

REPORT OF THE
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
TASK FORCE ON PHILANTHROPY

December 2008

INTRODUCTION

Strategic Goal 5 of the University System of Georgia (USG) states a commitment to “maintain affordability so that money is not a barrier to participation in the benefits of higher education.” One component of this goal is to “diversify and increase revenue sources.” In pursuit of this strategic objective, the chancellor appointed a Task Force on Philanthropy charged to assess the current conditions of fundraising within the USG and to propose improvements. (See Appendix I for the task force charge.)

The task force included 15 members, representing each of the USG’s institutional sectors (research, regional, and state universities, state and two-year colleges). (See Appendix II for a list of members.) The group identified seven tasks associated with its charge:

- To evaluate the current conditions of philanthropy within each institutional sector of the USG;
- To assess institutions’ capacity and preparedness for success in fundraising;
- To establish benchmarks for evaluating institutional performance in comparison with appropriate peers;
- To identify public policy issues that might hinder or support effective fundraising;
- To propose a process for setting institutional fundraising targets;
- To recommend professional development opportunities for fundraisers within the USG; and
- To ensure that adequate institutional programs are in place and operating in ways that will achieve their potential.

EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT CONDITIONS OF FUNDRAISING IN THE USG

Information on fundraising in higher education is limited. Available sources often are not comprehensive, include only a small proportion of all colleges and universities, and may be based upon institutional reporting methods of questionable reliability. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* publishes annually a report of college and university endowment values nationally, based upon institutional submissions to the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), excluding those institutions not participating in the NACUBO collection. *The Chronicle* listed nearly 800 colleges and universities in each of its latest two publications (FY 2006 and FY 2007).

The Chronicle listing is dominated by private universities, which rely on philanthropy as one of several critical revenue sources to reduce dependence on tuition. Two-thirds of the institutions listed are private, including seven of the ten highest ranking universities. In fact, two of the three public institutions in the Top 10 (the University of Texas and Texas A&M University) are somewhat anomalous since their endowments derive largely from an oil lease income program created by the state rather than from philanthropic sources.

Private institutional representation in the rankings is consistent with the proportion of all private colleges and universities in the United States (61 percent of the more than 4,000 institutions nationally), although public institutions enroll about 75 percent of the total student population. (See Appendix III for a list of institutions and endowment values ranked in the Top 10.)

The USG is represented in *The Chronicle* rankings by seven institutions, as identified in Table 1:

Table 1
National Endowment Rankings of USG Institutions

<u>Institution</u>	<u>2005-2006 Rank</u>	<u>2006-2007 Rank (Value)</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	46	46 (\$1.6 b)*
University of Georgia	108	96 (\$771 m)**
Medical College of Georgia	322	327 (\$134 m)
Georgia State University	374	377 (\$98 m)
Columbus State University	628	617 (\$32 m)
Georgia Southwestern State University	635	660 (\$25 m)
Georgia Perimeter College	765	785 (\$571 k)

* 18th ranked public ** 35th ranked public

Georgia is one of seven states with two or more public universities ranked in the Top 100. Nationally, the Top 5 public institutions are as follows: the University of Texas (ranked 5th overall, \$16 billion endowment), the University of Michigan (8th, \$7 billion), Texas A&M University (10th, \$6.6 billion), the University of California (12th, \$6.4 billion), and the University of Virginia (20th, \$4.4 billion). Within the southern region, the top ranked public institutions also include the following: the University of North Carolina (30th, 2.2 billion), the University of Florida (61st, \$1.2 billion), the University of Alabama (77th, \$1.0 billion), the University of Kentucky (82nd, \$958 million), and the University of Tennessee (83rd, \$954 million).

This national picture reflects the different patterns of participation in philanthropy by public colleges and universities. Although private institutions have historically engaged in fundraising, for most public colleges and universities, this is a relatively new endeavor with the exception of major public institutions such as land-grant and other statewide flagship universities. The evolution of institutions within and across other

public higher education sectors has led to fundraising efforts which are not so long-standing or consistent. Among the factors that have created roadblocks to effective philanthropic programs at these institutions are changing missions and identities over time; shifting student, alumni, and community expectations and demands; and limited or restricted state or institutional resources permitting or supporting fundraising activities.

Recently, competing demands for state resources have led many public institutions to join the search for additional sources of revenue. As the costs of higher education have continued to rise and outstrip the capacity of state government to respond, institutions have turned to fundraising to ensure continued operation of valued services and to achieve a margin of excellence unavailable through traditional funding sources. As a result, the proportion of total giving to higher education received by public institutions has increased significantly: from 25 percent of the total of \$2.1 billion given in FY 1977 to 46 percent of the \$25.2 billion given in FY 2007. Concomitantly, funding from state sources is a decreasing proportion of most institutional budgets.

Institutions within the University System of Georgia are no exception. Thirty-three of the 35 colleges and universities reported endowments for FY 2007, with a total endowment value of \$2.83 billion. As might be expected, nearly 90 percent of that total is comprised of research university endowments, and 90 percent of those endowments were held by two of the four research institutions.

Within each sector of the USG, the range of endowment values varies widely, with the exception of the two regional universities, which have endowments valued at \$37 million and \$20 million, respectively. (See Appendix IV for a list of FY 2007 endowment values by institution and sector.) Among the state universities, four of the

thirteen institutions account for 57 percent of the endowment total. The endowment market values at these universities range from less than \$1 million to \$34.3 million. Among the state colleges, two of the six institutions account for 52 percent of the total, with market values ranging from less than \$1 million (excluding the newly chartered Georgia Gwinnett College) to \$12.5 million. For the two-year colleges, two of the nine institutions account for 62 percent of the total, with values ranging from no endowment to \$4.7 million. This variation is consistent with the diverse institutional circumstances and development patterns of the USG colleges and universities. It also signifies a baseline from which to improve.

Endowments are one form of giving, intended to provide earnings that can be spent while protecting the value of the corpus, which accumulates over time. Other forms of giving contribute directly to institutions' annual operating and capital budgets. The task force secured information on total gifts and contributions through a survey based upon the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) annual data collection program. Institutions provided information for FY 2005 - FY 2007. Table 2 summarizes total giving for these years by USG sector:

Table 2
 Total Gifts and Contributions
 (excluding pledges)
 USG Institutions by Sector
 FY 2005 - FY 2007 (in millions)

<u>Sector</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>
Research	\$163.7	\$185.7	\$230.2
Regional	6.6	7.8	5.1
State Universities	34.5	39.0	42.7
State Colleges	1.3	5.7	7.3
Two-Year Colleges	2.6	4.9	2.4
Total	\$208.7	\$243.1	\$287.6

Total giving fluctuates by year. For example, the FY 2006 total for two-year colleges was boosted by an unusually large capital gift to one institution. The totals also are affected by the changing status of institutions from one sector to another. In 2005, Georgia Gwinnett and Gainesville State were authorized as state colleges. Gordon College became a state college in 2006, and Coastal Georgia did so in 2008.

The three-year average for all USG institutions is \$251.9 million. Again, the research universities account for the predominant share of these gifts, above 75 percent each year, with the state university sector providing an additional 17 percent of the totals. (See Appendix IV for a detailed summary of giving for FY 2007 by institution.)

