



Convergence & Competition: United Ways & Community Foundations

A National Inquiry

By Nancy Ragey with
Jan Masaoka and
Jeanne Bell Peters

CompassPoint Nonprofit Services
San Francisco CA
August 2005

This study was funded by the C.S. Mott Foundation and the Community
Foundations Leadership Team of the Council of Foundations



This Highlights Report summarizes key findings of the inquiry. The full report can be viewed and downloaded at www.compasspoint.org/uwcf

Convergence & Competition: United Ways & Community Foundations

A National Inquiry

For more than 100 years, United Ways and community foundations have helped shape the landscape of American philanthropy. They champion giving—

providing means by which every individual and business can be philanthropic. In 2003 (the most recent year for which data is available), the two organizations raised \$8.2 billion in charitable funds collectively.¹ Grants and other financial support were provided to nonprofit organizations across a broad range of mission areas including health and human service, education, the environment, workforce development, and arts and culture. Beyond direct financial support, the institutions both provide leadership in addressing some of our most intractable social problems by nurturing civic engagement and convening community stakeholders for the development of coherent strategies. As community organizers and stewards, United Ways and community foundations play critical roles in the philanthropic and nonprofit infrastructure in a community.

Each of the country's 1,400 United Way organizations and 700 community foundations is chartered to serve a particular geographic region and has a fundamental commitment to fostering the health and vibrancy of that region. In fact, many regions and communities throughout the country are served by both organizations. This close proximity along with a changing philanthropic environment have contributed to a heightened interest in how these organizations relate to each other on behalf of their mutual communities. While there are examples of successful relationships between the two organizations, throughout the field of philanthropy there are also stories of indifference and even all-out war between some local United Ways and community foundations. Leaders in both organizations recognize the source of this tension and mistrust as the unprecedented convergence and competition among the organizations. In turn, it is clear that the primary driver of this competition is a philanthropic environment that has altered significantly over the past ten years. Study participants identified these trends:

- The mobility of the American public means people may not have the deep ties to their communities that they once had, while both community foundations and United Ways remain institutions deeply tied to “home” communities.
- The off-shoring of industrial jobs and a new generation of corporate leaders may affect workplace giving adversely.
- With the shrinking of urban centers and the growth of suburbs, many people are less engaged with the urban challenges to which United Ways and to some extent community foundations are attempting to respond.
- Where once donors had limited choices in philanthropic vehicles and programs, there is now a vast array of services and products available—not only from the nonprofit sector but from the commercial sector as well.
- Technology and the Internet have made researching, selecting, and contributing to nonprofits easier than ever for donors.
- There appears to be a greater desire by donors for control over how their charitable dollars are spent.

As United Ways and community foundations respond to these changes, they are increasingly reaching out to the same donors, employing some of the same fundraising tactics, overlapping in fund disbursement strategies, and bumping into one other in community leadership roles. This research was commissioned to support the active dialogue among leaders of both institutions about their respective roles in community philanthropy and what the options for strategic coexistence—if not full-fledged collaboration—will look like in the coming years.

As community organizers and stewards, United Ways and community foundations play critical roles in the philanthropic and nonprofit infrastructure in a community.

¹ This includes endowed and passed-through funds. Sources: United Way of America, <http://national.unitedway.org/aboutuwa/2002results.cfm> and The Columbus Foundation, 2003 Community Foundation Survey, http://www.columbusfoundation.org/GD/_gd_templates/pages/gdPageSecondary.aspx?page=38

About the inquiry and its participants

CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, a California nonprofit consulting and research firm, and the Council of Michigan Foundations conducted a national inquiry into the question of United Way and community foundation convergence and competition. The C.S. Mott Foundation and the community foundation Leadership Team of the Council on Foundations underwrote the research. Data were collected between March and August 2005 from the following sources:


- Three hundred and nineteen executives—182 from United Ways and 137 from community foundations—completed a comprehensive online survey.²
- Twenty community foundation Leadership Team members participated in a focus group.
- Eight community foundation and United Way executives and board members engaged in in-depth interviews.
- Thirteen executives from United Ways and community foundations, as well as leadership from the Council on Foundations and United Way of America, served on the study's National Advisory Committee, providing both research guidance and direct qualitative data.

