Journal of Applied Sport Management

Volume 9 | Issue 3 Article 7

1-1-2017

Best Practices in Athletic Donor Relations: The NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision

Liz Wanless

David A. Pierce

J. Michael Martinez

Heather J. Lawrence-Benedict

Nick Kopka

Recommended Citation

Wanless, Liz; Pierce, David A.; Martinez, J. Michael; Lawrence-Benedict, Heather J.; and Kopka, Nick (2017) "Best Practices in Athletic Donor Relations: The NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision," *Journal of Applied Sport Management*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 3.
https://doi.org/10.18666/JASM-2017-V9-I3-8151
Available at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm/vol9/iss3/7

Journal of Applied Sport Management Vol. 9, No. 3, Fall 2017
https://doi.org/10.18666/JASM-2017-V9-I3-8151

Best Practices in Athletic Donor Relations

The NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision

Liz Wanless
David A. Pierce
J. Michael Martinez
Heather J. Lawrence-Benedict
Nick Kopka

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to identify best practices in intercollegiate athletic donor relations for the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). Neither philanthropy research nor athletic fund-raising research presents a contemporary model of donor relations best practices. Additionally, athletic development tactics are given little attention in evidence-based literature. To investigate this topic, three rounds of the Delphi method were completed by 17 intercollegiate athletic development directors in the FBS. Forty-two best practices for donor acquisition and 38 best practices for donor retention and upgrade emerged. Implications for intercollegiate athletic development campaigns are addressed.

Keywords: *FBS, athletic fund-raising, best practices, donor relations*

Liz Wanless is the coordinator of the Undergraduate Sport Administration Program and assistant professor of Sport Administration at Ball State University.

David A. Pierce is an associate professor in the Department of Tourism, Conventions, and Event Management at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

J. Michael Martinez is an assistant professor in the School of Kinesiology at Louisiana State University.

Heather J. Lawrence-Benedict is an associate professor in the Department of Sports Administration at Ohio University.

Nick Kopka is a research graduate assistant in the Department of Sports Administration at Ohio University.

Please send correspondence to Liz Wanless, eawanless@bsu.edu

Ticket sales, NCAA and Conference distributions, and fund-raising have traditionally been the largest athletic-generated revenue streams for National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) athletic departments (Fulks, 2016). However, declining football attendance and escalating expenses are placing tremendous pressure on athletic development offices to bolster fund-raising efforts. From 2006 to 2015, average home football game attendance declined by 1,145 per game (NCAA Research, 2015), while median expenses per institution rose 53.9% (Fulks, 2016). Fund-raising[1] has emerged as the largest revenue source for FBS institutions accounting for a median of $9.53 million (ticket sales and NCAA/Conference distributions account for a median of $8.99 and $6.08 million, respectively). For FBS institutions in the top quartile of expenses, revenue generated from fund-raising is even more significant, accounting for 28% of total athletic department revenues, or $26.72 million annually (Fulks, 2016; Wolverton & Kambhampati, 2016). There is a finite number of seats to sell, and a limited amount of attractive sponsorship inventory, so the focus to enhance current athletic-generated revenue likely falls largely on fund-raising (Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2005). The value of understanding a comprehensive and effective approach to intercollegiate athletic fund-raising is more pressing than ever. Given the importance and potential of fund-raising to intercollegiate athletic programs, understanding how to best acquire new donors, retain donors, and increase gift size is essential, particularly because donor perceptions of how an organization delivers a fund-raising campaign predicts donor value (Sargeant, West, & Ford, 2001; Shapiro, 2010).

Previous athletic development research has assessed key topics such as why donors give (Gladden et al., 2005) and the extent to which winning increases giving to the university (Martinez, Stinson, Kang, & Jubenville, 2010). The focus of this work was not to vet fund-raising strategy nor to uncover successful athletic fund-raising practice; however, an important byproduct of this research lies in revealing the significance of internal mechanisms to athletic contributions generation (Hall & Mahoney, 1997). While winning certainly creates tailwinds for development officers, donor relations efforts, staff size, staff experience, and internal processes play an even more critical role for fund-raising sustainability (Martinez et al., 2010; Shapiro, 2010; Wells, Southall, Stotlar, & Mundfrom, 2005). Despite the importance of internal mechanisms to a successful athletic fund-raising campaign, literature revealing successful fund-raising practice for the sport sector remains sparse and an empirically tested set of best practices in donor relations has not been developed. For fund-raising practitioners, this is problematic given the complexity of fund-raising campaigns and donor relationships.

