 2012$ | 10 | $\$ 39,899.00$ |

Keeping track of Donor IDs is essential, as these are necessary for confidently bringing RFM scores back onto donor records.

## Creating Scoring

The final RFM score will be made up of the sum of the R, F, and M scores. For our purpose, each of these scores will be from 1 to 100 , such that the RFM total score can be anywhere from 3-300 for a given donor.

| Donor ID\# | Last Gift Date | Number of <br> Gifts | Total Giving | Recency | Frequency | Monetary | RFM Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $11 / 5 / 1992$ | 5 | $\$ 90.00$ | 17 | 80 | 49 | 146 |
| 100 | $11 / 24 / 2006$ | 22 | $\$ 2,183.00$ | 48 | 96 | 88 | 232 |
| 1000 | $12 / 31 / 1999$ | 2 | $\$ 46.00$ | 35 | 48 | 39 | 122 |
| 10000 | $12 / 31 / 2011$ | 5 | $\$ 1,173.00$ | 60 | 80 | 84 | 224 |
| 10001 | $5 / 12 / 2010$ | 1 | $\$ 5.00$ | 56 | 1 | 8 | 65 |
| 10002 | $6 / 25 / 2008$ | 6 | $\$ 149.00$ | 52 | 75 | 58 | 185 |
| 10003 | $6 / 11 / 2010$ | 1 | $\$ 3.00$ | 56 | 1 | 5 | 62 |
| 10004 | $5 / 30 / 2008$ | 6 | $\$ 23,474.00$ | 51 | 83 | 98 | 232 |
| 10005 | $3 / 7 / 2012$ | 2 | $\$ 16.00$ | 60 | 48 | 20 | 128 |
| 10006 | $9 / 10 / 2014$ | 6 | 6 | $\$ 21,463.00$ | 67 | 83 | 98 |
| 10007 | $6 / 26 / 2012$ | 10 | $\$ 39,899.00$ | 61 | 91 | 99 | 258 |

## Scoring Formula: Percentile Rank

## The RFM component scores are based on a percentile rank of donors based on the key

## RFM fields. Percentile rank is a function that ranks a value within a specified range

 from 0 to 1. Fortunately, this function is already available in Excel and is easy to use:USING THE PERCENTRANK.EXC FORMULA IN EXCEL TO CALCULATE RFM SCORES:

- This formula takes as inputs the range of values for the ranking and the specific value to be ranked in that range.
- The range of values is the Last Gift Date (column B) and the specific value to be ranked is " $11 / 5 / 1992$ " (cell B2).
- The 'Significance' value is set to 2 , which determines the number of decimal places in the percentile rank score.
- The percentile rank score is multiplied by 100 to convert it from a decimal to a percentage, and then 1 is added to
 the result to finalize the score as a value between 1 and 100.
- The same method is used to calculate the $F$ and $M$ scores.


## Finalizing Scores And Checking Work

Getting the final RFM score is as simple as adding the R, F, and M scores for a 3-300 total.

| sum $\quad$ : | $\times \checkmark f_{x} \quad=E 2$ | +F2+G2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. A | B | c | D | E | F | G | H |
| Donor ID\# | Last Gift Date | Number of Gifts | Total Giving | Recency | Frequency | Monetary | RFM Total |
| 21 | 11/5/1992 | 5 | \$90.00 | 17 | 80 | 49 | I=E2+F2+G2 |
| 3100 | 11/24/2006 | 22 | \$2,183.00 | 48 | 96 | 88 | 232 |
| 41000 | 12/31/1999 | 2 | \$46.00 | 35 | 48 | 39 | 122 |
| 510000 | 12/31/2011 | 5 | \$1,173.00 | 60 | 80 | 84 | 224 |
| 610001 | 5/12/2010 | 1 | \$5.00 | 56 | 1 | 8 | 65 |
| , 10nno | 6/25/3nnel | 1 | \$1190n | 50 | 75 | 5 | 105 |

The Excel values for the RFM scores should be copied separately from the formulae, to have the static results saved with the Donor ID and key RFM fields.

The RFM results can be spot-checked against the key RFM fields. The most recent donor should have the highest $R$ score, those with only one gift should have an $F$ score of 1 for example.

## Further Applications: Engagement RFM

Beyond measuring donor affinity, RFM scores can also measure other sorts of engagement. The key idea is developing multi-faceted scores based on the percentile rank of certain important data you may be tracking in your database.