As with endowments, the range of total gifts for institutions within each sector is broad. Among research universities, the three-year average of annual total gifts ranges from \$8.3 million to \$99.2 million; at the two regional universities, the three-year averages are \$1.2 million and \$5.3 million; at the state universities, these averages range from \$386 thousand to \$17.1 million; at the state colleges, from \$134 thousand to \$1.8 million; and at the two-year colleges from \$71 thousand to \$1.6 million.

Most gifts are used for current operations. In 2006-2007, the only year for which reliable information is available, 53 percent of gifts to USG colleges and universities were targeted for current operations. At the state colleges and two-year colleges 80 and 90 percent of their respective totals went to current operations. Nearly all other gifts were for capital purposes, including property, buildings and equipment (19 percent of the System total) or endowment (26 percent of the total). In 2006-2007, total private giving equaled 18 percent of the state appropriation to the USG institutions.

**ASSESSMENT OF USG INSTITUTIONS' CAPACITY
AND PREPAREDNESS FOR FUNDRAISING**

Any explanation for the variance among institutions must take into account the differing circumstances under which these colleges and universities developed and operate. To gain this knowledge, the task force conducted a survey of all USG institutions. The survey was based upon professional standards by which comprehensive fundraising programs are judged, including participation of volunteers, organizational structures, staffing, functions performed, measures of success, and perceptions of and involvement with institutions by external constituencies. Based upon this rich database, the task force offers the following observations about each sector's preparedness and capacity for fundraising:

The Research Universities:

- Three of the universities institutionalized fundraising under a chief development officer in the 1970s, although one institution has practiced elements of fundraising for over fifty years.
- Georgia State University, the most recent entrant to this sector, conducted fundraising until the 1990s through the alumni office working with its schools and colleges.
- All four have at least one institutionally related philanthropic foundation.
- All have other volunteer boards that work with their institutions, many of which engage in fundraising efforts, while others serve other advisory and support functions. Two indicate that it is somewhat or very difficult to recruit good foundation trustees.
- Two have extensive professional staffs associated with fundraising. Georgia Tech employs 47 and the University of Georgia 59 full-time equivalent professional frontline development staff as well as robust alumni relations staffs (46 at Georgia Tech, 34.5 at the University of Georgia). [NOTE: The top three public institutions had an average fundraising staff of 126 in 2005-2006. Source: *The Chronicle of Higher Education*]
- Two have smaller staffs: 18 and 9 frontline fundraising professionals, plus 10 and 7.5 alumni relations staff members, respectively, reflecting their different circumstances as a stand-alone medical college and as a recent designate to the status of research university.
- All staffs are organized as hybrid combinations of central office professionals and support staff, plus others working in specific units of the university (e.g. schools and colleges, athletics, libraries, and museums).
- All have staff dedicated to the distinct areas of Principal and Major Gifts, Corporate Relations, Annual Giving, Foundation Relations, and Gift and Estate Planning. Most are concentrated in the Major Gifts area.
- All staffs are led by vice presidents with significant fundraising experience (8 to 40 years).
- Presidents of the research universities devote considerable effort to fundraising, (an estimated 15 to 30 percent of their time). Three involve deans or their equivalent frequently in fundraising.

- All offer potential donors a variety of giving opportunities, including annual giving, online giving, faculty/staff contribution programs, endowed professorships and faculty chairs, endowed scholarships, and naming opportunities. Three have student contribution programs.
- All launched or completed a comprehensive or focused campaign over the last ten years and are currently planning or conducting such campaigns.
- All have fundraising software systems and communication strategies. Three have staff dedicated to development communications and formal donor relations/stewardship offices. All conduct annual events to honor donors
- All maintain directories of living alumni, with less than 10 percent having an unknown address. Addresses are updated frequently, as are electronic ratings of potential donors.
- All publish alumni magazines at least quarterly, reaching household audiences of more than 100,000 on average at the three larger universities.
- Three occasionally conduct literature readership and opinion surveys, as well as internal and external audits to learn more about potential donors. Two have done market analyses, and three have completed formal campaign feasibility studies within the decade.

The results of these operations are quantified in the endowment values and total giving summaries reported earlier. Some additional measures of these programs' success can be documented for annual giving, endowed professorships, chairs, and scholarships, and in the source of new gifts.

- Annual gifts are a portion of each year's total giving. Annual giving to all the research institutions for FY 2005 - FY 2007 averaged \$22.2 million per year. The two larger philanthropy programs account for approximately three-quarters of the total.
- The four programs have received endowments that fund 208 endowed chairs, 184 endowed professorships, and 1,600 student scholarships.
- The highest proportion of FY 2007 gifts received by these institutions came from alumni (45 percent of all gifts). Corporations (18 percent) and friends of the institution (17 percent) also are important contributors to these programs.

The Regional Universities:

- One of the regional institutions hired its first full-time fundraiser in 1973, the other in the early 1980s.
- Both have philanthropic foundations and other volunteer boards, about one-fourth of which assist with fundraising. Neither has difficulty in recruiting good foundation trustees.
- Frontline fundraising staffs include ten professional and six support staff at one institution, four professional and six support staff at the other.
- Alumni relations staffs additionally consist of four and two full-time equivalent staff members at the two institutions, respectively.
- Staff members are concentrated in annual giving and principal and major gift areas, with corporate and foundation relations functions being served on a part-time basis
- Additional staff members (three in one instance, one in the other) are in alumni records and development research.
- One organizes its staff centrally, while the other operates as a hybrid organization. Both chief advancement officers are vice presidents with several years of experience.
- The two presidents devote considerable time to fundraising (40 percent of total presidential time in one instance, 30 percent in the other). Deans and department chairs are only occasionally involved in philanthropy.
- Both offer annual giving programs, online giving and faculty/staff as well as student contribution programs.
- Neither has a staff member dedicated to development communications, but one does have a formal donor relations office.
- Both communicate regularly with alumni through magazines published multiple times per year and reaching more than 40,000 households each.
- Regular efforts are made at both institutions to update alumni addresses (about 17 percent of alumni have unknown addresses), to rate prospective donors, and to sponsor activities that honor donors.
- One has been involved with a comprehensive campaign within recent years; both have plans for such a campaign within the next three years.

- One completed a formal campaign study prior to its past campaign. The other does an annual opinion survey and has completed a program audit recently.
- Results of the two annual giving programs combined averaged \$3.4 million per year for FY 2005 - FY 2007.
- New gifts tend to come from friends of the universities (40 percent) more than other constituencies. Alumni account for 23 percent of these gifts, with corporations (23 percent) also playing a prominent role.
- One has a total of nine endowed chairs and two endowed professorships; the other has no such positions. One institution has 273 endowed scholarships, the other 53.

The State Universities:

- All 13 institutions have philanthropic foundations, and most have other voluntary boards, some of which engage in fundraising. Six report that it is somewhat difficult to recruit good foundation trustees.
- Most established full-time fundraising staffs in the 1980s. Nearly all chief advancement officers are vice presidents operating centralized fundraising structures.
- The range of experience for senior leadership teams varies widely: more than half of those listed (24 of 42) have less than 10 years of fundraising experience; 8 have more than 20 years experience.
- The majority have two or fewer full-time equivalent frontline development staff, and nearly all have one for alumni relations.
- Frontline staff members often serve multiple roles, with their time being distributed among the various development programs. A majority of institutions have one full-time equivalent staff member devoted to annual giving; a minority have one for major gifts; and few have one assigned to corporate or foundation relations or to planned giving. Nine have plans to increase these frontline fundraising staffs in the near future.
- Nine have conducted capital or focused campaigns within the last decade, and nine are planning a campaign to begin within the next three years.
- Presidents devote an average of 15-20 percent of their time to fundraising. Most deans and department heads are involved only occasionally or rarely in fundraising.

