

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table of Contents   |     |
| Summary of Findings   | 26  |
| Survey Participants   | 36  |
| Dimensions of the Sample  | 37  |
| Chapter One: Promotional Vehicles   | 39  |
| Chapter Two: Cost of Raising Funds  | 51  |
| Chapter Three: Personnel Issues   | 65  |
| Chapter Four: Best Fundraising Vehicles   | 69  |
| Chapter Five: Booster clubs   | 82  |
| Chapter Six: The Annual Fund  | 87  |
| Chapter Seven: Gifts of Non-Monetary Assets   | 95  |
| Chapter Eight: Campaign Consultants   | 98  |
| Chapter Nine: Fundraising Feasibility Studies   | 105 |
| Chapter Ten: Office Funding and Structure   | 107 |
| Chapter Eleven: Auctions  | 115 |
| Chapter Twelve: Growth Rate of Various Kinds of Fundraising   | 121 |
| Chapter Thirteen: Rewarding Donors  | 129 |
| Chapter Fourteen: Raising Money from Faculty and Staff  | 132 |
| Chapter Fifteen: Fundraising Software   | 135 |
| Other Reports of Interest from Primary Research Group   | 138 |
| <b>List of Tables</b>   |     |
| Table 1.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Total Quantity of Pieces Mailed in the Past Year to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors  | 39  |
| Table 1.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Total Quantity of Pieces Mailed in the Past Year to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 39  |
| Table 1.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Total Quantity of Pieces Mailed in the Past Year to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 39  |
| Table 1.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Total Quantity of Pieces Mailed in the Past Year to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 39  |
| Table 1.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Total Quantity of Pieces Mailed in the Past Year to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 40  |
| Table 1.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Mail Pieces to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors per Student   | 40  |
| Table 1.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Mail Pieces to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors per Student, Broken Out by Type of College  | 40  |
| Table 1.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Mail Pieces to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors per Student, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                          | 40  |
| Table 1.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Mail Pieces to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors per Student, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 41  |
| Table 1.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Mail Pieces to Raise Funds from All Potential Donors per Student, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 41  |
| Table 1.11: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Advertise through Google, Yahoo!, or Other Search Engines  | 41  |
| Table 1.12: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Advertise through Google, Yahoo!, or Other Search Engines, Broken Out by Type of College   | 41  |
| Table 1.13: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Advertise through Google, Yahoo!, or Other Search Engines, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                   | 41  |
| Table 1.14: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Advertise through Google, Yahoo!, or Other Search Engines, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 42  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1.15: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Advertise through Google, Yahoo!, or Other Search Engines, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 42 |
| Table 1.16: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed Blogs for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years  | 42 |
| Table 1.17: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed Blogs for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 42 |
| Table 1.18: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed Blogs for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 42 |
| Table 1.19: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed Blogs for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 43 |
| Table 1.20: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed Blogs for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 43 |
| Table 1.21: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed E-Newsletters for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years  | 43 |
| Table 1.22: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed E-Newsletters for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 43 |
| Table 1.23: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed E-Newsletters for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 43 |
| Table 1.24: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed E-Newsletters for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 44 |
| Table 1.25: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Developed E-Newsletters for Specific Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 44 |
| Table 1.26: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on Pages of the College Website Devoted to Fundraising for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years  | 44 |
| Table 1.27: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on Pages of the College Website Devoted to Fundraising for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 44 |
| Table 1.28: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on Pages of the College Website Devoted to Fundraising for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 44 |
| Table 1.29: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on Pages of the College Website Devoted to Fundraising for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 45 |
| Table 1.30: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on Pages of the College Website Devoted to Fundraising for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 45 |
| Table 1.31: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on the General College Website for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years  | 45 |
| Table 1.32: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on the General College Website for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 45 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1.33: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on the General College Website for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 46 |
| Table 1.34: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on the General College Website for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 46 |
| Table 1.35: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Posted Content on the General College Website for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 46 |
| Table 1.36: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Announcements through Listservs for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years   | 46 |
| Table 1.37: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Announcements through Listservs for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College                                  | 46 |
| Table 1.38: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Announcements through Listservs for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College          | 47 |
| Table 1.39: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Announcements through Listservs for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                               | 47 |
| Table 1.40: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Announcements through Listservs for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                           | 47 |
| Table 1.41: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Emails to Past Donors for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years   | 47 |
