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This report is the culmination of a six-month process to conduct the first ever Donor Designation Success Study ("D2S2"). Last year, the Donate Life America (DLA) Board of Directors established a goal of increasing donor designation to 125 million by year-end 2012. To assess and better understand the effectiveness of donor designation efforts among the 51 State Teams and 58 Organ Procurement Organizations, the DLA Board initiated the development of the D2S2. This report reflects the D2S2 results, focusing on donor designation best practices and benchmarking donor designation activities.

D2S2 data was collected primarily through a survey sent this summer to all State Teams and OPOs. In this report, you will find invaluable information on how to increase donor designation, how to avoid common mistakes, and how you and your colleagues are approaching the challenge of increasing donor designation.

As the committee responsible for the study, we believe this is an essential first step in gaining a more complete understanding of what works - and what doesn't - for increasing donor designations in the U.S. As might be expected, there is no "silver bullet" solution to donor designation, and depending on your individual circumstances, some approaches will prove more successful than others and more appropriate for your community. In many ways, for every answer this study provides, a new question emerged. But as we continue the learning process through ongoing analysis of donor designation and collaboration among our organizations, we believe we will make great strides in achieving our goals.

Thank you to all the State Team and OPO participants who took considerable time and effort to complete the study survey, and who shared invaluable information for this study. Your willingness to contribute made this study possible.

And special thanks to the Donate Life America board of directors, who had the vision for this study and whose support was instrumental in its completion.
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Study Overview

The Donor Designation Success Study ("D2S2") had two goals:

1. To better understand which efforts by participating groups (State Teams and OPOs) have had the best success in increasing donor* designation.

2. To benchmark donor designation efforts by participating groups.

While there are many important donation goals, such as conversion rates and the number of overall transplants performed, this study focuses on information related solely to donor designation for two primary reasons. First, this matches the single goal of Donate Life America (to increase donor designation). Second, focusing on one key aspect of the donation process (designation), allowed for a more focused and therefore more effective, study. Information for the study was collected primarily from an electronic survey sent to all 51 State Teams and 58 Organ Procurement Organizations in the U.S. in late September. Forty-two responses were received, including:

* 23 State Team responses
* 19 OPO responses
* more than 100 success stories submitted
* more than 30 “failure” stories submitted

These survey responses provided a wealth of information, and this report provides an overview of that data with a focus on donor designation activities.

QUALITATIVE VS QUANTITATIVE DATA

Early on, the D2S2 steering committee realized that a true empirical study of the causes and effects of increased donor designations may be unrealistic. For example, to truly isolate the causes for differing designation rates in different states would require a substantial research effort that would need to control for such variables as demographic mix, economic circumstances (housing, unemployment, etc.), political climate, cultural variances and more. Rather than taking a global approach to studying differences in donor designation rates across the country, the D2S2 sought a qualitative approach to understanding which efforts are most successful in driving donor designation, as well as benchmarking overall donor designations among State Teams and OPOs.

SURVEY INFORMATION

This report represents the overall findings from the D2S2. Additional survey data, including success stories and failure stories will be available in a special section at DonateLife.net.

* Please note: for clarity’s sake, the word “donation” is used throughout this report as a general term meaning “organ, eye and tissue donation.”
Following are nine success stories selected by the D2S2 steering committee (“the committee”) from the more than 100 submitted in the study survey. These nine were selected as best practices for increasing donor designation and represent efforts by both State Teams and OPOs. The success stories highlighted in this report were selected with the following criteria:

- there was a clear, comprehensive description of the effort
- there was *material* success (the effort really moved the needle)
- there was *demonstrable* success (there was a clear connection between the effort and a resulting increase in donor designation)
- it was a *replacable* success (others could repeat the effort)

In some situations, the success stories reflect efforts that have been used by multiple organizations, and more than one story could have been highlighted. In these situations, the committee tried to select the most representative case study. Other success stories with similar efforts are listed with each case study so organizations can follow up with multiple resources.

For each case study, the following is provided:

- overall description
- results
- keys to success
- challenges
- costs
- staff time
- volunteer time
- contact information
- similar programs and contact information
- a link to download the complete success story submission

COMMON TRAITS

In reviewing the more than 100 success stories submitted, the D2S2 committee saw a number of common traits among those that reflected best-measured successes. Some of these traits reinforce long-held beliefs among donation organizations, while others may provide new insights.

On the following page, seven of the more common and valuable traits are described. These common traits can be found among the nine success stories featured in this report, and the most relevant are listed with each. By outlining these traits, the hope is that organizations can not only gain success by replicating these programs, but can also apply the underlying dynamics to other programs or new efforts as well.
COMMON SUCCESS TRAITS

**Networks of trust**
In a “network of trust,” select supporters who are passionate about the cause of donation have existing trust with a much wider audience, and become effective messengers to carry the donation message to the wider audience. For state teams and OPOs, leveraging these supporters can be more effective than communicating directly with the wider audience. Examples could include hospital staff, student advocates, affinity group leaders or even DMV staff. (See “Hospital Donor Registry Challenge” on pgs 11-12).

**Affinity group**
In a similar vein, targeting affinity groups can improve the impact of donor designation efforts by tapping into the common cause/theme/connection of the group. (See “Univision Phone Bank” on pgs 19-20).

**Relevant messages**
Like any marketing communications effort, finding a way to promote your cause in a way that is relevant to your audience is critical to success. This is also important when targeting affinity groups: just because the group has a connection among its members doesn’t mean they have a connection with donation. The best efforts tie the message of donation to the affinity in some way. (See “Silver Fox Campaign” on pgs 15-16).

**Real stories**
Not surprisingly, featuring the stories of those most impacted by donation - such as recipients or donor families - adds an emotional component that helps many people move beyond fears or apathy to become designated donors. In some cases, featuring the disheartening side of donation - such as profiling those waiting for a transplant, or even those who died waiting - can send an even more powerful message. (See “Patient Waiting Story” on pgs 13-14).

**Tap emotion/investment/energy**
One of the reasons leveraging affinity groups and real stories (such as donor recipients as volunteers) works is the passion those individuals may employ in promoting the cause. Finding that passion in other ways, such as working with college students who tend to be more socially/politically active, can have a similar impact. (See “SUNY Student Campaign” on pgs 7-8).

**Research drives insights**
Conducting research, whether a study of a demographic segment’s views on donation or surveying customers at a Driver’s License station, can lead to valuable new insights on opportunities to increase donor designation or ongoing evaluation of what is working. (See “DMV Ambassador Program” on pgs 9-10).

