



TCG

THEATRE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP, INC.

CENTERPIECE

FOCUS ON:

DEVELOPMENT & MARKETING

• • • •

THE NEW LANDSCAPE

BY ROSLYN BLACK

As we begin a new century, it is easy to forget that philanthropy has been part of our culture for centuries. The reasons why people give money to the arts — or give money at all for that matter — haven't changed much. Public recognition. Keeping up with the "Rockefellers." A sincere desire to change the community for the better. The following two pieces share and express a common belief: while the Information Age of computers and web solutions has had its profound and undeniable impact on the process of philanthropy, at the core of it all is the art of developing a trusting personal relationship.

In the first piece, chat room insights from three different, yet equally successful, development directors from regional theatre world combine to deliver a snapshot of the highs and lows of fundraising. Although they offer helpful advice regarding the logistics of development, the theme of building relationships remains front and center. This interview sets the table for the second article, *Building Relationships: The Ongoing Challenge* by Susan St. John, reprinted here with the generous permission of *Planned Giving Today*. She explains how the new technology must help us continue to cultivate the personal aspect of philanthropy.

Please feel free to email your comments and follow-up questions to me at rblack@mccarter.org, and I will pass them along to my colleagues participating in the interview. I also welcome suggestions for upcoming *Centerpiece* articles.

Development & Marketing *Centerpiece* Curators: Roslyn Black, Director of Development, McCarter Theatre Center; Jim Royce, Director of Marketing and Communications, Mark Taper Forum/Ahmanson Theatre
Copyright © 2001 by Theatre Communications Group, Inc. All articles reproduced by permission of the authors. No portion of this publication may be reproduced in any form, or by any means, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher or author. Theatre Communications Group, Inc., 355 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10017, telephone (212) 697-5230, fax (212) 983-4847, Web site: www.tcg.org. Ben Cameron, Channick Shuff

CASUAL INSIGHTS FROM TCG MEMBER DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS

Participants:

- (JL) Julia Levy,**
Roundabout Theatre Company,
New York, NY
- (YB) Yvonne Bell,**
Center Theatre Group,
Los Angeles, CA
- (EL) Eve Loeb,**
Alabama Shakespeare Festival,
Montgomery, AL
- (RB) Roslyn Black,**
McCarter Theatre Center,
Princeton, NJ

Fundraising breeds paranoia. Am I doing enough? Am I doing it right? So, I am forever wondering about my development colleagues and their approach to key issues in our field. Corporate sponsorships, secret telefundraising strategies for a capital campaign while maintaining (or even increasing) the annual fund...Sound familiar? Having interviewed three highly respected and experienced development directors from theatres located in three different regions, it is nice to know that we are not alone in our struggles — everyone is facing the same challenges.

Each of the three participants works in a unique shop:

The **Roundabout Theatre Company's** annual operating budget is \$50 million, making it one of the largest nonprofit theatres in the country. Their season includes eight plays produced in four different venues, reaching an audience of more than 700,000 each year including a subscriber audience of more than 46,000. With the multitude of both commercial and nonprofit theatre in New York, there is much competition for both audience and "backers."

A theatre with an \$8 million annual budget, the **Alabama Shakespeare Festival** is located in Montgomery, Alabama, which is the state capital, with a population of about 200,000 people. Montgomery is not an urban center and the major employer is the state government. Therefore, there are

simply not the resources available as would be in a large metropolitan center.

Center Theatre Group (Mark Taper Forum and Ahmanson Theatre) is the largest theatre in the Los Angeles region, with a budget of \$33 million, offering six productions a year on each of two stages. Audiences total 650,000 per year with a subscriber base of 26,000 households. Although the population base is vast, Los Angeles is a one-industry town — the movies — and the performing arts definitely take a back seat.

RB: Considering the recent economic fluctuations, prevalent corporate mergers and proposed changes in the tax code, do you anticipate any major changes in corporate support of the arts? What is the best approach to acquiring new sponsorships? Have the rules changed?

YB: Corporate support of the arts has dramatically changed over the last fifteen years, ever since I have been in fundraising. Because of mergers, many of the major "community-minded" corporations are no longer in existence. ARCO and *The Los Angeles Times* were two Los Angeles-based companies that were very philanthropic. They had prominent CEOs who served on various nonprofit boards throughout the city and were known for providing philanthropic leadership on every major civic project. Both companies have been bought out and their corporate headquarters are no longer in the region. This has happened over and over again, especially in Los Angeles. The long-time relationships development officers have had with the corporate program officers are now useless. Program officers are no longer at the company and their departments have been restructured and absorbed into other areas. It's difficult to figure out how to even go about getting a gift.