| Table 1.42: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Emails to Past Donors for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 47 |
| Table 1.43: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Emails to Past Donors for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                    | 48 |
| Table 1.44: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Emails to Past Donors for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 48 |
| Table 1.45: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Emails to Past Donors for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                                     | 48 |
| Table 1.46: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Banner Ads or Website Sponsorships for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years  | 48 |
| Table 1.47: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Banner Ads or Website Sponsorship for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College                                | 48 |
| Table 1.48: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Banner Ads or Website Sponsorship for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College        | 49 |
| Table 1.49: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Banner Ads or Website Sponsorship for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                             | 49 |
| Table 1.50: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Have Used Banner Ads or Website Sponsorship for Particular Fundraising Campaigns in the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                         | 49 |
| Table 1.51: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Telephone Solicitation, Either In-House or Outsourced, Including Spending for Labor, Scripts, Telecom Costs, etc., in the Past Year (in US\$)                     | 49 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1.52: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Telephone Solicitation, Either In-House or Outsourced, Including Spending for Labor, Scripts, Telecom Costs, etc., in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College                           | 50 |
| Table 1.53: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Telephone Solicitation, Either In-House or Outsourced, Including Spending for Labor, Scripts, Telecom Costs, etc., in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 50 |
| Table 1.54: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Telephone Solicitation, Either In-House or Outsourced, Including Spending for Labor, Scripts, Telecom Costs, etc., in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment                        | 50 |
| Table 1.55: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Telephone Solicitation, Either In-House or Outsourced, Including Spending for Labor, Scripts, Telecom Costs, etc., in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                    | 50 |
| Table 2.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Marginal Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Excluding Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead  | 51 |
| Table 2.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Marginal Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Excluding Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Type of College   | 51 |
| Table 2.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Marginal Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Excluding Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                           | 51 |
| Table 2.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Marginal Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Excluding Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 51 |
| Table 2.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Marginal Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Excluding Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 52 |
| Table 2.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Including Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead   | 52 |
| Table 2.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Including Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Type of College  | 52 |
| Table 2.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Including Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                                    | 52 |
| Table 2.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Including Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 53 |
| Table 2.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Cost of Raising Funds as Expressed as a Percentage of Total Funds Raised, Including Costs of Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 53 |
| Table 2.11: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries, Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that Performs the Same Duties for the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$)                                | 53 |
| Table 2.12: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries, Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that Performs the Same Duties for the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College | 53 |
| Table 2.13: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries, Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office  |    |

|             |   |    |
|-------------|---|----|
|             | that Performs the Same Duties for the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 54 |
| Table 2.14: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 54 |
| Table 2.15: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 54 |
| Table 2.16: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$)   | 54 |
| Table 2.17: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Type of College                         | 55 |
| Table 2.18: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 55 |
| Table 2.19: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 55 |
| Table 2.20: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget, Excluding Salaries,<br>Benefits, and Office Space, for the Office of Advancement or Similar Office<br>that Performs the Same Duties for the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 55 |
| Table 2.21: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$)   | 56 |
| Table 2.22: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Type of College                                   | 56 |
| Table 2.23: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College           | 56 |
| Table 2.24: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Value of Endowment                                | 56 |
| Table 2.25: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                            | 57 |
| Table 2.26: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$)   | 57 |
| Table 2.27: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and<br>Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that<br>Performs the Same Functions in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$),<br>Broken Out by Type of College                                   | 57 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 2.28: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that Performs the Same Functions in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 57 |
| Table 2.29: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that Performs the Same Functions in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 58 |
| Table 2.30: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Salaries and Benefits for Employees of the Office of Advancement or Similar Office that Performs the Same Functions in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 58 |
| Table 2.31: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$)   | 58 |
| Table 2.32: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College  | 58 |
| Table 2.33: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 59 |
| Table 2.34: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 59 |
