

# ANNUAL REVIEW OF ENDOWMENTS

FISCAL YEAR 2022



CAMBRIDGE  
ASSOCIATES

# CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Investment Portfolio Returns	2
Investment Policy	22
Portfolio Asset Allocation	31
Investment Manager Structures	40
Institutional Support	44
Investment Office Staffing and Governance	52
Notes on the Data	62
Appendix	64
Participants	82

---

## SIDEBAR

Percentile Rankings	4
Performance Methodology Descriptions	6
Special Topics in Fiscal Year 2022	34

---

## FIGURES

1. Trailing 1-Yr Returns for 70% Equity/30% Bond Benchmark	2
2. Trailing 1-Yr Median Returns	3
3. Fiscal Year 2022 Total Return Percentiles by Institution Type	3
4. Fiscal Year 2022 Total Return Percentiles by Asset Size	4
5. Dispersion in Trailing 1-Yr Returns Relative to the Median Return	5
6. Performance Reporting Methodologies: Private Investments	6
7. Cambridge Associates' Private Investment Index IRRs	7
8. Range of Fiscal Year 2022 Returns by Private Investment Reporting Methodology	7
9. Types of Fees Deducted in FY 2022 Net Return Calculation	8
10. 1-Yr Index Returns	9
11. 1-Yr Mean Asset Allocation by Performance Quartile	10
12. 1-Yr Attribution Analysis	11
13. 1-Yr Median Asset Class Returns by Performance Quartile	12
14. Total Returns Summary: Trailing 3-, 5-, 10-, and 20-Yr	13
15. Rolling Median Returns and Out/Underperformance vs 70/30 Benchmark	14
16. Median Trailing 3-, 5-, 10-, and 20-Yr Returns by Asset Size	14
17. Median Trailing 3-, 5-, 10-, and 20-Yr Returns by Institution Type	15
18. 10-Yr Index Returns	15
19. 10-Yr Mean Asset Allocation by Performance Quartile	16
20. 10-Yr PE/VC Allocation vs Total Return	17
21. 10-Yr Attribution Analysis by Performance Quartile	17
22. 10-Yr Median Asset Class Returns by Performance Quartile	18
23. Trailing 1-Yr Inflation Rate	19
24. Rolling Median Real Returns: Trailing 10- and 20-Yr	20
25. 10- and 20-Yr Real Returns After Spending	20
26. 10-Yr Standard Deviation and Sharpe Ratio	21

27. Real Total Portfolio Return Objectives	23
28. Number of Categories in the Policy Allocation Framework	24
29. Capturing Equities in the Asset Allocation Policy	25
30. Types of Policy Portfolio Benchmarks	26
31. Components of the Policy Portfolio Benchmark: Public Equity	26
32. Components of the Policy Portfolio Benchmark: Private Equity	27
33. Components of the Policy Portfolio Benchmark: Hedge Funds	28
34. Components of the Policy Portfolio Benchmark: Fixed Income	28
35. Fiscal Year 2022 Total Return vs Policy Benchmark	29
36. Range of Out/Underperformance of Total Return vs Policy Portfolio Benchmark	30
37. Summary Asset Allocation Distribution	31
38. Mean Asset Allocation: Public Equity and PE/VC	32
39. Mean Asset Allocation by Asset Size	33
40. 1-Yr Changes in Mean Actual and Target Asset Allocation	35
41. Changes in Target Asset Allocation	35
42. Historical Mean Asset Allocation Trends	37
43. Uncalled Capital Committed to Private Investment Funds	38
44. Trends in Uncalled Capital Commitments to Private Investment Funds	39
45. Number of External Managers and Investment Vehicles	40
46. Dispersion in Number of Managers for Selected Asset Classes	41
47. Portfolio Implementation: Private Investments	42
48. Portfolio Implementation: Traditional Equities and Bonds	43
49. Endowment Dependence	44
50. Spending Rule Types	45
51. Spending Rule Types by Endowment Dependence	46
52. Target Spending Rates for Market Value-Based Rules	47
53. Net Flow Rates for Fiscal Year 2022	48
54. Cumulative Dollar Growth After Inflation, Net Flows, and Spending	49
55. Composition of Long-Term Investment Portfolio	50
56. Operating Funds	50
57. Endowment to Debt	51
58. Chief Investment Officer Reporting Lines	52
59. Average Staffing Levels	53
60. Average Investment Staff by Function	54
61. Use of External Advisors and Consultants	54
62. Governing Body of Oversight Committee by Organization Type	56
63. Decision-Making and Implementation Responsibility for Key Investment Functions: Asset Allocation Policy Development	57
64. Decision-Making and Implementation Responsibility for Key Investment Functions: Portfolio Rebalancing	57
65. Decision-Making and Implementation Responsibility for Key Investment Functions: Manager Selection and Termination	58
66. Profile of Investment Committee Members	59
67. Percent of Investment Committee Members Who Are Investment Professionals	59
68. Investment Committee Term Lengths and Limits	60