However, with this change in the corporate landscape, new fundraising opportunities have been created, especially from

companies that seem to be overnight success stories. The challenge I have found as a fundraiser is, "How do you get to them?" There's no corporate giving department and it takes a lot of research to find out how decisions are made, especially when it comes to charitable donations. At Center Theatre Group, we are just beginning to be successful with these companies. Working in our favor is a strong subscriber base comprised of 25,000+ households. Two recent gifts we received resulted from a founder or company president that was a long-time subscriber to the theatre and felt very passionately about what we were doing. They hadn't made a gift before, because they didn't realize we needed the money. Prospect research identified these people, and cultivating their *personal* interest led us to these gifts.

In addition, last year we started an annual corporate giving program known as the Corporate Circle. A new board member with extensive corporate connections was recruited to the board, and because of this person's leadership, we raised \$350,000 in our first year from companies who had never contributed to us before. Now we have a Corporate Circle Committee that actively solicits contributions. Identifying volunteer leadership that can and will leverage their relationships is vital.

EL: Over the past five years the biggest change in our fundraising sources has been in corporate giving. Never a center for many corporate headquarters, Montgomery has seen the few headquarters it claimed bought out or merged. With the disappearance of local ownership went the philosophy of corporate citizenry. For the most part, the new owners are bottom-line oriented and have no sense that being a good corporate citizen helps pad that bottom line. (Given the opportunity, we would heartily argue that point!) The corporate sources that remain with us — bless them all — are those that still have a philanthropic concern and a desire to give back to their

communities, and at the same time, recognize the economic, educational and cultural value of our theatre to the state and region. The new corporate support we develop is primarily relationship based with some emphasis on exposure for the corporation. They, and we, recognize that we can never give them a dollar for dollar return on their investment. We get regional and national corporate support through their foundations, thus in those cases the subject of *quid pro quo* is moot. Because we are not an urban center, national companies don't feel that ASF is able to provide them enough exposure. Smaller businesses support theatre on an annual basis. These are typically home-based companies that we think of as businesses, not "corporations."

JL: Corporate support for the arts has evolved since it first flourished in the early 1980s. I believe that it will continue to evolve as the businesses themselves, and their industries evolve. In New York, fewer and fewer corporations use good corporate social responsibility as the driving force behind their giving philosophy. They are more strategic in their giving, driven by marketing objectives via sponsorships. We at Roundabout have unabashedly gone after that sponsorship dollar — with moderate success.

Our strategy in approaching prospective sponsors is to identify companies that have the right to be a corporate sponsor at Roundabout. By right I mean that it makes sense for them and for us; there is some synergy in our products and services and our general corporate philosophy. When we approach a sponsor, the first thing we do is listen. Each corporation is looking for something different for their sponsorship dollar. Before we send a full proposal we research their industry and their marketing/corporate philosophy, and then meet with the key people to find out what they are looking for: client entertaining, visibility, access to a valued client base, etc. From there, we can put together a proposal that better meets their objectives. I like to tell a funny story (it wasn't that funny then) about hooking USAir as our domestic airlines, only to learn that after we had them sold, that they did not fly direct from New York to L.A. — the

primary route we needed. I had to say, thanks, but no thanks, and continue looking. I never went into a meeting again without researching even the most basic information. The other tip I have relating to approaching sponsors is be creative, tell them how they can use your artists, your events, your performances, your board, your major donors and other assets you have to their benefit.

With that said, I must admit that most of our major sponsorships have been secured through board members. I will say that I don't believe corporate sponsorship is a prudent strategy for smaller companies. I encourage them to spend their energies in securing other sources of private and public support.

In short, yes the rules have changed. They are constantly changing. I think as an industry we were slow to change, seeing corporate sponsorship as an intrusion on the art. In my experience, it has been anything but. The corporations don't want to get involved with what we do, and like American Airlines, have chosen to spend their sponsorship dollars with us because they believe it is a good investment offering them unique visibility and access.

One strategy that I have become aware of, that has been successful in the regions, is telefunding local small and mid-sized businesses. I don't believe it can work in New York, but in cities and towns across the country where there is a great sense of civic pride in their arts organizations, it has proven successful in acquiring new sources of funding at minimal cost.

RB: How has the "new" technology of website fundraising, internet research (both individuals and institutions) and online communications changed the way we do business?