| Table 2.35: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 59 |
| Table 2.36: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$)   | 59 |
| Table 2.37: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College  | 60 |
| Table 2.38: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 60 |
| Table 2.39: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 60 |
| Table 2.40: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Cost for Office of Advancement Employee Salaries and Benefits per Student in the 2007-2008 Academic Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 60 |
| Table 2.41: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement for the 2006-2007 Academic Year   | 61 |
| Table 2.42: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement for the 2006-2007 Academic Year, Broken Out by Type of College  | 61 |
| Table 2.43: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement for the 2006-2007 Academic Year, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 61 |
| Table 2.44: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement for the 2006-2007 Academic Year, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 61 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 2.45: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement for the 2006-2007 Academic Year, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 62 |
| Table 2.46: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement in the 2007-2008 Academic Year   | 62 |
| Table 2.47: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Broken Out by Type of College  | 62 |
| Table 2.48: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 62 |
| Table 2.49: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 63 |
| Table 2.50: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the Office of Advancement in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 63 |
| Table 2.51: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Square Feet of Office Space is Allocated to the Office of Advancement or Office with Similar Responsibilities   | 63 |
| Table 2.52: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Square Feet of Office Space is Allocated to the Office of Advancement or Office with Similar Responsibilities, Broken Out by Type of College  | 63 |
| Table 2.53: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Square Feet of Office Space is Allocated to the Office of Advancement or Office with Similar Responsibilities, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                          | 64 |
| Table 2.54: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Square Feet of Office Space is Allocated to the Office of Advancement or Office with Similar Responsibilities, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 64 |
| Table 2.55: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Square Feet of Office Space is Allocated to the Office of Advancement or Office with Similar Responsibilities, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 64 |
| Table 3.1: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Awarded Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in Any Form, for Employees that are Most Responsible for Fund Raising, in the Past Year  | 65 |
| Table 3.2: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Awarded Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in Any Form, for Employees that are Most Responsible for Fund Raising, in the Past Year, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 65 |
| Table 3.3: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Awarded Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in Any Form, for Employees that are Most Responsible for Fund Raising, in the Past Year, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 65 |
| Table 3.4: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Awarded Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in Any Form, for Employees that are Most Responsible for Fund Raising, in the Past Year, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 65 |
| Table 3.5: Percentage of College Advancement Offices that Awarded Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in Any Form, for Employees that are Most Responsible for Fund Raising, in the Past Year, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 66 |
| Table 3.6: Level of Merit-Based Pay or Bonus Awarded by College Advancement Offices with Merit-Based Pay Policies   | 66 |
| Table 3.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Full Time Staff that Qualified for Any Form of Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in the Past Year   | 66 |
| Table 3.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Full Time Staff that Qualified for Any Form of Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in the Past Year, Broken Out by Type of College  | 66 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 3.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Full Time Staff that Qualified for Any Form of Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in the Past Year, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 66 |
| Table 3.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Full Time Staff that Qualified for Any Form of Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in the Past Year, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                     | 67 |
| Table 3.11: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Full Time Staff that Qualified for Any Form of Merit-Based Pay or Bonuses in the Past Year, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                 | 67 |
| Table 3.12: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Employing One or More Full Time Grant Writers  | 67 |
| Table 3.13: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Employing One or More Full Time Grant Writers, Broken Out by Type of College   | 67 |
| Table 3.14: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Employing One or More Full Time Grant Writers, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 67 |
| Table 3.15: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Employing One or More Full Time Grant Writers, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 68 |
| Table 3.16: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Employing One or More Full Time Grant Writers, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 68 |
| Table 4.1: Effectiveness of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years  | 69 |
| Table 4.2: Effectiveness of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 69 |
| Table 4.3: Effectiveness of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 69 |
| Table 4.4: Effectiveness of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 69 |
| Table 4.5: Effectiveness of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 70 |
| Table 4.6: Effectiveness of Telethons as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years  | 70 |
| Table 4.7: Effectiveness of Telethons as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 70 |
| Table 4.8: Effectiveness of Telethons as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 70 |
| Table 4.9: Effectiveness of Telethons as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 71 |
| Table 4.10: Effectiveness of Telethons as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 71 |
| Table 4.11: Effectiveness of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   | 71 |
| Table 4.12: Effectiveness of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 71 |
| Table 4.13: Effectiveness of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 72 |
| Table 4.14: Effectiveness of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 72 |
| Table 4.15: Effectiveness of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 72 |
| Table 4.16: Effectiveness of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   | 72 |
| Table 4.17: Effectiveness of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 73 |
| Table 4.18: Effectiveness of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 73 |