- All offer annual giving, online giving, and faculty/staff contribution programs. Four also have student giving programs
- All publish alumni magazines, most more than once per year. Each of these publications reaches on average more than 20,000 households.
- All track their alumni, with annual address updates at nearly all institutions. An average of 17 percent of their alumni have unknown addresses.
- The majority do not have a donor rating system or a formal donor relations office. All publish annual donor recognition reports, and most have annual events to honor donors.
- Few engage in readership, opinion, or market surveys. Five have completed formal campaign feasibility studies in the last three years, and eight have conducted internal or external audits of their philanthropy programs by professional firms in the last five years.
- Annual giving programs generated \$3.2 million, \$5.2 million, and \$5.8 million for this sector in FY 2005, FY 2006, and FY 2007 respectively, for a three-year annual average per institution of \$438 thousand for those reporting each year.
- Giving amounts at many institutions fluctuate from year to year. Total amounts given tend to concentrate at a small number of institutions: in FY 2005, three institutions accounted for 70 percent of the sector total; in FY 2006, three universities accumulated 63 percent of the total; and in FY 2007, three institutions represented 93 percent of the total.
- Endowments support an average of 106 scholarships, with a range extending from 3 scholarships at one institution to 336 at another.
- Endowed chairs range from less than 3 chairs at nine of the institutions to 13 at one. Endowed professorships are relatively rare at all state universities, with only one having more than two.
- New gifts are received from several major sources, including friends (29 percent of all new gifts), alumni (25 percent), corporations (20 percent), and foundations (19 percent).

The State Colleges:

- All six state colleges have philanthropic foundations; four have additional volunteer boards that support philanthropic efforts. Three indicate that it is somewhat difficult, and one that it is very difficult to recruit good foundation trustees.

- Two hired their first full-time fundraiser in the 1970s, the rest since the late 1990s. Most chief advancement officers are at the director level and operate centralized offices.
- Frontline development staffs average two full-time equivalent professional staff members and one support staff, with additional staff devoted part-time to alumni relations.
- Staff are concentrated in the annual giving program, with limited (less than full) time allocated to other areas, including major gifts, corporate relations, foundation relations, and planned giving.
- One of the six colleges has a full-time equivalent alumni records and development research staff member; one has a staff member devoted to development communications.
- Most presidents devote 10-15 percent of their time on this activity, one an estimated 40-50 percent. Other administrative officers are rarely involved.
- Four have engaged in a comprehensive or focused campaign over the last decade, with the two completed campaigns having exceeded their goals. Three institutions are planning a campaign in the near future.
- Four offer online giving opportunities; all have annual giving and faculty/staff contribution programs; and one has a student giving program.
- Contact with alumni is maintained through alumni magazines at five of the six colleges, four published more than once a year. These magazines reach an average of 15,000 households each.
- Each updates its alumni address information every three to five years. The proportion of alumni with unknown addresses varies widely, from 4-5 percent at two institutions to more than half of all alumni at two others.
- One uses computer screening of donor prospects. None has a formal donor relations office, but three recognize donors through an annual report and five have annual recognition events.
- Most have not conducted readership surveys or market analyses; half have surveyed opinions of the institution or done formal campaign feasibility studies. Four have completed program audits within the last five years.

- Annual fund giving ranges from \$23 thousand to \$608 thousand across the three-year period from FY 2005 to FY 2007. Sector totals for these three years are \$1.1 million, \$1.2 million, and \$1.5 million, respectively. Three colleges have relatively large donations accounting for more than 80 percent of the sector total in each of these years.
- Sector endowments have produced more than 300 scholarships, an average of 52 per institution, two-thirds at two of the institutions. Endowed chairs (a total of six) and professorships (one total) are limited.
- Patterns of giving by state college constituents are somewhat unique. Most new gifts come from friends (33 percent of the total) or corporations (28 percent), with few (7 percent) coming from alumni.

Two-Year Colleges:

- All nine colleges have philanthropic foundations; two have additional volunteer boards that engage in philanthropic activities. Four report that it is somewhat difficult to recruit good foundation trustees.
- Professional fundraising is relatively new: although one institution hired a full-time staff member in the 1970s, six did so in the 1990s.
- Chief advancement officers have a variety of titles, two at the rank of vice president. In several instances, the leader is the only senior administrator identified with the program.
- Of the 15 professional staff members identified in the survey, 8 have less than two years of experience.
- Staffs tend to be small and inexperienced as well: six of the nine institutions have one full-time equivalent professional development fundraiser; one has more than one support staff member; only three have any full-time equivalent frontline alumni relations staff. Four have active plans to increase these staffs.
- Many professionals spread their responsibilities across several functional areas: only one institution has a full-time equivalent annual giving professional; none has either a full-time equivalent major gifts, corporate relations, foundation relations, or planned giving officer.
- Some professional and support staff members have significant institutional responsibilities in addition to their philanthropy assignments.
- Seven of the nine institutions have conducted a comprehensive or focused capital campaign within the last decade, and six are planning another within the next few years.

- Presidents devote an average of 20 percent of their time (with a range from 5 percent at three institutions to 40-50 percent at one). Deans and department heads rarely or occasionally get involved in fundraising.
- All have annual giving and faculty/staff contribution programs. Online giving is an option at one-third of the institutions; none has a student contribution program.
- Three have staff dedicated to development communications. None electronically screens and rates donor prospects.
- Five publish an alumni magazine, two reaching more than 10,000 households.
- The sector's annual fund gifts average about \$50 thousand per institution, resulting in an annual total for FY 2005 - FY 2007 of between \$400 and \$500 thousand for the sector. Three colleges receive the largest share of these gifts, accounting for between 75 and 90 percent of each year's sector totals.
- Sector institutions have established 313 endowed scholarships, with a range from zero at one college to more than 100 at another. None of the two-year institutions has an endowed chair or professorship.
- These colleges receive few new pledges and rarely from alumni. (Only one institution reports an alumni participation rate greater than one percent.) Friends of the colleges and corporations account for most new gifts.