[1]In this study, athletic fund-raising is defined as "Amounts received directly from individuals, corporations, associations, foundations, clubs or other organizations that are designated, restricted, or unrestricted by the donor for the operation of the athletics program. Amounts paid in excess of a ticket's value are included. Contributions include cash, marketable securities, and in-kind services or property. Gifts and merchandise from corporate sponsorship agreements are not included" (Fulks, 2016, p. 103).

In philanthropic research literature beyond the sport setting, researchers have assessed the effectiveness of fund-raising practice, including donor relations strategy. This line of philanthropic research aids practitioners by illuminating donor relations efficacy. From donor prioritization method (Bag & Roy, 2008; Boenigk & Scherhag, 2013) to relationship fund-raising techniques (Sargeant et al., 2001; Shaker, Kienker, & Borden, 2014), researchers have assessed the effectiveness of fund-raising practice on enhancing donor relationships throughout the donor lifecycle. See Table 1 for a summary of notable literature investigating the effectiveness of fund-raising methods in the nonprofit sector. The table is organized according to fund-raising method and spans practices from donor prioritization to relationship marketing/stewardship activities. This philanthropic research line serves as the literary foundation and justification for this paper as well as for future directions in applied athletic development research.

Purpose

This research identifies a comprehensive set of best practices in intercollegiate athletic development donor relations at NCAA FBS institutions, the most highly resourced and competitive division of NCAA football. Specifically, the donor life cycle of interactions with the athletic department and the proactive engagement actions by the development office were explored. The resulting best practices can be applied to development offices of NCAA FBS institutions, as well as to other sizes and types of athletic programs that can adjust the application of the findings according to their fund-raising environment. Study conclusions serve as a catalyst for the operational assessment of athletic fund-raising methods (donor relations and beyond).

Methods

Selection of Delphi Method

The Delphi method is a group communication process that allows experts in varied locations to offer confidential input in an anonymous environment where all opinions are allowed to emerge (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). The Delphi method has been used in a variety of settings to identify current and future trends within a specific industry (Martino, 1983) and demonstrates viability for applied research where gaining consensus among experts is necessary (Busch, 2013; Martino, 1983; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005; Ziglio, 1996). The Delphi method is an alternative to an in-person committee and typical survey research that provides three advantages over the aforementioned research methods. First, participants are not made aware of the identities of the other participants, which allows other participants to avoid matching specific answers with a specific person. Participants can also change their answers without publically admitting doing so. Thus, each idea is considered on its merits, rather than being influenced by a dominant personality, which sometimes occurs during face-to-face committees. Second, the method allows for controlled

