Improving the Effectiveness of Fundraising and Alumni Programs using International Benchmarks

Working Paper No. CPNS 35

Dr Daniel McDiarmid

Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia

October 2006

GPO Box 2434
BRISBANE QLD 4001
Phone: 07 3138 1020
Fax: 07 3138 9131
Email: cpns@qut.edu.au
http://cpns.bus.qut.edu.au
CRICOS code: 00213J

The Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies (CPNS)

is a specialist research and teaching unit at the

Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane, Australia.

It seeks to promote the understanding of philanthropy and nonprofit issues by drawing upon academics from many disciplines and working closely with nonprofit, practitioners, intermediaries and government departments. CPNS's mission is "to bring to the community the benefits of teaching, research, technology and service relevant to philanthropic and nonprofit communities".

The Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies reproduces and distributes these working papers from authors who are affiliated with the Centre or who present papers at Centre seminars. They are not edited or reviewed, and the views in them are those of their authors.

A list of all the Centre's publications and working papers is available from the address below:

http://cpns.bus.qut.edu.au

CRICOS code: 002*13J*

ISBN 1 74107 145 3

Background

In New Zealand and Australia our Universities and Schools, even our private universities and schools, are highly regulated. While Headmasters and Vice-Chancellors, senior managers and leaders of programs make a great many decisions about academic programs and student life, there is not much that happens on our campuses that is not subject to government regulation and reporting.

Two of the activities that have a minimum of legal restrictions (mostly limited to some basic fundraising laws that apply to all nonprofit organisations), few regulations, and which do not operate to any agreed performance standards are the activities of fundraising and alumni relations.

This is an important starting point, because however positively our institutions view their investment in fundraising and alumni programs, they must remember that they undertake it voluntarily, and pretty-much in any many they choose (as long as they comply with some basic laws that apply generally to fundraising). It also explains why there is so little government interest in whether or not the institutions raise funds, how they raise funds, and how effectively or economically their fundraising is.

Comparison with international student marketing

The current situation of fundraising and alumni relations is comparable to the early days of the international student boom; a time when some institutions had seen a degree of success, but when it had not yet been embraced by the whole sector; a time when governments were awakening to the economic benefit that international students might bring, but had not yet invested in providing incentives to institutions to encourage their participation; a time when the better universities and schools were seen to be attractive to international students, but regional, smaller, and more technical institutions had not yet realised that they had potential in this market.

The comparison between fundraising and alumni relations of today and the early international education market is useful for several reasons: first, educational administrators who have been through the international education boom might understand the parallel and thereby gain insight into the potential of fundraising and alumni relations; secondly, some who see the international education market changing or diminishing may see that benefaction and sponsorship offer new revenue streams to replace or better declining international student revenues; and thirdly, governments who have crunched the numbers on the economic benefits of international students, and who claim some of the credit for the development of this market by judicious assistance to the sector, may become convinced of the economic value of private support for education, and understand that incentives that encourages institutions to invest in fundraising and alumni relations, may prove as effective for these activities, and hence for the economy, as did their investment in international student marketing.

Benchmarking

While benchmark may once have meant "a mark on a survey peg or stone that acts as a permanent reference point against which the levels of various topographic features can be measured" it is used here to mean a way of comparing one's performance with one's peers'[i] and the purpose of benchmarking, to quote NACUBO is '… to provide managers with an external point of reference or standard for evaluating the quality and cost of their organisation's internal activities, practices and processes.'[ii] The Commonwealth Higher Education Management Service provides a good introduction to benchmarking in universities – even if now a little dated.

Benchmarking is a means of making comparisons of performance, "usually with a view to establishing 'good' - or more ambitiously 'best' -practice methods, and as such it is also used to diagnose problems in performance and to identify areas of strength. Like the publication of performance indicators, benchmarking does not necessarily provide solutions to problems - it is an aid to judgement rather than a substitute for it".[iii]

Benchmarking is often associated with Quality Assurance processes, and I think it is very appropriate that this is the case. There seems little point looking at what others are doing, if you are not closely monitoring and improving your own activities – and this is what good quality procedures will do.

There are several types of benchmarking.

1. **Internal benchmarking** in which comparisons are made of the performance of different departments, campuses or sites within a university in order to identify best practice in the institution, without necessarily having an external standard against which to compare the results. Internal benchmarking might, for example be used at a University with multiple foundations to compare the fundraising performance of the different foundations, or in another University to compare the performance of devolved faculty alumni programs, or in a school operating from several campuses, to compare the results between campuses.