**Integrated efforts**
In these days of social media and digital communications, using variable channels to deliver messages and connect with audiences will likely increase the effectiveness of donor designation efforts (See “Motorcyclists Campaign” on pgs 21-22).
Success Story: SUNY Student Campaign

Center for Donation & Transplant, NY

DESCRIPTION
Each year, the Center for Donation & Transplant, NY (CDT) sponsors an undergraduate communications course at the State University of New York at Albany. Students taking the semester-long practicum develop a campaign to promote donor designation for the “client,” CDT. The campaign targets fellow students on campus and the class is given a set number of designations they must achieve. To help prepare the class for the effort, CDT representatives meet with the instructor each year prior to the class to discuss the project, and the first two classes feature speakers on donor designation. First, students hear from the CEO of CDT and communications leaders about the organization and the cause. In the second class, students hear from volunteers who have been affected by organ donation, such as donor family members or a transplant recipient. According to Lauren Quinn, who leads the effort, it’s the second class that really energizes the students. “College students are typically more active in causes than others, and when they hear the stories behind donor designation, that natural energy pours out,” she says.

Students have a semester to develop and implement the campaign, and the cohorts, which typically range from 25-30 students, usually break into different subgroups to focus on different aspects of the campaign, such as advertising, sponsorship and social media. Past campaigns have leveraged public relations, advertising, tabling, social media, events and interactive marketing. The campaigns are limited to the SUNY campus both to avoid conflict with other CDT efforts that may be going on in the community, and because experience has shown the classes tend to have greater success when they focus on an audience with which they have an affinity (other students).

RESULTS
The program, which has been run by CDT for the past five years since the original grant supporting it closed, regularly brings in 1,000 or more donor designations, as measured by signed registry cards. According to Quinn, that represents both the highest number of designations among the various public education efforts managed by CDT, as well as the highest return on investment. She says that one of the most successful efforts by students revolved around a student donor from the university who had been shot and killed. The class received permission from the family to highlight her story to receive local press and campus awareness on the issue of donation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:
- Network of trust
- Tap emotion/investment/energy
- Real stories
- Affinity group

“College students are typically more active in causes than others, and when they hear the stories behind donor designation, that natural energy pours out,” she says.
Success Story: SUNY Student Campaign

Center for Donation & Transplant, NY

**KEYS TO SUCCESS:**
- tapping into the natural enthusiasm and activism of college students.
- introducing the benefits and challenges of donation to students through the stories of those who have been impacted by donation.
- limiting the campaign to the campus, which allows the students to leverage their affinity and understanding of the target audience (other students).
- initiating the class and providing funding ensures that the opportunity will exist each year (as opposed to having to share the role of class "client" with other cause organizations).

**CHALLENGES:**
- as college students, the class participants tend to procrastinate, which can make it hard for them to activate some of their best ideas (e.g. waiting too long to find a volunteer to speak at a campus event).
- for Quinn, knowing that some of the ideas will not work, or seeing how disorganization will dampen the class efforts, but having to sit back and let them learn on their own.
- while CDT has maintained a strong relationship with SUNY-Albany, it has been difficult to find other universities that will allow a similar, single-sponsorship class.

**COSTS:**
$9,000 - cost of instructor’s salary and campaign expenses for class (the class was initially developed by the New York state team with a grant in 2002, but now is funded by a sponsorship by CDT)

**STAFF TIME:**
6-8 hours each program year

**VOLUNTEER TIME:**
2-4 hours (for speaking to class)

**FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:**
Lauren Quinn
Center for Donation & Transplant, NY
lquinn@cdtny.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION [HERE].
Success Story: DMV Ambassador Program

Donate Life North Carolina

DESCRIPTION

In 2009, Donate Life North Carolina (DLNC) introduced a comprehensive ambassador program aimed at leaders and staff of the 100 driver’s license offices across the state, as well as 14 district supervisors, three regional chiefs and other state DMV personnel. More than 75 volunteers were trained to be ambassadors to these audiences. Ambassadors “adopted” their local driver’s license offices, making quarterly visits to deliver materials and thank-you cards, providing information and answering questions, and showing examiners how much DLNC valued their efforts. (DLNC leadership were assigned as ambassadors to state DMV leadership.) After each visit, the ambassadors completed and returned a visit report to DLNC so appropriate follow-up could be completed by DLNC staff. This reporting helped create an ongoing feedback-loop for constant monitoring of the situation at DMV offices across the state.

As part of the ambassador program in 2010 and 2011, examiner and DMV customer surveys were conducted to better understand how the question of donor designation was being handled. This proved invaluable to DLNC in better understanding the DMV dynamic, and helped show that having examiners proactively ask about donor designation had a demonstrable impact on actual designations (see results section).

One of the keys to this program was the extensive training given to DMV ambassadors, most of whom are transplant recipients. A training curriculum was developed that includes a two-hour initial training session, a training manual (English and Spanish versions), and tools (such as name tags and tote bags). Special attention is given to how to build relationships with the DMV audience and how to properly complete the after-visit reports.

RESULTS

While data restrictions make it difficult to determine the exact impact of this program on donor designations, survey results show the positive impact of the effort and have unveiled invaluable insights.

- In 2011, 77% of DMV customers reported being asked about donation, versus 66% in 2010. This is especially important because based on the survey responses, being asked about donation by an examiner is the strongest predictor of registration.
- Of those who said they were asked about donation by an examiner, 65% said they registered, while only 37% of those who were not asked said they registered.
- In 2010, 90% of examiners said they felt comfortable asking customers about donation, a significant increase from 2009.
- The percentage of examiners who have concerns about donation has declined from 14% in 2008 to 9% in 2010.
- In 2010, 90% of examiners had met a transplant recipient or donor family member, up from 85% the previous year. This is important because data shows that if an examiner has personally met an organ recipient or donor family member, that will have a positive impact on the examiner’s attitudes regarding their donation-related job responsibilities.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:
Network of trust
Research drives insights
Integrated effort
Real stories
SUCCESS STORY: DMV Ambassador Program

KEYS TO SUCCESS:
• using research, both from the after-visit reports and the examiner/customer surveys, allows for insights and continual improvement of DMV efforts.
• comprehensive training for volunteers, including training materials and ongoing assistance.
• showing designation data by office to local DMV leaders and staff inspires them to improve to achieve better results.

CHALLENGES:
• volunteer retention can be difficult, given that many DMV ambassadors are transplant recipients who may become ill.
• isolating the actual impact of this program on donor designations has been difficult, though examiner and customer surveys help demonstrate the correlation between more engaged DMV staff and higher rates of designation.
• initially, incentives and rewards were given to DMV staff to help demonstrate gratitude and award offices for successfully increasing designations. However, this was eventually deemed to be against state regulations, so it had to be discontinued.

COSTS:
2009 - $150,000
2010 - $100,000
2011 - $100,000

Costs are primarily for research and personnel. In 2009, there were initial costs for development of materials and displays.

STAFF TIME:
Initially 1,000 hours annually, but with addition of other elements (such as DMV Awards Program), currently closer to 1,500 hours annually.

