Columbus Survey 2010 Results:
Guideposts Point to Growth

TRENDS ACROSS THE COMMUNITY
FOUNDATION FIELD
SNAPSHOT OF 2010

With this report, CF Insights’ aim is to share a snapshot of community foundation asset growth and activity during 2010. The findings are based on over 250 community foundation responses to the Columbus Survey as of March 2011.

Participants interested in detailed 2010 results for their foundation can visit www.cfinsights.org to find a wider range of comparative and longitudinal reports. CF Insights members can compare their 2010 performance to peer benchmarks in over 60 online reports. Available metrics focus on asset development, grantmaking, investment performance, and sustainability.

And for those community foundations who have not yet contributed data, there is still time. We encourage you to share your 2010 results and use the resources at www.cfinsights.org to create custom reports that put your own foundation’s performance in context.

As more foundations contribute and 990s are completed, more comparative data will be available and CF Insights will continue to build on this snapshot with analyses based on the growing data set.
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We would also like to thank the Council on Foundations’ Community Foundations Leadership Team (CFLT) for providing funding to transition the Columbus Survey to CF Insights in 2009, building on the infrastructure The Columbus Foundation established. This funding helped incorporate the Columbus Survey data within CF Insights’ online database, creating a longitudinal field-wide dataset of great breadth and depth that is easily accessed by community foundations. The CFLT’s support also helped to improve the quality and variety of reports available to the field.

In addition, a wide range of community foundations contributed data to this report. We would like to thank all Columbus Survey participants for your contributions. We especially thank CF Insights members and funders for their continued support, which makes possible the growth and development of CF Insights’ knowledge base.

CF INSIGHTS MEMBERSHIP

If you find this report valuable, we hope you will join CF Insights’ membership and become part of a community that is improving access to performance data and sharing knowledge across the field. Annual membership contributions start at $200 and are based on asset size. Visit www.cfinsights.org to learn more.
OVERVIEW OF 2010 FINDINGS

In 2010, the community foundation field as represented by Columbus Survey participants accounted for over $50B in assets, $4.5B in philanthropic gifts, and $4.1B in grants to nonprofit organizations. As assets begin to recover from the global economic crisis and communities continue to feel the effects of a sluggish economy, community foundations are working to strike a sustainable balance between addressing current needs and investing for the future. Over the past few years, community foundations and donors have stretched to maintain operating capacity and grantmaking efforts in spite of dramatic changes in the resources available. As assets increase once more, each community foundation must calibrate its own sense of optimism.

“Is the glass half full, or half empty?”

The data on community foundation growth and grantmaking from 2010 provides evidence to support both inclinations.

The Case for Optimism

Looking at the broader economy, the stock market continues to climb and economic indicators are improving in health. Community foundation assets reflect the glow of these positive trends.

Participants in the Columbus Survey experienced average asset growth of 13% in 2010. This compares to 2009’s 12% decline in assets as reported by CF Insights in Guideposts on the Path to Recovery. Moreover, community foundation asset growth appears to be outpacing the growth of large private foundations. The median asset growth rate in 2010 was 10.1% for 97 of the 100 largest U.S. community foundations who participated in the Columbus Survey in 2009 and 2010, higher than the median asset growth of 3.4% in 2010 for the largest U.S. foundations responding to a March 2011 Chronicle of Philanthropy survey.1

Gifts and grants are also up among community foundations, and the inflow of gifts once again exceeds the outflow of grant funds, a relationship that was reversed in 2009.

Almost 1/3 of community foundations reflected an expectation of growth and optimism in their operating budgets, increasing overall operating expenses by an average of 19%.

Reasons for Caution

But a closer look at 2010 shows only a mild uptick in gifts and grants. Donor activity trails the market recovery. Spending policies designed to smooth volatility during the downturn are now dampening growth in grantmaking and operating budgets, affecting some community foundations more than others. And while most community foundations are experiencing asset growth, 52% of responding community foundations are not yet back to historical highs marked in 2007.

Diving a bit deeper, smaller community foundations are experiencing more mixed results. While assets, gifts, and grants grew for all sizes of community foundations, the 2010 increases in gifts at smaller foundations were more modest than the increases in gifts at larger community foundations.