Shared Deficiencies and Areas Needing Improvement: Despite the wide variations in institutional and sector fundraising capabilities, characteristic challenges and problems common to many USG philanthropy programs include the following:

- Lack of full-time staff devoted to particular fundraising functions (e.g., corporate or foundation relations, planned giving)
- Underdeveloped alumni relations staffs and programs, and low rates of alumni giving
- Difficulty in recruiting foundation trustees experienced in or committed to fundraising on behalf of the institution
- Limited attention to communications affecting cultivation and donor stewardship
- Problems in maintaining alumni contacts via up-to-date addresses and other information

- Absence or limited use of donor rating systems, research, and other analytical tools to support fundraising
- Wide disparities in securing endowed chairs/professorships and scholarships
- Inadequate involvement in fundraising of senior administrators other than the president
- An uneven record of conducting capital campaigns
- Apparent differences in the level of awareness and focus on philanthropy as a source of financial support

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Voluntary System of Education (VSE) Report proved valuable for the work of the task force. Its framework provides a useful and reliable set of giving categories for reporting fundraising results. The definitions of the variables reported by institutions offer a meaningful basis for tracking performance and making valid comparisons. The yearly reporting cycle guarantees a continuous record of fundraising results. Participation in the VSE by USG institutions has fluctuated. In the absence of this information, the task force had to rely on self-reported data that may not be collected on an annual basis or be based reliably upon the same definitions. Requiring institutions to participate in the VSE annual survey would ensure common metrics for evaluating fundraising progress and accurate updates for the Board. The head staff member of the Council for Aid to Education, which conducts the VSE survey, has volunteered to come to Atlanta to train USG institutional staff on how to complete this report and account for philanthropic gifts.

Task Force Recommendation 1: That each institution within the University System of Georgia be required to participate in the VSE annual survey of philanthropy.

Task Force Recommendation 2: That the USG sponsor a professional development workshop on the VSE reporting process conducted by the Council for Aid to Education staff, which produces the VSE report.

The Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising prepared and conducted by the task force was structured as a template and checklist of standard elements for successful fundraising in higher education. Since the USG institutions differ greatly in many respects, a single survey is not the only tool to use in evaluating fundraising programs. This survey does, however, afford institutions a quick and easy way to spot gaps in their programs and to generate ideas for strengthening their readiness and capacity for fundraising. The review and comparison process can be valuable for internal use by institutions and to inform the institutional target-setting process.

Task Force Recommendation 3: That each institution review and compare responses to the Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising with the responses of other institutions within its sector (and outside the sector, if appropriate) to identify ways to improve institutional capacity to conduct effective fundraising.

Overcoming deficiencies and making improvements to institutional programs will require strategic investment of resources, including reallocation of existing funds and securing additional funds to support and enhance philanthropy.

Task Force Recommendation 4: That the Board, the institutions, and their affiliated foundations undertake initiatives, individually and together, to provide resources to increase fundraising staffs and the capacity of the University System of Georgia colleges and universities to conduct effective fundraising.

Benchmarking: The diversity of colleges and universities within the University System of Georgia is remarkable. In FY 2007, enrollment at individual institutions varied from

less than 1,000 full-time equivalent students to nearly 34,000, educational and general budgets from \$10 million to \$1.3 billion. Institutions are located in communities extending from less than 12,000 in Bleckley County, where Middle Georgia College is located, to the City of Atlanta (more than 500,000) and its metropolitan area (5.3 million). Institutions' service areas include small and/or declining rural towns, major cities, and burgeoning metropolitan suburbs. Some serve regions with large proportions of the poor and poorly educated, some nationally ranked centers of affluence and excellent K-12 school systems. These disparate circumstances make it especially difficult and unproductive to base fundraising comparisons upon generalizations across USG institutions or sectors.

In 2000, the Board of Regents adopted institutional peers for benchmarking purposes after an exhaustive study based upon similarities using data gathered by the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The intent was to include a sufficient number of variables to establish a valid set of comparable institutions within or outside Georgia for each college and university in the USG. After vetting proposed peers with institutional officials, the USG assigned a benchmark group to each of its colleges and universities.

These benchmark groups were used sporadically, and institutional changes have led to questions about the appropriateness of some peers. In response, the Board staff recently began a review of benchmark groups, using much the same procedures employed previously. Benchmark groupings are now being revised, with the idea of distinguishing explicitly between comparator peers, which share significant similarities as defined by key variables used in the federal database, and aspirational peers, including

institutions that USG colleges and universities wish to emulate. When the new peer groups are finalized, they can be used to assess how well individual colleges and universities are succeeding in fundraising activities compared to both benchmark groups. That information also will be helpful as a baseline against which to set future institutional fundraising targets and for periodic updates of institutional performance.

Policy Issues Related to Fundraising: Among the potential external factors affecting fundraising at the institutions are public policies adopted by the USG or the state that either inhibit or support giving. To determine the perceived impact of policies on philanthropy, the task force conducted a survey of USG institutions. The survey also asked for recommendations on new policies that might provide incentives or enhance fundraising success.

Respondents cited several policies and legislation that support philanthropy, including protection of access to donor records, flexibility in spending endowment funds, institutional authority to make some naming decisions, the Georgia Research Alliance Venture Fund, the Eminent Scholars program, exemption from no-call list legislation, and Regents' policies in support of cooperative organizations. Concerns expressed included state policies regarding vendor disclosures of contributions, System solicitations that might compete with institutional donor cultivations, complicated processes and guidelines associated with naming guidelines, unpredictable state funding for the Eminent Scholar Endowment Trust Fund, the loss of the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (ICAPP[®]) state match, and limitations on the Georgia Research Alliance state matching funds. Board staff already have taken the initiative to resolve concerns about

vendor disclosures, securing changes in the legislative language to exempt philanthropic contributions from other reporting requirements.

Potential conflicts between System and institutional fundraising can be mitigated through an understanding that most individual philanthropy is motivated by local allegiances. In fact, “Charitable Giving in Georgia,” a December 2008 study prepared by The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, found that “Georgia residents directed most of their giving to local organizations.” Individuals give for a variety of reasons, but most prefer to contribute to particular institutions, programs, and people based upon personal experience and enthusiasms – inspired by memories of a period of their lives well spent on a beloved campus or a valued faculty member who inspired them – or by a belief in the value of a college or university’s presence in their community as a stimulus to economic development and an enriched quality of life. Corporations and foundations may be more open to collective initiatives, including Systemwide programs, although once again, the University of Indiana study of Georgia giving found that the state’s foundations show a preference for local organizations. Conflicts between solicitations can be alleviated through dialogue between System Office officials and presidents, and agreements beforehand about responsibility for approaching specified donors.

Advocacy for policy changes that might strengthen fundraising centered on a new matching gift program that would overcome the weaknesses of the Eminent Scholars program established by the state in 1981. The task force conducted research on state matching fund programs to determine the best practices associated with successful programs. The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) Center for Public Higher Education Trusteeship and Governance conducted a 2002 study of “creative

public/private partnerships” and “discovered that state matching funds programs serve as powerful incentives for institutions to leverage and raise funds from private sources. Public and private colleges and universities that fully utilize state matching funds programs maintain a considerable competitive advantage over their peer institutions.” The study concluded that “most matching programs were established during good economic conditions... when state revenues were growing at record-breaking rates. States that continue to generously support these programs, even during difficult economic times, will maintain a significant competitive advantage over those states that only marginally fund these programs or, even worse, are still trying to establish a matching fund program. Higher education leaders and state policy makers should be able to clearly articulate their case for matching fund programs and look for ways to better leverage them during economic downturns when financial needs are so great.”

At the time of the AGB study, 23 states had matching funds programs. A sample of 16 of these states documented that for an investment of \$168 million, these states had leveraged more than twice that amount – \$377 million – from private sources. Almost half that total went to institutions’ general endowments, and about one-third supported endowed chairs or faculty, with the balance going to support for student scholarships, capital projects, technology initiatives, and research.