2. **External competitive benchmarking** where a comparison of performance in key areas is based upon information from institutions which are seen as competitors. Although initiatives of this kind may be potentially very valuable, the process may be fraught with difficulty and is better if it involves comparisons with a larger group of institutions who are not immediate competitors. For example Anglican Schools in Sydney might have a benchmarking arrangement, but also include comparisons with Anglican Schools in Melbourne, Brisbane and Auckland.

3. **External trans-industry (best-in-class) benchmarking** seeks to look across multiple industries in search of new and innovative practices, no matter what their source. While this is seen by some to be the ideal, reaching best practice levels that apply in other industries, it is not much used by educational organisations. Nevertheless, there would be value in measuring annual fund performance against large non-profit organisations, and measuring database performance against commercial organisations.

4. **'Implicit benchmarking'** is not strictly benchmarking – rather it refers to the league tables or rankings that are published on various aspects of industry performance. This quasi-benchmarking is likely to increase in future years as governments and central funding agencies seek to compare performance between institutions. There have been occasions in which the higher education press simply pulls out the "Donations and Bequests" line from the Australian universities' annual reports and published an ordered list of fundraising performance.

Separate from these types of benchmarking are the methodologies that institutions can adopt, and the main approaches are:

1. **Ideal type standards** (or 'gold' standards) whereby an model is created based on idealised best practice, and then used as the basis to assess institutions on the extent to which they fit that model. For example, the components of a gold standard bequest program might be agreed, and a series of descriptions for each aspect of the ideal bequest program. Institutions can then assess their performance against the gold standard. While one might be initially sceptical whether institutions could ever agree on what constitutes a good program, I think there would be widespread agreement on the key elements, and such standards could be written across a range of activities, including: prospect management; donor stewardship; campaign; annual fund; bequest program; alumni communications; alumni tracking; and database management.

2. **Activity based benchmarking** is a methodology in which a selected number of activities, which are either typical or representative of the range of institutional provision, are analysed and compared with similar activities in other selected institutions. Such activities may be considered solely in their own terms, or may act as a proxy for overall performance across the fundraising and alumni functions.

3. **Vertical benchmarking** seeks to quantify the costs, workloads, productivity and performance of a defined functional area, for example the work of a student admissions department. This approach would not apply to any but our biggest departments.

4. **Horizontal benchmarking** on the other hand seeks to analyse the cost, workloads, productivity, and performance of a single process that cuts across one or more functional areas, for example scholarship management.

A key issue for any benchmarking exercise is deciding what to measure. In this there seem to be two main considerations. The first is that we might not simply measure outcomes (raw dollar or number results, increases over previous years, numbers of gifts or bequests, annual fund renewals, number of new donors, average gift, or alumni attending) but seek to measure the items that make a difference to outcomes, such as goals (what the institution is trying to accomplish), inputs (budget, staff time, volunteer time), and processes (moves managed, solicitations, annual fund mailings, alumni events, alumni researched, telephone solicitations, grants written). In 1995 Rod Miller, writing one of the earliest papers on benchmarking of advancement observed that more benchmarking would be most useful if it measured more than just outcomes.

> Although the key areas requiring improvement will differ from one institution to another according the the stage of development, emphases or styles of leadership, and institutional priorities, three sets of principles underpin effective institutional advancement. These are (1) strategic, (2) process, and (3) behavioural. [iv]

The other consideration on what to measure is that we measure what is readily to hand – that comes from existing reports – or at least from reports that a well-run office would be producing as a matter of course.

By seeking to measure what contributes to results, and measuring what is readily available it is to be hoped there will be good incentive, and few disincentives, for institutions to take part.

In proposing that data be gathered and analysed one can look to the value of the data and the people will use it. The following would use fundraising and alumni relation benchmarking data:

- **Managers** who have responsibility for designing and evaluating fundraising and alumni relations programs
- **Staff** who want to know how their work compares – important information when building a career in this field
- **Principals and Vice-Chancellors** who make the resource allocation to pay for fundraising and alumni activities want to know the return on their investment – both absolute returns and relative to peer institutions
- **Alumni** who want to know the level of effort their institution is putting into the relationship
- **Donors** who want to know if the institution they support is attracting wide support, and doing so efficiently
- **Volunteers** who give their time to assist a particular institution, and want to know how their efforts compare with others
- **Governments** which might be assisting with resources want to know if the government assistance is effective
- **The Public** including potential students, who might reasonably judge private support and the quality of alumni relations as indicative of the quality of an institution.