## RECENCY

## EXAMPLES

- Last Ticket Date
- Last Volunteer Date

MONETARY
EXAMPLES

- Total Amount Spent on

Tickets

- Total Time Spent

Volunteering


FREQUENCY EXAMPLES

- Total Ticket

Count

- Number of Times Volunteered


## Utilizing RFM Scores

## Top Scorers are Identified, Now What? Utilizing Wealth Screening \& Capacity

D
DONORSEARCH

## iuave

Upper-level RFM scores can be used to prioritize high affinity households whose capacity to give should be researched.

There are many vendors that can help establish a household's capacity to give a meaningful gift.

## Wealth Screening

## Questions to think about:

- What criteria should be used to screen?
- How should you segment the screening results?


Utilizing publicly available data wealth screening identifies the net worth and capacity of prospective donors. Gift capacity rating is typically projected total philanthropic giving over five years to all causes.

Data points driving wealth rating results:

- Salary
- Stocks
- Additional compensation
- FEC data
- Political giving
- Charitable giving
- Job title/business ownership
- Real estate


## Revisiting Tiers After Data Analysis

## Total constituents in CRM

Top 50\% of RFM Scores; new donors to be wealth screened

Top Scorers with a gift capacity rating of \$100K+

Top Scorers with a high gift capacity and have a lifetime giving of \$5,000+

Top Prospects: All the above and have given since 2021

Tiers 1-4

Tiers 1-3

Tiers 1 \&
2

Tier 1

Focus

## RFM Scores in Action:

## Hagerstown Community College

## Overview of Work

 With Hagerstown Community College (HCC)RFM Scores were used to rank each household in the CRM on a scale of $3-300$. Following the completion of the RFM analysis, top scorers were screened for estimated giving capacity through WealthEngine.

CCS then explored the results and analyzed prospective donors through two segments:

- Donor Universe: Households that were identified as on the radar.

- Non-Donor Universe: All other households.

Eighteen months following the completion of the analysis, Hagerstown Community College (HCC) provided a refreshed data export to CCS to conduct a follow-up analysis. This analysis is intended to assess the accuracy of the RFM scores and the performance of the prioritized prospects.

CCS's Impact Analysis focuses on the 462 Top
Prioritized Prospects CCS recommended in 2021.

## RFM Process With HCC



Segmented and Prioritized 462 top Households

## Reviewing The Relationship of New Giving, Since 2021, To RFM Score

After receiving a file of updated lifetime giving, CCS analyzed the distribution of new giving since the May 2021 and the original RFM scores.


There is a positive correlation between RFM scores and new giving. New giving from those with an RFM score of 286 or more was 14X the giving as those with under a 151 RFM score.

## Evaluating Major Donors

\$500.6K
Was the largest new gift for the Top 50\% of RFM scorers
\$29.5K
Was the largest new gift for the Bottom $50 \%$ of RFM scorers

## Average New Giving

Top 50\% RFM Scorers
Bottom 50\% RFM Scorers
\$2,548

51 households gave \$10K+ since May 2021. Below are their RFM Scores from 2021.

| RFM Score | Households | Giving Vs. Capacity |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Giving to HCC <br> $(5 / 21-1 / 23)$ | Total Available Gift <br> Capacity | Average Capacity <br> Captured |
| $286-300$ |  | $\$ 1,801,893$ | $\$ 2,729,999$ | $66 \%$ |
| $271-285$ | 10 | $\$ 605,000$ | $\$ 1,090,000$ | $56 \%$ |
| $241-270$ | 12 | $\$ 340,330$ | $\$ 879,999$ | $39 \%$ |
| $<151$ | 5 | $\$ 99,911$ | $\$ 265,000$ | $38 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 51 | $\$ 2,847,133$ | $\$ 4,964,998$ | $57 \%$ |

## Donor Outcomes for HCC

## Summary of the 462 priority households that CCS identified

## 35

Households were validated as prospects for our campaign

## \$2,098,500 <br> was raised


met the minimum $\$ 25 \mathrm{~K}$ requirement to establish an endowed scholarship


## \$1 Million

gift received

## 5

estate gifts, one of the gifts was \$500K

## UNTAPPED POTENTIAL:

- We were encouraged to have more conversations with individuals from this list about legacy giving donors to make priorities for fundraising and relationship building after the campaign
- We identified a need to increase cultivation and stewardship efforts with prospective and current donors from the College's Foundation Board, Trustees, Alumni Board, current employees, and college retirees


## Thanks!

## Questions? Email Analytics@ccsfundraising.com



JRoberts@ccsfundraising.com


JGreenstine@ccsfundraising.com


DR. ASHLEY WHALEY
ANWhaley@hagerstowncc.edu