This study is based on a survey that Cambridge Associates (CA) administers annually to our endowment clients. The report summarizes returns, asset allocation, and other investment-related data for 316 institutions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022. Included in this year's report are commentary and exhibits that are spread across six separate sections.

Just one year after the best investment returns endowments had seen in decades, fiscal year 2022 brought about the most challenging market environment since the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of the late 2000s. Our **INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO RETURNS** section highlights performance results for this past fiscal year as well as longer trailing period longer trailing periods. This section includes our usual suite of analyses that investigates the drives of investment performance and what made top performers stand out. Also included in this section is commentary on private investment reporting methodologies and discussion of why this topic is particularly critical in the analysis of comparative peer returns reported this past fiscal year.

Despite the poor returns earned on an absolute basis in fiscal year 2022, many endowments performed quite well in relation to their policy portfolio benchmark. However, the composition of the benchmark, notably when it comes to how private equity is captured, was a significant factor in whether or not an endowment outperformed its benchmark and by how much. Our **INVESTMENT POLICY** section touches on this topic and illustrates the most common components used for policy benchmarks. Relatedly, this section also includes insights into how asset allocation strategies among endowments can differ from a policy perspective.

CA has been conducting this survey for several decades, which gives us unique insights into trends in asset allocations over the long term. The **PORTFOLIO ASSET ALLOCATION** section highlights how endowments have evolved in investing their portfolios from the early 2000s to today, with a particular focus on the increased equity exposure that endowments have taken on in recent years. This section also incorporates data on target asset allocations to lend insights into how institutions are altering their portfolios heading into the future.

The number of managers that endowments use for their overall portfolio and within specific asset classes can vary widely. Our **INVESTMENT MANAGER STRUCTURES** section explores data on this topic, as well as implementation strategies for traditional assets (i.e., active versus passive management) and alternative assets.

Meanwhile, the **INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT** section contains analyses that highlight how much institutions rely on their endowments to support their annual operating budgets. Also included in this section are exhibits on spending policies, portfolio inflows and outflows, operating funds, and endowment market values relative to outstanding debt.

Finally, our **INVESTMENT OFFICE STAFFING AND GOVERNANCE** section of the report takes a look at topics such as the number of personnel in the investment office and investment committee structure. Also included are analyses on how endowments use outside advisors/consultants and who has decision rights for asset allocation policy development and manager selection.


## Section 1: Investment Portfolio Returns

### RETURNS IN FISCAL YEAR 2022

The first half of the fiscal year saw public equity markets in many countries, including the United States, continuing to push toward new highs. However, the market environment changed swiftly during the second half of the year as central banks raised interest rates in response to high inflation. As a result, the global equity market, as represented by the MSCI All Country World Index, ended up with its worst year, performance-wise, since the GFC of the late 2000s. Bonds fared even worse compared to historical standards, as 2022 was the lowest-returning fiscal year across the entire history of the Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index since its inception in 1976. A simple benchmark consisting of 70% global equities and 30% bonds produced the second-worst return in fiscal year 2022 across this historical period (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1 TRAILING 1-YR RETURNS FOR 70% EQUITY/30% BOND BENCHMARK**

Fiscal Years 1977–2022 • Periods Ended June 30




Sources: Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

Notes: The equity component of the benchmark is represented by the MSCI World Index (Gross) from 7/1/76 through 12/31/87; the MSCI ACWI (Gross) from 1/1/88 through 9/30/01; and the MSCI ACWI w/ US Gross from 10/1/01 through present day. The bond component is represented by the Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index for the entire historical series.