Survey respondents had the following characteristics:

- One hundred and fifty-eight respondents were in mid-sized communities, 109 in rural areas, and 32 were in metropolitan areas. This distribution mirrors the national distribution of the institutions.
- United Ways are typically 20 years older or more than their neighboring community foundations. The average age of United Ways responding to this survey was 59 years (with a median of 60 years); for community foundations it was 30 years (with a median of 23 years).
- United Ways average 12 full time staff equivalents and 29 board members, while community foundations average 8 full time staff equivalents and 18 board members.
- Although endowments are more commonly associated with community foundations, many United Ways have also built endowments. The median United Way endowment was \$2 million, while the median community foundation endowment was \$73 million.
- While community foundations receive significantly greater contributions annually, most of these funds go into endowments. United Ways typically have more discretionary funds to give annually than do community foundations. *See chart below.*

Because responses to the survey and requests for interviews were not controlled through random sampling, the report is somewhat biased towards the views of those who were interested enough to participate in the study. This bias is somewhat mitigated by the large number of responses—a response that was surprisingly high to the study's sponsors.

Budgets, Contributions, Grants



² A link to the web-based survey was distributed through United Way of America and the Council on Foundations to all United Ways and community foundations in the United States. A total of 319 surveys were returned, representing 15% of the organizations. Data was compiled with WebSurveyor.

Key Findings

1 Relationships between the organizations span a continuum from interdependence to direct competition

The study revealed a continuum of relationships between community foundations and United Ways. On one end of the spectrum, there was interdependence and genuine cooperation. Characteristics of interdependent organizations included:

- Articulated roles for each—both in terms of donor products and support of the nonprofit sector.
- Significant and frequent joint projects and collaborations.
- Robust communication such as regular interaction between the boards and the CEOs.
- Significant financial interaction, such as United Way endowment funds managed by the community foundation, or United Way campaigns conducted within community foundations.

On the survey and in groups and interviews, executives elaborated on their relationship with the other organization. Below are some examples of organizational interdependence:

“We helped to launch the community foundation in our community five years ago. Their board has many of our former board members on it.”—United Way Executive

“The United Way has an Organizational Fund at our community foundation, which is endowed but with different criteria from other endowed funds. The community foundation also holds a challenge fund, which is not endowed. Our CEO is the former Executive Director of the United Way and during his tenure, the present Executive Director of United Way worked for him for five years. Several of the community foundation founders were former United Way leaders.”—Community Foundation Executive

“While lines are somewhat blurred now, both boards and executives work hard to maintain a good relationship. On all key community committees at United Way – impact councils, community assessment, capital funds, technology funds, etc. – the community foundation is represented, as it is when we do strategic planning. Finally, we have a funders coalition that is staffed by United Way, but includes the community foundation, government, and some private foundations. It meets monthly for coordination and collaboration. This is not a community that would tolerate a bad relationship between two loved organizations.”—United Way Executive

On the other end of the spectrum was unfriendly and even occasional acrimonious competition, often characterized by:

- Competition for the position of community leader and “ownership” of initiatives or community successes
- Direct competition for major donors
- Infrequent or nonexistent communication between the leaders;
- Frustration with the other organization about perceived duplication of services, products or fundraising strategy; and
- Relatively little funding of the other’s initiatives and participation in the other’s convenings, often resentfully done.
- Little discussion within either organization about an intentional strategy or stance towards the other.

A word about terms

Some of the same concepts are discussed differently among United Ways and community foundations. This report tries to use a balance of terms without having to devise generic terms.