VOLUNTEER TIME:
Roughly 1,100 hours a year for volunteers to serve as ambassadors.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Katie Paulson
DLNC
KPaulson@DonateLifeNC.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS (CLICK TO DOWNLOAD):
Frontline Staff Engagement Program
LifeCenter Northwest - Washington

DMV Donor Registry Coordinator Program
New England Organ Bank - New Hampshire
Donor Network of Arizona

DESCRIPTION
In the summer of 2011, Donor Network of Arizona (DNA) partnered with the Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association (AzHHA) to create the Hospital Donor Registry Challenge. The program kicked-off with an introductory letter to all hospital CEOs in the AzHHA network asking them to enroll their organization in the Challenge. Team leaders for each of the 31 participating hospitals were provided with a set of materials to support their organization’s efforts, including t-shirts, lapel pins, life preserver stress rings, tumblers and more, all featuring a campaign logo. Each hospital was responsible for determining its own efforts. Most chose to focus first on registering their own staff members, and many set up tables in cafeterias, lobbies or community events to approach patients, visitors and community members.

For the competition, hospitals were divided into groups based on bed count, and emails were sent to team leaders every other week with updates on current designation statistics for each participating organization, as well as to share best practices. The competition ran two months and culminated in an award ceremony at DNA’s annual Donation Celebration event. Winners were acknowledged in each hospital group for most designations attained, most collaborative effort and most creative effort.

RESULTS
Having tried challenge programs with the three main Arizona universities in the past, DNA decided to set a stretch-goal of 5,000 new designations for the Hospital Donor Registry Challenge. The final results were 5,200 new designations, which were tracked from both a drop-down menu on the DNA Web site (which allowed for designation by hospital) or from hard copy forms turned in by competing hospitals.

The Hospital Donor Registry Challenge led to 5,200 new donor designations.
Success Story: Hospital Donor Registry Challenge

Donor Network of Arizona

KEYS TO SUCCESS:
• highlighting the participants’ designation count on a regular basis really helped stoke the competitive spirit among the hospitals.
• allowing the hospitals to be creative and run with their own ideas helped with participation and drive better results.
• hospitals that built an ongoing, consistent effort, such as staffing a table in one place for the same hours each day, helped build familiarity for those in the organization making it easier for them to engage.

CHALLENGES:
• sustaining the effort for two months was difficult for participants. Future efforts will focus on a one-month timeframe.
• initiating communications to hospitals sooner would have given them more time to prepare for the actual competition. Future efforts will begin communications in January for the competition to run in April.

COSTS:
$3,300 - cost of campaign materials
(Many of the campaign materials, such as donor designation forms and pens, were already available for use.)

STAFF TIME:
200 hours

VOLUNTEER TIME:
400 hours (includes time by volunteers to participate in individual hospital efforts)

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Annie Jennings
Donor Network of Arizona
annie@dnaz.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS (CLICK TO DOWNLOAD):
Hospital Challenge Campaign
Donate Life Louisiana
Donate Life Texas Registry Challenge
LifeGift - Texas
Transplant Center Challenge
California State Team
Success Story: Patient Waiting Story

Gift of Life Michigan

DESCRIPTION
In the past, Gift of Life Michigan has typically focused on stories of donors or those who have received organ transplants to help promote donation. In 2010, a former Gift of Life volunteer, Kerry Hutchins, was facing a life or death battle with cystic fibrosis, having been placed on a respirator at the University of Michigan Medical Center to wait for a lung transplant. The 33-year-old wife and mother of two wanted to share her story to help raise awareness for the need for organ donors, and she approached Gift of Life to help tell her story. Over the course of three visits to the hospital, Gift of Life staffers shot videos of Kerry, who told her story with spirit, clarity and inspiration. Gift of Life contacted the Grand Rapids Press, from Kerry’s hometown, to tell her story, and the paper wrote a front-page feature article about her situation. The videos were made available on the newspaper’s Web site and on YouTube. Three weeks after shooting the final video, Kerry died while still waiting for a lung transplant. The Press continued to cover Kerry’s story, even after she passed, and other media outlets picked up on the story as well. The videos of Kerry continue to be used by Gift of Life on their Web site and in presentations.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:
Real stories
Tap emotion/investment/energy
Use relevant messages

RESULTS
The posting of Kerry’s videos and the coverage by the media resulted in 400-500 new donor registrations in the week following the first story. Overall, more than 900 donor designations can be tied to Kerry’s story, as measured by a drop-down menu on the OPO’s Web site that allows registrants to select where they heard about donation with such terms as “Kerry Hutchins” and “Grand Rapids Press.” More than a year after Kerry’s story was first published, registrants are still indicating they’ve signed up because of her story. To see the end product, go to http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvTBKqdGp0

Overall, more than 900 donor designations can be tied to Kerry’s story...
Success Story: Patient Waiting Story

Gift of Life Michigan

KEYS TO SUCCESS:

• telling the compelling story of someone waiting for an organ transplant. Unfortunately, it’s probably fair to say that more people were moved to register because Kerry didn’t make it (seeing that not everyone survives the wait for an organ transplant demonstrates the urgency and severity of the problem).

• the subject of the story had a powerful personality and was passionate and articulate about the issue of donation.

• pitching the story to the media using a local angle (Kerry was from Grand Rapids) helped engage the newspaper.

• the University of Michigan Medical Center had a champion for donation who understood the need and wanted to help with telling Kerry’s story.

CHALLENGES:

• it can be hard to locate people who are willing to be the subject of such a story, when the positive outcome of a transplant isn’t a guarantee, or finding a willing subject who’s well-spoken and compelling when telling the story.

• finding a transplant center that is willing to be part of the story. Many are fearful of being associated with a story that could have a negative outcome for their patient (even though a patient dying while waiting for a transplant is not the fault of the hospital).

COSTS:

$2,200 - for Flip Camera originally used to record video of Kerry, production costs (for higher-end video work) and copies of CDs.

STAFF TIME:

40-50 hours

VOLUNTEER TIME:

6-8 hours of interviews/visits with Kerry.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Tim Makinen
Gift of Life Michigan
tmakinngiftoflifemichigan.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.
DESCRIPTION
In 2005, staff at Intermountain Donor Services (IDS) discovered that registry data showed a dramatic drop in donor designation rates for those 50 years and older. When staff encountered those in that age range at community events or health fairs, they often heard challenges to the idea of registering to be an organ donor: “you don’t want my organs, I’m too old.” Further investigation revealed that this type of “self-exclusion” was the top reason older people didn’t register to become donors, as opposed to other reasons such as discomfort with or lack of education on the cause.

“To us, that looked like low-hanging fruit,” says Alex McDonald, Director, Public Education/Public Relations at IDS. “They didn’t have any real hang-ups about donation, so we thought if we could just correct this misperception, we’d have some luck increasing designation in this age group.”