This was the broad market backdrop that endowments had to work with in fiscal year 2022. It was a strikingly different environment compared to the previous year, when the median endowment return was the second *highest* calculated across the four-plus decades that CA has been collecting performance data. For fiscal year 2022, the median return for participating institutions landed at -7.8%, the second *lowest* fiscal year return reported across the 45-year historical period (Figure 2).

## FIGURE 2 TRAILING 1-YR MEDIAN RETURNS

Fiscal Years 1977–2022 • Periods Ended June 30




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: The number of institutions included in the median calculation varies from one period to the next, ranging from 37 in 1977 to 316 in 2022.

For the second straight year, the median participant return was significantly higher than the 70/30 benchmark return. The vast majority (88%) of institutions in the overall endowment universe outperformed the simple benchmark in fiscal year 2022. Furthermore, the benchmark return would have landed in the bottom quartile of each of the subgroups based on institution type in Figure 3.

## FIGURE 3 FISCAL YEAR 2022 TOTAL RETURN PERCENTILES BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking




Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

Note: For more information, see page 64 in the Appendix.

## PERCENTILE RANKINGS


The percentile rankings in our analysis are in ascending order so that the highest figure in the data set is 0 and the lowest figure is 100. The graphs throughout this report that show a range of data are organized to highlight various percentile breaks as displayed here.



The median return (-6.6%) for colleges and universities (C&Us) was markedly higher than the medians of the other institution types. The profile of the C&U subgroup is one that is overrepresented by larger portfolios compared to rest of the endowment universe. More than half (88 of 158) of participating C&Us had endowments that were larger than \$1 billion at the end of the fiscal year. In contrast, just one-quarter (40 of 158) of the remaining endowments had asset sizes that exceeded that threshold. These statistics are noteworthy because larger endowments generally performed better than smaller endowments in 2022. Figure 4 organizes the overall endowment universe into five asset size ranges and shows the range of returns for each of these subgroups. The median return for the largest endowments—those with \$3 billion or greater in assets—was -4.4%, which was almost 600 basis points (bps) higher than the median for endowments less than \$200 million.

**FIGURE 4 FISCAL YEAR 2022 TOTAL RETURN PERCENTILES BY ASSET SIZE**

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 64 in the Appendix.

There was a significant degree of dispersion in returns reported across the participant group in fiscal year 2022. Figure 5 compares the level of dispersion in returns among the overall endowment universe across each fiscal year going back to 1977. After a period of relatively smaller variations in returns during the 2010s, the level of dispersion spiked dramatically in fiscal year 2021. The overall range in returns trended back down in 2022 but remained elevated compared to the experience of the previous decade. The 5th percentile return, at 1.6%, was 9.4 percentage points (ppts) higher

than the median return in 2022. The level of dispersion was slightly smaller in the lower half of the universe, as the 95th percentile return (-15.4%) was 7.6 ppts lower than the median mark.

**FIGURE 5 DISPERSION IN TRAILING 1-YR RETURNS RELATIVE TO THE MEDIAN RETURN**  
Fiscal Years 1977–2022 • Periods Ended June 30



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## IMPACT OF PERFORMANCE REPORTING METHODOLOGIES ON PEER COMPARISONS

Because of the illiquid nature of private investments, valuations of these assets are not readily available following the end of a quarter. It can take several months for managers to report valuations, which delays the timing for when an endowment can calculate a fiscal year return with June 30 private marks. Some institutions must close out their investment reporting shortly after fiscal year end, while others have the flexibility to wait until later in the fall to calculate their final fiscal year return. Consequently, the methodology for capturing private investments in the total portfolio return is not apples-to-apples across all endowments.


Endowments using the lagged methodology mark private investments as of March 31, when the fiscal year return is reported. Private valuations are perpetually lagged by one quarter under this method, resulting in a fiscal year return that captures private investment performance from April 1, 2021, to March 31, 2022. Just 11% of participants in this study used the lagged basis for their fiscal year return calculation. In contrast, the majority of participants (83%) in this study incorporated private investment marks into the fiscal year total return on a current basis (Figure 6). For these endowments, private investment performance is time-matched with the actual trailing one-year period and reflects investment activity from July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022.