|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| Table 4.19: Effectiveness of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 73 |    |
| Table 4.20: Effectiveness of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 73 |    |
| Table 4.21: Effectiveness of Live Auctions as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   | 74 |    |
| Table 4.22: Effectiveness of Live Auctions as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 74 |    |
| Table 4.23: Effectiveness of Live Auctions as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 74 |    |
| Table 4.24: Effectiveness of Live Auctions as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment | 75 |    |
| Table 4.25: Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years  | 75 |    |
| Table 4.26: Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 75 |    |
| Table 4.27: Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 75 |    |
| Table 4.28: Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 76 |    |
| Table 4.29: Effectiveness of Appeals to Faculty and Staff as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 76 |    |
| Table 4.30: Effectiveness of Bequests as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years  |    | 76 |
| Table 4.31: Effectiveness of Bequests as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 76 |    |
| Table 4.32: Effectiveness of Bequests as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 77 |    |
| Table 4.33: Effectiveness of Bequests as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 77 |    |
| Table 4.34: Effectiveness of Bequests as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 77 |    |
| Table 4.35: Effectiveness of Facility Naming Gifts as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   | 77 |    |
| Table 4.36: Effectiveness of Facility Naming Gifts as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 78 |    |
| Table 4.37: Effectiveness of Facility Naming Gifts as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 78 |    |
| Table 4.38: Effectiveness of Facility Naming Gifts as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 78 |    |
| Table 4.39: Effectiveness of Facility Naming Gifts as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 78 |    |
| Table 4.40: Effectiveness of Raffles as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   |    | 79 |
| Table 4.41: Effectiveness of Raffles as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 79 |    |
| Table 4.42: Effectiveness of Raffles as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 79 |    |
| Table 4.43: Effectiveness of Raffles as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 79 |    |
| Table 4.44: Effectiveness of Raffles as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 80 |    |
| Table 4.45: Effectiveness of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years   | 80 |    |
| Table 4.46: Effectiveness of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College  | 80 |    |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 4.47: Effectiveness of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 80 |
| Table 4.48: Effectiveness of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 81 |
| Table 4.49: Effectiveness of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Method Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 81 |
| Table 5.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of Athletic Booster Clubs Maintained by the College  | 82 |
| Table 5.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of Athletic Booster Clubs Maintained by the College, Broken Out by Type of College   | 82 |
| Table 5.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of Athletic Booster Clubs Maintained by the College, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 82 |
| Table 5.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of Athletic Booster Clubs Maintained by the College, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 82 |
| Table 5.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of Athletic Booster Clubs Maintained by the College, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 83 |
| Table 5.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised by and from the College's Athletic Booster Clubs (in US\$)  | 83 |
| Table 5.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised by and from the College's Athletic Booster Clubs (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College   | 83 |
| Table 5.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised by and from the College's Athletic Booster Clubs (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 83 |
| Table 5.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised by and from the College's Athletic Booster Clubs (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 83 |
| Table 5.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised by and from the College's Athletic Booster Clubs (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 84 |
| Table 5.11: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Funds Raised by and from Booster Clubs that Went Directly to the College's Athletic Programs   | 84 |
| Table 5.12: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Funds Raised by and from Booster Clubs that Went Directly to the College's Athletic Programs, Broken Out by Type of College                              | 84 |
| Table 5.13: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Funds Raised by and from Booster Clubs that Went Directly to the College's Athletic Programs, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College      | 84 |
| Table 5.14: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Funds Raised by and from Booster Clubs that Went Directly to the College's Athletic Programs, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                           | 85 |
| Table 5.15: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Funds Raised by and from Booster Clubs that Went Directly to the College's Athletic Programs, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                       | 85 |
| Table 5.16: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of the College's Athletic Booster Clubs Managed Directly by the Office of Advancement or Fundraising  | 85 |
| Table 5.17: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of the College's Athletic Booster Clubs Managed Directly by the Office of Advancement or Fundraising, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 85 |
| Table 5.18: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of the College's Athletic Booster Clubs Managed Directly by the Office of Advancement or Fundraising, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 86 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 5.19: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of the College's Athletic Booster Clubs Managed Directly by the Office of Advancement or Fundraising, Broken Out by Value of Endowment           | 86 |
| Table 5.20: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of the College's Athletic Booster Clubs Managed Directly by the Office of Advancement or Fundraising, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment       | 86 |
| Table 6.1: Percentage of Annual Fund Efforts Outsourced Vs. Percentage Done in House  | 87 |
| Table 6.2: Percentage of Annual Fund Efforts Outsourced Vs. Percentage Done in House, Broken Out by Type of College   | 87 |
| Table 6.3: Percentage of Annual Fund Efforts Outsourced Vs. Percentage Done in House, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 87 |
| Table 6.4: Percentage of Annual Fund Efforts Outsourced Vs. Percentage Done in House, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 88 |
| Table 6.5: Percentage of Annual Fund Efforts Outsourced Vs. Percentage Done in House, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 88 |
| Table 6.6: The College's Definition of Annual Fund Revenues   | 88 |