Table 1

Donor Relations Method Assessment Research in the Non-Profit Sector

Method	Study	Sample	Analysis	Primary Conclusions
Donor Prioritization	Boenigk & Scherhag (2013)	804 German museum donors	Partial least squares models/multigroup analysis	Donor prioritization positively affects donor satisfaction and loyalty among both higher and lower level donors.
Donor prioritization	Scherhag & Boenik (2013)	73 non-profit organizations in Germany	A propensity score matching analysis	Donor prioritization method increased generated-revenue and total profit per donor.
Messaging	Lamberton (2013)	292 homeowners; 151 students; 401 taxpayers	Three studies: factor analysis/ANOVA/ANCOVA	Allowing choice in the donation process can increase donor satisfaction.
Messaging	Aknin, Dunn, & Norton (2012)	51 affiliates of the University of British Columbia	ANOVA	Showing impact as a result of donation causes donor happiness; this happiness increases the likelihood that donors will donate again.
Messaging	Cryder, Loewenstein, & Scheines, (2013)	119 adults in a city; 94 adults in a city; 197 adults recruited via online service	Three studies: linear regression models	Providing donors with tangible details about their donation encourages generosity through sympathy and anticipating impact.
Messaging	Feiler, Tost, & Grant (2012)	2,000 alumni at a large U.S. public university, 159 undergraduates, 88 undergraduate students from a psychology course at a U.S public university	Pairwise Comparison, three-factor model	Incorporating both self-interest and altruistic motives elicits feelings of suspicion towards philanthropic organizations.
Relationship Marketing/Stewardship	Sargeant et al. (2001)	5,000 active and 5,000 lapsed United Kingdom (UK) donors	Focus groups; exploratory factor analysis	A little over sixty-one percent of the variance in service quality rating could be attributed to the following factors: 1) Factor One: Responsiveness (receiving personal attention and responding to donor needs promptly), 2) Factor Two: Feedback (receiving adequate feedback according to how the money was spent), and 3) Factor Three: Effectiveness (organization cares about the full range of its stakeholders/honors its promises).
Relationship Marketing/Stewardship	Bennett and Barkensjo (2004)	141 donors of UK charities	Partial Least Squares Model	Perceptions of relationship marketing quality were strongly associated with personalized messages, a desire on behalf of the charity to interact, and those charities that generated feelings of trust.

feedback. The researcher solicits relevant answers from the participants and presents them as an organized consolidation of information relevant to the issue. Third, by providing frequency counts for every response, there is representation from the entire group instead of only a majority. The statistical feedback provides a quantitative source from which to base subsequent opinion (Martino, 1983; Ziglio, 1996). Over the course of three rounds of survey questions, consensus is typically reached between experts on the panel through feedback delivered by a moderator via summary statistics and qualitative statements (Ziglio, 1996). In sum, the Delphi method provides researchers with a systematic approach to collecting informed opinions in a cost-effective and rigorous fashion with the ability to transcend organizational and geographic boundaries (Busch, 2013).

Delphi Rounds Procedure

The Delphi method was utilized for this investigation. Three rounds of data were collected from FBS intercollegiate athletic directors.

Round one. Participants were emailed a link using a web-based survey platform and asked to respond to the following prompts regarding best practices in intercollegiate athletic development.

1. What are effective strategies to acquire new intercollegiate athletic donors? List as many as apply.
2. What are effective strategies to retain and increase gift size among intercollegiate athletic donors? List as many as apply.

The constant comparative method was used to summarize and present the practices identified in the first round. This method compared "segments of data for similarities and differences in order to identify patterns leading to categorization" (Busch, 2013, p. 301). These practices were compared to Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and National Association of Athletic Development Director supplements, past fund-raising method research, and a fund-raising expert not included as a participant in the study. After this data reduction and validation process, round one yielded 92 distinct practices that could be divided into nine general categories for donor acquisition and seven general categories for donor retention and upgrade.

Round two. Panelists rated these 92 practices using a 5-point Likert scale. The scale asked panelists to rate the importance of each practice success in 1) donor acquisition and 2) donor retention and increased gift size according to the following constructs: 1, not at all important; 2 of little importance; 3 of average importance; 4 very important; and 5 absolutely essential. Because the Delphi technique is a consensus-building process, benchmarks were established in order to eliminate practices from subsequent rounds. The benchmarks established by Hurd and Buschbom (2010) were adopted: 1, no importance (M = 1.00 – 1.49); 2, little importance (M = 1.50 – 2.49); 3, average importance (M = 2.50 – 3.49); 4, very important (M = 3.50 – 4.49); and 5, absolutely essential (M = 4.50 – 5.00), with 3.5 used as the cutoff for inclusion. Last, participants were asked to provide written comments to explain the rationale for their ratings.

Round three. Participants were provided with the mean, standard deviation, frequency count, open-ended answers, and their original rating for all 92 items. Participants then considered the opinions of the other development directors and re-scored all 92 items. The participants were also encouraged to provide an explanation if they changed their answer by more than two points, or if their answer deviated from the mean by more than two points. Practices below the

3.50 cutoff were removed. Once all of the responses in round three were tabulated and practices below 3.50 were removed, the framework set forth in Busch (2013) was then utilized to draw distinctions between primary and secondary practices within each category. Practices with a mean score of 4.0 or above and a range of 1.0 or less, and competencies with a mean score of 4.0 or above and a range of 1.0 or greater with a maximum of one response below 4 were coded as primary practices (Pierce & Irwin, 2016). In other words, if at least 16 of 17 panelists rated a competency at 4 or 5, then the competency was coded as primary. The remaining practices were coded as secondary.