## FIGURE 6 PERFORMANCE REPORTING METHODOLOGIES: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

As of June 30, 2022

### All Endowments



### Endowments by Asset Size

	Current Basis	Lagged Basis	No PI Allocation
Under \$200M	81%	—	19%
<i>n</i>	75		18
\$200M–\$500M	97%	—	3%
<i>n</i>	58		2
\$500M–\$1B	91%	9%	—
<i>n</i>	32	3	
\$1B–\$3B	79%	19%	1%
<i>n</i>	53	13	1
Over \$3B	70%	30%	—
<i>n</i>	43	18	

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Institutions with no significant private investment allocations (<1% of their total investment portfolios) are reflected in the No PI Allocation category in the pie graph and table by asset size.

### PERFORMANCE METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTIONS

#### Current Basis

Total investment pool return for the trailing one-year period includes marketable asset performance and private investment performance for July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022.

Marketable Assets			
3Q21	4Q21	1Q22	2Q22
Private Investments			

#### Lagged Basis


Total investment pool return for the trailing one-year period includes marketable asset performance for July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022, and private investment performance for April 1, 2021, to March 31, 2022.

Marketable Assets				
2Q21	3Q21	4Q21	1Q22	2Q22
Private Investments				

The performance impact of using one methodology over the other is substantial for this most recent fiscal year. With the lagged basis methodology, private investment performance for second quarter 2021 will be included in the one-year total return calculation, but performance for second quarter 2022 will be excluded. Figure 7 shows the returns of several CA private investment indexes for these two separate quarterly periods. The returns from the second quarter 2021 were higher across all strategies, giving the lagged methodology a significant comparative advantage over the current methodology for fiscal year 2022.

**FIGURE 7 CAMBRIDGE ASSOCIATES' PRIVATE INVESTMENT INDEX IRRs**

Percent (%)



Source: Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Private investment return statistics are reported as horizon internal rates of return.

The differentials between second quarter 2021 and second quarter 2022 returns were extremely large for the private equity and venture capital (PE/VC) strategies. This is noteworthy since, on average, more than three-quarters of the total private investment comes from exposure to PE/VC. Given this context, one would expect that endowments using the lagged methodology would report a fiscal year 2022 return that was much higher than what would have been calculated under the current basis. This is exactly what we found when we organized the participant universe into subgroups based on private investment reporting methodology. The median return for lagged reporters was -2.6%, which was more than 500 bps higher than the median for current reporters (-7.9%) (Figure 8).

**FIGURE 8 RANGE OF FISCAL YEAR 2022 RETURNS BY PRIVATE INVESTMENT REPORTING METHODOLOGY**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment and foundation data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Excluded from this analysis are three institutions that had little to no private investment allocation (i.e., &lt; 1%).


The impact of different private reporting methodologies becomes less significant over longer measurement periods. Using fiscal year 2022 as an example, the lagged reporters certainly benefitted from a comparative perspective by not having the second quarter 2022 private investment markdowns incorporated into the trailing one-year

return. However, they benefitted even more so from having second quarter 2021, a period with exceptionally strong private performance, on the front end of the fiscal year return. Over longer multiyear trailing periods, the second quarter 2021 period gets captured for all institutions, which puts both the current and lagged methodology on more even footing. In addition, the remaining advantage from not having the second quarter 2022 markdowns incorporated is diminished over longer periods through the annualized return calculation. For example, a 100-bp impact from a single fiscal year would equate to approximately 10 bps for an annualized ten-year period.

Another reporting issue that can impact peer return comparisons is the method in which net returns are calculated. While each endowment in this study provided performance on a net-of-fees basis, the types of fees deducted in the net return calculation differ among participants. Most respondents (84%) reported returns net solely of external manager fees in fiscal year 2022 (Figure 9). Another 12% of respondents deduct external manager fees plus all or most of investment oversight expenses. The main drivers of these costs tend to be staff compensation for those institutions that have internal investment offices or consultant/advisor fees for those that rely heavily on external investment advisors. The remaining 3% of respondents deduct external manager fees plus some additional costs but are gross of the major oversight expense categories.

