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Foreword

With this report, CF Insights’ aim is to share a snapshot of community foundation asset growth and activity during 2011. The findings are based on 290 community foundation responses to the Columbus Survey as of March 2012.

Participants interested in detailed 2011 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 2011 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 2011 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.

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 2011 Findings

Despite economic indicators signifying recovery, growth in a number of areas, and increasing consumer confidence, 2011 continued to feel like an adventure across peaks and valleys. In many ways, the state of the community foundation field in 2011 mirrored the ups and downs of the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) and we echo the message from last year’s Columbus Survey Results: these are times of cautious optimism punctuated by concerns about volatility. What is important to remember is that while no community foundation is “typical” in any given year, mapping performance relative to the field as a whole and choosing relevant peer benchmarks can provide context for your own community foundation’s performance.

The 2011 Peaks

Overall, the 290 participants in the 2011 Columbus Survey represent $53 billion in assets, $5 billion in gifts, and $4 billion in grants. Assets increased between 2010 and 2011 by an average of 8% for individual community foundations. This growth rate is lower than the rate of 13% experienced between 2009 and 2010. It is noteworthy that 63% of community foundations report 2011 asset levels that exceed the highs experienced in 2007.

In a time of cautious optimism, grantmaking by community foundations has grown by an average of 7% since 2010, increasing support to nonprofits and their constituents in communities across the U.S. Interestingly, this increase in grantmaking is more common among smaller community foundations.

The majority of community foundations have taken the step of increasing their operating budgets by more than 5% over 2010 levels. And while administrative fees tend to be the largest source of revenue to cover these costs, the majority of community foundations responding to a supplemental survey by CF Insights have sources of revenue beyond administrative fees, which can be more stable during times of market volatility.
The 2011 Valleys

Not all community foundations experienced growth in assets between 2010 and 2011. In fact, 35% of respondents experienced either no change or a decrease in assets that averaged 5%. Almost all of the foundations experiencing a decrease in assets had a FYE in September or December, reflecting a decline in market performance towards the end of the year.

Additionally, while grantmaking has increased at community foundations on average, the picture looks different among the largest 100 community foundations. For this group, total grants have stayed steady over the last three years.

Lastly, the flat fundraising experienced by many Columbus Survey participants and decline in giving across Donor Advised Funds is notable. Between 2010 and 2011 gifts to community foundations remained largely unchanged from the previous year. When looking at the average change in gifts, this trend cuts across community foundations of all asset sizes. And Donor Advised Fund donors reflected caution in 2011, with gifts from these donors down an average of 7% from 2010.

What Does this Mean for your Community Foundation?

Individual community foundation results vary dramatically and depend on strategy and business model, the demographics and circumstances of local donors, and the characteristics of the community served. Knowing this, it is helpful to place your foundation in the context of specific peer benchmarks. At CF Insights, you can compare your foundation’s peaks and valleys to those experienced by others. Also, stay tuned for these upcoming publications from CF Insights and FSG to help further your understanding of the field:

- **Benchmarking Beyond Asset Size: Top 100 Lists** – three lists that rank Columbus Survey participants on Distribution Rates, Gifts per Capita, and Total Gift and Grant Transactions
- **The Strategic Value of Donor Advised Funds** – a closer look at how DAFs impact community foundations’ growth, grantmaking, and engagement of donors
2011 Findings

The Participants

Data from the 290 participants in the 2011 Columbus Survey provides an opportunity to assess the experiences of the U.S. community foundation field as a whole. For instance, have community foundation assets recovered from the economic downturn? How were gift and grantmaking behaviors affected by the continued market volatility of 2011? Columbus Survey respondents represent over 90% of estimated total field assets and reflect the field’s diversity in assets, 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 historical trends for the field.

![Graphs showing participant FYE, asset, and regional distributions]

Large Community Foundation Trends

Between 2010 and 2011, the 100 largest community foundations grew by $1 billion in assets to a total of $45B, 10% higher than total assets in 2006. However, asset levels remain lower than the $46B held by this group of large community foundations in 2007, prior to the economic downturn.

Total giving to large community foundations increased 13% between 2010 and 2011 to $4.5B. This increase is largely driven by 16 foundations that experienced increases in gifts of more than 100% between 2010 and 2011. However, giving remains 9% lower than the highest levels experienced in 2006 and 2007, suggesting continued caution by donors.