IDS developed a television campaign that initially featured Lavell Edwards, the popular football coach at Brigham Young University, who touted the cause of donation and highlighted different kinds of heroes in life, such as Ed Nelson, a 79-year old who saved two lives with donation. Future ads featured an adult son discussing the death of his father and his surprise that even at his father’s age, he was able to donate his organs, and how that had saved three lives. The television spots were supported by newspaper advertising, DMV posters and visits to area senior centers. The campaign has run continuously from 2005 until 2011.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:
Research drives insights
Use relevant messages
Integrated effort

RESULTS
Donor designations among those over 50 have continued to rise over the five years the campaign has run, with the following increases in designation (showing percentage of those in each age group who are registered donors):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-74</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campaign also had a positive impact on consent rates for the same age groups.
Success Story: Silver Fox Campaign

KEYS TO SUCCESS:

- delivering a message targeted specifically to this audience helped reduce confusion and increase awareness and acceptance of donor designation.
- donation is also more relevant to this age group, who are more likely to be open to considering topics related to their own mortality.
- using a celebrity spokesperson who also fit the same demographic as the targeted audience.
- given smaller size of Salt Lake City, visits to senior centers helped build word of mouth to support the television spots.

CHALLENGES:

- continually finding funds to support the effort at the right level.
- did not have much success finding partners or sponsors for the effort. For example, continued pursuit of AARP did not lead to any engagement.

COSTS:

- $30,000 - initial year, covering ad production and placement
- $40,000 - 50,000 - each subsequent year, for placement

STAFF TIME:

- 100 hours annually (primarily for visits to senior centers)

VOLUNTEER TIME:

- 75-100 hours annually (primarily for visits to senior centers)

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Alex McDonald
Intermountain Donor Services
alex@idslife.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.
Success Story: Employee Advertising Campaign

Iowa Donor Network

DESCRIPTION
As part of a campaign promoting donation in 2002, the Iowa Donor Network (IDN) had run television advertising featuring transplant recipients and donors, with no noticeable impact on donor designation. Inspired by a telecommunications company spot that was running at the time which featured the company’s employees, IDN decided to take a similar tack with its next spot. IDN employees were interviewed on tape and asked to describe what they liked about their job, what they liked about the organization’s mission, and other questions. After focus groups showed that viewers were drawn to the employee stories, portions of the most compelling interviews were then pulled together in a television spot that ran in 2004.

“"This really just flew in the face of everything we thought we knew about telling the donation story through those most impacted by it, such as donor families or recipients,” says Paul Sodders, Public Affairs Manager for IDN. “We were skeptical in featuring our own employees, so we really didn’t see the success coming at all.”

Sodders says that IDN tried to keep as many elements of the spots as consistent as they could, such as always having an upbeat message or using the same call to action. He said the only real difference between the ads were the people telling the story.

“The focus group participants said they liked seeing the people who worked at IDN and how caring they were, but honestly, we’re not really sure why the employee-oriented ads resonated while the others didn’t,” says Sodders. “But the results were clear in showing they had a real impact on donor designation.

RESULTS
By comparing donor designations during the commercial run to the same timeframe immediately before the advertising, as well as to the previous year, IDN showed designations grew from roughly 800 per month to more than 2,000 per month during the time the employee-oriented spot ran. The spots featuring other subjects garnered no noticeable increases in designation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:
Real stories
Research drives insights

“This really just flew in the face of everything we thought we knew about telling the donation story.”
Success Story: Employee Advertising Campaign

KEYS TO SUCCESS:
• using focus groups to test the employee-focused spots helped validate the direction, allowing IDN to feel comfortable running spots that turned out to be very successful.
• the campaign budget was among the largest IDN had ever used, and they believe concentrating such a big budget at one time had a greater impact than spreading the promotion over time with smaller placements.
• IDN was able to leverage its status as a cause organization to get a bargain on media placement costs, and television stations used the spots to fill open time slots at no cost.

CHALLENGES:
• finding and designating so much money was difficult, given that the OPO had never attempted anything on that scale previously.
• employee participation had to be handled delicately, so those interviewed knew they might not make the final cut. Agreements were used that allowed IDN to continue to use the spots even if a featured employee left the organization.
• the unanticipated success of the employee-oriented spot led to administrative difficulties in handling the flood of new designations.

COSTS:
$300,000 - covered the cost of the television spot production, creative agency fees and the media placement for the two years of the campaign.

STAFF TIME:
12 hours

VOLUNTEER TIME:
None

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Paul Sodders
Iowa Donor Network
psodders@iadn.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS (CLICK TO DOWNLOAD):
Black Hills Campaign
DonateLife - South Dakota
Success Story: Univision Phone Bank

LifeGift

**DESCRIPTION**
In 2011, LifeGift in Houston hosted a live phone bank on the local Univision television affiliate to answer questions about organ and tissue donation and to register people for the Donate Life Texas Registry. Phones were managed by volunteers who took calls from viewers and helped them register on the spot. During the phone bank, Univision anchors interviewed several volunteers who were members of donor families, transplant recipients, or those on the waiting list. Hosting the phone bank required finding bilingual volunteers for the effort and adequately training them on the issue of donation. Bilingual collateral materials and registration forms were also developed to mail out to viewers who required more information.

**KEY TAKEAWAYS:**
- Affinity group
- Use relevant messages
- Real stories
- Tap emotion/investment/energy

According to Elvia Valdez, PR and Multicultural Outreach Coordinator at LifeGift, the key to the event was the relationship the OPO had developed with Univision. Over the last two years, Elvia and her team pitched numerous stories on donation to the station, and helped show how, considering that the majority of Texans on the waiting list for a transplant are Hispanic, the issue was so important to their audience.

“We’ve pitched the idea of a phone bank to other stations, but it never took hold,” says Valdez. “By building this relationship through giving the station exclusives and constantly tying the issue of donation back to the Hispanic audience they served, we really made it an issue for them.”

**RESULTS**
Roughly 240 phone calls were taken during the 5.5 hour phone bank and 160 people were registered as an organ, eye or tissue donor.

“By building this relationship through giving the station exclusives and constantly tying the issue of donation back to the Hispanic audience they served, we really made it an issue for them.”
Success Story: Univision Phone Bank

KEYS TO SUCCESS:

- building a relationship with the television station before the phone bank by tying the issue of donation to their affinity group – their Hispanic audience – and keeping the issue in front of them on an ongoing basis.
- picking the right volunteers for the phone bank. It helps to find those with compelling stories who are articulate and passionate, and who can speak to the issue of donation.
- the phone bank included a local Hispanic celebrity (a popular TV host in Mexico) whose father has received an organ transplant. Having the celebrity on-air and taking calls help drive up interest and further connect the cause to the Hispanic audience.

CHALLENGES:

- a similar phone bank was held in 2010, but for that event, information was taken from callers, who then had to be sent organ donor packets. This caused an administrative nightmare for LifeGift and its volunteers. For the 2011 phone bank, volunteers were able to register callers while on the phone through the online registry (which does not require a signature in Texas).
- it can be difficult to find the right volunteers who can manage the phones, who have compelling stories, who can speak clearly on the issue, and, in this case, who are Hispanic.

COSTS:

$2,100 - covering brochures and collateral materials, copies, food for volunteers, and parking.