**FIGURE 9 TYPES OF FEES DEDUCTED IN FY 2022 NET RETURN CALCULATION**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment and foundation data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions in the "All/Most Oversight Costs" category net out all or the majority of oversight costs, including the major cost drivers (e.g., investment staff compensation and consultant/advisor fees). Institutions in the "Some Oversight Costs" category deduct external manager fees and some investment oversight costs, but are gross of the major cost drivers.

Smaller endowments are much less likely to deduct oversight costs compared to larger endowments. Only one endowment that is less than \$500 million in this study deducts investment oversight costs in their net return calculation. In contrast, a significant portion of endowments with asset sizes greater than \$3 billion reported returns net of some or all/most oversight expenses, with 30% netting out the major cost drivers. Past surveys that CA has conducted on this topic show that most endowments have total oversight costs that fall within a range of 10 bps to 20 bps. However, the scale of assets is an important factor, as costs in basis points tend to be lower for larger endowments compared to smaller endowments.


## RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASSET ALLOCATION AND PERFORMANCE IN FISCAL YEAR 2022

Asset allocation has traditionally been a key factor that helps explain the dispersion in returns reported among participating endowments. Our analysis on this topic begins with an overview of the capital market environment for fiscal year 2022. On the public side, most of the indexes listed in Figure 10 declined by double digits. The exceptions were the Bloomberg Commodity and MSCI World Natural Resources indexes, which returned 24.3% and 18.3%, respectively. Index returns for private strategies were substantially higher than the modified public market equivalent (mPME) benchmarks across the board.<sup>1</sup> Similar to the experience in the public markets, the best private investment returns were produced by real assets–related strategies, with the CA Private Natural Resources Index posting the top return. The CA Private Real Estate Index also grew by more than 20% and outperformed its mPME benchmark by a huge margin. The US PE/VC indexes eked out smaller gains, but still performed much better relative to public equity benchmarks.


**FIGURE 10 1-YR INDEX RETURNS**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

### Public Indexes



### Private Index IRRs and mPME IRRs



Sources: Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited, Cambridge Associates LLC, Frank Russell Company, FTSE International Limited, Hedge Fund Research, Inc., MSCI Inc., the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, Standard & Poor's, and Thomson Reuters Datastream. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

The market backdrop provides important context as we explore the differences in asset allocation structures among endowments. The heat map analysis in Figure 11 breaks the participant group into four quartiles based on fiscal year 2022 performance and displays the average allocation across the one-year period for the endowments within each quartile. We typically find that the top-performing endowments had the highest allocations to the strategies that produced the best returns.


<sup>1</sup> The mPME analysis computes public market performance, which traditionally is reported as a time-weighted return, on an internal rate of return (IRR) basis and allows for a direct comparison of returns between public and private market. The results of the mPME calculation are the return that would have been earned had the capital invested in the private strategy been invested in the public market index instead.

This relationship held true in fiscal year 2022, as top performers had the highest allocations to private strategies. The average private investment allocation among the top quartile of endowments was 37.9%, more than triple what the average was for the bottom quartile (11.4%). On a more granular asset class level, the differentials across the four performance quartiles were largest in PE/VC, which is where most endowments have the bulk of their private exposure. While the gap among peers was smaller in real assets, top performers still had an average allocation (8.5%) that was much greater than that of the bottom quartile (1.5%).

It was mostly the opposite picture when it came to allocations to marketable assets. On average, the top quartile of performers had 62.1% allocated across the marketable asset classes in our framework, while the bottom quartile had an average of 88.6%. Most of that differential can be explained by public equity allocations, where top performers reported significantly less exposure compared to bottom performers.

**FIGURE 11 1-YR MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION BY PERFORMANCE QUARTILE**

Percent (%) • n = 313



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


Note: Asset allocation is averaged across the two June 30 periods from 2021 to 2022 for each institution in this analysis.

Our attribution analysis in Figure 12 estimates the performance impact of these different asset allocation structures and the effect on overall peer performance. This analysis assigns a specific index return to represent each asset class in our framework. For each endowment in our universe, we have calculated a blended index return that is based on the portfolio's beginning fiscal year asset allocation.<sup>2</sup> The result of this calculation is the "return from asset allocation" and represents what the endowment would have earned if it was managed passively throughout the year. For fiscal year 2022, the average asset allocation return was negative for each of the four performance quartiles. However, the average for the top quartile of performers at -2.8% was significantly better than the average for the bottom quartile (-10.5%).