	Community Foundations	United Ways
Incoming donations that are unrestricted by the donor as to use	Contributions to the endowment	Contributions to the Community Fund
Incoming donation designated by the donor	Donor-advised fund: assets held for future designation advice by the donor	Donor-designated contribution
Disbursements to nonprofits where the selection of nonprofit was made by the CF or UW	Discretionary grant	Allocation or grant from the Community Fund
Disbursement to nonprofits where the selection of nonprofit was advised or made by the donor	Donor-advised grant	Donor-designated funds


I see the community foundation as the major competitor to our office. It has depleted our annual campaign.—United Way Executive

The national United Way is trying to become a national community foundation with branches.—Community Foundation Executive

The United Way acts like a checking account. Our community foundation acts like a savings account. They operate a year at a time... we are forever!—Community Foundation Executive

We asked United Ways and community foundations to characterize their relationships with the other. The chart below summarizes responses from each group. It is interesting to note that for the most part, respondents viewed the relationships positively. Community foundations are more likely to characterize the relationship as “cordial and collegial” while United Ways were about equally likely to choose “highly interactive and supportive” as “cordial and collegial.”

How would you characterize the overall quality of the leadership between the two organizations?



As the chart shows, the largest number of respondents (43% of United Ways and 50% of community foundations) characterized the relationship as cordial and collegial. As a result, based on survey analysis, we can conclude that in roughly half of communities, the relationships are likely to include one or more of the following:

- Occasional collaboration and coordination of activities, particularly in the area of initiatives, community needs assessment, and convening.
- Occasional to frequent communication.
- Limited awareness of the other organization’s activities.
- Absence of a proactive joint strategy or joint projects.


A smaller number of respondents characterized the relationship as friendly rivalry, indifferent, or adversarial (19% of United Ways and 23% of community foundations respectively). In interviews and discussions with the researchers, respondents were more likely to characterize the relationships as adversarial or indifferent than the written surveys demonstrate. This divergence may mean that relationships are more collegial and supportive than conventional wisdom suggests, or it may reflect a desire in writing to be positive and statesmanlike.

When asked how he could characterize his relationship with the other as “cordial and collegial” while having so much overlap in donor base, one executive commented:

Well of course we’re going to say that our relationship is cordial and collegial. But the reality is that they drive us crazy.

2 The evolution of organizational strategies has led to some overlap in critical areas, particularly in grantmaking focus and in donor base

To inquire neutrally about convergence and competition, we asked about *overlap* in critical areas: mission, community convening, grant making focus, and donor base. Responses are illustrated below. It's telling that nearly 100% of respondents see overlap in donor base, while 92% see overlap in grantmaking focus.



“Overlap” does not necessarily mean competition. Many respondents from both institutions saw competition as negative—as opposed to a market inevitability with good and bad aspects, for instance—and identified the best strategy for eliminating competition as avoidance of duplication.

“We don’t compete for funds. We’ve heard of others that compete with one another, but we go out of our way not to do that.”—United Way Executive

“We do our thing and they do theirs.”—Community Foundation Executive

Collaborations between the organizations seem most likely to take one of two forms:

- Funding one another’s initiatives
- Back-office sharing of resources

“We set up a joint committee of board members that met over a three-year period. They started off with pages and pages of things we could do together, and one by one every idea except one got dropped off. The one thing is that now we share an HR person who works half time for us and half time for them.”—Community Foundation Executive

3 Convergence in grant making

The high degree of overlap in grantmaking focus and in donor base reflects a convergence of organizational strategy. Both organizations have made significant changes in these areas over the past several years.

In grantmaking focus, it is easier to track changes in United Ways due to a formalized national structure. In 2000, United Way of America launched a national strategy that would position United Way less as fundraisers than as the leading community impact organizations in their communities. While local United Ways have implemented this strategy to widely differing degrees, the practical impact of this shift for United Way—along with varying shifts among community foundations—has been a convergence of mission in many cities. Both now frequently describe themselves as identifying and addressing long-term needs of communities, as convening and coordinating responses to complicated issues, and as change agents (in addition to or instead of safety nets).

As part of this strategy, many United Ways are moving to annual proposal-based grantmaking in specific areas of community need to create measurable impact, and away from providing relatively stable, unrestricted funding allocations to an identified cohort of nonprofits.