STAFF TIME:

15-20 hours

VOLUNTEER TIME:

88 hours

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Elvia Valdez
LifeGift
Evaldez@lifegift.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.
DESCRIPTION

In 2009, Lifeline of Ohio targeted a unique affinity group: motorcycle enthusiasts. Staffers knew motorcyclists had a reputation as a charitable group, so they began with extensive research to help determine the best way to motivate this audience. Focus groups and interviews with key influencers among the audience turned up a number of important insights, including that motorcyclists as a group had a lower donor designation rate than the general population, that there were two key types of motorcycle groups (“cruisers” and “sport bikers”) that would require different approaches, and that the term “organ donor” was a negative term used among cyclists for those who drove recklessly. Further research confirmed the group’s reputation as charitable, and also showed that sixty percent of cyclists were college-educated, and that the group was more affluent than the overall population. Using these insights, Lifeline created the “Live On. Ride On.” campaign, with the message that motorcyclists could ride on, even after death, by giving the gift of life. Elements included outreach to group leaders through the research and feedback process, custom materials such as brochures, patches and t-shirts, video and written stories of motorcyclists with a connection to donation, counter signs for use at retail locations, a campaign landing page on the Lifeline Web site, a campaign Facebook page and Twitter handle, and staffed booths at 35 local cycling events.

RESULTS

Lifeline set an aggressive goal of converting 5% of central and southeast Ohio motorcycle enthusiasts to registered organ donors (12,250 people). After the first three years of the four-year license cycle, 6,143 additional motorcyclists are now registered as organ donors in the targeted area (as measured by actual designations).

In addition, events included in the motorcycle campaign generated five times more registrants per hour than the average Lifeline of Ohio event (1.29 registrants per hour of event for this campaign vs. .27 per hour at other events). More than 3,300 patches and 2,250 t-shirts were distributed, 98 people follow the Facebook page, and more than 315 people follow the campaign Twitter feed. The campaign landing page had the longest “time per visit” of any page on the Lifeline Web site (average of 15 minutes), and the entire Web site saw a 59% increase in user traffic during the summer of 2010 compared to the summer of 2009, which saw a 66% increase in traffic over the summer of 2008 (the campaign ran from May through October in 2009, 2010 and 2011, though results are not yet available for the 2011 phase.)

KEY TAKEAWAYS:

- Research drives insights
- Affinity group
- Integrated effort
- Use relevant messages

Lifeline of Ohio
Success Story: Motorcyclists Campaign

KEYS TO SUCCESS:
- in-depth research led to valuable insights and strategies for connecting with the target audience.
- key to that connection was finding a way to make the cause of donation relevant to the audience (by addressing the stigma of the term “organ donor” used by motorcyclists, and by telling stories of those in the group who had been impacted by donation).
- engaging members of the target audience in the research phase was critical to understanding the audience, to also help build buy-in and enthusiasm for the campaign once it launched.

CHALLENGES:
- it took a lot of effort to truly understand this affinity group and how to connect with it.
- struggled initially with how best to integrate the cause with a group or movement that already existed, rather than reinvent the wheel with something new.

COSTS:
$78,000 - giveaways, communications materials and PR agency fees for research, planning and implementation

STAFF TIME:
a lot (did not measure)

VOLUNTEER TIME:
100 hours (for 2009 and 2010 efforts)

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Heather Blausey
Lifeline of Ohio
hblausey@lifelineofohio.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.
LifeSource

Success Story: Driver’s Education Program

DESCRIPTION

In 2002, the Minnesota state legislature passed a law mandating all driver’s education programs include information on donation. It wasn’t until 2007, however, thanks to the work of a group of inspired high school students, that LifeSource was able to fully capitalize on the legislation. The high school students, of their own accord, took up the cause of donation and lobbied legislators in 2006 to strengthen the 2002 law by mandating at least 30 minutes of donation information be provided in each Minnesota driver’s education program.

“We’d tried to pass a similar law previously and never had success,” said Jeff Richert, community advocacy coordinator for LifeSource. “The only reason it passed was because of the passion of those students, which had a huge impact on the legislators.”

The 30-minute requirement became law on January 1, 2007, which gave a boost to the comprehensive driver’s education instructor outreach program LifeSource had implemented five years earlier. Every other year, instructors receive a letter reminding them of the requirement to provide 30 minutes of instruction on donation, and providing an order form for available resources. Those resources include a DVD that follows a donation story from the organ donor to the recipient, a booklet for students, and a PowerPoint presentation. In addition to the informational resources, Richert and a team of volunteers speak to roughly 20 driver’s education classes a month across Minnesota. Finally, LifeSource staff attend an annual conference of driver’s education instructors to provide further information and support.

RESULTS

Data provided by the state beginning in 2006 allows LifeSource to see donor designation rates by age group. According to the data, those receiving driver’s education after the new 30-minute mandate was instituted in 2007 show a significantly higher designation rate than the groups that passed through driver’s education before the new law. The most recent group for which there is data, those aged 18-19 in 2010, has a donor designation rate of 68%, while the groups that passed through driver’s education over the prior 35 years averaged a donor designation rate of 50%.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:

Real stories
Tap emotion/investment/energy
Integrated effort

The 30-minute requirement became law on January 1, 2007, which gave a boost to the comprehensive driver’s education instructor outreach program LifeSource had implemented five years earlier. Every other year, instructors receive a letter reminding them of the requirement to provide 30 minutes of instruction on donation, and providing an order form for available resources. Those resources include a DVD that follows a donation story from the organ donor to the recipient, a booklet for students, and a PowerPoint presentation. In addition to the informational resources, Richert and a team of volunteers speak to roughly 20 driver’s education classes a month across Minnesota. Finally, LifeSource staff attend an annual conference of driver’s education instructors to provide further information and support.
KEYS TO SUCCESS:

- the work of the high school students to help pass the 30-minute mandate was critical to the success of the program. Without it, driver’s education instructors would have less incentive to use the donation information provided by LifeSource.
- making the various elements of the program turn-key for instructors, so they are as easy as possible to order and use in classes.

CHALLENGES:

- reaching driver’s education classes in rural Minnesota and urban centers can be difficult.
- driver’s education classes skew toward upper-income families, so the program may be missed by many lower-income students.
- the economic downturn has dramatically lowered the number of students taking driver’s education classes, reducing the impact of the donation information program.
- without audits by the state, there is no real way to manage or track driver’s education instructor participation or compliance with the law.
- Two other states in the LifeSource service area, North Dakota and South Dakota, are not affected by the Minnesota law and require their own legislation or plan to mandate donation education.

COSTS:

$5,000 annually - includes costs to reprint materials, mileage reimbursement and other miscellaneous expenses.

STAFF TIME:

25-30 hours per month

VOLUNTEER TIME:

25 hours per month

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jeff Richert
LifeSource
jrichert@life-source.org

DOWNLOAD THE SUBMITTED SUCCESS STORY SUBMISSION HERE.

SIMILAR PROGRAMS (CLICK TO DOWNLOAD):

Driver's Education Program
New Mexico State Team

Student Education Research
North Carolina State Team
In addition to submitting more than 100 success stories, D2S2 participants also provided more than 30 “failure” stories. While these donor designation efforts failed to meet their intended goals in any number of ways, as much can be learned from these stories as from the successful efforts. Those willing to look beyond the “failure” of their efforts and share their learnings through this study should be applauded, and the committee encourages the continued collaboration around what works - and what doesn’t - in fostering innovation and advancing the cause of donation.