In addition, approximately 1/4 of community foundations reflected caution in their operating budgets, reducing overall operating expenses by an average of 20%.

On Balance

The picture from 2010 suggests an attitude of cautious optimism, with resources for community philanthropy growing and donor activity increasing relative to 2009, though increases in gifts and grants trail the market recovery. Community foundations must persist in promoting philanthropy in an environment where donors are also cautious, increasing resources available to effective nonprofits, and leading the way toward collective impact.

INFORMING YOUR OWN PERSPECTIVE AND GUIDEPOSTS

Growth is a function of gifts, grants, investment performance, and operating model choices, and happens in the context of your own community. Each community foundation can use comparative data to gauge performance and set goals, tapping the data contributed by peers and reports made available through CF Insights.

---

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE PARTICIPANTS

Data from the 252 participants in the 2010 Columbus Survey provides a window into the experiences of the U.S. community foundation field as a whole. Did assets grow relative to 2009? Did gifts to community foundations increase or decrease? How did grantmaking change? Columbus Survey respondents represent 91% of estimated total field assets and reflect the field’s diversity in asset size, geographies, and strategies. The survey analysis focuses on all respondents and also looks closely at the 100 largest community foundations, where data is more consistently available and helps paint a picture of larger trends.

MAJOR TRENDS—COHORT OF LARGER COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

Between 2009 and 2010, the 100 largest community foundations grew by $4 billion in assets to a total of $44B, 7% higher than total assets in 2006. However, this is still 4% lower than the $46B in assets held by this group in 2007.

Giving to large community foundations increased in 2010 to $3.8B from the low of 2009, however, giving remains over $1B lower than 2006 and 2007.

In contrast, grantmaking has steadily increased from 2006. Following a slight dip in 2009, grantmaking at the largest foundations increased slightly in 2010 to $3.7B and exceeds levels seen in 2006 and 2007.

Change in Aggregate Assets, Gifts and Grants Among the Top 100 CFs 2006-2010

- Total Assets: $41B to $46B (7% increase from 2006 asset levels)
- Total Gifts: $4.9B to $3.8B (-21% decrease from 2006 gift levels)
- Total Grants: $3.1B to $3.7B (19% increase from 2006 grant levels)
MAJOR TRENDS—AVERAGE GROWTH EXPERIENCED

While the Top 100 provide a consistent historical picture as a cohort, the magnitude of their aggregate assets, gifts, and grants makes it difficult to understand the performance of smaller community foundations.

It is also helpful to get a sense of the average changes in assets, gifts and grants across community foundations. This can offer a basic comparison point for an individual community foundation.

Change from 2009 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Change for CFs &gt;$250M in assets</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs $50 - $249M in assets</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs &lt;$49M in assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td>Increased 11%</td>
<td>Increased 13%</td>
<td>Increased 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifts</strong></td>
<td>Increased 8%</td>
<td>Increased 3%</td>
<td>Increased &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td>Increased 2%</td>
<td>Increased 2%</td>
<td>Increased 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A CLOSER LOOK AT GIFTS AND GRANTMAKING

But underneath the aggregates and averages, what type of changes did the range of community foundations experience? A closer analysis reveals significant variation.

Changes in Gifts

Gifts to community foundations tend to be volatile from year to year, but the trend is positive from 2009 to 2010, with a shift toward more foundations seeing moderate and dramatic increases. In 2010, approximately 1/2 of community foundations experienced a greater than 10% increase in gifts versus 1/3 having a greater than 10% decrease in gifts.
Changes in Grants

The picture is slightly different for grantmaking, with roughly one-third maintaining grantmaking levels from the previous year (+/-10%). Another third experienced a greater than 10% increase in grants and the final third decreased grants more than 10% between 2009 and 2010.