YB: In the fundraising arena, I don't think the internet has changed the way we cultivate and solicit our donors too much — not yet. Whereas, in marketing departments, it has changed the way business is done rather dramatically *and* there are measurable results. Each year, the number of tickets that are sold online significantly increases. And, we have a

growing database of email addresses of our subscribers. Even though donors are able to contribute to Center Theatre Group via our website, there are not a significant number of gifts that are made this way — rather it's through telefunding, letter writing campaigns and personal visits. I believe this is because donors to the arts require very personal attention. They want to pick up the phone and speak with someone they know personally — whether they are changing their theatre tickets, getting an accounting of how much they gave you last year or making a contribution. Communicating through email complements this relationship, but it does not replace it. I think there are lucrative opportunities in website fundraising, but we haven't adequately explored them yet.

However, I do believe that technology has had a significant impact on fundraising, and two ways come to mind immediately. The first being the way we "state our case" to the donor. We are no longer limited to a printed brochure and a written proposal. Through Powerpoint presentations using striking images and bulleted points, we can succinctly tell our story to a prospect. And we can easily tailor each presentation to make our case more compelling to that particular person. I previously worked at a museum and we created a virtual tour of the new building before construction even started. We were raising money for the building, and through this new technology, we were able to give donors a very clear understanding of our vision. It was amazing and effective.

Technology has also streamlined our access to prospect research. By no means am I a guru in this area, but even with the few search engines I use, I am able to find out quite a bit of information on donors and prospects. Ten years ago we had access to a very limited amount of information. Now we can find out professional information on a person and personal background — depending on what the search engine pulls up. The first search engine I always check out is Google.com, then I go from there.

EL: Typically, people in the South are very relationship oriented, very interconnected and very private about how

they use their money. Most of our leads are generated from people who know people. Other than researching foundations, we do not use the internet for prospecting. Our website does give donors an opportunity to contribute to ASF online but few select this method of giving.

Our strong focus is on the individual donor. We have found that a \$10,000 annual gift is an affordable gift for many people, and if we do our work right, we will have a lifelong relationship with these individuals that will ultimately lead to planned gifts. I believe that in this age of technology, we need to remember to use interpersonal tools to extend our ability to *touch* people. Never should electronic communication overtake our communicating in person, over the phone or in a personally written note.

JL: The use of the internet is changing the way we do business — for the better, in my opinion — by giving us more options to communicate. At Roundabout, it has enhanced the way we distribute information to our audience, the way we raise money and sell tickets. And it has had a tremendous impact on our research abilities.

In short, the internet offers a more cost effective and expansive way for our audience to participate in the life of Roundabout. For example, we used the internet effectively to enhance our capital campaign funding materials. We created a virtual tour of our new 42nd Street theatre complete with updates on the construction process. We were able to showcase our naming opportunities and show people on the tour where their name would be permanently recognized.

As we as a society become more comfortable conducting business over the internet, purchasing products and communicating with one another, the internet will become a more powerful marketing, fundraising, research and P.R. tool.

RB: How can we maximize our net income from special events, when talent fees for well-known entertainers continue to climb to stratospheric levels? Can you suggest

other creative approaches to achieving income goals from gala benefits?

YB: I find that the key to a successful event (monetarily lucrative) is in the event leadership, i.e., who's chairing your event. It's important to recruit a chair who is an effective fundraiser, rather than someone who just wants to plan a party. If they know fundraising, they will open doors and work with staff to recruit an impressive honorary committee, put together a strong working committee and create a focus or theme for the event that is strategic and supports the bottom line. In putting together events, every decision made should support the fundraising goal, and not just add to the ambiance of the party.

EL: I wish I had the answer to this question! In my experience, the only way to net a good return is to have all expenses underwritten and to charge a heap of money to attend! Our annual campaigns necessitate that we find gifts from every imaginable source, so to then uncover additional donors to underwrite terrifically high gala expenses is daunting. I believe the only successful galas that ASF has managed have been those galas that pay tribute to our founders, Carolyn and Red Blount. In these cases, people who would not otherwise make significant gifts are willing to help underwrite our costs, and likewise, so many people who love and respect the Blounts are willing to pay significant amounts to attend the tribute gala. Perhaps, the way to attract otherwise unconnected corporate support is to approach them to underwrite the entire gala. They would certainly get a big splash for their big contribution. We tend to shy away from fundraising galas, too, because they drain our already overloaded personnel. There are also so many galas in Montgomery and only so many people in the area who choose to attend them. We seem to be more successful in securing several \$10,000-\$25,000 sponsors than we are in trying to raise a similar amount of money through a gala.