Relationships between the two organizations have become more tenuous. This may be due to a higher visibility of United Way as we focus on impact.—United Way Executive

The difference in where dollars went used to be clear. United Way raised current dollars for current needs and provided support to health and human services nonprofits in a predictable way year in and year out. Community foundations focused on more quality of life issues, the intrinsic intractable problems that require a long view and a flexible grantmaking approach.

—Community Foundation Executive

Many United Ways now partner with nonprofits on specific community issues; these partners may extend beyond their traditional member agencies. In some cases, core support may not be available but project support is. There is also evidence that some United Ways have extended their funding beyond health and human services to include educational institutions and in a few instances, environment and the arts.

In an interview with members from each respective organization in a community where the United Way had shifted to the community impact model, each admitted that when this funding shift began, there was no conversation between the United Way and the community foundation. Nonprofits began to approach the community foundation to replace core funding lost by the shift in funding from the United Way, resulting in significant challenges for the community foundation.

The net result may be that United Ways will look more like community foundations and community foundations are stepping in to fill the void created by United Ways. It is unclear the ultimate value to the community.—Community Foundation Executive

At least for these two organizations, there appears to be a need and an opportunity to address together the issue of core support for safety net organizations to ensure critical services will be available for the most vulnerable in a community.

Historically United Ways were more likely to characterize their grantmaking as stable and critical support for the vulnerable, while community foundations were more likely to characterize their grantmaking as responsive to changing issues and oriented to long-term change. Today, both organizations are more likely now to articulate both kinds of goals in their grantmaking.


4 Convergence in donor products and services and competition for donors

In donor base, both United Ways and community foundations appear to have increased attention on a similar group of high net worth individuals. Many United Ways saw their fastest rates of increased donations occurring with major donors³, and in response have intensified their work with this segment. At the same time, many community foundations have shifted from an emphasis on bequests and planned gifts to focus on living donors and donor-advised funds. In addition, some community foundations are beginning to work with corporations, corporate foundations, and employee giving programs—traditionally areas where United Ways have been strong.

The chart below illustrates the level of priority (measured in time and resources) each organization places on various donor segments. While there are still clear differences in some of the primary donor markets for each organization, it is also clear that there is shared focus on high net worth individuals and CEOs.


Corporate philanthropy and workplace giving should remain the United Way's domain, though our community foundation is in some companies now.
—United Way Executive

Percentage identifying each segment as high or medium-high priority



The chart below illustrates the percentage of respondents that offer a variety of donor products.

Percentage offering each product or service



While this chart illustrates that there are still differentiators, there is some duplication of products. The impact on fundraising should be tracked over time to determine if this duplication increases the overall giving to both organizations.

As the mission and activities of community foundations and United Ways increasingly overlap, many respondents expressed at least some interest in collaborating or working with the other organization. Many organizations find they cannot find substantial ways to do so, despite belief that such cooperation is necessary.

American communities have changed a great deal since these entities were created. There are now many more vehicles for giving. Both must advocate for community giving. Remember who the ultimate beneficiary is.
—Community Foundation Executive

If the two organizations cannot find a way to work together and instead choose to compete with one another in a negative way, the donor may decide to choose another nonprofit to work with.—United Way Executive

³ Major donors to United Ways are frequently called “Alexis de Toqueville donors”—individuals who have made personal contributions of \$10,000 or more to a United Way campaign.

5 The area where competitiveness is most keenly felt is in competition for the position of community leader

A key finding from this inquiry is the intensity of executive feeling on the issue of competition for community leadership position. When we asked the question, “How often do the community foundation and United Way occupy the same leadership position in the community?” 43% of respondents said the statement was somewhat or very accurate. On the other hand, when we asked about perceived *collaboration* in the area of community leadership, a similar 48% said that it was somewhat or very strong, indicating an effort to work together in providing community leadership.

As one executive put it:

It’s not that there aren’t enough community issues to go around. We need to cooperate and coordinate—we don’t have to be tripping over each other to meet community needs. We don’t need to do the same thing.

