

FACT SHEET ON THE CAMPAIGN REVENUES OF UNITED ARTS FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEAR 2016

United Arts Funds (UAFs) are private organizations that raise money for the arts, work to broaden support for the arts, encourage arts attendance and participation, promote excellence in the arts and arts management, and ensure that arts organizations are financially stable. Americans for the Arts defines a UAF campaign as a combined or federated appeal for arts funding conducted annually to raise unrestricted money on behalf of three or more arts, culture, and/or science organizations.

- Most UAFs are also the primary local arts agency (LAA) for their community.
- The most common geographic service area of a UAF is city and county (36 percent), followed by those that serve multiple counties (22 percent) and a single county (17 percent), the rest (24 percent) serve multiple cities, states, a single city, or areas delimited by a different combination of geographic boundaries.
- The majority of UAFs were initiated by local business leaders seeking to minimize individual funding requests and to ensure that arts organizations meet standards of quality and financial stability.
- UAFs primarily raise unrestricted operating support for organizations that they fund—though many also raise funds for special projects or to address specific community issues (e.g., marketing, stabilization, and arts education). An increasing number of UAFs also operate programs that support specific projects, and many also have conducted capital campaigns and helped create and/or operate cultural facilities.
- UAFs generally have a board of directors composed of community leaders who span a wide range of sectors, and who are able to engage in one-on-one fundraising efforts.

FY2016 UAF CAMPAIGN REVENUE

- As of August 2017, **44 united arts funds are known to be actively operating** (as recently as 2003 there were at least 66 UAFs in operation).
- **The 37 participating UAFs reported aggregate campaign revenue of \$85.5 million during their campaigns that ended during 2016.**
 - The responding UAFs raised a **median revenue of \$1.1 million** and an **average of \$2.3 million** in revenue during FY2016.
- Twenty-nine UAFs have provided their total campaign revenue annually since 2007, making them a reliable indicator of the year-to-year changes in UAF fundraising.
 - These 29 consistent responders reported an overall increase of 5.3 percent (inflation adjusted) in their aggregate campaign revenue from FY2015 to FY2016.

- Eleven of these consistently-responding UAFs reported a campaign revenue increase from FY2015 to FY2016, up from 8 that reported an increase from FY2014 to FY2015.
- The \$116.7 total campaign revenue raised on behalf of the arts and culture in FY2016 is \$4.1 million more than the inflation adjusted total of \$112.8 million they raised during FY2007. All together, these findings suggest that the united arts fundraising sector is continuing its recovery from the Great Recession.

UAF GRANTMAKING

- Three in four UAFs provide allocations/grants for **general operating support** (76 percent) and special **project grants** (74 percent), about half for **arts education** grants (55 percent), a third for ongoing **program support** (37 percent) and one in 10 for **challenge/matching grants**. In addition, 13 percent of UAFs indicated that they provide support for “other” categories including capacity building and individual artist grants.
- Most UAFs distribute at least a portion of their funds through an **open application process** (74 percent). However, UAFs also have programs where **organizations receive awards each year** through a noncompetitive process (37 percent), that receive applications **by invitation only** (24 percent), or where they make grant decisions based on **board or staff recommendations** (11 percent).
- Fifty-six percent have a **formula for allocating grants**, 41 percent do not (3 percent don’t know). Sixty-three percent have a limit on the amount of money an organization can receive, 34 percent do not (3 percent don’t know)
- Sixty-three percent reported that their **allocation policy has changed** significantly in the past 24 months, while 66 percent report that their allocation process includes specific outcome/impact reporting.
- Fifty-nine percent have designed or re-designed one or more grant programs with a **diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) lens**, 13 percent reported having plans to do it in the next twelve months, while 19 percent have not done it and are not planning to in the next twelve months. Those who selected “other” (9 percent) most commonly cited **informal practices** aimed at attracting and supporting diverse grantees.