Before looking at proposed survey, it is instructive to review the history of such surveys in countries that are often used for comparisons in educational development, The United States of America and the United Kingdom, and at a recent survey in Australia and New Zealand.

United States of America

Alumni relations, fundraising and business offices in US universities have been developing standard definitions for reporting gift income and expenditures in alumni relations, fundraising and other constituent relations since the late 1970s.

Since then, several standards have been published and used to gather data. These voluntary surveys have been used to measure and compare the fundraising-philanthropy performance of U.S. universities and colleges. The Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) of the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) is comprehensive in its information. Participants are able to access their own data, and undertake extensive data mining and analysis of results going back ten years. Nearly 1000 institutions participate in the VSE survey, including more than 75% of four-year institutions. The survey forms and some of the data are available on the CAE website[1]. Included amongst the available date are league tables of private support in total, and by state and by type of institution.

The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) provides standard definitions and a reporting regime for the management of advancement and for

[1] www.cae.org

fundraising campaigns, and conducts an annual survey of the cumulative results of university fundraising campaigns. [2] Using on-line tools, CASE also offers benchmarking in alumni relations, and rolling surveys in email solicitation, soft-credits and salaries in the sector.

United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, a group of about twenty university Development Directors, the "Ross Group," developed an annual survey of gift revenue and costs with the express aim of "measuring the philanthropic health of institutions."

Almost 80 UK institutions currently complete the survey – and these range across the spectrum of UK higher education, but exclude the universities of Oxford and Cambridge whose philanthropic returns are significantly higher than other UK institutions.

The UK survey does not measure bequest intentions nor does it measure the cost of fundraising. It does however provide, in an accompanying paper, extensive advice on how staff are to distinguish what is a "philanthropic donations" which are to be reported in the survey), and "exchange transactions" which are not reported in the survey.

Recognising that each year there are institutions completing the survey for the first time, the UK survey asks for current year and previous two year's data on the following:

- New funds raised (counting new pledges, unpledged cash, but excludes payments on previous pledges and excludes bequests)
- Cash income from philanthropic gifts, bequests, and other fundraising
- Value of gifts in kind
- Value of single largest gift and pledge received
- The number of gifts and pledges of GBP500,000 and above
- Details of the annual fund appeal: no of alumni of record, amount of gifts and pledges received and the number of alumni contributing
- Key questions about capital campaigns: financial target, duration of public phase, and the percentage of target received before "going public"

The UK survey also seeks data on fundraising costs:

- Staff and non-staff costs
- Expenditure on alumni relations
- No of fundraising staff and alumni staff
- The institution's total expenditure

The last questions of the UK survey seek data that will assist in analysis of the data:

- In what year did the fundraising program commence
- To whom does the Director of Development report
- Does the university have overseas offices or staff that participate in fundraising
- Is the institution involved in clinical medicine

Although this UK data has been kept for only a few years it has already proved valuable in the broad policy area, providing the data which underpinned a British Government taskforce report on increasing voluntary giving to higher education. [v]

Australia and New Zealand: The 2005 ADAPE Survey

---

[2] The survey can be seen at http://case.org/files/Research/PDFs/03survey.pdf .

In 2005 ADAPE commissioned a "Benchmarking Survey" in Australia and New Zealand through the ADAPE membership.[vi] This survey covered universities and schools. This was a valuable start.

The 2005 ADAPE Benchmarking Survey had elements of all of these as summed up in this Table.[vii]

Part One	Demographic information relating to the respondents.
Part Two	Institutional details including type of educational institution, location by state, how long established, and institution student populations.
Part Three	Description of development offices such as years in operation, responsibilities, and perceptions of the office from others.
Part Four	Revenue raising questions about general fundraising, annual giving, capital campaigns, and bequests and planned giving.
Part Five	Questions about institutional alumni programs including whether they are fee-based, and membership populations.
Part Six	Open-ended questions relating to perceived future challenges and future information respondents would value.

There were a number of interesting results, including: that only just over one third of respondent institutions have active bequests programs, and most of these promote bequests principally in brochures and other publications; and that 60% of alumni organisations are dues-paying.

The 2005 Benchmarking Survey sought to provide aggregate data only. It did not give details of practice in particular institutions, and hence it was not able to be used by institutions wishing to compare their results or practices with like institutions, in the way that US institutions can use the CAE data.