Grants Distribution Rate

Looking at community foundations’ distribution rate, or total grants for the year divided by end of fiscal year end assets, there is variation over the last five years. The distribution rate grew in 2007, and then has been affected by volatility in assets over 2008-2010. As assets declined due to market performance and lower giving levels, and grantmaking leveled off, the metric rose. As assets grew in 2010, the payout rate dropped because changes in grantmaking have not kept pace with asset growth. This reflects a more cautious approach to grantmaking in an uncertain financial climate. However, payout rates vary dramatically by community foundations depending on their mix of funds and strategic priorities. Details on individual distribution rates will be further examined in CF Insights’ upcoming report, Benchmarking Beyond Asset Size: New Top 100 Lists.
A CLOSER LOOK AT OTHER METRICS

Operating Expenses
While 45% of community foundations kept operating expenses at a steady rate between 2009 and 2010 (+/-5%), almost 1/3 of community foundations reflected an expectation of growth and optimism in their operating budgets, increasing overall operating expenses by an average of 19%. The remaining community foundations decreased budgets by an average of 20%. And interestingly, there is almost no difference in the mix of decisions made by larger and smaller community foundations.

Gifts per Capita
Giving patterns in 2010 varied by region, showing higher rates of giving per capita in the West and Midwest. Further details on gifts per capita for individual community foundations will also be examined in CF Insights’ upcoming report, Benchmarking Beyond Asset Size: New Top 100 Lists.

Average Gifts Per Capita By Region, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Avg. Population Served</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.4M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1.3M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$33.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.4M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$36.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPARE METRICS FOR YOUR OWN COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

We hope this field-wide analysis serves as a starting point for understanding your community foundation’s growth and grantmaking in the context of relevant comparisons.

CF Insights supports the field and our members in using data to uncover insights. Some action steps to consider:

- **SHARE** this report with your board, highlighting how your foundation compares to the field
- **CONNECT** with you peers to understand best practices and fresh ideas in the field
- **CREATE** benchmark reports at [www.cfinsights.org](http://www.cfinsights.org) to view metrics for your foundation’s performance over time or compared to a peer aggregate

Once you’ve logged in to [www.cfinsights.org](http://www.cfinsights.org), you can instantly generate comparative data to further understand your community foundation’s performance relative to peers. Longitudinal trend and high level comparative reports are available for the field and CF Insights members have access to reports with customized benchmarking data. Examples of these reports are listed below and more detail is available in Appendix III.

**CF Insights Non-Member Reports**

- **Longitudinal**
  - Example reports
    - Average fund size
    - Average gift size
    - Grants per capita
    - Budget to asset ratio

- **Peer Benchmarking**
  - Example reports
    - Change in assets
    - Change in gifts
    - Change in grants

**CF Insights Member Reports**

- **Assets**
  - Example reports
    - Average fund size vs. peers
    - Assets by product vs. peers
    - Asset growth/historical assets among peers

- **Gifts & Grants**
  - Example reports
    - Avg gift size vs. peers
    - Annual payout rate vs. peers
    - Gifts/Grants per capita vs. peers

- **Operating Budget**
  - Example reports
    - Budget to asset ratio vs. peers
    - Peer fee schedules by fund

- **Staffing**
  - Example reports
    - Assets per FTE among peers
    - Funds per FTE among peers
### APPENDIX I. Rankings