Participant Recruitment and Profiles

The population was comprised of 128 Division I FBS intercollegiate athletic development directors. Invitations to participate were emailed to 119 who had email addresses publicly available. Each participant was required to have at least two years of experience in FBS athletic development. Of the 119 potential participants, 36 met the criteria and participated in round one (30% return), 24 in round two (67% return), and 17 (71% return) in round three. The final number of participants (n = 17) as well as the participation across the three rounds meets Linstone and Turoff's (2002) recommendation that the Delphi method panel consist of between 10 and 30 participants.

Seventeen intercollegiate athletic development directors representing seven of ten FBS conferences completed all three rounds of the study. Panelists hailed from the American Athletic Conference (n = 1), the Big Ten Conference (n = 3), the Big 12 Conference (n = 5), the Mid-America Conference (n = 3), the Mountain West Conference (n = 1), the Pac-12 Conference (n = 3), the Southeastern Conference (n = 2), and the Sun Belt Conference (n = 1). Fifteen panelists were male, two were female. Although only two females participated in the study, this ratio is representative of intercollegiate athletic development as roughly 13% of development directors were female at the time of study. Panelists ranged from 25 to 55 years old (M = 35.31) with a range of 2 to 27 years of experience in FBS development (M = 11.31).

Results

Forty-two best practices for donor acquisition and 38 best practices for donor retention and upgrade emerged. Twelve practices athletic development directors originally suggested were important to athletic contributions development were collectively rated below the 3.50 benchmark and removed. Tables 2 and 3 display the resulting best practices across the donor lifecycle.

Table 2
Best Practices in FBS Intercollegiate Athletics Donor Acquisition

Category 1: Athletic Department
Practices executed within the athletic department.
Primary practices:
1. Sport program success
2. Providing a great fan/customer service experience
Category 2: Research/Prospecting
Practices associated with researching and prospecting donors.
Primary practices:
1. Utilizing research/data mining from current donors or ticket buyers to predict likely donors
2. Identifying donors' potential area of interest
3. Maintaining an effective database
Secondary practices:
1. Routine in-depth research qualifying potential prospects
Category 3: Solicitation and Promotion
Practices by which athletic development directors promote athletics development and solicit donors.
Primary practices:
1. Conducting face-to-face visits
Secondary practices:
1. Sending direct mail appeals
2. Conducting year-end giving solicitations
3. Sending emails
4. Sharing strategic vision/plans with the community
Category 4: Targets
Practices involving targeting specific groups to solicit donors.
Primary practices:
1. Soliciting the current fan base
2. Soliciting alumni within the general region (within 100 miles)
Secondary practices:
1. Soliciting former student-athletes
2. Soliciting alumni outside the general region (outside 100 miles)
3. Soliciting during non-game athletic events such as "meet the coach" opportunities
4. Soliciting parents of student-athletes
5. Soliciting from various university databases
Category 5: Referrals
Practices in gaining referrals for athletic donors.
Secondary practices:
1. Asking current donors to solicit prospective donors

Table 2 (cont.)

Category 6: Message
Practices involving the message delivered to donors. *Primary practices:* 1. Utilizing campaign-based appeals (new sports, facility upgrades, etc.) with specific goals 2. Conveying impact/using student-athlete success stories 3. Developing and educating the fan base *Secondary practices:* 1. Including the ask 2. Targeting the right list of prospects with effective communication for that target group
Category 7: Incentives and Benefits
Practices in donor prioritization; assigning benefits or membership levels according to the donor amount given. *Primary practices:* 1. Providing unique engagement opportunities and events 2. Offering season ticket priority 3. Offering exclusive hospitality options 4. Offering prioritized parking *Secondary practices:* 1. Incorporating giving levels and corresponding benefits 2. Offering team travel incentives 3. Inviting target groups for athletic director/head coach luncheons 4. Inviting target groups for interactions with student-athletes
Category 8: Collaborations/Partnerships
Practices involving alignment or partnership with groups external to athletics development. *Primary practices:* 1. Collaborating within central advancement 2. Relationship building with wealthy philanthropic alumni and friends *Secondary practices:* 1. Collaborating with other groups external to the home department 2. Collaborating with the community 3. Working with alumni office and attending alumni events 4. Working closely with internal fundraising constituents from the academic side
Category 9: Internal Operations
Practices within the internal operations of the athletics development office. Primary practices: 1. Believing in the leadership and vision of athletics development 2. Identifying the appropriate staff person to cultivate the relationship *Secondary competencies:* 1. Evaluating development officers based on officer metrics