Further research conducted by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) in 2004 concluded that matching programs “proved themselves effective strategies to strengthen the capacity for raising independent income of colleges and universities, contribute to the development of a philanthropic culture that is supportive of higher education and its broader underpinning of economic development

and social inclusion, and are persuasive examples of public-private partnerships, which contribute significantly to the development of innovative funding models for post-secondary institutions.”

The CASE study focused on characteristics of the best matching funds programs. Among its conclusions: 1) higher education board leadership in championing such programs with the legislature is essential; 2) these schemes are “not a substitute for public funding, nor does evidence suggest they lead to a diminished need for public funding, at least in the short term;” 3) it is possible to “structure schemes in ways that provide incentives for institutions of various kinds, both large and small, and with varying missions;” 4) the best programs “tend to be characterized by relatively short time scales,” involve “detailed specifications of eligibility” and “targeted particular priorities,” are restricted to gifts rather than pledges, delineate minimum and maximum levels of matching and matching ratios (between state and private donor contributions), and specify the designated time period during which matching funds are available (usually two to five years); 5) the programs are effective “where there are adequate state funds to underpin the process, where the contextual economy is robust, and where institutional capacity to rise to the challenge is reasonably developed;” and 6) the programs are preceded “by a scheme through which higher education institutions are encouraged to invest in development infrastructure (through staffing, staff training, improved databases) to strengthen the platform on which matched donations can be implemented with the greatest effectiveness.” Within the southern region, the CASE study documented effective programs in Florida, Kentucky, and Louisiana.

The task force is convinced that revision of the state's Eminent Scholars program based upon best practices of other state matching programs can be an effective incentive to encourage increased giving to the USG with competitive benefits to higher education and to state economic development. For such a program to be effective, it should be accompanied by a System initiative to enhance institutions' fundraising capabilities, including staffing, professional development, and infrastructure supporting philanthropy programs. Such an initiative would enable all institutional sectors to take advantage of the program. Current economic uncertainties may make it difficult to attain such an initiative; however, the USG can gain a competitive advantage regionally and nationally if it can implement a revised program when the economy rebounds. Meanwhile, steps taken to improve USG institutions' fundraising capabilities can position institutions to respond successfully to such an incentive-based program.

Task Force Recommendation 5: That the Board advocate a revised state matching gift program based upon best practices of such programs nationally.

Building naming policies have been adopted and implemented by the Board. However, concerns and uncertainties remain over the process of naming regulations for assets other than buildings, especially the naming of academic units such as schools or colleges, departments, programs, centers, and institutes. One issue is how best to ensure that individuals or other entities proposed for such a naming be worthy of such an honor. A second issue is to ensure that a naming reflect a significant contribution to the institution and to higher education, recognizing that terms of significance may vary across institutional sectors. In both instances, these issues can be resolved without an elaborate approval process by placing responsibility for making these assessments with presidents, in consultation with appropriate USG officials. If proposals are submitted for

vetting by both institutional and System personnel, agreements can be reached in support of a president's final decision on these matters.

Task Force Recommendation 6: That presidents submit a proposal for naming other than buildings to the Office of Legal Affairs. That submissions include information on associated gift amounts and results of due diligence assessments of the character of the individual or entity to receive the naming honor. That the Board staff, including the appropriate sector head, discuss the matter with the president so that he or she can make a final decision on the matter within 60 days of the submission.

Professional Development Opportunities: The task force conducted a survey of chief advancement officers at the 35 USG institutions to ascertain the current status of professional development for fundraising in the USG, to delineate training needs, and to identify resources available or required to meet these needs. Twenty-three officers responded to the survey. Results are summarized below.

Current Professional Development Programs: Two of the larger research institutions provide in-house professional development for staff, including orientations, periodic topical training classes, and web-based seminars for development staff; "Fundraising 101" for academic administrators; major gifts training for academic deans and top volunteers; and monthly campus-wide trainings. The other institutions rely on professional associations. CASE and the Georgia Education Advancement Council (GEAC) are the most frequently cited organizations, although GEAC historically has focused on public relations issues. A few institutions pursue certification for fundraising professionals through the Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) International, an organization that offers a voluntary certification process based upon relevant competencies and experience.

Training and Resource Needs: Respondents to the survey in many instances identified broad training needs, such as best practices for fundraising operations, overviews of advancement departments, uniform training in core areas, or sessions to prepare for fundraiser certification programs. Others focused on particular training topics, such as interaction with affiliated foundations, effective publicity, or marketing strategies. No comprehensive inventory of professional development needs emerged from the survey, perhaps reflecting the divergent states of philanthropy programs within the USG.

For many institutions, making the investment in training programs even when available can be costly. This is especially true for smaller-scale colleges with modest budgets, which also are more likely to have inexperienced fundraising professionals, other administrators expected to engage in fundraising, and volunteers. Funds are required to support travel and registration costs, and training organizations do not take into account differing institutional capacities to afford these costs. Institutional funds when available to support occasional training often are provided on an ad hoc basis, rather than being incorporated into a planned strategy of professional development linked with budget allocation commitments. Such funds nearly always come from institutional budgets since related foundations typically do not view training as their financial responsibility and other revenue sources are unavailable.

The financial impact of sending staff to programs offered by professional organizations suggests an alternative: to create programs sponsored by the USG that could be offered at the System Office or other central locations, minimizing travel (and registration) costs. A majority of survey respondents indicated an interest in participating

in such programs if the topics were applicable to identified institutional needs. Since those needs vary greatly across sectors, the design of such programs should be targeted to common training topics of relevance to a particular sector or training issues relevant to multiple sectors. The programs could be imported from professional training organizations or designed and offered by professionals recruited from within the USG or employed as consultants.

The shared conditions of capacity and preparedness noted among most institutions in the state and two-year college sectors could serve as the basis for an initial System program. These institutions typically are a starting point for new professionals who bring energy and commitment to their work but lack experience or formal training. This places a premium on development opportunities to support and advance these staff members' professional knowledge and skills. These also are the institutions most likely to have few travel and training funds available, especially given recent budget cuts. A System Strategic Funding Initiative that provided comprehensive baseline training for these two sectors would help overcome shared deficiencies and hopefully be a catalyst to improved sector performance.

Such a Strategic Funding Initiative also could be used to fund additional targeted professional development programs appropriate for other sectors' needs. In the short term, these funds could be used to take advantage of programs now offered by the professional associations. CASE, for example, will host its regional conference in Atlanta in February 2009 and usually offers one or more programs each year at this central location. USG institutions could take advantage of these local offerings.

For the longer term, a systematic professional development strategy for the USG is necessary. Such a strategy should incorporate baseline, specialized, and advanced training needs of fundraising officers, as well as programs to assist non-development professionals who engage in fundraising activities, including presidents, academic or other administrators, and volunteers on affiliated foundation or advisory boards. The strategy should consider both individual and team training approaches. An advisory committee of fundraising professionals appointed to support the Office of Planning and Implementation could help to implement such a program, charged to work with the USG's Professional Development Officer to design modules for baseline training, to create an inventory of other training needs, and to recommend pathways for professional development programs to meet those needs.