JL: Roundabout is somewhat new in the gala arena, having held our very first in 1995. Five galas later, I am not a seasoned veteran of these special events but I have learned a thing or two. To limit expenses

and to showcase what Roundabout is, I have created a tradition of building our galas around one of our shows, selecting the most high profile production with the greatest appeal to the corporate community (our target audience). By building the gala around something that already exists, it allows the staff to focus on selling tickets and not creating an event, which can exhaust even the most ambitious staff. In New York, the competition is heartbreaking. For example, American Ballet Theatre and The James Beard Foundation are just two of the nonprofits holding galas on the same night as ours. For us, the key for a financially successful event has been to secure support from the board to sell tickets, and choose a chairperson who has broad reach into the community.

What I find continually frustrating is successfully turning a gala ticket buyer into an annual fund donor. I have abandoned that strategy, believing that gala ticket buyers are not interested in annual support or the institution itself for that matter. They buy gala tickets because someone twisted their arm or they have a particular interest in or connection to the event. Our focus is now on getting those gala ticket buyers to step up to the next level in their ticket buying. One strategy we used this past year was an auction, a live auction with only ten items, all of which could not be purchased on the open market. Walk-on roles, dinners with artists, etc., all can bring extraordinary rewards if packaged correctly to the audience. Auctions are truly an art form in and of themselves and should be well-planned and strategized.

RB: Many major institutions have recently committed to a major capital campaign for construction, renovation or endowment. How can we safeguard our contributed income for operations, while simultaneously soliciting for major support of one-time campaigns?

YB: Safeguarding the annual fund while running a campaign is always a challenge. When I was at the museum, my first position there was Campaign Director. I was in charge of raising \$33 million for a new building...and the annual fund

suffered. When we finished the campaign I was put in charge of re-building the annual fund, and that was like pulling teeth. Because of this experience, I strongly believe that a campaign should be positioned so that the annual fund goals are included in the campaign goals and the donors see the importance of participating in both efforts. At Center Theatre Group, we are embarking on a campaign and are positioning the annual fund goal within the campaign goal. About one third of the total campaign goal is our aggregate annual fund goal over five years. The remaining two thirds is divided between a cash and deferred gift endowment. Right now, we are in the process of securing commitments from our board, and they are stepping forward with endowment gifts and increased annual commitments. Because they are so intimately involved with the institution, they see the importance of doing both. When we solicit gifts from the broader donor community, it will be vital to remain focused on this dual message. If you get back to me in three years, I will let you know how it's working.

EL: I smile at the term "one-time" capital campaign; I think we really mean to say "one-at-a-time" capital campaign. There are those sophisticated, and financially capable, donors who readily and marvelously understand that every few years they will be asked to make a significant gift over and above their annual gift. These donors come through time and time again.

Then, there are those donors who understand our needs but cannot make both a significant capital gift and continue their annual gift. Would it make sense to ask them to consider increasing their gift ten to fifteen percent a year over the next three to five years and applying the increase toward the capital campaign? Also, inexpensive naming opportunities (e.g., buy a brick for a walkway at \$500-\$1,000 a brick) that are payable over a three-year period allow those less capable donors to participate in the capital campaign while keeping sacred the annual gift. Sometimes you can convert a modest annual donor into a rather significant capital donor — at the sacrifice of their

annual gift — and it makes good financial sense to do so.

People respond to challenges. If you can succeed in finding someone, or several people, to issue a challenge for a capital campaign, then there will be people who feel increasingly motivated by the challenge in leveraging their gift. With a capital campaign challenge, the focus may well shift from a "double ask" to "meeting the challenge." If we are really strategically prepared and know our financial needs five years out, we can package our annual and capital needs and make an ask payable over a five-year period that would encompass both.

JL: There is no easy answer to this question. Nor is there any right answer to this question. What I have learned from our recent capital campaign, our first major campaign, is to educate your donors and prospective donors to understand the needs of the organization during a special effort, i.e., that the annual fund is to live and the capital campaign is to grow. This education must be ongoing even when there is an absence of a capital effort. The seasoned donors who have a history of philanthropy understand this well and continue to make their annual gift while paying off their capital pledge. Some donors newer to philanthropy may not fully understand this concept but over time, and with ongoing education from the nonprofit world, I believe they will.

RB: One of the major challenges of telefundraising is keeping good callers motivated. What are some creative incentives to help prevent the perpetual revolving door?