Grantmaking at the largest foundations remained flat between 2010 and 2011, but exceeds levels experienced in 2006 and 2007. This pattern reflects community foundations’ and individual donors’ interest in maintaining funds to support community needs, even during challenging economic times.
Average Growth for all Community Foundations

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

It is helpful to supplement this data with average changes in assets, gifts and grants across community foundations by size. This offers a basic comparison point for an individual community foundation. Mid-size and small foundations experienced greater asset growth and increases in grantmaking than larger community foundations, on average. All community foundations, regardless of size, experienced little change in gifts between 2010 and 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Change for CFs &gt;$250M in Assets N = 49</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs $50 - $249M in Assets N = 106</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs &lt; $49M in Assets N = 101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td><strong>Increased 4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased 9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased 9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td><strong>Increased 1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unchanged</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unchanged</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td><strong>Increased 4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased 6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased 10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fiscal year end date of a community foundation is as important a consideration as asset size when understanding patterns of asset growth. Because of market performance, community foundations with FYEs in March or June experienced higher asset growth between 2010 and 2011 than those community foundations that have FYEs in September or December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs with March or June FYE</th>
<th>Average Change for CFs with September of December FYE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 98</td>
<td>N = 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Closer Look at Gifts and Grantmaking

While the aggregates and averages are helpful for comparison purposes, there is more to the data. Some community foundations experienced more dramatic changes in gifts and grants than the averages suggest, which speaks to the variability in the field and the benefits of comparing individual performance not only to field wide trends, but also to a set of specific peer community foundations.

Changes in Gifts

Gifts to community foundations tend to be volatile from year to year. While the average change in gifts between 2010 and 2011 was negligible, 37% of respondents experienced moderate or dramatic increases in gifts and an additional 19% experienced changes of +/-10%. Balancing this is the fact that 44% of respondents experienced moderate or dramatic decreases in gifts of more than 10%.

Percent of Respondents Experiencing Change in Gifts, 2010 - 2011

- 17% Dramatic Increase (+50% to +100%)
- 20% Moderate Increase (+11% to +49%)
- 19% Neutral (-10% to +10%)
- 36% Moderate Decrease (-11% to -49%)
- 14% Dramatic Decrease (-50% to -100%)

Avg. Change = <1%
Changes in Grants

The picture is slightly different for grantmaking, with roughly one-third maintaining grantmaking levels from the previous year (+/-10%). But moderate and dramatic increases in grantmaking were more likely to occur for respondents than moderate or dramatic decreases.

Grant Distribution Rates

Looking at community foundations’ distribution rate, or total grants for the year divided by total assets, there is variation over the last six years. The distribution rate has been impacted by volatility in assets. As assets declined due to market performance and lower giving levels, and grantmaking leveled off, the metric rose (see 2008 in graph below). As assets have continued to grow since 2009, the payout rate has declined because changes in grantmaking have not generally kept pace with asset growth. 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: Top 100 Lists.
Operating Expenses

Operating budgets grew at most community foundations, regardless of asset size. This reflects a sense of optimism as community foundations made investments in staff, infrastructure, and special initiatives. Though a small number overall, the community foundations that decreased their operating budget tended to be smaller in overall asset size (< $50M in assets).

In fact, operating budgets have been trending upward over the last few years. Among a consistent sample of community foundations, 52% increased their operating budget between 2008 and 2009, 55% increased between 2009 and 2010, and 73% increased between 2010 and 2011.
The Donor Advised Fund Affect

In total, DAFs represent 53% of gifts and 52% of grants within the community foundation field. When looking at averages across foundations, DAFs represent an average 28% of core community foundation assets (not including supporting organizations), 41% of core gifts, and 42% of core grants.

Between 2010 and 2011, 44% of community foundations in the sample experienced moderate or dramatic increases in DAF assets, driving up the average change of DAF assets to 10%. Alternatively, only 11% experienced a moderate or dramatic decline in DAF assets.

The picture is more nuanced for DAF gifts and grants. DAF gifts fell by 7% between 2010 and 2011, with almost 50% of respondents experiencing declines of more than 10%. However, DAF grants increased by 6% on average between 2010 and 2011, compared to a 7% average increase in grants overall.