Task Force Recommendation 7: That the Board establish a Strategic Funding Initiative for Philanthropy to strengthen fundraising capacity, with the goals of having a least one full-time professional dedicated to philanthropy at each USG institution and to launch a major professional development undertaking for the state and two-year colleges sectors;

Task Force Recommendation 8: That the Board charge the advisory committee of fundraising professionals established by the Office of Planning and Implementation to assist the USG Professional Development Officer in designing a comprehensive professional development strategy for philanthropy programs to be supported by Strategic Initiative funds. That elements of the program include initial baseline training for state and two-year college sector fundraising staff members and an inventory of other professional development needs to be addressed through future professional development programs. That the Professional Development Officer and advisory committee also propose how best to deliver these programs, drawing on training available through professional associations, consultants, and in-house experts recruited from the USG.

Institutional fundraising targets: Institutional plans for fundraising are appropriately established by presidents and based upon assessments of the institution's history, setting, previous philanthropic activities and outcomes, current capabilities of the

institution to conduct fundraising, the capacity of its potential donor communities to give, and the college or university's strategy of future development. Since results of fundraising fluctuate in the short term, plans should encompass multiple years, with goals (targets) monitored throughout the planning period. Goals should specify the purposes for which funds are sought, with particular attention paid to the connection between fundraising and access to higher education.

The information obtained through the task force institutional surveys provides the basis for these assessments and for creating the initial institutional plans. Given the diversity of past philanthropy efforts across the USG and its several institutional sectors, it is to be expected that institutional goals for these plans will vary accordingly. Goals and targets should take into account the institution's history, as well as comparisons with benchmark peer institutions. Evaluations of proposed plans should be vetted through a process involving System officials, leading to final plans and implementation agreements and periodic assessments of progress toward meeting agreed upon goals. Since presidents are asked to take responsibility for the plans, these assessments should be incorporated into presidential performance evaluations.

Task Force Recommendation 9: That each USG president prepare and submit to the USG Office of Planning and Implementation a draft "Institutional Fundraising Plan for 2009-2012" by May 1, 2009. That the plan include information on the following topics:

- 1. An outline of past (2000-2009) fundraising activities and results (annual fund, capital campaign results, current endowment value, and total foundation and institutional assets from private donations)**
- 2. An overall assessment of the current state of institutional fundraising based on data submitted for the 2006-2007 Voluntary Support of Higher Education Philanthropy Overview and the Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising-- Institutional Assessment**

3. **An assessment of the institution's standing among its comparator and aspirational benchmark peer groups as reported by the task force**
4. **A proposed three-year fundraising plan, including the following:**
 - a. **Goals (including monetary targets for specified purposes);**
 - b. **Key organizational actions to meet goals (e.g., changes in organizational structure, professional development programs, and allocation of university resources);**
 - c. **Additional resources being sought to support the plan (NOTE: the goals and targets should not be contingent on receiving these funds);**
 - d. **Milestones for achieving progress toward goals (including dates); and**
 - e. **Projected dates for next comprehensive campaign (estimated date if beyond planning period).**

Task Force Recommendation 10: That each draft submitted be forwarded to the appropriate sector head for review, discussion, and approval.

Task Force Recommendation 11: That the institutional plans include consideration of the System commitment to increase access to higher education, with emphasis on fundraising to increase need-based financial assistance for students in support of USG Strategic Goal No. 5;

Task Force Recommendation 12: That the institutional plan as adopted be incorporated into the annual review of its president's performance, with adjustments to goals, milestones, and targets based upon those reviews.

Program Monitoring: The information contained in this task force report can serve as a baseline for monitoring System progress in future years, including: (1) the VSE data, which provides annual reports on total giving for all participating institutions; (2) the Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising, which details the present fundraising circumstances for each college and university (except Georgia Gwinnett College) and summaries of the standing of each USG sector, enabling institutions to document their current position and to locate themselves within their particular sector; (3)

the benchmark groups (when completed), which will define each institution's competitive position in relationship to comparator and aspirational peer institutions; (4) the survey of professional development needs and opportunities, which identifies deficiencies faced by institutions and sectors and recommends education and training programs to overcome these shortcomings; and (5) the target-setting process, which will build upon this information and establish a set of goals and milestones to measure institutional progress. Information on performance will be documented each year as part of the presidential performance evaluation and summarized for each three-year target period.

This same information can be used to present to the Board a periodic report of progress for the System and its institutional sectors. The Office of Planning and Implementation can be charged to conduct this assessment, assisted by the proposed committee of fundraising professionals who bring expertise to analyze the data and broader perspectives on developments in philanthropy regionally or nationally.

Task Force Recommendation 13: That the Chancellor's Office establish a timetable for reports to the Board of progress in philanthropy within the University System of Georgia and its institutional sectors. These reports should include an annual update based upon VSE data reported by each University System of Georgia institution; and a report by sector to be completed at the end of each three-year cycle of institutional fundraising plans.

Task Force Recommendation 14: That the Office of Planning and Implementation be assigned responsibility to prepare these progress reports to the Board, assisted by the committee of fundraising professionals and utilizing information obtained from the institutional target-setting process and subsequent annual evaluations of institutional performance based upon target goals.

University System of Georgia
Task Force on Philanthropy
Summary of Recommendations

Task Force Recommendation 1: That each institution within the University System of Georgia be required to participate in the VSE annual survey of philanthropy.

Task Force Recommendation 2: That the USG sponsor a professional development workshop on the VSE reporting process conducted by the Council for Aid to Education staff, which produces the VSE report.

Task Force Recommendation 3: That each institution review and compare responses to the Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising with the responses of other institutions within its sector (and outside the sector, if appropriate) to identify ways to improve institutional capacity to conduct effective fundraising.

Task Force Recommendation 4: That the Board, the institutions, and their affiliated foundations undertake initiatives, individually and together, to provide resources to increase fundraising staffs and the capacity of the University System of Georgia colleges and universities to conduct effective fundraising.

Task Force Recommendation 5: That the Board advocate a revised state matching gift program based upon best practices of such programs nationally.

Task Force Recommendation 6: That presidents submit a proposal for naming other than buildings to the Office of Legal Affairs. That submissions include information on associated gift amounts and results of due diligence assessments of the character of the individual or entity to receive the naming honor. That the Board staff, including the appropriate sector head, discuss the matter with the president so that he or she can make a final decision on the matter within 60 days of the submission.

Task Force Recommendation 7: That the Board establish a Strategic Funding Initiative for Philanthropy to strengthen fundraising capacity, with the goals of having a least one full-time professional dedicated to philanthropy at each USG institution and to launch a major professional development undertaking for the state and two-year colleges sectors;

Task Force Recommendation 8: That the Board charge the advisory committee of fundraising professionals established by the Office of Planning and Implementation to assist the USG Professional Development Officer in designing a comprehensive professional development strategy for philanthropy programs to be supported by Strategic Initiative funds. That elements of the program include initial baseline training for state and two-year college sector fundraising staff members and an inventory of other professional development needs to be addressed through future professional development programs. That the Professional Development Officer and advisory committee also propose how best to deliver these programs, drawing on training available through professional associations, consultants, and in-house experts recruited from the USG.