<sup>2</sup> See the Appendix of this report for a list of asset class indexes used and an example of how the analysis is conducted using the participant group's mean asset allocation.

## FIGURE 12 1-YR ATTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • n = 313



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 65 in the Appendix.

Asset allocation alone is not the only driver of endowment performance, as implementation of the allocations is an important piece as well. Implementation is primarily driven by the effects of active management, or alpha. In addition, there is a performance impact if an asset allocation structure is altered or rebalanced in the middle of the fiscal year. Our attribution analysis aggregates these effects into the “return from other factors” category in Figure 12. The analysis estimates that the top quartile of performers added an average of 1.9% to their returns from these other factors in fiscal year 2022. In contrast, the average for the bottom quartile of performers was -3.3%. The combination of outperforming asset allocation structures and enhanced value add from implementation helps explain why the gap between top performers and bottom performers was so large in fiscal year 2022.

## ASSET CLASS RETURNS IN FISCAL YEAR 2022

The attribution analysis from the previous section establishes that there are differentials among endowments in the performance impact from implementation. The primary driver of these differentials is the returns that participants earn for the asset class strategies in their portfolios. Since the top quartile of performers had a higher implementation return compared to the rest of the universe, it stands to reason that this group also reported higher returns across most of the asset class composites. This was evident this past year in the returns earned from alternative asset classes.

Figure 13 uses our heat map-style table to display median asset class returns for each of the four performance quartiles—as defined by the fiscal year 2022 total portfolio return—and the overall participant group. The median returns varied most among the performance quartiles within the real assets and distressed securities categories. However, since the bulk of endowments’ exposure to private investments comes from PE/VC strategies, the results reported for this composite were the most influential on the peer performance narrative of 2022. The median PE/VC IRR for the top quartile of performers (14.7%) was more than 400 bps higher than the overall endowment median (10.3%). This differential was especially meaningful, given that top performers allocated more than one-quarter of their portfolio, on average, to these strategies.

**FIGURE 13 1-YR MEDIAN ASSET CLASS RETURNS BY PERFORMANCE QUARTILE**  
Percent (%)


**Private Investment IRRs**

Quartile	Total PE/VC	Venture Capital	Non-Venture Private Equity	Distressed Securities	Private Credit	Total Real Assets	Real Estate	Natural Resources
Top Quartile	14.7	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.2	28.5	22.7	36.4
2nd Quartile	9.7	5.3	9.3	15.8	10.1	26.4	17.6	29.2
3rd Quartile	10.2	3.8	10.0	23.7	6.7	22.6	16.3	24.8
Bottom Quartile	9.4	2.4	11.1	22.7	8.4	19.0	5.5	22.8
All Endowment Median	10.3	5.5	10.1	18.5	7.6	24.7	17.4	30.0

**Marketable Asset Classes**

Quartile	Total Public Equity	Global Equity Managers	US Equity	Dev Mkts ex US Equity	Emg Markets Equity	Fixed Income	Hedge Funds	Comm & Nat Res	Public Real Estate
Top Quartile	-18.0	-17.6	-13.7	-17.8	-21.3	-6.2	-3.1	16.0	-6.3
2nd Quartile	-17.2	-19.7	-13.1	-18.8	-21.3	-7.5	-7.8	9.0	-7.3
3rd Quartile	-17.7	-18.0	-14.2	-19.0	-21.4	-8.4	-8.1	9.4	-8.0
Bottom Quartile	-19.4	-29.8	-15.6	-19.6	-22.6	-8.6	-10.9	2.1	-8.0
All Endowment Median	-18.0	-21.7	-14.5	-18.9	-21.5	-7.9	-7.9	8.0	-8.0

Divergence From All Endowment Median



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their fiscal year 2022 total portfolio return. For more information, including the number of participants, see pages 66 and 67 in the Appendix.


The bottom table on Figure 13 shows median asset class returns among participants for marketable strategies. While the largest differential in returns across the four performance quartiles was within commodities and natural resources, allocations to these strategies tend to make up a small percentage of endowment portfolios. In contrast, the top performance quartile had an average allocation of 17% to hedge funds and a median return (-3.1%) in this category that was nearly 500 bps higher than the overall endowment median. The performance earned by these endowments in hedge fund strategies was a key reason they outperformed on the total portfolio level in fiscal year 2022.