Rather than highlight the worst (or best) “failure” stories, this report provides an overview of some of the key learnings from a review of all of the submissions. You may review all submitted “failure” stories by downloading this PDF.

LEARNING FROM FAILURE

Context matters

Simply targeting large groups or audiences with the donor designation message doesn’t necessarily lead to high volumes of designation. The context of the situation and the relevance of the message can make or break donor designation efforts. For example, setting up a booth at a large community holiday event may make sense from the perspective of approaching a large number of people, but the festive nature of the situation precludes many from wanting to learn more about the serious issue of donation.

Preaching to the choir

While leveraging those who have been impacted by donation, or whom have a passion for the cause, can be effective in reaching a larger audience, focusing directly on those already engaged in the cause rarely leads to significant increases in donor designation.

Affinity groups without an affinity for donation

As mentioned earlier, it seems natural to target large affinity groups - based on common demographics, hobbies, organizational affiliations (e.g. students and alumni of a university) or more - given their existing connection to one another. However, just because a group has an affinity among its members doesn’t mean the members have an affinity for the cause of donation. Without making donation relevant to the group in some way, it will be difficult to drive significant donor designation.

ROI matters

Large, expensive efforts to drive donor designation that don’t result in material, demonstrable increases in designation may do more damage than good. In terms of opportunity costs, how could those resources be used in other ways to better effect? Developing clear goals and a means for measuring results will help organizations choose between what works and what doesn’t. One useful approach could be designating programs using the following categories:

Best practices - those efforts that drive demonstrable donor designation

Necessary practices - those efforts that are not explicitly designed to demonstrably drive donor designation increases in the short term, but that are needed to support such efforts in the long term (for example, implementation of an online registry)

Favorite practices - those that provide strong anecdotal feedback, or that “have always been done,” but which provide little or no results
A number of questions in the D2S2 Survey were related to the organizational structures of State Teams and OPOs, as well as how organizations prioritize budgets related to donor designation. Here is some of the data from those questions:

**How many of the following organizations are active on your state team?**

Of the 21 **State Teams** responding to this question:

- 21 had at least one OPO active
- 19 had at least one eye bank active
- 17 had the DMV active
- 10 had at least one tissue bank active
- 7 had at least one donor hospital active
- 6 had at least one transplant center active
- 5 had the state hospital association active
- 4 had NKF active

Other active participants on State Teams listed included state departments of health and education, private foundations, the American Red Cross and local blood donor groups, donor family members and recipients, and state legislators.

Of the 14 **OPOs** responding to this question:

- 14 had at least one OPO active
- 10 had at least one eye bank active
- 10 had at least one tissue bank active
- 9 had the DMV active
- 6 had the state hospital association active
- 5 had at least one transplant center active
- 5 had NKF active
- 4 had at least one donor hospital active

Other active participants on State Teams listed included state departments of health, private foundations, the American Red Cross and local blood donor groups, the American Liver Foundation, the Roman Catholic Diocese, and donor family members and recipients.

**Does your state currently have a State Team that is active in increasing donor designation?**

Of the 19 OPOs responding:

- 13 responded yes
**Organizational Structure Feedback**

**Where does funding for the State Team come from?**
Of the 21 State Teams responding to this question:

- 9 indicated funding primarily from OPO(s)
- 4 indicated funding is split among members
- 3 indicated funding primarily from state government
- 2 indicated funding from state income tax check-off and driver’s license renewal check-off
- 2 indicated no direct funding
- 1 indicated a mix of funding (state, member dues, etc.)

**What has your OPO’s participation level been in the State Team?**
Of the 14 OPOs responding to this question:

- 13 responded High
- 1 responded Medium

**Does your OPO contribute financially to the State Team?**
Of the 14 OPOs responding to this question:

- 7 indicated they contributed financially on an ongoing basis
- 7 indicated they contributed financially on an occasional basis

**How many full-time equivalent staff members (FTEs) does your organization dedicate to increasing donor designation?**
Of the 18 OPOs responding:

- 3 indicated 1-2
- 10 indicated 3-5
- 5 indicated 6 or more

Of the 21 State Teams responding:

- 12 indicated 0
- 7 indicated 1-2
- 2 indicated 3 or more

**What are your three highest expense categories for donor designation?**
Of the 20 OPOs who answered this question, the number who indicated an expense category represented 20% or more of their total donor designation costs:

- 9 - Promotional campaigns
- 8 - DMV programs
- 6 - Youth programs/education
- 5 - Events
- 3 - Educational/communications/website or materials (non-campaign)
- 2 - Volunteer Management
- 1 - College outreach
- 1 - Media relations
- 1 - Support of State Team
In the D2S2 Survey, participants were asked 16 questions about their donor designation efforts, reflecting more than 70 different options for how efforts could be conducted. The resulting data provides a first-of-its kind benchmark of how State Teams and OPOs around the U.S. are approaching donor designation.

**HOW TO READ THE CHARTS**
The charts on the following pages show the percentage of survey respondents who indicated the frequency levels of “Ongoing,” “Occasionally,” “Rarely” or “Never” to various donor designation activities.

The charts reflect the answers of the 41 State Teams and OPOs who responded to the survey. In the vast majority of cases, all 41 recipients answered the question (i.e. N=41). In a few cases, not all 41 respondents provided an answer. Because the value of these charts is found in comparing the adoption of various donor designation efforts among a limited set of respondents, rather than in absolute terms for the whole universe of potential respondents, the individual N for each chart is not provided.

Please note: Due to the survey software rounding calculations, chart percentage totals often result in 99% or 101%. Rather than alter the actual responses to achieve an exact 100% total, the D2S2 committee chose to keep the responses accurate.

**EXAMPLE**
The following pie chart shows how survey recipients responded to the question, “For youth education programs, have you pursued any of the following in the last 3 years?” For the answer, “Elementary/Junior High,”

- 20% of respondents pursued an activity on an “ongoing” basis
- 15% of respondents pursued an activity “occasionally”
- 38% of respondents pursued an activity “rarely”
- 28% of respondents have never pursued an activity

All charts can be read in a similar manner. In addition to these charts, a few pullout statistics from the survey are also included on the following pages.
Donor Designation Activities

Youth Education Programs

Elementary/Junior High
- Never: 20%
- Rarely: 15%
- Occasionally: 38%
- Ongoing: 28%