| Table 6.7: The College's Definition of Annual Fund Revenues, Broken Out by Type of College  | 88 |
| Table 6.8: The College's Definition of Annual Fund Revenues, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 89 |
| Table 6.9: The College's Definition of Annual Fund Revenues, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 89 |
| Table 6.10: The College's Definition of Annual Fund Revenues, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 89 |
| Table 6.11: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Expenses for Printed Promotional Materials Specifically Intended for the Last Annual Fund   | 89 |
| Table 6.12: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Expenses for Printed Promotional Materials Specifically Intended for the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Type of College                                    | 89 |
| Table 6.13: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Expenses for Printed Promotional Materials Specifically Intended for the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College            | 90 |
| Table 6.14: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Expenses for Printed Promotional Materials Specifically Intended for the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                                 | 90 |
| Table 6.15: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Expenses for Printed Promotional Materials Specifically Intended for the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                             | 90 |
| Table 6.16: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Professional Staff Time Spent on the Last Annual Fund, in Man Hours  | 90 |
| Table 6.17: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Professional Staff Time Spent on the Last Annual Fund, in Man Hours, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 91 |
| Table 6.18: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Professional Staff Time Spent on the Last Annual Fund, in Man Hours, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 91 |
| Table 6.19: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Professional Staff Time Spent on the Last Annual Fund, in Man Hours, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 91 |
| Table 6.20: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Professional Staff Time Spent on the Last Annual Fund, in Man Hours, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 91 |
| Table 6.21: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Student Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund  | 92 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 6.22: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Student Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Type of College   | 92 |
| Table 6.23: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Student Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 92 |
| Table 6.24: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Student Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 92 |
| Table 6.25: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Student Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 93 |
| Table 6.26: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Non-Student Clerical Staff Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund   | 93 |
| Table 6.27: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Non-Student Clerical Staff Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Type of College  | 93 |
| Table 6.28: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Non-Student Clerical Staff Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 93 |
| Table 6.29: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Non-Student Clerical Staff Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 94 |
| Table 6.30: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Estimated Number of Man Hours of Non-Student Clerical Staff Labor Spent on the Last Annual Fund, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 94 |
| Table 7.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Total Assets and Funds Raised by the College in the Last Year that can be Described as Non-Monetary Assets such as Real Estate, Artwork, Memorabilia, and Other Objects that are not Financial Instruments*  | 95 |
| Table 7.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Total Assets and Funds Raised by the College in the Last Year that can be Described as Non-Monetary Assets such as Real Estate, Artwork, Memorabilia, and Other Objects that are not Financial Instruments*, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 95 |
| Table 7.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Total Assets and Funds Raised by the College in the Last Year that can be Described as Non-Monetary Assets such as Real Estate, Artwork, Memorabilia, and Other Objects that are not Financial Instruments*, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 95 |
| Table 7.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Total Assets and Funds Raised by the College in the Last Year that can be Described as Non-Monetary Assets such as Real Estate, Artwork, Memorabilia, and Other Objects that are not Financial Instruments*, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 96 |
| Table 7.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Percentage of Total Assets and Funds Raised by the College in the Last Year that can be Described as Non-Monetary Assets such as Real Estate, Artwork, Memorabilia, and Other Objects that are not Financial Instruments*, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 96 |
| Table 7.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Costs Accrued in the Past Year to Appraise, Sell, Rent, Tender, House, or Otherwise Dispose of or Care for Assets, (in US\$)   | 96 |
| Table 7.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Costs Accrued in the Past Year to Appraise, Sell, Rent, Tender, House, or Otherwise Dispose of or Care for Assets, Broken Out by Type of College ( in US\$)  | 96 |

|             |   |     |    |
|-------------|---|-----|----|
| Table 7.8:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Costs Accrued in the Past Year to Appraise, Sell, Rent, Tender, House, or Otherwise Dispose of or Care for Assets, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College (in US\$)                            | 97  |    |
| Table 7.9:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Costs Accrued in the Past Year to Appraise, Sell, Rent, Tender, House, or Otherwise Dispose of or Care for Assets, Broken Out by Value of Endowment (in US\$)   | 97  |    |
| Table 7.10: | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Costs Accrued in the Past Year to Appraise, Sell, Rent, Tender, House, or Otherwise Dispose of or Care for Assets, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment (in US\$)   | 97  |    |
| Table 8.1:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Consultants to Conduct Fundraising Campaigns or to Otherwise Enhance the College's Fundraising Capabilities (in US\$)  | 98  |    |
| Table 8.2:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Consultants to Conduct Fundraising Campaigns or to Otherwise Enhance the College's Fundraising Capabilities, Broken Out by Type of College (in US\$)                         | 98  |    |
| Table 8.3:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Consultants to Conduct Fundraising Campaigns or to Otherwise Enhance the College's Fundraising Capabilities, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College (in US\$) | 98  |    |
| Table 8.4:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Consultants to Conduct Fundraising Campaigns or to Otherwise Enhance the College's Fundraising Capabilities, Broken Out by Value of Endowment (in US\$)                      | 98  |    |
| Table 8.5:  | Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Consultants to Conduct Fundraising Campaigns or to Otherwise Enhance the College's Fundraising Capabilities, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment (in US\$)                  | 99  |    |