Table 3

Best Practices in FBS Intercollegiate Athletics Donor Retention and Increasing Gift Size

Category 1: Athletics Department
Practices executed within the athletic department.
Primary practices:
1. Sport program success
2. Providing a great fa/customer service experience
Category 2: Internal Operations
Practices within the internal operations of the athletics development office.
Primary practices:
1. Creating a donors relations program
2. Hiring a donor relations specialist position
Secondary practices:
1. Routine in-depth research qualifying potential prospects
Category 3: Stewardship
Practices encompassing donor relations and relationship marketing practices geared towards developing long-term donor relationships.
Primary practices:
1. Incorporating contact from coaches and the athletic director
2. Building effective personal relationships between donors and development staff
3. Valuing and utilizing both positive and negative donor feedback
4. Keeping donors engaged and informed through effective communication strategies throughout the year (aside from asking for funds)
5. Making personal visits to current donors who have stopped giving in the past year
6. Thanking through email personal notes, phone calls, and thank-a-thons
7. Organizing strategic recognition platforms for all levels
Secondary practices:
1. Personalizing stewardship activities
2. Creating/sending videos
3. Keeping donors engaged and informed through events
4. Providing formal impact reports
Category 4: Message
Practices involving the message delivered to donors.
Primary practices:
1. Making the right ask
2. Making a specific case for support (example: increasing scholarship costs including cost of attendance, facility upgrades to compete and recruit, endowment growth)
3. Developing customers over the long-term through annual to capital and endowment support
Secondary practices:
1. Implementing second-ask campaigns
2. Incorporating next level giving incentives (example: 110% campaign)
3. Aligning benefits of the next level with reasons associated with why they donated

Table 3 (cont.)

Category 5: Renewal Process
Practices associated with the donor renewal process.
Primary practices:
1. Personalizing renewals
2. Making the renewal process convenient for the donor
3. Incorporating a timely and recurring renewal process
4. Providing multiple gifting opportunities for donors to review (annual fund campaigns, sport-specific, endowment)
Category 6: Accountability
Practices in displaying accountability to donors.
Primary practices:
1. Following through with promises to donors
2. Billing correctly and timely
3. Managing expectations
4. Maintaining clarity and transparency with executive vision, goals, and plans
5. Maintaining transparency of challenges and opportunities
Category 7: Incentives and Benefits
Practices in donor prioritization; assigning benefits or membership levels according to the donor amount given.
Secondary competencies:
1. Implementing a strong ladder of annual membership levels
2. Inviting upgrading donors to exclusive events
3. Inspiring competition among donors with rankings or priority points
4. Systematically reviewing and readjusting giving levels

Discussion

Although fund-raising in intercollegiate athletics has been widely studied, research has yet to identify best practices in donor relations until now. Themes across best practices in the donor lifecycle both reflect and contradict philanthropic research conclusions, illuminate opportunities to improve sport fund-raising methods, and serve as a platform for a new direction in applied sport fund-raising research. One of the most impactful, practical benefits of this research is providing athletic development officers with a rigorously generated toolkit of applicable tactics.

For the Practitioner

The results of this study highlight the wide-ranging set of coordinated efforts needed to successfully cultivate donor relationships throughout the donor lifecycle. With the great degree and depth of practices identified by intercollegiate athletic development directors representing multiple conferences in the FBS, study results serve as a comprehensive framework from which athletic development officers can create successful donor relationships. Opportunity exists for athletic development directors to crosscheck their donor relations programs against the results of this study in order to identify areas for improvement. This framework will be particularly useful for intercollegiate fund-raisers looking to ensure this extensive process is effectively executed and donor relations responsibilities are allocated across staff.

