Oxford Chapter Term Review

Summary:

To other chapters

- Run a Big Match Campaign
- Do a Giving Game
- Publicity via other societies whose interests are relevant to a specific event is key
- The most time efficient publicity is inviting >1000 people to every facebook event
    - This can be done by getting everyone on the committee to choose sets of friends who are likely to be in the right city e.g. “University of Oxford” using codes like this one to automatically select them all so you can invite them all in one click
- Use feedback forms, record the key data and share it with other chapters
    - hand them to each attendee personally during the Q&A with pens and wait for them to fill them in then take them back - this increases % filling out from ~10% to ~85%
- We recommend all of our speakers, but many will likely be less available to other chapters

To own chapter for the future

- We should do more Giving Games (happening with AIESEC next term)
- Consult other chapters on publicity - our events are always liked and lead to a decent amount of interest but this is a perpetual area to improve
- Evaluate and improve methods to get more people to sign the pledge

Measuring impact

- 1 TOG, 3 more committee members (at least in fb group), at least 1 new member
- Lots of publicity for Giving What We Can and AMF through campaigns such as the Big Match

Events:

Rob Mather talk & Q&A:

Statistics: 65 attendees (no more stats as we had no feedback forms)

Pros: very well attended (though we publicised it a lot), some people seemed very keen afterwards

Cons: Got fewer people than 80k:Ox got last year and than we had expected. We spent a lot of money on a large venue that wasn’t filled. Possible causes: had to change event date nearly last-minute, lack of publicity via RAG

Recommendations: Do it if Rob Mather will bless you with his time and you are willing to promote it,

publicising events within the college (/close to the venue) they are taking place on the day is very effective - especially if you have free food and drink (loads of St John's people came)

Toby talk & Q&A:
Statistics: 25 attendees, talk averaged rating of 4.5/5, 7 (unique) interested in TOG/volunteering/committee
Pros: Pretty much everyone was convinced
Cons: Attendance. Considering it's Toby himself, this really should have gone better. Possible causes: publicity officer was unwell for the week before (unforeseeable/not her fault obviously), no RAG publicity again, putting straight after Rob Mather's talk, the title, for some reason Rob Mather and AMF seems easier to sell to the general public.
Recommendations: Better publicity - but we gather he won't talk at other chapters. Try to do jointly with a philosophy society to focus on people the speaker will appeal to.

Giving and Happiness (Andreas):
Statistics: 27 attendees, talk averaged rating of 4.2 (skewed by a couple), 8 (unique) interested in TOG/volunteering/committee
Pros: Awesome presentation. Good for people who already know a bit about Giving What We Can.
Cons: Attendance quite low, though not a high-key event. Also quite a few wanted more relating to charity evaluation/pledge/10%, which suggests they should have had better publicity for the Toby talk.
Recommendations: Do it - it's pretty simple, but slightly off-key. Perhaps do jointly with a finance/medical/psychology/social science society to get more people who the speaker might appeal to.

Giving Game (AMF vs GiveDirectly)
Statistics: 40+ attendees, talk averaged rating of 4.2, 12 (unique) interested in TOG/volunteering/committee
Pros: Very easy to organise, co-ordinated with RAG, easily marketable (£10 for charity for turning up - 14 cited this on the feedback form)
Cons: Audience will, in general, be a bit less interested (more likely to be a fundraiser "let's raise money for charity and I don't care which one"). But probably inevitable given it appeals to a wider audience, which is a good thing! Some also said that it was too adversarial, but others wanted more comparison - this is probably a mix of people thinking "I love all charities!" and "where do I give my £10?".
Recommendations: Do it. We should try and share the talks, and improve them. Presentations for top charities in Giving What We Can's shared resources folder makes this event much less time consuming

Alan Fenwick talk & Q&A
Statistics: ~20 attendees, talk averaged 4.7, 5 (unique) interested in TOG/volunteering/committee
Pros: Audience highly interested despite being a very long and in-depth talk (1h15 - allow time/inform him of timescale!). Really powerful, even for regulars who had seen it before.
Cons: Some wanted more on the future plan for NTDs (action point: tell Alan? only 2 people said so though.) SCI seems harder to market than AMF to a general audience.
Recommendations: Do it. It's probably easier for other chapters to get Alan in than any other major

speaker, and would help interested people become very interested. Do it jointly with a medical society or global health group to target people who will be easier to sell this to. And make sure you go to dinner with Alan afterwards - he's great!

YTFN [Steph]
Statistics: ~50 attendees, raised over £3000
Pros: Established a relationship with TFN for future events, raised about £1500 irreplaceably
Cons: Poorly attended - 155 confirmed on facebook. Was intended to be much more of a mass audience. Only 4 feedback forms filled in.
Recommendations: Other chapters, in particular Cambridge/York/London, should do it. Organisation should run through central first.

The Big Match [Max]
Statistics: £14k raised + £12k matched. A worst case scenario estimate would put the leveraged money at >£5000 at a cost of 100 hours of committee time.
Pros: Around £4-5k was given by non-members, and thus can be seen as very high leverage. Even the money given by members may contain some leverage, as discussed below. Thus, there was significant leverage in terms of donations to AMF.
This values our time at >£50 per hour - a good return on investment. However the true figure is potentially much much greater that this. In addition, this does not take into account all the publicity benefits for Giving What We Can and AMF. Furthermore, if this campaign is repeated we hope to create more and more central resources to make it easier and easier for successive chapters to do this. Hopefully this will reduce time spent and increase impact, making this more and more attractive.
The Big Match and be managed by a person on the committee for whom it is their main role, so easy to split work from other committee stuff and is a great project for an individual person.
Cons: AMF were dropped by GiveDirectly during the campaign (but is still highly recommended elsewhere, and seems like a good charity to create leverage to). The Big Match has not created a significant boost in publicity or involvement, as it did in Warwick - this was expected to be the highest leverage part of the project, but it did not fulfill expectations.
We were lucky to have some special help in raising so much money (see below).
A significant amount of time was spent on this campaign, detailed below. It is possible that that time could have been spent more effectively on raising publicity.
Recommendations:
Read the detailed analysis below. Consider carefully whether running The Big Match is a priority for your chapter. If you decide it is, learn from our experiences in the analysis below. Some further considerations if you decide to go ahead:
If needed, ask EA members who would give money anyway to contribute to the pot, if there is difficulty in gaining matching money within the chapter. But this reduces leverage, so think carefully.
Contact more societies, and be more insistent - this is very low cost and possible high reward.
Consider supporting other effective charities, which might have more room for funding (i.e. try not to have your charity dropped by GiveWell half way through your campaign…!)
Consider running a launch/finale event.
SCI are less well known and so may benefit from the publicity more (plus are still recommended by

GiveWell) - consider supporting them instead.
Please go here for a much more detailed analysis of The Big Match

Other:

Publicity statistics

	Facebook	Friend	Mailing list	JCR e-mail	Other
Toby	5	6	7	1	0
Andreas	8	4	4	2	~5
Giving Game	20	18	9	2	7 (5 RAG)
SCI	7	1	5	0	1
Total	40	29	25	5	13 (5 RAG)

Note these are not unique - i.e. someone could say they both heard about an event from facebook and the mailing list

Freshers' Fair

- "Hi, I'm [name]" works well apparently
- Spend more time on those genuinely interested and less on those not