High School
- Never: 5%
- Rarely: 28%
- Occasionally: 67%
- Ongoing: 5%

Post-secondary
- Never: 13%
- Rarely: 10%
- Occasionally: 44%
- Ongoing: 33%

DMV Efforts

Manager training
- Never: 5%
- Rarely: 7%
- Occasionally: 20%
- Ongoing: 68%

Clerk training
- Never: 5%
- Rarely: 10%
- Occasionally: 15%
- Ongoing: 70%

Volunteers in DMV
- Never: 15%
- Rarely: 8%
- Occasionally: 28%
- Ongoing: 50%

Materials in DMV
- Never: 7%
- Rarely: 93%

DMV recognition
- Never: 10%
- Rarely: 5%
- Occasionally: 32%
- Ongoing: 54%

Official DMV relationship
- Never: 36%
- Rarely: 15%
- Occasionally: 8%
- Ongoing: 41%

Other
- Never: 28%
- Rarely: 11%
- Occasionally: 17%
- Ongoing: 44%
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Donor Designation Activities

Promotional campaigns

- **Paid advertising**
  - 5% Never
  - 10% Rarely
  - 44% Occasionally
  - 41% Ongoing

- **Workplace partnerships**
  - 7% Never
  - 22% Rarely
  - 32% Occasionally
  - 39% Ongoing

- **Focused PR efforts**
  - 2% Never
  - 2% Rarely
  - 17% Occasionally
  - 78% Ongoing

- **Campaign microsite**
  - 5% Never
  - 19% Rarely
  - 46% Occasionally
  - 30% Ongoing

- **Guerrilla marketing**
  - 7% Never
  - 10% Rarely
  - 80% Occasionally
  - 2% Ongoing

- **Social media**
  - 2% Never
  - 22% Rarely
  - 76% Occasionally
  - 3% Ongoing

- **Email marketing**
  - 3% Never
  - 41% Rarely
  - 44% Occasionally
  - 13% Ongoing

- **Direct mail**
  - 23% Never
  - 13% Rarely
  - 51% Occasionally
  - 13% Ongoing

- **Ad agency/PR firm support**
  - 18% Never
  - 18% Rarely
  - 55% Occasionally
  - 16% Ongoing

- **Research**
  - 3% Never
  - 26% Rarely
  - 55% Occasionally
  - 16% Ongoing

- **Targeted specific groups**
  - 7% Never
  - 22% Rarely
  - 32% Occasionally
  - 39% Ongoing

- **Donate Life month program**
  - 2% Never
  - 7% Rarely
  - 90% Occasionally
  - 0% Ongoing

Percentage of respondents who have a job position assigned to media relations:

56%
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Donor Designation Activities

Promotional campaigns (cont.)

- National Donor Sabbath
  - 3% Never
  - 15% Rarely
  - 29% Occasionally
  - 50% Ongoing

- National Donor Day
  - 3% Never
  - 17% Rarely
  - 22% Occasionally
  - 32% Ongoing

- Nat. Minority Donor Awareness Day
  - 32% Never
  - 17% Rarely
  - 20% Occasionally
  - 32% Ongoing

Social media channels

- Facebook
  - 88% Ongoing

- Twitter
  - 51% Occasionally
  - 23% Ongoing
  - 8% Rarely

- YouTube
  - 50% Ongoing
  - 18% Occasionally
  - 8% Rarely

- LinkedIn
  - 76% Ongoing

- Google +
  - 84% Ongoing

- Blogging
  - 19% Occasionally
  - 50% Ongoing
  - 17% Rarely

- Other
  - 23% Occasionally
  - 50% Ongoing
  - 14% Rarely

Percentage of respondents who consider their media relations to be proactive: 76%
Donor Designation Activities

Corporate communications

- Annual report: 44% (Ongoing), 46% (Corporate), 3% (Occasionally), 8% (Rarely)
- Educational materials: 90% (Ongoing), 2% (Corporate), 7% (Occasionally), 3% (Rarely)
- New website: 77% (Ongoing), 3% (Corporate), 18% (Occasionally)
- Promotional items: 85% (Ongoing), 3% (Corporate), 5% (Occasionally), 8% (Rarely)

Percentage of respondents who have a crisis communications plan: 58%

Events

- Community events: 66% (Ongoing), 29% (Corporate), 2% (Occasionally), 2% (Rarely)
- Health fairs: 51% (Ongoing), 7% (Corporate), 2% (Occasionally), 2% (Rarely)
- Corporate events: 44% (Ongoing), 15% (Corporate), 10% (Occasionally), 17% (Rarely)
- Sporting events: 34% (Ongoing), 17% (Corporate), 7% (Occasionally), 1% (Rarely)

2011 Donor Designation Success Study
Donor Designation Activities

Events (cont.)

- **Percentage of respondents who have a staff member dedicated to volunteer management:** 59%

- **Faith-based events**
  - 48%
  - 35%
  - 13%
  - 5%

- **Civic organizations**
  - 44%
  - 33%
  - 23%

Age focus

- **0 - 18**
  - 50%
  - 35%
  - 8%
  - 8%

- **19 - 25**
  - 37%
  - 32%
  - 22%
  - 10%

- **26 - 40**
  - 36%
  - 32%
  - 15%
  - 18%

- **41 - 55**
  - 41%
  - 23%
  - 10%
  - 19%

- **56 - 75**
  - 32%
  - 29%
  - 18%
  - 21%

- **75 +**
  - 19%
  - 49%
  - 11%
  - 22%
Donor Designation Activities

Gender focus

- Men
  - 18%
  - 15%
  - 10%
  - 58%

- Women
  - 13%
  - 16%
  - 58%

Racial focus

- American Indian
  - 5%
  - 3%
  - 29%
  - 63%

- Asian
  - 15%
  - 3%
  - 28%
  - 54%

- Black
  - 17%
  - 19%
  - 20%
  - 48%

- Hispanic
  - 20%
  - 8%
  - 25%
  - 48%

- White
  - 10%
  - 25%
  - 32%
  - 59%

- Other
  - 10%
  - 25%
  - 65%
  - 10%

Legend:
- Red: Never
- Yellow: Rarely
- Blue: Occasionally
- Green: Ongoing
Donor Designation Activities

Geographic focus

- **Rural**
  - 42% Ongoing
  - 26% Never
  - 26% Rarely
  - 5% Occasionally

- **Urban**
  - 64% Ongoing
  - 21% Never
  - 15% Rarely
  - 6% Occasionally

- **Suburban**
  - 53% Ongoing
  - 21% Never
  - 24% Rarely
  - 3% Occasionally

- **Other**
  - 12% Ongoing
  - 76% Never
  - 6% Rarely
  - 6% Occasionally

Other groups

- **Immigrants**
  - 69% Ongoing
  - 17% Never
  - 12% Rarely
  - 8% Occasionally

- **New license**
  - 76% Ongoing
  - 2% Never
  - 12% Rarely
  - 10% Occasionally

- **Renewals**
  - 80% Ongoing
  - 2% Never
  - 7% Rarely
  - 10% Occasionally

- **Faith-based**
  - 32% Ongoing
  - 46% Never
  - 15% Rarely
  - 7% Occasionally

- **Political**
  - 70% Ongoing
  - 3% Never
  - 19% Rarely
  - 8% Occasionally

- **Health providers**
  - 50% Ongoing
  - 3% Never
  - 10% Rarely
  - 3% Occasionally

- **Other**
  - 63% Ongoing
  - 19% Never
  - 6% Rarely
  - 13% Occasionally
Opinions on donor designation

The last question in the D2S2 survey asked if, since 2007, there was anything special about the recipient’s state that has impacted donor designation, either positively or negatively. Here are some of the responses.