YB: It is vital to recruit callers who are passionate about the theatre. In Los Angeles, we have a large base of aspiring actors and performers, and we recruit through the Hollywood trade publications. In this way, we have callers who speak passionately about the theatre and who are motivated by perks that we can comfortably provide, e.g., tickets to other big shows in town and grand prizes such as a Broadway weekend in New York. I also feel that a caller's hourly wage should be modest and complemented by a strong

monetary incentive program. In this way, callers can't afford *not* to successfully solicit gifts. The goal is to identify, reward and keep your strongest callers, thereby building an effective team.

RB: Are there any other helpful fundraising tips that you have discovered that might be of general interest to the field? Are there better ways of networking so we can share ideas and new approaches to common issues?

YB: I have been at Center Theatre Group for a year and a half and have found the network among development directors at regional theatres pretty dismal. Perhaps it's because I'm new in the theatre field and relationships take time to build? In any case, development seems to be the stepchild department within most theatres — it's a necessary evil. On a national level, development issues seem to be the last topic on the agenda and, "We'll discuss it if we have the time." Our network among development professionals at regional theatres needs to be stronger and more cohesive. As fundraising becomes even more vital to our organizations, development issues will not be ignored, and we will become a more cohesive network and voice within the field.

JL: You ask about ways we can share information. I would welcome the opportunity to have online conversations by creating email or listserv groups. It would allow us to communicate on a regular basis with our colleagues around the country about a variety of issues. This could supplement the live conference calls that TCG organizes from time to time. In fact, this could be a wonderful project for TCG to take on behalf of the field for each discipline in the nonprofit arts.

I would like to end my comments by sharing a wonderful statement that I was reminded of when I went to meet with a longtime corporate donor. I was talking with him at length about some of the extraordinary work that his company was doing in supporting the AIDS crisis in Africa. When talk came back to Roundabout, it seemed a bit trite in the face of what they were trying to accomplish. Here is what he said to me:

George Weissman, then Chairman of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, said in response to a question about why corporations should support the arts, “When all is said and done, it is the art that we remember and honor.” And that is why

we will always have great supporters for the work we do.

RB: Thank you all for sharing your ideas with the field. I quite agree that more communication among the regional theatre development directors would be

enormously helpful for not only learning about how we operate effectively given the ever-evolving new trends and strategies in philanthropy, but for recognizing the commonality of our experiences — both triumphs and challenges.

BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS: THE ONGOING CHALLENGE

BY SUSAN ST. JOHN

A team of Swiss evolutionary biologists conducted an experiment that demonstrates the key role that public recognition plays in motivating people to give. Findings were published in *Science Magazine* dated May 5, 2000.

Scientists designed a game in which each player had to decide how much money he or she wanted to donate to other players. None of the players knew the others' identities so they couldn't set up any direct exchanges of money, gifts or favors to those players who helped them.

The study reconfirmed age-old traditions surrounding philanthropy. First, that helping others can emerge out of a world of selfish genes; second, that moral pressure plays a key role in philanthropy; and third, that we feel cheated when our deeds go unnoticed. The study also found that the players were most likely to give to those who had been generous themselves.

Today, we hear that the transformations of our Information Age will change philanthropy as we know it. Ours is a philanthropy that grew out of the giving of John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie. Instead of tithing, these titans put their vast new wealth to work to improve communities and address social problems.

TODAY'S CHALLENGE

One hundred years later, our challenge is to channel the rewards of this new technology and to capture its staggering wealth. If the nonprofit community can motivate and enlighten those who control this new wealth and technical capability, then we have the chance to solve problems that will advance the health and well-being of everyone on the planet and get us all home for supper on time.

While we see the timeless traditions of philanthropy still performing with success and integrity, real advancements will occur when we effectively mobilize the wealth, the technology and the information networks. Just as 100 years ago, there is tremendous energy in innovation and invention. What's different today?

When John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie and their contemporaries made the decisions, they acted with paternalistic benevolence. Today, we're less tolerant of special interests and support of the status quo. The old paternalistic structure that delivered philanthropy is transforming into a vast network of powerful partnerships. New partnerships strengthened by technology, information systems and a strategic focus represent the exciting wave of the future and will do much to promote profound social transformation. Now, one person's circle of influence is infinite. The unending possibility of connections is awesome and, when put to work, it can create significant change miraculously!

JODY'S SUCCESS

Witness the success of Jody Williams who used today's technology to raise funds and build a voice of advocacy against the use of land mines. From her cozy farm in New England, Williams used email — the same technology available to a vast array of technological titans and ordinary citizens — to give people around the world a voice for significant change.