But others were more cautious:

We’ve both [the community foundation and the United Way] acquired and assumed the role of community convener. We’re competitors to be the convener on this or that.

And:

The United Way’s Community Impact Agenda does focus on convening, which is a priority for community foundations also. But the difference is how we start. Community foundations start with other funders, while United Ways start with business, nonprofits, and government.—United Way Executive


This same United Way executive was one of a very few interviewees who articulated areas beyond convening for possible leadership collaboration with the local community foundation:

Public policy is an area for potential collaboration as we both are realizing how important that area is. We can also work together to affect service systems such as volunteerism.—United Way Executive

In short, cooperating around key community issues is occurring, but there is also real competition between community foundations and United Ways for the most intangible of distinctions, community leadership position. How the two organizations resolve this issue will make a critical difference to both in successfully strengthening their communities.

6 CEOs make an important difference in the nature of the relationship

It appears that much of the success and failure of the relationship between these two types of organizations lies at the CEO level. We asked how frequently CEOs interact with counterparts at the other organization. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the CEOs report interacting regularly or frequently.



When we shared this finding in interviews and discussions, we found different perspectives on its meaning. Some respondents were pleasantly surprised that 58% of organizations reported regular or frequent interactions and felt encouraged by the finding. Other respondents were disappointed that there wasn't more interaction among the executives, particularly as community leaders. Both responses suggest an overall desire by the field to see more regular interaction among CEOs.

Beyond the frequency of interaction, the comments provided by respondents further illuminate the critical role this relationship plays in determining the attitude and behavior towards the other organization.

When she [the United Way executive] left to take on the community foundation position [as executive], she brought significant resources (board members, donors, staff, etc.) with her. This is the primary reason for the antagonism between the two organizations.—United Way Executive

The two CEOs have a strong relationship and work hard to include each other in positive interactions. The relationship between the two organizations is strong mainly due to the commitment of the two CEOs to make it so.—United Way Executive


The central role of the CEOs means that the opportunity for new kinds of relationships may need to wait for a new CEO at one of the organizations.

There is new leadership at both organizations currently. The past was fraught with competition. The new leaders are always looking for ways to collaborate.—United Way Executive

After 33 years of animosity they have a new executive who's approached us and asked us to set an example for the community of strategic partnering.—Community Foundation Executive

7 United Ways and community foundations have significant financial interaction

The survey revealed a significant amount of financial interaction between the two organizations. Most significant, 65% reported that the United Way holds one or more funds at the community foundation. The majority of these are endowment funds. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of community foundations participate in their local United Way campaign. Another key area of financial relationship was money that flowed between the two organizations. As might be expected, community foundations are more likely to make grants to United Ways than the other way around. Of these, about half (42%) were donor advised grants, and about half (47%) were to special initiatives and projects. Twelve percent (12%) of United Ways had made grants to the community foundations within the last year, with the largest percentage (9%) going to special initiatives or projects.



In a very few cases there were joint fundraising activities—financial intertwining and interdependence.

The United Way keeps its endowment fund at the community foundation and the community foundation assists the United Way planned giving staff with planned giving calls.—United Way Executive

8 There is significant crossover among board members, representing an opportunity for strategic cooperation

Our study found 45% of organizations have board members in common. In many cases, United Ways formed community foundations fairly recently and the move from the United Way board to the community foundation board seemed like a natural part of that creation. Interestingly, when individuals were asked whether they consider in board recruitment present or past participation on the board of the other organization, 75% said they did not. Some interviewees noted that board overlap was related to the existence of a small civic leadership group:

This is an area with a relatively small population. You will find many of the same people on numerous boards of non-profit charitable organizations.

In addition to sharing board members, we also asked if organizations had held a joint board event or meeting in the last 24 months; 23% indicated they had. Subjects for discussion fell into six broad categories:

- **The relationship between the two organizations**
- **Collaborative programs**
- **Technical assistance seminars focused primarily on governance issues**
- **Community needs assessments and priority setting**
- **Planned giving**
- **Endowment investment performance**
(for United Ways that have endowment funds at community foundations)

> Recommendations

In the course of working on this project, our National Advisory Committee proposed that the researchers develop a list of recommendations that would inform work and relationship-building between local and regional community foundations and United Ways. So as we have held focus groups and conducted interviews, we have asked what an appropriate set of recommendations might be. Below is a list of these, reflecting where we heard agreement from a variety of stakeholders.