The successful donor relations practices identified by development directors in this study largely aligned with philanthropic research conclusions (see Table 1). Athletic development directors emphasized practices important to the nonprofit sector at large (e.g., donor prioritization and making a specific case for soliciting donations; Bag & Roy, 2008). In practical terms, the methods identified as best practice in this study align with more broadly based stages of the fund-raising life cycle, including planning, prospect identification, cultivation and ultimately solicitation (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2016). Much of the research, literature, and guidance offered by the non-sport context will be useful for practitioners fund-raising for the sport product; an important conclusion of this study.

For example, personalized approaches emerged as best practice throughout the donor lifecycle reflecting conclusions from philanthropic studies situated in the non-sport sector (Bennett & Barkensjo, 2004; Sargeant et al., 2001). Face-to-face visits, personalized stewardship activities, and personalized renewal options are three fund-raising activities that could be leveraged from athletic development offices and nonprofit organizations, regardless of size. Emphasis on this trend to personalize may also be implied when development directors acknowledged that partnering with central advancement was a best practice. Central university development offices typically utilize advanced customer relationship management (CRM) technology and processes. Opportunity exists for athletic development directors to continue to explore innovative techniques and partnerships to personalize the donor relationship and experience.

Fund-raising in the FBS environment, however, presents a unique set of challenges in comparison with non-sport fund-raising. One of the unique aspects of sport fund-raising is the additional impact of athletic department functions. Respondents indicated that team performance and the fan experience rated extremely high as best practice throughout the donor lifecycle; a conclusion that aligns with studies that showed athletic success impacted contributions (Martinez et al., 2010). Scholars indicated, however, that team performance, part of the core product in sport management literature, is beyond the control of the marketer (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2014), or in this case the fund-raiser. Without control over the core sport product performance, the interplay between transactional (emphasizing benefits to the game experience) versus transformational (emphasizing impact to student-athletes) approaches was evident. Development directors suggested greater access to the core product be highlighted as a benefit for donating, yet specific student-athlete impact statements ranked as a top messaging technique. Top prospects involved individuals who might benefit from an enhanced game experience, those who might be more invested in creating student-athlete impact, and potentially, a combination of both. Philanthropic literature widely praises transformational messaging (Aknin, Dunn, & Norton, 2012; Cryder, Loewenstein, & Scheines, 2013), and found that dual transactional and transformational messaging created distrust among donors (Feiler, Tost, & Grant, 2012). Messaging is one area where the unique nature of fund-raising for the sport product is evident. Best practices in this balancing act between transformational and transactional tactics may slide on a continuum depending on the athletic department brand. Some of the top-resource tier schools in the FBS may benefit from advertising a transactional message, while some of the lower-resource tier schools may increase donor lifetime value with transformational messaging and recruitment (realizing that showcasing the core product may only be intermittently attractive). Opportunity exists for the athletic development director to assess their environment and align messaging.

Athletic development directors reached quick consensus across many of the practices throughout the donor lifecycle; however, practices regarding referrals, certain marketing tactics and the incorporation of analytics varied, potentially, according to the varying financial support of athletic development offices within the FBS. As fund-raising becomes an increasingly important revenue source for FBS programs, this pattern in the results shows the financial disparity among institutions may only be further exacerbated as institutions with more revenue to support fund-raising practice will continue to outpace the fund-raising efforts of those institutions with less support.

Future Directions in Applied Research: Fund-raising for the Sport Product

While a significant amount of research has been conducted on revenue-generation strategy to maximize attendance, corporate partnerships, and sport media consumption, fund-raising research has lagged behind despite its perch atop the income statement and crucial position in determining the bottom line for intercollegiate athletics (Fulks, 2016). The current findings only serve as a starting point for future inquiry into this topic. Where philanthropic research has vetted fund-raising strategy in numerous publications, there is a need to assess fund-raising method for the sport product given that conclusions from this study revealed differences between the two, specifically regarding messaging. Future research should aim to operationally assess the wide range of intercollegiate athletic donor acquisition, retention and upgrade methods, and create contemporary models to predict intercollegiate athletic contributions.