**Top 100 Community Foundations by 2010 Asset Size**

*Note: Available for download in Excel format at www.cfinsights.org*

#### 2010 Columbus Survey of Community Foundations

List of Top 100 Community Foundations by Asset Size as of April 28, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation Name</th>
<th>2010 assets</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation Name</th>
<th>2010 assets</th>
<th>FYE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tulsa Community Foundation</td>
<td>$4,151M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>San Antonio Area Foundation</td>
<td>$224M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>$1,869M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Community Foundation of New Jersey</td>
<td>$217M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The New York Community Trust</td>
<td>$1,877M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Community Foundation</td>
<td>$211M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,830M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rochester Area Community Foundation</td>
<td>$208M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Chicago Community Trust</td>
<td>$1,596M</td>
<td>09-30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Greater Buffalo</td>
<td>$202M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Oregon Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,176M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Fremont Area Community Foundation</td>
<td>$194M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Greater Kansas City Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,133M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Delaware Community Foundation</td>
<td>$190M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>California Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,128M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>The Dallas Foundation</td>
<td>$183M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marin Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,087M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Des Moines</td>
<td>$183M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Columbus Foundation</td>
<td>$1,064M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Community Foundation for the Fox Valley Region, Inc.</td>
<td>$178M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The San Francisco Foundation</td>
<td>$980M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Community Foundation</td>
<td>$173M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Minnesota Community Foundation and Saint Paul Foundation</td>
<td>$985M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Amarillo Area Foundation</td>
<td>$172M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Foundation For The Carolinas</td>
<td>$863M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Enie Community Foundation</td>
<td>$171M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Foundation</td>
<td>$781M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>St. Louis Community Foundation</td>
<td>$170M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hartford Foundation for Public Giving</td>
<td>$762M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Stark Community Foundation</td>
<td>$167M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Boston Foundation</td>
<td>$733M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Sarasota County</td>
<td>$163M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta</td>
<td>$726M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Baltimore Community Foundation</td>
<td>$158M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Communities Foundation of Texas, Inc.</td>
<td>$705M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>The Vermont Community Foundation</td>
<td>$155M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Seattle Foundation</td>
<td>$648M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>The Mami Foundation</td>
<td>$154M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baton Rouge Area Foundation</td>
<td>$620M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Greater Birmingham</td>
<td>$154M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Community Foundation Serving Richmond and Central Virginia</td>
<td>$619M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Toledo Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$151M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Omaha Community Foundation</td>
<td>$602M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>The Community Foundation in Jacksonville</td>
<td>$150M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan</td>
<td>$599M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Northwest Arkansas Community Foundation</td>
<td>$148M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Central Indiana Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$588M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Sonoma County</td>
<td>$147M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Denver Foundation</td>
<td>$576M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Western North Carolina</td>
<td>$145M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Rhode Island Community Foundation</td>
<td>$567M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Community Foundation of North Texas</td>
<td>$138M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Minneapolis Foundation</td>
<td>$563M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Madison Community Foundation</td>
<td>$138M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Greater Milwaukee Foundation</td>
<td>$562M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Community Foundation For Monterey County</td>
<td>$138M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hawaii Community Foundation</td>
<td>$525M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Community Foundation of the Ozarks</td>
<td>$137M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Oklahoma City Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$524M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>East Tennessee Foundation</td>
<td>$136M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>New Hampshire Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>$479M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Greater Kanawha Valley Foundation</td>
<td>$132M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The San Diego Foundation</td>
<td>$473M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>North Carolina Community Foundation</td>
<td>$131M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Arizona Community Foundation</td>
<td>$470M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Tampa Bay, Inc.</td>
<td>$130M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Greater Cincinnati Foundation</td>
<td>$470M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Fairfield County Community Foundation</td>
<td>$127M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>East Bay Community Foundation</td>
<td>$428M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Triangle Community Foundation</td>
<td>$126M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Middle Tennessee</td>
<td>$410M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Coastal Community Foundation of South Carolina</td>
<td>$126M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region</td>
<td>$338M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Akron Community Foundation</td>
<td>$126M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The Dayton Foundation</td>
<td>$332M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Muskegon County</td>
<td>$124M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kalamazoo Community Foundation</td>
<td>$322M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Palm Beach and Martin Counties</td>
<td>$124M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for Greater New Haven</td>
<td>$312M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Arkansas Community Foundation</td>
<td>$122M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Philadelphia Foundation</td>
<td>$297M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Greater Worcester Community Foundation</td>
<td>$121M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Greater Houston Community Foundation</td>
<td>$297M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Flint</td>
<td>$121M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Memphis, Inc.</td>
<td>$296M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Greensboro</td>
<td>$119M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Louisville, Inc.</td>
<td>$294M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Orange County Community Foundation</td>
<td>$119M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The Winston-Salem Foundation</td>
<td>$286M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Community Foundation of St. Joseph County, Inc.</td>
<td>$116M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Foundation</td>
<td>$284M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Harrison County Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$115M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Maine Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$264M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Austin Community Foundation</td>
<td>$114M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rose Community Foundation</td>
<td>$263M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>The Greater Cedar Rapids Foundation</td>
<td>$112M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Community Foundation</td>
<td>$244M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Central New York Community Foundation</td>
<td>$112M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Greater New Orleans Foundation</td>
<td>$235M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ventura County Community Foundation</td>
<td>$103M</td>
<td>09-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2009 data
APPENDIX II. Methodology

This year’s Columbus Survey builds upon the work of The Columbus Foundation from 1988-2007. The Survey was transitioned to CF Insights for data collection via CF Insights’ online benchmarking database (www.cfinsights.org).