An introduction to the Proposed Survey: SOFAR

The survey proposed in this paper, the Survey of Fundraising and Alumni Relations (SOFAR), has two significant differences to the ADAPE Survey. The first of these is that the survey is open to a wider range of educational institutions – including, pre-schools, government, parish and other independent primary schools, University residential colleges, government secondary schools, technical colleges and polytechnics, and even for-profit institutions.

The second difference is that the bulk of the analysis be undertaken with like institutions: Universities with Universities, independent schools with independent schools, government secondary with other government secondary schools, pre-schools with pre-schools and so one. Comparison across institutional types will give provide useful data on philanthropic trends but practitioners will learn most from examining their own results and data from like organisations. For these purposes, comparisons made between Australia and New Zealand for like institutions should be useful both for comparisons of institutions, and also for comparisons of results in different regulatory and cultural environments.

Like the ADAPE Survey, SOFAR will be independently analysed, by the Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies (CPNS) at Queensland University of Technology, or their appointed agent; but unlike the ADAPE Survey, it is expected that the SOFAR results will be released with full disclosure of participating institutions and their results.

SOFAR was developed by Dr Daniel McDiarmid, General Manager of the consultancy Global Philanthropic and Adjunct Professor at CPNS under the auspices of CPNS. The Myer Foundation provided financial support to the initial stage of this project.

During 2005 an initial survey was circulated amongst practitioners for comment, and in early 2006 a revised survey was trialled with Australian and New Zealand Universities. It has since been further revised, including revisions to include schools and university colleges.

The balance of this paper is an explanation of the Survey of Fundraising and Alumni Relations (SOFAR). There are fifteen sections to SOFAR. The last is an evaluation of SOFAR that will add to continuing refinement.

It is hoped that SOFAR will find widespread use early in 2007 recording fundraising and alumni relations data, and that, after a further review, it will be used by most universities, and universities colleges, and a good proportion of independent school from early 2008, measuring 2007 results.
There are still a number of steps to be undertaken by CPNS before the survey can be implemented: on-line survey design, ethical clearance, determination of a pricing structure, piloting of the survey format, and development of the publications and seminars that may accompany the release of the survey findings. It is expected that CPNS will seek endorsement for the Survey from education peak bodies and professional association.

Survey of
Fundraising and Alumni Relations
(Australia and New Zealand)
SOFAR

SOFAR

Identification

Name of *Institution* ________________________________

The Survey is submitted on behalf of the *Institution* by:

Name ________________________________

Position ________________________________

Signature ________________________________

Date ____/____/_______

Email: ________________________________

About SOFAR

This survey is designed as an aid to educational *institutions* in Australia and New Zealand. It enables *institutions* to measure and compare their results.

It is expected that the survey results will be distributed in full to all *institutions* that participate fully in SOFAR, and to SOFAR sponsor, Global Philanthropic Pty Ltd.

This Survey covers fundraising and relations results for a full calendar year (in the first instance the 2006 year). It will be administered as an on-line survey.

All italicised words are defined in the Glossary. These definitions should enable *institutions* to provide standardised information.

SECTION ONE: *INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS: CASH* AND PLEDGES

Contributor Category	**No. of *contributions***	**Total amount banked**	**Number of Pledges**	***New Pledges Outstanding***
Governing Board				
Foundation Board				
Staff				
Alumni				
Parents of students or alumni				
Other				
TOTAL			(1)	(2)

Does your institution include a *contribution* option on the fees statements?
□ YES □NO

If yes, what percentage of fee-payers make a *contribution* when paying the fees?
_____%

SECTION TWO: CORPORATE AND FOUNDATION *CASH CONTRIBUTIONS* AND PLEDGES

Contributor Category	**No. of *contributions***	**Total amount banked**	***New Pledges Outstanding***
Domestic statutory corporations and government entities			
Domestic companies			
Domestic foundations, trustee companies and *corporate contributions*			
Domestic nonprofit organisations			
Corporate foundations			
International sources			
TOTAL		(3)	(4)

SECTION THREE: BEQUESTS

	No.	**Total $**
Bequests realised in the previous 12 months		(5)
Bequests notified of known value		
Bequests notified of unknown value		

Our *institution* has a gift club or other form of society for people who have advised the *institution* that they have made a bequest in favour of the *institution*. □ YES □NO

SECTION FOUR: GIFTS IN KIND

	Estimated $ value
Equipment	
Land	
Software licences	
Artwork	
Shares (if not counted in Section One)	
Museum artefacts	
Other (please specify)	
TOTAL	(6)