| Table 8.6:  | Expected Expenditure on Campaign Consultants Over the Next Two Years  |     | 99 |
| Table 8.7:  | Expected Expenditure on Campaign Consultants Over the Next Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 99  |    |
| Table 8.8:  | Expected Expenditure on Campaign Consultants Over the Next Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 99  |    |
| Table 8.9:  | Expected Expenditure on Campaign Consultants Over the Next Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 100 |    |
| Table 8.10: | Expected Expenditure on Campaign Consultants Over the Next Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 100 |    |
| Table 8.11: | Size of the Development Consultancies Used  | 100 |    |
| Table 8.12: | Size of the Development Consultancies Used, Broken Out by Type of College   | 100 |    |
| Table 8.13: | Size of the Development Consultancies Used, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 101 |    |
| Table 8.14: | Size of the Development Consultancies Used, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 101 |    |
| Table 8.15: | Size of the Development Consultancies Used, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 101 |    |
| Table 8.16: | Attitude toward the Use of Campaign Consultants and Other Fundraising Consultants   | 101 |    |
| Table 8.17: | Attitude toward the Use of Campaign Consultants and Other Fundraising Consultants, Broken Out by Type of College  | 102 |    |
| Table 8.18: | Attitude toward the Use of Campaign Consultants and Other Fundraising Consultants, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 102 |    |
| Table 8.19: | Attitude toward the Use of Campaign Consultants and Other Fundraising Consultants, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 102 |    |
| Table 8.20: | Attitude toward the Use of Campaign Consultants and Other Fundraising Consultants, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 103 |    |
| Table 8.21: | Self-Evaluation of the Sample Colleges' Fundraising Efforts Relative to Peer Institutions   | 103 |    |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 8.22: Self-Evaluation of the Sample Colleges' Fundraising Efforts Relative to Peer Institutions, Broken Out by Type of College   | 103 |
| Table 8.23: Self-Evaluation of the Sample Colleges' Fundraising Efforts Relative to Peer Institutions, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 104 |
| Table 8.24: Self-Evaluation of the Sample Colleges' Fundraising Efforts Relative to Peer Institutions, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 104 |
| Table 8.25: Self-Evaluation of the Sample Colleges' Fundraising Efforts Relative to Peer Institutions, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 104 |
| Table 9.1: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have Used an Outside Consultant or Firm to Conduct a Feasibility Study for a Fundraising Project  | 105 |
| Table 9.2: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have Used an Outside Consultant or Firm to Conduct a Feasibility Study for a Fundraising Project, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 105 |
| Table 9.3: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have Used an Outside Consultant or Firm to Conduct a Feasibility Study for a Fundraising Project, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 105 |
| Table 9.4: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have Used an Outside Consultant or Firm to Conduct a Feasibility Study for a Fundraising Project, Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 105 |
| Table 9.5: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have Used an Outside Consultant or Firm to Conduct a Feasibility Study for a Fundraising Project, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 105 |
| Table 9.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent on Last Study by Outside Consultants by Colleges Using Consultants for Feasibility Studies (in US\$)   | 106 |
| Table 10.1: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Receiving Funding from the General College Administrative Budget   | 107 |
| Table 10.2: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Receiving Funding from the General College Administrative Budget , Broken Out by Type of College   | 107 |
| Table 10.3: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Receiving Funding from the General College Administrative Budget, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                                | 107 |
| Table 10.4: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Receiving Funding from the General College Administrative Budget, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 107 |
| Table 10.5: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Receiving Funding from the General College Administrative Budget, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 107 |
| Table 10.6: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Funded from a Percentage of Funds Raised   | 108 |
| Table 10.7: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Funded from a Percentage of Funds Raised, Broken Out by Type of College  | 108 |
| Table 10.8: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Funded from a Percentage of Funds Raised, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 108 |
| Table 10.9: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Funded from a Percentage of Funds Raised, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 108 |
| Table 10.10: Percentage of College Advancement Offices Funded from a Percentage of Funds Raised, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 108 |
| Table 10.11: Percentage of College Advancement Offices That Receive Funding from a Specific Student Fee Assessed Specifically for Advancement  | 108 |
| Table 10.12: Percentage of College Advancement Offices That Receive Funding from a Specific Student Fee Assessed Specifically for Advancement, Broken Out by Type of College                                 | 109 |
| Table 10.13: Percentage of College Advancement Offices That Receive Funding from a Specific Student Fee Assessed Specifically for Advancement, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College         | 109 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 10.14: Percentage of College Advancement Offices That Receive Funding from a Specific Student Fee Assessed Specifically for Advancement, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 109 |
| Table 10.15: Percentage of College Advancement Offices That Receive Funding from a Specific Student Fee Assessed Specifically for Advancement, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 109 |
| Table 10.16: Percentage of Sample College Advancement Offices that Receive Funding through Services Offered by the Advancement Office  | 109 |
| Table 10.17: Percentage of Sample College Advancement Offices that Receive Funding through Services Offered by the Advancement Office, Broken Out by Type of College   | 110 |
| Table 10.18: Percentage of Sample College Advancement Offices that Receive Funding through Services Offered by the Advancement Office, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 110 |
| Table 10.19: Percentage of Sample College Advancement Offices that Receive Funding through Services Offered by the Advancement Office, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 110 |
| Table 10.20: Percentage of Sample College Advancement Offices that Receive Funding through Services Offered by the Advancement Office, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 110 |
| Table 10.21: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the College's Office of Advancement  | 110 |
| Table 10.22: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the College's Office of Advancement, Broken Out by Type of College   | 111 |
| Table 10.23: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the College's Office of Advancement, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 111 |