Within eighteen months, Williams accomplished what would have been impossible one hundred years ago. She sent a message to hundreds of thousands of people across continents and cultures. She gave folks from all walks of life the chance to be informed and to make a difference through personal advocacy and support.

Jody Williams' impact on the land mine issue was recognized and celebrated with unusual alacrity by the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, who awarded her its prize in 1997.

What is wonderful in all of this, perhaps even transformational, is that in this new age of highly evolved philanthropy, great partnerships promoting “the love of mankind” can be forged quickly over great distances and diverse cultures. Most importantly, Williams demonstrated how technology — in the hands of one woman on a farm in New England — could truly change the world.

NEW PARADIGM

The key for us in philanthropy is to align our nonprofit charitable practices with the methodologies and strategic thinking behind

this new wealth. With a new paradigm, there is a very real possibility of providing a quality life for all people.

How can we do this successfully? While the titans of the dot.com world are brilliant, the experience, the knowledge and the expertise of the nonprofit world is essential in a new composite. The recipe for success needs a mix of high-tech skills and dollars along with the nonprofit research and understanding to create the gruel for real transformation. Never before has our role been so important. Today, the nonprofit world must act as the convener and facilitator of global change.

As professionals, we must work the tried and true practices of successful philanthropy using a new language and a new egalitarian approach. While high tech gives everyone a voice in change, the traditional techniques of building strong, lasting partnerships with donors are the taproots of effective fund development. So, though we look at the world with new eyes, we cannot forget to:

- ◆ deliver service, information and experience;
- ◆ inform and build constituency;
- ◆ offer opportunities to give;
- ◆ recognize and celebrate philanthropy;
- ◆ reward and honor the givers.

Above all we must build honest and real relationships with potential donors. The good news is that everyone is a potential major donor in this rich community. Individually and collectively, we have the possibility to change the world as we know it. When we partner, we make it a certainty.

PROBLEM SOLVERS

Through advances of technology, everyone can become truly well-informed about the issues and the problems. Nonprofit organizations will benefit from the addition of effective management practice and increased financial support by seeking connections with new dot.com titans. Using these connections and the new technology, nonprofits will become problem solvers initiating community change in dynamic partnership. Just as before, the best nonprofit advocates/supporters, if highly informed and well stewarded, will become articulate advocates, the real rainmakers throughout our communities.

Who doesn't know about the philanthropy of Bill Gates and Ted Turner? How are they different from Rockefeller and Carnegie? Each embraced a need to give back. All were personally motivated to make the world a better place — to return their share of wealth for the common good. Thanks to technology and effective nonprofit organizations, the philanthropic community of givers and advocates is significantly broader than it was a century ago. Today's donors can rely on and partner with nonprofits to define complex issues and deliver effective solutions.

While our issues and solutions are global, much of philanthropy today is focusing strategically and/or locally with micro-initiatives and community activism. Scrutiny is ever present and the importance of knowledge and skill in program design and delivery critical. Although millions of people now can have a voice, the importance of building and strengthening relationships with new supporters still remains the essential ingredient. Never before have information and data been so key to effective communication.

Jody Williams' success proves that one person can use technology to successfully send a message and motivate people around the globe. If the ingenuity and passion of Jody Williams is magnified with the infusion of dot.com wealth and creativity, imagine what might result!

John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie invested in humanity. Were they operating today, they would capitalize on current technology. (You can bet those libraries would be wired.) Beyond this, operating as venture capitalists, they would look to the network of nonprofit organizations and professionals to provide research, insight and know-how on key issues and the delivery of service and solutions.

Today's world has what they had a century ago — wealth and the desire to share that wealth for the greater good. But today we have more. We have a worldwide nonprofit resource that can direct the enormous fruits of the new technology to work for the greater good. Our vast nonprofit resource will ensure that amid all this technology, we continue to cultivate the personal aspect of philanthropy, and we practice the age-old lesson Jody Williams delivered worldwide: that philanthropic partnerships are still about motivating people. Our new technology is the magical wand to connect us worldwide with millions of diverse people so they too can invest in humanity.

Susan St. John is development and community relations director for the Parks and Trails Council of Minnesota. Previously, she was an account executive for Heartland Financial Group, Ltd., and before that 3/4 for thirteen years 3/4 she served as a development professional with the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum.

This article is reprinted, by permission, from the September 2000 issue of Planned Giving Today® Copyright ©2000. All rights reserved.