SECTION FIVE: *OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS*

Contribution	**Value**
TOTAL	(7)

SECTION SIX: *TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS* FOR THE YEAR

$____,_____,_____.00

SECTION SEVEN: *ANNUAL FUND*

Donor Category	**% Gifts received**	**% total given**
Governing Board		
Foundation Board		
Staff		
Alumni		
Parents of students or alumni		
Other		
Total	**100%**	**100%**

The percentage of last year's *annual fund* contributors contributing to this year's annual fund. ______ %

Renewing donors' total *annual fund contributions* as a percentage of their total annual fund giving last year. ____%

The total of this year's *annual fund contributions* expressed as a percentage of the cost of this year's *annual fund* (including relevant direct staff costs). _____%

SECTION EIGHT: *STAFF*

Main activity of staff	Central Office	*Units*	Total
Senior Fundraising and Alumni Relations Management			
Fundraising			
Alumni Relations			
Database management and database entry			
Prospect and Alumni Research			
Gift processing			
Event management			
Donor Stewardship			
Administration support			
Other			
Total Staff in Fundraising and Alumni Relations			

SECTION NINE: *PROSPECT MANAGEMENT*

Gift Potential	Prospects and Donors actively managed
$10,000,000 +	
$5,000,000 +	
$1,000,000 +	
$500,000 +	
$100,000 +	
$50,000 +	
$10,000 +	
Not rated	

SECTION TEN: EXPENDITURE

Fundraising	Central Office	*Units*	Total
Salaries			
Database			
Consultants			
Publications			
Other Media			
Events - *domestic*			
Events – international			
Mailing			
Telephones			
Office expenses Travel			
Other			
Total			

SECTION ELEVEN: CAMPAIGN

Which description best applies at your *institution*?

For the *Institution* as a whole:
(a) Not involved in a campaign at present
(b) Planning Phase (Project development, feasibility study, or considering a campaign)
(c) Quiet Phase (Recruitment of volunteer leaders and lead gifts)
(d) Public Phase (Active, publicised campaign)
(e) Accounting-stewardship (wrapping up)

Campaign Goal $________________
Campaign Results to date $_________________

For one or more *Units* within the Institution:
(a) Not involved in a campaign at present
(b) Planning Phase (Project development, feasibility study, or considering a campaign)
(c) Quiet Phase (Recruitment of volunteer leaders and lead gifts)
(d) Public Phase (Active, publicised campaign)
(e) Accounting-stewardship (wrapping up)

Campaign Goal $________________
Campaign Results to date $_________________
(Provide Goal and Results for each *Unit* campaign)

SECTION TWELVE: ALUMNI DATA

Living Alumni of known address	________________
Living alumni of unknown address	________________
No. of alumni who paid *alumni dues* during the year	________________
Total receipts from *alumni dues*	$________________
No. of active domestic chapters	________________
No. of international chapters	________________
% of alumni attending an event during the year	________________

SECTION THIRTEEN: ORGANISATION

What is the title of the person most directly concerned with leading and managing the fundraising activity of the *institution*?

Title of the position to which this position reports:

SECTION FOURTEEN: ORGANISATION

Please indicate the additional number of positions which will be sought in the next year in these categories:

Fundraising staff - general or major gifts __________
Fundraising staff - alumni or annual giving __________
Fundraising staff – bequests __________
Alumni staff – general __________
Alumni staff – reunions __________
Alumni staff – communications and publications __________
Database staff __________
Prospect Research staff __________
Donor Stewardship staff __________

What is the title of the most senior person most directly concerned with leading and managing the fundraising activity at the *institution*? ______________________________
What is the title of the position that this position reports to? ________________________

SECTION FIFTEEN: SOFAR

Estimate of hours taken to complete this survey. __________
Terms that need further clarification _______________ __________________
__________________ _________________ _______________.

Other comments:
____
____
____
____

Person to whom SOFAR results should be sent (if different to person submitting this Survey).