**In New York, the lack of progress in implementing electronic signatures for the donor registry has negatively impacted donor designation efforts. In Vermont, the DMV is not currently linked to the online registry, which dramatically limits the donor designations.**

- Vermont OPO

**Creation of state donor registry and new legislation. Positive impact.**

- Florida OPO

**Very old registry that has stalled.**

- Pennsylvania OPO

**Excellent state team that works very well together. Just had first statewide transplant games in the United States. We have a registry that is in the green in all areas.**

- Virginia OPO

**Since 2008 the Governor has sent an annual appeal to all state employees to encourage them to consider registering as donors. She does it in conjunction with Donate Life Month, and the spike in web site traffic is measurable.**

- Washington OPO

In 2008, our state team began seeking funds through the License to Give Trustfund. We began building programs and coming together as a cohesive state team. With the support of its members, (Carolina Donor Services, LifeShare of the Carolinas, and the North Carolina Eye Bank primarily), DLNC began building programs specifically to increase donor designations in our state. Our DMV Ambassador Program is now a national model and we have recently launched a Teen Outreach Program. Working together with the recovery agencies and having 2 FTE staff members with DLNC has really set the stage for North Carolina to become a leader in donation. We have the sixth largest registry in the country and received a Silver Award from DLA.

- North Carolina OPO
Opinions on donor designation

In May 2011, a trainer for the Kentucky Derby horse Mucho Macho Man was a heart recipient named Kathy Ritvo. While Kathy was in Louisville for the 3 weeks preceding the KY Derby, she worked with KODA in promoting Donor Designation and we had 157 new registrants as a result of her efforts.

- Kentucky OPO

The addition of staff members with PR, media and social media experience has definitely benefitted or efforts. Our relationships with the OMV and LHA have been vital to our continued growth, as well as creating a state team to try to pool our resources and create a consistent message about donation with one key goal of increasing the registry.

- Louisiana OPO

Continued partnership with DLO in Colorado. Looking for creative ways to continue to partner and get word to customers has been key.

- Colorado OPO

In September of 2009, the three OPOs in Texas worked on legislation that made it easier for Texans to register as organ and tissue donors through the DPS offices and enforced DPS staff to ask patrons if they would like to become organ and tissue donors. The legislation also did away with the need for a witness. In 2011, the three OPOs pushed for legislation to take the ownership of the registry away from the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) and also to revise questions that are asked at the DPS offices about donation. Previously people were asked if they: a) would like to be an organ and tissue donor and, b) would they authorize their information to be released to a third-party OPO. The second question read almost like personal information was being released to a third-party solicitor, therefore, someone may check YES to the first question and NO to the second question. By doing so, the questions canceled each other out and the person would not be on the registry. The efforts to streamline the process will hopefully help get more Texans on the registry.

- Texas OPO

Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones death affected African American designations.

- Ohio OPO
Opinions on donor designation

As of July 2011, DMV's now have a secondary option to the donation question which makes the question about donation a "required" question. We expect to see a bump in the numbers from those who renewed or obtained licenses or ID cards based on our observations that some of the "yes" marks on customer forms were missed.

- California OPO

We hosted the 2010 NKF US Transplant Games in Madison, WI in late July, 2010. This was part of our four year plan, which involved passing the revised UAGA with the addition of some language specific to authorizing an Online Donor Registry and establishing the administrative rules for how that would take place and be set up, as well as clarifying conflicting statutes that were in place regarding First Person Authorization for donation, so that FPA would be solidified and legally binding. Next phase was to seek funding to build the new Registry, develop the infrastructure and get it ready to go and launch. Final phase was a 12 month effort to promote the Registry, and the Games were a big part in that plan.

- Wisconsin State Team

The overall environment related to immigration in 2009 and 2010 somewhat impacted participation in community events (meaning participation was low in the community).

- Arizona OPO

Hero Act of New Jersey, which mandates education in public secondary schools, medical and nursing schools as well as information on public college campuses; establishment of online registry as well as paper form; formalized hierarchy of next-of-kin, by forming state team, enabled various stakeholders to come together and focus on what is best for state, not just individual organizations, identified a champion within the DMV which has greatly improved our access to front line staff, establishment of Donate Life New Jersey, its Web site and collateral materials.

- New Jersey State Team

The relationship with the DMV has been the key piece.

- Washington D.C. State Team

In summer 2011 the State of Minnesota shut down for 21 days. This stalled driver's license renewals and halted new licenses. It is unclear how this has impacted donor designation.

- Minnesota State Team
Opinions on donor designation

In late 2009, CT reached the milestone of 1 million registered donors. The event was marked with a press conference at the DMV with the Commissioner of DMV as the host. During the celebration, the Commissioner shared a personal donation story, commended the DMV staff for their efforts to support the Donor Registry and signed a large banner signifying his commitment to donation. Several local media outlets were in attendance (including TV, print and radio). While we do not have significant numbers to show an increase, this was a key step in our relationship with the DMV. Our ability to collect data has also improved most recently, so some of our efforts prior to these advancements are more difficult to track. Donate Life New England launched at the end of 2009, allowing us to track the efforts to specific events through a question on the registry form. Since late 2008, we have been receiving quarterly donor designation rates by branch from our state DMV. Our ability to assign specific outreach efforts to changes in designation rates remains extremely difficult, but we are finding ways to utilize the designation rate numbers by branch in our DMV staff training and (soon to be launched!) rewards program for DMV.

- Connecticut State Team

Establishment of an online registry, the introduction of a paper form that is tied into their next of kin registry, DMV manager and staff trainings, airing ad on the television monitors in DMV centers in the state, partnering with the DE Sports League to reach younger people.

- Delaware State Team


- North Carolina State Team

There have been several things: an online portal to register, the student decision toolkit, the report by the PA Legislative and Finance Committee on how the Trust Fund has done in last 10 years and recommendations for the future, a steady funding stream to help finance public relations/awareness campaigns.

- Pennsylvania State Team
Opinions on donor designation

DMV clerks did not begin asking customers directly if they wanted to join the donor registry until this year. There was also not a written question, so it was entirely up to the DMV customers to tell the clerk that they wanted to join. That changed starting in April this year.

- Michigan State Team

Negative: New person to take over as state team leader with in the last year. No funding. Rural population in WV. Older population in WV. Driver's License renewal is 10 years after a certain age. Positive: Assistance from neighboring OPOs from nearby states who cover hospitals in WV.

- West Virginia State Team

South Dakota has an imperfect process for donor registration. A law change will be required in order to fix it. In 2010 South Dakota adopted RealID making it onerous for each person who renews their list. This may have negatively impacted donor designation in the state.

- South Dakota State Team