| Table 10.24: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the College's Office of Advancement, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 111 |
| Table 10.25: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Number of FTE Positions Allocated to the College's Office of Advancement, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 111 |
| Table 10.26: Change in the Number of FTE Positions in the Office of Advancement Over the Past Two Years  | 112 |
| Table 10.27: Change in the Number of FTE Positions in the Office of Advancement Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Type of College   | 112 |
| Table 10.28: Change in the Number of FTE Positions in the Office of Advancement Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 112 |
| Table 10.29: Change in the Number of FTE Positions in the Office of Advancement Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 112 |
| Table 10.30: Change in the Number of FTE Positions in the Office of Advancement Over the Past Two Years, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 113 |
| Table 10.31: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, but not Including the Cost of Office Space  | 113 |
| Table 10.32: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, but not Including the Cost of Office Space, Broken Out by Type of College                         | 113 |
| Table 10.33: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2006-2007 Academic Year (in US\$), Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, but not Including the Cost of Office Space, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 113 |
| Table 10.34: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Projected Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, But Not Including the Cost of Office Space (in US\$)  | 114 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 10.35: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Projected Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, But Not Including the Cost of Office Space (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College                         | 114 |
| Table 10.36: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Projected Overall Budget for the Advancement Office in the 2007-2008 Academic Year, Including Spending for Salaries and Benefits, But Not Including the Cost of Office Space (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 114 |
| Table 11.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised through Auctions in the Past Year (in US\$)  | 115 |
| Table 11.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised through Auctions in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College   | 115 |
| Table 11.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised through Auctions in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 115 |
| Table 11.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised through Auctions in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 115 |
| Table 11.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised through Auctions in the Past Year (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 116 |
| Table 11.6: Percentage of Colleges that have Conducted an Online Auction, Either Stand Alone or in Conjunction with an Auction Held at a Physical Site   | 116 |
| Table 11.7: Percentage of Colleges that have Conducted an Online Auction, Either Stand Alone or in Conjunction with an Auction Held at a Physical Site, Broken Out by Type of College  | 116 |
| Table 11.8: Percentage of Colleges that have Conducted an Online Auction, Either Stand Alone or in Conjunction with an Auction Held at a Physical Site, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College  | 116 |
| Table 11.9: Percentage of Colleges that have Conducted an Online Auction, Either Stand Alone or in Conjunction with an Auction Held at a Physical Site, Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 116 |
| Table 11.10: Percentage of Colleges that have Conducted an Online Auction, Either Stand Alone or in Conjunction with an Auction Held at a Physical Site, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 117 |
| Table 11.11: Attitudes toward Online Auctions as a Fundraising Tool  | 117 |
| Table 11.12: Attitudes toward Online Auctions as a Fundraising Tool, Broken Out by Type of College   | 117 |
| Table 11.13: Attitudes toward Online Auctions as a Fundraising Tool, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 117 |
| Table 11.14: Attitudes toward Online Auctions as a Fundraising Tool, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 118 |
| Table 11.15: Attitudes toward Online Auctions as a Fundraising Tool, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 118 |
| Table 11.16: Self-Evaluation of College's Online Fundraising Efforts, Including Web Promotions, Website Development, Fundraising Blogs and Listservs, Podcasts and Other Internet-Based Promotional and Fundraising Efforts  | 118 |
| Table 11.17: Self-Evaluation of College's Online Fundraising Efforts, Including Web Promotions, Website Development, Fundraising Blogs and Listservs, Podcasts and Other Internet-Based Promotional and Fundraising Efforts, Broken Out by Type of College                                   | 119 |
| Table 11.18: Self-Evaluation of College's Online Fundraising Efforts, Including Web Promotions, Website Development, Fundraising Blogs and Listservs, Podcasts and Other Internet-Based Promotional and Fundraising Efforts, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College           | 119 |
| Table 11.19: Self-Evaluation of College's Online Fundraising Efforts, Including Web Promotions, Website Development, Fundraising Blogs and Listservs,  |     |



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Podcasts and Other Internet-Based Promotional and Fundraising Efforts,<br>Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 119 |
| Table 11.20: Self-Evaluation of College's Online Fundraising Efforts, Including Web<br>Promotions, Website Development, Fundraising Blogs and Listservs,<br>Podcasts and Other Internet-Based Promotional and Fundraising Efforts,<br>Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment | 120 |
| Table 12.1: Performance of Telethons as a Fundraising Vehicle  | 121 |
| Table 12.2: Performance of Telethons as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Type of<br>College  | 121 |
| Table 12.3: Performance of Telethons as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Public or<br>Private Status of the College  | 121 |
| Table 12.4: Performance of Telethons as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Value of<br>Endowment   | 121 |
| Table 12.5: Performance of Telethons as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Size of<br>FTE Enrollment   | 122 |
| Table 12.6: Performance of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Vehicle  | 122 |
| Table 12.7: Performance of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Type of<br>College  | 122 |
| Table 12.8: Performance of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Public or<br>Private Status of the College  | 122 |
| Table 12.9: Performance of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Value of<br>Endowment   | 122 |
| Table 12.10: Performance of Direct Mail as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Size of<br>FTE Enrollment  | 123 |
| Table 12.11: Performance of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Vehicle   | 123 |
| Table 12.12: Performance of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken<br>Out by Type of College   | 123 |
| Table 12.13: Performance of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken<br>Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 123 |
| Table 12.14: Performance of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken<br>Out by Value of Endowment  | 123 |
| Table 12.15: Performance of Web-Based Fundraising as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken<br>Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 124 |
| Table 12.16: Performance of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle   | 124 |