Considering Revenue Sources

Administrative fees continue to represent the largest revenue source for most community foundations. Among 68 community foundations with an average asset size of $258M responding to a supplemental survey, administrative fees represented 68% of total revenue, on average. However, many community foundations rely on a variety of other sources. The following two charts show the prevalence of these alternative sources. Non-administrative fee revenue is derived most often from disbursements from special funds/endowments and gifts/grants for operating capacity. A smaller portion of other income is derived from alternative approaches such as fee-for-service income, grants for programmatic work, memberships, or real estate.

---

1 Based on core gifts and grants (excluding supporting organizations).
The choices made about revenue sources vary by community foundations and are dependent upon a specific strategy and business model. But for many foundations, the diversification of revenue is necessary in order to successfully pursue the many roles of today’s community foundation and support operating capacity, particularly as a smaller community foundation.

*Other Revenue includes diverse sources, such as Class Action Lawsuit Settlements, Event Sponsorship, and Miscellaneous Income

Moving Forward

Asset growth, grants, and especially gifts will vary by foundation and by year. This variation underscores the importance of understanding your community foundation’s performance not only as part of the overall trends, but also in the context of your peers. To engage in benchmarking, and make data-driven decisions about your goals for the future, visit cfinsights.org. Our goal is to support your community foundation along the path to greater sustainability and impact.
Appendix I – Next Steps

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 your 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 IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CF Insights Non-Member Reports</th>
<th>CF Insights Member Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longitudinal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gifts &amp; Grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average fund size</td>
<td>Avg gift size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average gift size</td>
<td>Annual payout rate vs. peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants per capita</td>
<td>Gifts/Grants per capita vs. peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to asset ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in gifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                |
| Operating Budget | Staffing       |
| Example reports  | Example reports|
| Budget to asset ratio vs. peers | Assets per FTE among peers |
| Peer tax schedule vs fund | Funds per FTE among peers |