References

Aknin, L. B., Dunn, E. W., Norton, M. I. (2012). Happiness runs in a circular motion: Evidence for a positive feedback loop between prosocial spending and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13,* 347–355.

Bag, P. K., & Roy, S. (2008). Repeated charitable donations under incomplete information. *The Economic Journal, 118*(525), 60–91.

Boenigk, S., & Scherhag, C. (2013). Effects of donor priority strategy on relationship fund-raising outcomes. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 24*(3), 307–336.

Busch, T. (2013). Determining competencies for frontline sales managers in for-profit organizations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 15*(3), 296–313.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education. (2016). The cultivation process. Retrieved from: http://www.case.org/Publications_and_Products/Fund-raising_Fundamentals_Intro/ Fund-raising_Fundamentals_section_7/Fund-raising_Fundamentals_section_71.html

Cryder, C. E., Loewenstein, G., & Scheines, R. (2013). The donor is in the details. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 120*(1), 15–23.

Feiler, D. C., Tost, L. P., & Grant, A. M. (2012). Mixed reasons, missed givings: The costs of blending egoistic and altruistic reasons in donation requests. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 48*(6), 1322–1328.

Fulks, D. L. (2016). Revenues and expenses, 2004–2014: NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics programs report. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2015%20Division%20I%20RE%20report.pdf

Gladden, J. M., Mahony, D. F., & Apostolopoulou. (2005). Toward a better understanding of college athletic donors: What are the primary motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 14*, 18–30.

Hall, J. S., & Mahony, D. E. (1997). Factors affecting methods used by annual giving programs: A qualitative study of NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 6*(3), 21–30.

Lamberton, C. (2013). A spoonful of choice: How allocation increases satisfaction with tax payments. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 32*(2), 223–228.

Linstone, H., & Turoff, M. (2002). The delphi method: Techniques and applications. Retrieved from http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/delphibook.pdf

Martinez, J. M., Stinson, J. L., Kang, M. & Jubenville, C. B. (2010). Intercollegiate athletics and institutional fund-raising: A meta-analysis. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 19*, 36–47.

Martino, J. P. (1983). *Technological forecasting for decision making*. New York, NY: Elsevier Science.

Mullin, B. J., Hardy, S., & Sutton, W. A. (2014). *Sport marketing.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

NCAA Research. (2015). Eleven-year Tresnds in Division I Athletics Finances. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/DivisionI_ElevenYearFinances-20150917.pdf

Pierce, D., & Irwin, R. (2016). Competency assessment for entry-level sport ticket sales professionals. *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 8*(2), 54–75.

Sargeant, A., West, D. C, & Ford, J. (2001). The role of perceptions in predicting donor value. *Journal of Marketing Management, 17*, 407–428.

Scherhag, C., & Boenigk, S. (2013). Different or equal treatment? Donor priority strategy and fund-raising performance assessed by a propensity score matching study. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 23*(4), 443–472.

Shaker, G. G., Kienker, B. L., & Borden, V. M. H. (2014). The ecology of internal workplace giving at Indiana University: A case study of faculty and staff campus campaign communications and fund-raising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 19*, 262–276.

Shapiro, S. L. (2010). Does service matter? An examination of donor perceptions of service quality in college athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 19*, 154–165.

USA Today. (2016). NCAA finances. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/schools/finances/

Wells, D. E., Southall, R. M., Stotlar, D., & Mundfrom, D. J. (2005). Factors related to annual fund-raising campaigns from individual donors to NCAA Division I-A institutions. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 6*(1), 3–10.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (2005). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Wolverton, B., & Kambhampati, S. (2016, January 27). Colleges raised $1.2 billion in donations for sports in 2015. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Raised-12-Billion/235058

Ziglio, E. (1996). The delphi method and its contribution to decision making. In M. Adler & E. Ziglio (Eds.), *Gazing into the oracle: The delphi method and its applications to social policy and public health* (pp. 3–25). Bristol, PA: Jessica Kingsley.