| Table 12.17: Performance of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Type of College   | 124 |
| Table 12.18: Performance of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Public or Private Status of the College   | 124 |
| Table 12.19: Performance of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Value of Endowment  | 124 |
| Table 12.20: Performance of Brick Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Size of FTE Enrollment  | 125 |
| Table 12.21: Performance of Raffles as a Fundraising Vehicle   | 125 |
| Table 12.22: Performance of Raffles as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Type of<br>College   | 125 |
| Table 12.23: Performance of Raffles as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Public or<br>Private Status of the College   | 125 |
| Table 12.24: Performance of Raffles as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Value of<br>Endowment  | 125 |
| Table 12.25: Performance of Raffles as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Size of FTE<br>Enrollment  | 126 |
| Table 12.26: Performance of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle   | 126 |
| Table 12.27: Performance of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Type of College   | 126 |
| Table 12.28: Performance of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by<br>Public or Private Status of the College   | 126 |

|   |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| Table 12.29: Performance of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 126 |     |
| Table 12.30: Performance of Capital Campaigns as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 127 |     |
| Table 12.31: Performance of Appeals to Students and Faculty as a Fundraising Vehicle  |     | 127 |
| Table 12.32: Performance of Appeals to Students and Faculty as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Type of College   | 127 |     |
| Table 12.33: Performance of Appeals to Students and Faculty as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 127 |     |
| Table 12.34: Performance of Appeals to Students and Faculty as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 127 |     |
| Table 12.35: Performance of Appeals to Students and Faculty as a Fundraising Vehicle, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 128 |     |
| Table 13.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Plaques, Medals, and Other Mementos or Gifts to Reward Donors (in US\$)  |     | 129 |
| Table 13.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Plaques, Medals, and Other Mementos or Gifts to Reward Donors (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College   | 129 |     |
| Table 13.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Plaques, Medals, and Other Mementos or Gifts to Reward Donors (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                             | 129 |     |
| Table 13.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Plaques, Medals, and Other Mementos or Gifts to Reward Donors (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 129 |     |
| Table 13.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Plaques, Medals, and Other Mementos or Gifts to Reward Donors (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 130 |     |
| Table 13.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Events Designed to Celebrate the Generosity or Other Virtues of Key Givers to the College (in US\$)  | 130 |     |
| Table 13.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Events Designed to Celebrate the Generosity or Other Virtues of Key Givers to the College (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College                         | 130 |     |
| Table 13.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Events Designed to Celebrate the Generosity or Other Virtues of Key Givers to the College (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 130 |     |
| Table 13.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Events Designed to Celebrate the Generosity or Other Virtues of Key Givers to the College (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 131 |     |
| Table 13.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year on Events Designed to Celebrate the Generosity or Other Virtues of Key Givers to the College (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                 | 131 |     |
| Table 14.1: Percentage of Colleges that Stage Particular Campaigns Aimed Specifically at the College's Faculty and Staff  | 132 |     |
| Table 14.2: Percentage of Colleges that Stage Particular Campaigns Aimed Specifically at the College's Faculty and Staff, Broken Out by Type of College   | 132 |     |
| Table 14.3: Percentage of Colleges that Stage Particular Campaigns Aimed Specifically at the College's Faculty and Staff, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 132 |     |
| Table 14.4: Percentage of Colleges that Stage Particular Campaigns Aimed Specifically at the College's Faculty and Staff, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 132 |     |
| Table 14.5: Percentage of Colleges that Stage Particular Campaigns Aimed Specifically at the College's Faculty and Staff, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 132 |     |
| Table 14.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised in the Past Year by Faculty and Staff in All Campaigns (in US\$)  | 133 |     |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 14.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised in the Past Year by Faculty and Staff in All Campaigns (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College  | 133 |
| Table 14.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised in the Past Year by Faculty and Staff in All Campaigns (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College                                | 133 |
| Table 14.9: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised in the Past Year by Faculty and Staff in All Campaigns (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment   | 133 |
| Table 14.10: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Raised in the Past Year by Faculty and Staff in All Campaigns (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment  | 134 |
| Table 15.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year to License or Purchase Software to Assist Specifically in Fundraising (in US\$)  | 135 |
| Table 15.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year to License or Purchase Software to Assist Specifically in Fundraising (in US\$), Broken Out by Type of College                         | 135 |
| Table 15.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year to License or Purchase Software to Assist Specifically in Fundraising (in US\$), Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College | 135 |
| Table 15.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year to License or Purchase Software to Assist Specifically in Fundraising (in US\$), Broken Out by Value of Endowment                      | 135 |
| Table 15.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Amount Spent in the Past Year to License or Purchase Software to Assist Specifically in Fundraising (in US\$), Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment                  | 136 |
| Table 15.6: Percentage of Sample Colleges that Use Blackbaud Raiser's Edge Fundraising Software  | 136 |
| Table 15.7: Percentage of Sample Colleges that Use Blackbaud Raiser's Edge Fundraising Software, Broken Out by Type of College   | 136 |
| Table 15.8: Percentage of Sample Colleges that Use Blackbaud Raiser's Edge Fundraising Software, Broken Out by Public or Private Status of the College   | 136 |
| Table 15.9: Percentage of Sample Colleges that Use Blackbaud Raiser's Edge Fundraising Software, Broken Out by Value of Endowment  | 136 |
| Table 15.10: Percentage of Sample Colleges that Use Blackbaud Raiser's Edge Fundraising Software, Broken Out by Size of FTE Enrollment   | 137 |