

Summary of Comments on the Giving/Endowment Papers

1. It was suggested and supported that we include the word “Legacy” in the name.

How about calling it the “FOUNTAIN HILLS COMMUNITY FOUNDATION LEGACY/ENDOWMENT FUND”. I do believe that we need to have the words “endowment fund” in the name, since it properly describes what we are encouraging. I do not believe that it is correct to add the word “society” or something similar into the name.

2. It was suggested that we combine parts one and two, since we do have some duplication.

I can certainly combine the two documents into only one. It was structured as two documents originally because of my fear that one would be too long and the part two was designed to delve more deeply into just “endowment funds” and act as a follow-up to the more general part one, which discussed related explanations and possibilities.

3. It was suggested that annual giving be discussed as a “fundraising” effort and not be mentioned.

The intent in the Giving Paper was to discuss and introduce “Giving” in general and be separate and apart from the Endowment Papers. In my experience activities were divided into two distinct segments -- Giving and Fundraising.

Giving was considered any donation solicited with no quid pro quo. In other words, one is giving or donating with no expectation of something in return, except perhaps recognition.

Fundraising was considered to be an activity which was designed to raise money, but the payor received something in return. I.e. a dinner, auction, “flutter”, lottery, etc. where someone gives a donation, which may be higher than the actual value, but gets the possibility of or actually receives something in return.

I do believe that both endowment and annual giving should be under the same umbrella. The annual giving levels should be established and be consistent for a long period; however, one could add to the levels if appropriate. I.e. one could add a \$1,000 level for annual giving. Levels need to be discussed.

4. It was suggested that there may be too much information for a marketing package.

We can use the material as best determined to be effective. I do believe that most large contributions come through personal contact with the donor. The web site is certainly a great place to introduce something, but when it come down to someone donating a large amount of money, a personal meeting is needed. Additionally, the donor’s attorney or CPA may want something in writing.

5. It was asked - Should we mention the specific types of nonprofits that we support or perhaps name them?

This could be a separate pull down on the web site, which could be easily changed as needed, if the Board wishes but I probably would not include in these documents.

6. Should the paragraph asking for outside input be included in the documents?

It was originally included because I thought that an initial paper may be sent out to a test audience of recipients, but that did not occur. I have removed the question in the paper.

7. Are we duplicating information that is already covered in the web site of the Arizona Community Foundation?

Yes, we are. We work with the AZCF, but I believe that it is very important that we promote the Fountain Hills Foundation as a separate and distinct entity. I believe that it is important to the FH citizens that we are doing something for FH and not necessarily for the State of Arizona. I did send Part One of the documents to the AZCF endowment coordinator for review. She did suggest the order in which the material was presented, but little else. We shall continue to work with the AZCF and receive their input and I was going to send all the information to them prior to our final approval.