Task Force Recommendation 9: That each USG president prepare and submit to the USG Office of Planning and Implementation a draft “Institutional Fundraising Plan for 2009-2012” by May 1, 2009. That the plan include information on the following topics:

1. An outline of past (2000-2009) fundraising activities and results (annual fund, capital campaign results, current endowment value, and total foundation and institutional assets from private donations)
2. An overall assessment of the current state of institutional fundraising based on data submitted for the 2006-2007 Voluntary Support of Higher Education Philanthropy Overview and the Survey of Preparedness and Capacity for Fundraising-- Institutional Assessment
3. An assessment of the institution’s standing among its comparator and aspirational benchmark peer groups as reported by the task force
4. A proposed three-year fundraising plan, including the following:
 - a. Goals (including monetary targets for specified purposes);
 - b. Key organizational actions to meet goals (e.g., changes in organizational structure, professional development programs, and allocation of university resources);
 - c. Additional resources being sought to support the plan (NOTE: the goals and targets should not be contingent on receiving these funds);
 - d. Milestones for achieving progress toward goals (including dates); and
 - e. Projected dates for next comprehensive campaign (estimated date if beyond planning period).

Task Force Recommendation 10: That each draft submitted be forwarded to the appropriate sector head for review, discussion, and approval.

Task Force Recommendation 11: That the institutional plans include consideration of the System commitment to increase access to higher education, with emphasis on fundraising to increase need-based financial assistance for students in support of USG Strategic Goal No. 5;

Task Force Recommendation 12: That the institutional plan as adopted be incorporated into the annual review of its president’s performance, with adjustments to goals, milestones, and targets based upon those reviews.

Task Force Recommendation 13: That the Chancellor’s Office establish a timetable for reports to the Board of progress in philanthropy within the University System of Georgia

and its institutional sectors. These reports should include an annual update based upon VSE data reported by each University System of Georgia institution; and a report by sector to be completed at the end of each three-year cycle of institutional fundraising plans.

Task Force Recommendation 14: That the Office of Planning and Implementation be assigned responsibility to prepare these progress reports to the Board, assisted by the committee of fundraising professionals and utilizing information obtained from the institutional target-setting process and subsequent annual evaluations of institutional performance based upon target goals.

Appendix I

Charge to the President and the Task Force on Philanthropy

Background and Rationale

In response to *Strategic Goal Five: Maintain affordability so that money is not a barrier to participation in the benefits of higher education*, we propose the establishment of a systemwide project for improving fundraising capacity.

The State of Georgia has provided significant funding for public higher education over the last 30 years, including formula funding, general obligation bonds, and lottery funds. The Board of Regents has approved modest tuition and fee increases over the same period of time, keeping Georgia a low-tuition state. Funding from the Georgia Lottery, established in 1993, has had a significant impact on how students pay for college. However, even with strong state funding, USG institutions find themselves with unmet growth needs, as well as ongoing cost pressures.

Resources can be increased through a number of avenues: tuition, level of state support, research dollars absorbing more overhead, auxiliary operations profitability, productivity and efficiency, and lastly, fundraising.

Many institutions are paying increasing attention to fundraising to address institutional needs. Most major institutions are accustomed to public-private partnerships for funding, the development and utilization of proceeds from endowment and other special investments, targeted fundraising, and many other conventions of higher education. Smaller institutions, particularly small public institutions, are just entering this arena. The purpose of this effort will be to increase the fundraising capacity of the USG as a whole.

The President and team are charged with the following outcomes:

1. Assess the current conditions of fundraising by sector and institutional type within the USG, benchmarking against national peers.
2. Assess institutional capacity and preparedness for fundraising.
3. Assess public policy issues impacting public college fundraising.
4. Set institutional target ranges for fundraising, both amount and timing, at the institution level.
5. Establish professional development opportunities for institutional development officers.
6. Ensure that adequate programs are in place, containing all identified precursors of successful programs, and that they are operating in a manner that will allow each institution to achieve its fundraising potential.

Appendix II

Members of the University System of Georgia Task Force on Philanthropy

Ms. Amy Amason
Vice President for External Relations
& University Advancement
Georgia College & State University

Dr. David Bridges
President
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College

Dr. Frank Brown
President Emeritus
Columbus State University

Mr. Barrett H. Carson
Vice President for Development
Georgia Institute of Technology

Ms. Sue Chipman
Executive Director, MSC Foundation
& Chief Development Officer
Macon State College

Dr. Ron Dempsey
Vice President for University Advancement
Southern Polytechnic State University

Mr. David J. Elrod
Director of Institutional Advancement
Dalton State College

Mr. Billy Griffis
Vice President for University Advancement
Georgia Southern University

Mr. Robert Hawkins
Associate Vice President for Development
The University of Georgia

Dr. Gary McGaha
President
Atlanta Metropolitan College

Nancy E. Peterman
Vice President for Development and
President of the Foundation
Georgia State University

David Potter (chair)
President
North Georgia College & State University

Ms. Mary Claffey Smith
Vice President for Legal & External Affairs
East Georgia College

Mr. Jeff Tarnowski
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Georgia Perimeter College

Mr. Larion Williams
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Atlanta Metropolitan College

Appendix III

National College and University Endowment Rankings Fiscal 2007

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Endowment Market Value</u>
1	Harvard University	\$34.6 billion
2	Yale University	22.5 billion
3	Stanford University	17.2 billion
4	Princeton University	15.8 billion
5	University of Texas	15.5 billion
6	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	10.0 billion
7	Columbia University	7.1 billion
8	University of Michigan	7.1 billion
9	University of Pennsylvania	6.6 billion
10	Texas A&M	6.6 billion

University System of Georgia - Colleges and Universities

2006-07 Voluntary Support of Higher Education - FYE June 30, 2007 - by Institutional Size