Field-wide survey participants entered their FYE 2010 data in the online form between April 2010 and March 2011. This process generated 252 responses, though not all data points were filled in – including assets, gifts, grants, fund-level data, total expenses and geographic information. Partial responses in some areas result in different sample sizes for various data points.

Longitudinal analyses only use data from foundations with complete data across the time period defined. Therefore, the sample size for these analyses is smaller than the complete 2010 data set.

The survey captures fiscal year end data, which results in some differences due to the timing of changes in the market or overall economy over 2009-2010. The time at which the data was recorded is of significance, especially for asset values, and in comparing an individual foundation to a peer cohort, we recommend taking fiscal year end into account when selecting peers.

Still Need to Participate?

CF Insights will be publishing future analyses on the 2010 data – make sure your foundation is included! Visit www.cfinsights.org to enter your 2010 data or data from prior years. Click on the “Log-in” button in the upper right-hand corner of the homepage.

CF Insights members have data automatically submitted to the survey once their annual data entry is complete. You are able to submit “unaudited” data if your 990 or audit is not complete; CF Insights will ensure that your final 990 data will be automatically included once you submit your 990.

Non-members can email info@cfinsights.org to obtain log-in and password information.
APPENDIX III. Peer Benchmarking Reports

As a part of our field-building mission, CF Insights has made benchmarking reports available to all Columbus Survey participants. Participants can log-in at www.cfinsights.org to generate dynamic online reports that show longitudinal and benchmark data to analyze your foundation’s historical performance and your performance compared to a selected peer aggregate and the entire field.

Available to All Community Foundations Participating in Columbus Survey

Longitudinal reports for your foundation
- Total Asset Annual Growth Rate
- Assets per Capita
- Average Fund Size
- Total Gift Annual Growth Rate
- Gifts per Capita
- Average Gift Size
- Total Grants Annual Growth Rate

Benchmark reports
- Grants per Capita
- Average Grant Size
- Annual Payout Rate
- Total Asset Growth Rate
- Total Grant Growth Rate
- Total Gift Growth Rate

Available to CF Insights Members

Additionally, CF Insights members can generate customized comparative reports based on Columbus Survey data as well as many other detailed metrics. CF Insights members can define who their peers are according to a variety of characteristics such as product focus, geography, asset size or grantmaking levels. In addition to the non-member reports listed above, CF Insights members also have access to peer-group reports such as:

Assets
- Assets by Product Among Peers
- Average Fund Size Among Peers
- Change in Assets Among Peers
- Per Capita Assets Among Peers

Contributions
- Average Gift Size Among Peers
- Change in Gifts Among Peers
- Per Capita Gifts Among Peers
- Historical Gifts Among Peers
- Gift Ratio Among Peers

Grantmaking
- Average Grant Size Among Peers
- Change in Grants Among Peers
- Per Capita Grants Among Peers
- Historical Grants Among Peers
- Grant Ratio Among Peers
- Payout Rate Among Peers
- Community Leadership Activities

Operating Budget & Fees
- Budget to Asset Ratio Among Peers
- Peer Fee Schedules by Fund

Staffing
- Assets per FTE Among Peers
- FTEs by Functional Area Among Peers
- Funds per FTE Among Peers
The idea behind CF Insights is simple:
What if each community foundation could know what all community foundations collectively know?

CF Insights is a unique resource helping community foundations use information to improve decision making, performance, and sustainability. If you find this report valuable, we hope you’ll join CF Insights’ membership, and become part of a community that is improving access to performance data and sharing knowledge across the field. Visit www.cfinsights.org to learn more, update the database with your most recent performance data, and download tools for sustainability planning.

Created by community foundations.

We share one goal: improving our performance and sustainability—individually and collectively.

For community foundations, growing impact in the communities we serve begins with strong decision making. CF Insights was initiated in response to a shared hunger among U.S. community foundations for more accurate, timely, and complete information to inform our actions and drive improved performance.

Propelled by FSG.

As nonprofit consultants dedicated to social impact, FSG combines deep knowledge of the community foundation field with world-class research, strategy, and evaluation capabilities.

In partnership with the Council on Foundations’ Community Foundations Leadership Team, FSG has been a driving force for CF Insights since its inception.