1 As leadership organizations, model cooperation for your communities.

“Both of our organizations are trying to encourage greater collaboration and increased efficiencies among nonprofits. The reality is, we are not leading by example.”—United Way Executive

Examples:

- When the interests of the two organizations coincide, at the very least the organizations should coordinate if not collaborate.
- Explore sharing projects such as community assessments and research projects.
- Experiment with sharing back office activities.

2 Develop an intentional strategy for relating to and working with the other organization.

Despite what appears to be high energy around discussing the other organization, few community foundations or United Ways have intentional, articulated strategies or stances for working with the other. Interviewees were often struck by their lack of a developed stance.

“We don’t have a strategy, or actually, our strategy is wishful thinking—that they’ll go away. We should decide what we want to do. If we want to compete with them, we should do that. If we want to ignore them, we should do that and stop obsessing. If we want to help them... well, I don’t actually know what that would mean, but there must be something.”—Community Foundation Executive

Examples of how to develop a strategy:

- Schedule some time on a board agenda each year to talk about what the other is up to and how to respond.
- Invite a staff person or board member from the other organization to meet with your board.
- As appropriate, create explicit policies and philosophies for interaction, and communicate them throughout the organization.
- Develop language that your staff and board use when talking about the respective roles of each organization.

3 Recognize that competition can have benefits for both your donors and your community.

“This discussion is making me realize that maybe we need to HELP the United Way. It’s better for there to be both Kiwanis and Rotary, and it’s better to have us and the United Way. We should think about making sure they do well.”

—Community Foundation Executive

Examples:

- If the other organization is struggling financially, consider strategies to support their resurgence, such as a public contributions drive or encouraging major donors to support the other.
- Hold a joint community forum for nonprofits and/or donors where each organization explains how it sees its core competencies and role in the community.
- Support the other organization in public relations and media work by issuing joint press releases when possible, congratulatory press releases about the other, and supportive press work if the other is experiencing a public relations problem.

4 Acknowledge and utilize shared board members and those who have served on the other organization’s board in the past.

“Some of our key board members serve on the community foundation Board after completing their maximum term on our board.”

—United Way Executive

Examples:

- Use the wisdom in the room; if you have board members in common, invite them to lead a discussion about the goals, strategies, activities and successes of the other organization.
- Map the relationship of your board members with the other organization and nurture positive relationships between board members of the two organizations.
- Consider an annual joint board or officers meeting or event.

5 Develop a financial stake in the other organization.

Those organizations that have financial stakes in the other were more likely to have ongoing communication and collaboration—perhaps because they have at least some financial stake in the other’s financial success.

Examples:

- United Ways can consider placing their endowments at community foundations.
- Community foundations can consider participating in the annual United Way campaign, and community foundation CEOs may serve on United Way campaign cabinets.
- Community foundations and United Ways can develop vehicles whereby major donors can give to both organizations in one step.
- Both organizations can consider significant investments in the other’s initiatives—having a financial stake will encourage efforts to make the initiatives successful.

6 Take into account the community focus of the other organization and seek to complement their existing work or tackle a different problem in your community.

Examples

- Community foundations can consider complementary or enhancement strategies to support United Way national initiatives such as Success By 6® that focuses on early childhood development and childcare.
- Create a community structure that regularly convenes program staff from both organizations as well as staff from other foundations to discuss the work of each and opportunities for coordination and even collaboration.
- Map community needs together with existing philanthropic and government programs to identify and implement strategies to address areas currently overlooked.

United Way of America and the community foundations Leadership Team of the Council on Foundations are considering these recommendations and next steps to assist their members in discussing and implementing them.