BOR Classification	Total Fall FTE Enrollment	Total Voluntary Support	Voluntary Support per FTE Student	3 Yr Total Voluntary Support Avg	# of Years in Avg	State Appropriation	Educational and General Expenditures	Educational and General Expenditures per Student	Voluntary Support as a % of E and G	Endowment Market Value	Endowment per FTE Student	Source*
Research Universities												
Georgia Institute of Technology	17,100	\$119,454,789	\$6,986	\$99,180,644	3	\$212,078,495	\$903,900,000	\$52,860	13.2%	\$1,608,681,603	\$89,695	VSE
Georgia State University	22,745	\$15,905,392	\$699	\$12,909,435	3	\$189,453,014	\$454,702,908	\$19,991	3.5%	\$100,334,859	\$3,839	VSE
Medical College of Georgia	2,642	\$6,364,994	\$2,409	\$8,307,557	3	\$141,607,301	\$342,959,686	\$129,811	1.9%	\$126,433,000	\$46,897	VSE
University of Georgia	31,981	\$88,433,680	\$2,765	\$72,815,343	3	\$348,704,090	\$997,008,282	\$31,175	8.9%	\$705,316,000	\$20,770	VSE
<i>BOR Classification Subtotal/Averages:</i>	<i>74,468</i>	<i>\$230,158,855</i>	<i>\$3,091</i>	<i>\$193,212,979</i>		<i>\$891,842,900</i>	<i>\$2,698,570,876</i>	<i>\$36,238</i>	<i>8.5%</i>	<i>\$2,540,765,462</i>	<i>\$34,119</i>	
Regional Universities												
Georgia Southern University	14,962	\$4,195,914	\$280	\$5,278,856	3	\$85,536,108	\$162,541,695	\$10,864	2.6%	\$37,045,807	\$2,255	VSE
Valdosta State University	9,842	\$877,660	\$89	\$1,210,427	3	\$49,614,471	\$121,417,516	\$12,337	0.7%	\$20,270,000	\$1,862	Self
<i>BOR Classification Subtotal/Averages:</i>	<i>24,804</i>	<i>\$5,073,574</i>	<i>\$205</i>	<i>\$6,489,283</i>		<i>\$135,150,579</i>	<i>\$283,959,211</i>	<i>\$11,448</i>	<i>1.8%</i>	<i>\$57,315,807</i>	<i>\$2,311</i>	
State Universities												
Albany State University	4,033	\$279,901	\$69	\$386,300	3	\$21,063,911	\$57,633,000	\$14,290	0.5%	\$765,254	\$190	Self
Armstrong Atlantic State College	5,763	\$1,523,541	\$264	\$1,523,541	1	\$30,676,887	\$74,764,827	\$12,973	2.0%	\$7,997,800	\$1,171	VSE
Augusta State University	5,571	\$1,530,212	\$275	\$2,736,207	2	\$26,309,349	\$48,885,440	\$8,775	3.1%	\$13,963,203	\$2,124	VSE
Clayton State University	4,915	\$564,425	\$115	\$937,808	3	\$23,031,392	\$59,274,527	\$12,060	1.0%	\$3,433,693	\$565	Self
Columbus State University	6,425	\$13,889,412	\$2,162	\$17,147,483	3	\$34,680,062	\$73,159,619	\$11,387	19.0%	\$34,317,922	\$4,521	VSE
Fort Valley State University	2,043	\$1,399,444	\$685	\$1,433,148	3	\$21,764,904	\$54,320,413	\$26,589	2.6%	\$5,304,711	\$2,438	Self
Georgia College & State University	5,591	\$2,542,604	\$455	\$2,401,369	2	\$29,836,650	\$67,388,729	\$12,053	3.8%	\$20,954,813	\$3,469	VSE
Georgia Southwestern State University	2,161	\$2,019,147	\$934	\$2,039,716	3	\$12,222,665	\$30,745,147	\$14,227	6.6%	\$25,238,673	\$10,272	Self
Kennesaw State University	17,183	\$4,631,401	\$270	\$5,193,458	2	\$74,685,816	\$160,476,744	\$9,339	2.9%	\$22,639,992	\$1,140	VSE
North Georgia College & State Univ.	4,433	\$8,095,549	\$1,826	\$3,521,359	3	\$23,051,453	\$57,594,760	\$12,992	14.1%	\$24,947,315	\$4,892	VSE
Savannah State University	0	\$647,786	\$0	\$1,041,117	3	\$17,795,512	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$2,845,622	\$912	Self
Southern Polytechnic State University	3,523	\$2,609,742	\$741	\$2,096,910	3	\$19,946,589	\$44,074,897	\$12,511	5.9%	\$4,134,671	\$984	VSE
University of West Georgia Foundation, In	8,942	\$2,979,954	\$333	\$2,440,310	3	\$44,632,019	\$86,777,447	\$9,704	3.4%	\$20,368,618	\$2,004	VSE
<i>BOR Classification Subtotal/Averages:</i>	<i>70,583</i>	<i>\$42,713,118</i>	<i>\$605</i>	<i>\$42,898,726</i>		<i>\$379,697,209</i>	<i>\$815,095,550</i>	<i>\$11,548</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>\$186,912,287</i>	<i>\$2,648</i>	

APPENDIX IV

BOR Classification	Total Fall FTE Enrollment	Total Voluntary Support	Voluntary Support per FTE Student	3 Yr Total Voluntary Support Avg	# of Years in Avg	State Appropriation	Educational and General Expenditures	Educational and General Expenditures per Student	Voluntary Support as a % of E and G	Endowment Market Value	Endowment per FTE Student	Source*
State Colleges												
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	3,130	\$1,240,330	\$396	\$1,378,790	2	\$13,583,634	\$25,237,738	\$8,063	4.9%	\$7,199,767	\$1,964	VSE
Dalton State College	2,027	\$2,358,904	\$1,164	\$1,090,635	3	\$12,723,126	\$28,557,451	\$14,089	0.0%	\$12,471,910	\$2,868	Self
Gainesville State College	12,131	\$2,402,548	\$198	\$1,826,516	3	\$17,866,983	\$30,726,124	\$2,533	7.8%	\$11,921,087	\$742	VSE
Georgia Gwinnett College	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$10,368,675	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	Self
Gordon College	3,091	\$190,569	\$62	\$134,190	3	\$11,551,871	\$25,776,599	\$8,339	0.7%	\$6,200,380	\$1,724	VSE
Macon State College	4,744	\$953,068	\$201	\$1,050,310	2	\$19,766,520	\$30,953,349	\$6,525	3.1%	\$8,296,619	\$1,329	VSE
Middle Georgia College	2,050	\$146,552	\$71	\$119,517	3	\$12,092,191	\$26,104,012	\$12,734	0.6%	\$773,000	\$253	Self
<i>BOR Classification Subtotal/Averages:</i>	27,173	\$7,291,971	\$268	\$5,599,958		\$97,953,000	\$167,355,273	\$6,159	4.4%	\$46,862,763	\$1,725	
Two-Year Colleges												
Atlanta Metropolitan College	1,299	\$13,479	\$10	\$13,479	1	\$7,656,261	\$15,787,482	\$12,154	0.1%	\$0	\$0	Self
Bainbridge College	2,106	\$0	\$0	\$71,000	1	\$8,673,239	\$18,348,411	\$8,712	0.0%	\$652,452	\$234	Self
Coastal Georgia Community College	2,144	\$486,413	\$227	\$486,413	1	\$10,043,596	\$19,377,163	\$9,038	2.5%	\$4,654,525	\$1,520	VSE
Darton College	3,408	\$508,917	\$149	\$774,306	3	\$14,904,441	\$31,765,729	\$9,321	1.6%	\$1,094,832	\$239	Self
East Georgia College	1,779	\$155,850	\$88	\$144,045	3	\$5,515,117	\$10,872,283	\$6,111	1.4%	\$19,094	\$10	Self
Georgia Highlands College	3,214	\$291,248	\$91	\$343,749	3	\$13,060,107	\$25,058,557	\$7,797	1.2%	\$471,044	\$120	Self
Georgia Perimeter College	14,964	\$695,427	\$46	\$1,604,192	3	\$59,449,381	\$119,228,629	\$7,968	0.6%	\$521,778	\$26	VSE
South Georgia College	1,291	\$161,296	\$125	\$167,765	3	\$6,431,936	\$14,115,966	\$10,934	0.0%	\$2,211,518	\$1,510	Self
Waycross College	715	\$45,090	\$63	\$92,363	3	\$3,444,123	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$1,508,728	\$1,482	Self
<i>BOR Classification Subtotal/Averages:</i>	30,920	\$2,357,721	\$76	\$3,697,312		\$129,178,201	\$254,554,220	\$8,233	0.9%	\$11,133,970	\$360	
USG Total:	227,948	\$287,595,239	\$1,262	\$251,898,258		\$1,633,821,889	\$4,219,535,130	\$18,511	6.8%	\$2,842,990,290	\$12,472	