Expense to asset ratio

Payout ratio
Appendix II – Rankings

### List of Top 100 Community Foundations by Asset Size as of May 1, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation Name</th>
<th>2011 assets</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundation Name</th>
<th>2011 assets</th>
<th>FYE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tulsa Community Foundation</td>
<td>$3,480M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Greater New Orleans Foundation</td>
<td>$238M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Community Foundation</td>
<td>$2,082M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rochester Area Community Foundation</td>
<td>$235M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The New York Community Trust</td>
<td>$1,909M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Delaware Community Foundation</td>
<td>$229M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>$1,795M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>San Antonio Area Foundation</td>
<td>$218M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Chicago Community Trust</td>
<td>$1,583M</td>
<td>09-30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Community Foundation of New Jersey</td>
<td>$217M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marin Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,327M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Greater Buffalo</td>
<td>$210M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Oregon Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,257M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Community Foundation</td>
<td>$207M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>California Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,256M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Community Foundation for the Fox Valley Region, Inc.</td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Columbus Foundation</td>
<td>$1,193M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>The Dallas Foundation</td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Greater Kansas City Community Foundation</td>
<td>$1,162M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Sarasota County</td>
<td>$194M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The San Francisco Foundation</td>
<td>$1,100M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Des Moines</td>
<td>$186M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Boston Foundation</td>
<td>$877M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fremont Area Community Foundation</td>
<td>$184M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minnesota Community Foundation and The Saint Paul Foundation</td>
<td>$872M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>St. Louis Community Foundation</td>
<td>$184M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Foundation</td>
<td>$856M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Community Foundation of the Ozarks</td>
<td>$177M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Foundation For The Carolinas</td>
<td>$831M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Amarillo Area Foundation</td>
<td>$175M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Communities Foundation of Texas, Inc.</td>
<td>$789M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Western North Carolina</td>
<td>$174M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Community Foundation Serving Richmond and Central Virginia</td>
<td>$749M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Erie Community Foundation</td>
<td>$163M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta</td>
<td>$737M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>East Tennessee Foundation</td>
<td>$162M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hartford Foundation for Public Giving</td>
<td>$728M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Stark Community Foundation</td>
<td>$157M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Minneapolis Foundation</td>
<td>$625M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>The Community Foundation in Jacksonville</td>
<td>$156M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Seattle Foundation</td>
<td>$622M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Baltimore Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$156M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oklahoma City Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$621M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fairfield County Community Foundation</td>
<td>$155M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Omaha Community Foundation</td>
<td>$615M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Coastal Community Foundation of South Carolina</td>
<td>$154M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Baton Rouge Area Foundation</td>
<td>$614M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>The Miami Foundation</td>
<td>$152M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Rhode Island Community Foundation</td>
<td>$606M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>The Vermont Community Foundation</td>
<td>$152M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The San Diego Foundation</td>
<td>$565M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Greater Birmingham</td>
<td>$151M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan</td>
<td>$565M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Arkansas Community Foundation</td>
<td>$150M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Central Indiana Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$564M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Tampa Bay, Inc.</td>
<td>$150M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Greater Milwaukee Foundation</td>
<td>$559M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Toledo Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$149M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The Denver Foundation</td>
<td>$553M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Sonoma County</td>
<td>$148M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hawaii Community Foundation</td>
<td>$521M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Community Foundation of North Texas</td>
<td>$147M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Arizona Community Foundation</td>
<td>$510M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>North Carolina Community Foundation</td>
<td>$145M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>New Hampshire Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>$510M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Triangle Community Foundation</td>
<td>$144M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Greater Cincinnati Foundation</td>
<td>$447M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Flint</td>
<td>$140M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The Dayton Foundation</td>
<td>$378M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Palm Beach and Martin Counties</td>
<td>$140M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region</td>
<td>$368M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Orange County Community Foundation</td>
<td>$137M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Middle Tennessee</td>
<td>$366M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Community Foundation For Monterey County</td>
<td>$136M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>East Bay Community Foundation</td>
<td>$361M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Akron Community Foundation</td>
<td>$133M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The Community Foundation of Louisville, Inc.</td>
<td>$350M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Endeavor Foundation</td>
<td>$134M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The Community Foundation for Greater New Haven</td>
<td>$341M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Greensboro</td>
<td>$130M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kalamazoo Community Foundation</td>
<td>$314M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Madison Community Foundation</td>
<td>$129M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Greater Houston Community Foundation</td>
<td>$305M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Community Foundation of St. Joseph County, Inc.</td>
<td>$129M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The Philadelphia Foundation</td>
<td>$301M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Central New York Community Foundation</td>
<td>$128M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Community Foundation of Greater Memphis, Inc.</td>
<td>$293M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Greater Kanawha Valley Foundation</td>
<td>$125M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Foundation</td>
<td>$286M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Austin Community Foundation</td>
<td>$123M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The Winston-Salem Foundation</td>
<td>$286M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Muskogon County</td>
<td>$122M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Maine Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$283M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>The Greater Cedar Rapids Community Foundation</td>
<td>$114M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rose Community Foundation</td>
<td>$254M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Greater Worcester Community Foundation</td>
<td>$113M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Community Foundation</td>
<td>$250M</td>
<td>06-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Battle Creek Community Foundation</td>
<td>$104M</td>
<td>03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Community Foundation</td>
<td>$246M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Harrison County Community Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$104M</td>
<td>12-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III - 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 2011 data in the online form between April 2011 and March 2012. This process generated 290 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. For all data analysis, outliers of +/- 100% were removed from average calculations.

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 2011 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 2010-2011. 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 2011 data – make sure your foundation is included! Visit www.cfinsights.org to enter your 2011 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 IV – 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
- Grants per Capita
- Average Grant Size
- Annual Payout Rate

Benchmark reports
- 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:

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

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

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

Staffing
- Assets per FTE Among Peers
- FTEs by Functional Area Among Peers
- Funds per FTE Among Peers
All statements and conclusions, unless specifically attributed to another source, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the other organizations or references noted in this report.

For questions or comments on this report, please contact:

**Becca Graves**
Executive Director, CF Insights
Managing Director, FSG
rebecca.graves@fsg.org

**Diana Esposito**
Member Services & Program Manager
CF Insights
diana.esposito@fsg.org

**Hollie Marston**
Consultant, CF Insights
hollie.marston@fsg.org
The idea behind CF Insights is simple:
What if each community foundation could know what all community foundations collectively know?

Created by Community Foundations
CF Insights responds to a hunger for shared knowledge and greater impact among U.S. community foundations. Community foundations grow stronger when their decisions are based on timely, accurate, and complete information. Through CF Insights, community foundations improve performance and sustainability – individually and collectively.

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 Community Foundations Leadership Team, FSG has been a driving force for CF Insights since its inception.