Some concluding thoughts:

Both community foundations and United Ways are taking leadership roles in their communities by implementing and promoting standards and best practices for nonprofit organizations. This leadership at a time of increased congressional scrutiny of the nonprofit sector underscores the critical role organizations play in their communities. This report suggests opportunities to demonstrate a further dimension of leadership by coordinating, cooperating, and collaborating with one another on behalf of the community.

The roles and missions of United Ways and community foundations are evolving. The shifts in their missions, fundraising strategies, and activities are having an impact on the philanthropic ecosystem in local communities. It is difficult to predict what the ultimate impact of this shift will be; however, the potential for continued conflict and “turf wars” as this sorts itself out is concerning. We were struck by a comment made by this executive:

Our competition is not with the other organization. Our true challenge is with people’s interests in something other than our American local communities. People are not engaged in meeting local needs.

From our perspective, overcoming this challenge and re-engaging people in their local communities should be at the top of the list of every United Way and community foundation. By staying focused on the greater good, United Ways and community foundations can fulfill their community leadership potential and achieve their mutual goal: to improve people’s lives and create healthy vibrant communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This CompassPoint report was written by Nancy Ragey with assistance from Jan Masaoka and Jeanne Bell Peters. Rob Collier of The Council of Michigan Foundations, Suzanne Feurt of the Council on Foundations and Deborah Foster of United Way of America were invaluable contributors and supporters of this effort.

Report Partners

CompassPoint Nonprofit Services

The Council of Michigan Foundations

Funded by

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Community Foundations Leadership Team of the Council on Foundations

National Advisory Committee

David Balch

President, United Way Capital Area

Peter Carpino

President & CEO, United Way of Greater Rochester

Robert S. Collier

President & CEO, Council of Michigan Foundations

Suzanne L. Feurt

Managing Director, Council on Foundations

Deborah Foster

Executive Vice President, United Way of America

Terri Lee Freeman

President, Community Foundation of the National Capital Region

Thomas S. Hay

Vice President for Finance, The Pittsburgh Foundation

Connie Hodges

President, United Way of Northeast Florida

Jennifer Leonard

President and Executive Director, Rochester Area Community Foundation

Donnell Snite Mersereau

Director, Community Foundations, Council of Michigan Foundations

Miriam C. Nolan

President, Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan

Molly Stearns

Senior Vice President, The Seattle Foundation

Russy Sumariwalla

Founder and President, Global Philanthropy and Nonprofits

ABOUT THE REPORT PARTNERS

CompassPoint Nonprofit Services is a nonprofit consulting, education and research organization based in San Francisco with national programming. Through a broad range of services and initiatives, CompassPoint serves nonprofit volunteers and staff with the tools, concepts and strategies necessary to shape change in their communities. Especially well-known are CompassPoint's Executive Transitions programs, leadership development programs designed especially for women and executives of color, and its newsletter for board members, the *Board Café*. www.compasspoint.org

The Council of Michigan Foundations is a membership association of more than 400 grantmakers, including family, independent, community, public, and corporate foundations, as well as corporate giving programs. CMF is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit membership association for foundations and corporations whose mission is to enhance, improve, and increase philanthropy in Michigan. www.cmif.org

Individual Interviews

Peter Carpino

President & CEO, United Way of Greater Rochester

Roger Frick

President, Indiana Association of United Ways

Irv Katz

President & CEO

National Human Services Assembly

Stewart M. Landefeld

Trustee and Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Seattle Foundation

Jennifer Leonard

President and Executive Director, Rochester Area Community Foundation

Anne Wilson

CEO, United Way of the Bay Area

Russy Sumariwalla

Founder and President, Global Philanthropy and Nonprofits

James F. Tune

Chairman of the Board of Directors, United Way of King County



CompassPoint

NONPROFIT SERVICES

706 Mission Street, 5th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
www.compasspoint.org

San Francisco: 415.541.9000
Silicon Valley: 408.248.9505

This Highlights Report summarizes key findings of the inquiry.
The full report can be viewed and downloaded at www.compasspoint.org/uwcf