Name ________________________________
Position ________________________________
Signature ________________________________
Date ____/____/_______
Email: _________________________________

GLOSSARY

Alumni Dues	Membership payments, whether single or multi-year of lifetime. Include this amount under Alumni Dues heading not as alumni giving.
Annual Fund	Also known as alumni appeal or alumni fund. Can be solicited more than once per year, but characterised by seeking support of an amount that can be given year in year out and usually for general purposes, budgetary needs or a scholarship endowment.
Bequests realised	Bequests from persons now deceased and funds received by the institution, either as cash banked this year or gifts in kind liquidated and banked this year or accepted as an asset of the institution this year.
Bequests notified	The *institution* has a written copy of document indicating the amount or value on non-cash gifts a person has bequeathed by the *institution*
Cash	Cash includes currency, cheques, bank transfers, shares and other securities if there is not restriction on their disposal. Shares and other securities are included at their value on the day that ownership transferred to the *Institution. (*Shares and other securities with restriction on their disposal are included in *Gifts in Kind*.)
Contributions	Includes all payments that support the objectives of the *Institution* made without substantial benefit to the contributor. Includes donations, grants, Excludes peer-competitive grants, fee for service, sponsorships of a purely commercial character that have obligations significantly beyond naming and publicity. Exclude from the amount measured the value of the capital gains tax if this tax applies.
Contributor Category	Individuals may have several links with the *institution*. To prevent multiple counting of gifts when reporting by Contributor Category it is necessary to count gifts only once. For this survey, use the Contributor Categories for individuals form a hierarchy. Count individual gifts in the highest category on the hierarchy: Member of Governing Board (highest) Member of Foundation Board Staff Member Alumni Parent of student or alumni Student Other (lowest) For example: a $5000 donation from a person who was a member of the Foundation, a staff member and an

alumnus would count as a $5000 from a Foundation Board member.

Corporate Contributions Includes any form of gift, or sponsorship provided by a corporate entity. Do not include the value of GST. Do not include fee-for-service research.

Development Services Prospect research, donor stewardship, database management, data entry, gift processing

Domestic On-shore (for Australian institutions, Australian: for New Zealand Institutions, New Zealand), as indicated either by location of Head Office or the location of the giving decision.

Governing Board University Council or Senate, School Council or Board, College Council or similar.

Individual giving Includes contributions to Annual Fund and Campaigns but not bequests or alumni dues. Multiple gifts from the same person count as one.

Institution Include in this survey the data for the University, School, University College or other educational organisation participating in SOFAR. Include in the totals, the activities of associated companies, foundations and trusts established by the organisation for its benefit. Note contributions to trustee companies and non-controlled entities for the benefit of the organisation should not be included as income, but distributions from these entities should be included as income from "Domestic foundations and trustee companies".

International Sources Includes corporations and foundations with overseas headquarters and making contribution decisions overseas; foreign governments and other foreign entities.

Living Alumni of known address
Graduates or past students for whom the institution believes it has a valid address, or other contact information (e.g. telephone or email). Excludes missing and deceased alumni.

New Pledges Outstanding Count here the unpaid value of all pledged Commitments do not need to be binding but should be in writing. Do not include pledges paid or written off. Do not include amounts pledged beyond five years.

Other Contributions Any *contributions* received that have not been recorded in sections One, Two, Three or Four

Prospect Management	Count here at each potential gift level, the number of donors and prospective donors for which the *institution* has on individualised cultivation plan. If a potential gift level has not been established, include in “Not rated”. Do not include donors or prospects without a cultivation plan.
Staff	Answer in terms of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. Staff who manage units but also have a functional role (e.g. fundraising or alumni) count as a fulltime appointment – do not discount FTE for management and leadership roles.
Salaries	Include salaries of all staff listed in Section Eight, but do not include salaries of CEOs (Principals, Vice-Chancellors etc.) or project leaders (Deans, Research Directors).
Total Contributions	The sum of the figures entered in the shaded areas in sections one to five (the shaded areas are numbered 1-7).
Unit	An academic department, campus or research centre, as distinct from a central office serving the whole *institution*.

ENDNOTES

[i] John Fielden, *Benchmarking University Performance* CHEMS Paper 19, 1997, page 2. See also Commonwealth Higher Education Management Service, "Benchmarking in Higher Education: An International Review" 1998, including a chapter on benchmarking in Australian Universities.
[ii] National Association of College and University Business Officers NACUBO, 1995, in Fielden, 1997, p. 1).
[iii] CHEMS, 1998, pp. 9-10.
[iv] Rodney G. Miller, "Briefing to benchmark institutional advancement" AITEA conference, 28 April 1995.
[v] *Increasing Voluntary Giving to Higher Education* (The Thomas Report) accessed 18 September 2006 at http://www.dfes.gov.uk/hegateway/hereform/voluntarygiving/index.cfm .
[vi] ADAPE Australasia Inc and the Centre of Philanthropy and NonProfit Studies, *Educational Development in Australasia: 2005 Benchmarking Survey.*
[vii] ADAPE Survey, page 4.