## LONGER-TERM RETURNS

While the absolute returns that endowments earned plunged in fiscal year 2022, their relative performance was outstanding when compared to a blended 70% Global Equity/30% Bond index. This was the second straight year of strong relative performance for endowments, and this has led to a large spread between the endowment median and the simple benchmark over longer trailing periods. The endowment median outperformed by 320 bps and 150 bps for the trailing three- and five-year periods, respectively. The spreads were smaller, but still positive, for the trailing ten- and 20-year periods (Figure 14).

**FIGURE 14 TOTAL RETURNS SUMMARY: TRAILING 3-, 5-, 10-, AND 20-YR**

Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)



Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

Note: For more information, please see page 68 in the Appendix.


The charts on Figure 15 show the trend in the endowment median return across multiyear trailing periods. Also displayed is the spread between the median and the simple benchmark return for each respective period. The trailing three- and five-year returns as of this most recent June 30 were toward the middle of the pack of the results from the historical period. However, the spread between the endowment median's trailing three- and five-year returns and the simple benchmark were much larger for 2022 than they were at any other point over the past decade. Returns from private markets have been substantially higher than those from public markets over the last couple of years, and this has been a primary driver behind the spike in the endowment median's outperformance versus the simple benchmark. In addition, the poor performance of the public bond market component has been a significant drag on the 70/30 benchmark's return over the last two fiscal years.

The ten-year return for the endowment median in 2022 was the third highest from the past decade, while the 20-year return was the seventh highest. On a relative basis, the trend in the median's ten-year return versus the simple benchmark resembles that of the shorter trailing periods, as the magnitude of outperformance increased for this most recent year end. For the trailing 20-year periods, the median's value add over the benchmark had been gradually shrinking since 2014 but reversed course and ticked back up in 2022.



**FIGURE 15 ROLLING MEDIAN RETURNS AND OUT/UNDERPERFORMANCE VS 70/30 BENCHMARK**

Years Ended June 30 • Percent (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: The number of institutions included in the median calculation varies from one period to the next, and is smaller in earlier years compared to the present day.

Larger endowments outperformed smaller endowments by significant margins for the trailing periods ended June 30, 2022 (Figure 16). The contrast was most striking for the trailing three-year period, where the median return for endowments greater than \$3 billion (11.6%) was more than double the median of endowments less than \$200 million (5.6%). While the spreads between those two cohorts were narrower for longer-trailing periods, it was still a considerable 240 bps for the trailing 20-year period. For the various institution types in this study, C&Us again led the pack with the highest median return across each of these trailing periods (Figure 17).

**FIGURE 16 MEDIAN TRAILING 3-, 5-, 10-, AND 20-YR RETURNS BY ASSET SIZE**

Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, please see page 68 in the Appendix.

**FIGURE 17 MEDIAN TRAILING 3-, 5-, 10-, AND 20-YR RETURNS BY INSTITUTION TYPE**

Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


### PERFORMANCE DRIVERS FOR THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD

The market backdrop for the trailing ten-year period shows that private investment strategies outperformed their public market counterparts, and in some instances by very large margins. Among the indexes listed in Figure 18, venture capital strategies performed the best, with both the US and ex US versions returning approximately 20%. The private equity and private real estate indexes posted returns that were more than 10% as well. Among public indexes, the US stock market as represented by the Russell 3000® Index was by far the top-performing strategy. Meanwhile, the low interest rate environment of the last decade resulted in historically low returns for investment-grade fixed income strategies. And despite the outstanding performance produced by commodities and natural resources in fiscal year 2022, the returns of these strategies were muted over the full trailing ten-year period.


**FIGURE 18 10-YR INDEX RETURNS**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

#### Public Indexes



#### Private Index IRRs and mPME IRRs




Sources: Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited, Cambridge Associates LLC, Frank Russell Company, FTSE International Limited, Hedge Fund Research, Inc., MSCI Inc., the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, Standard & Poor's, and Thomson Reuters Datastream. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

The analysis of peer asset allocation structures over the last ten years fits right in with the takeaways from the index comparisons. The heat map analysis in Figure 19 averages asset allocation data of participating endowments across the 11 June 30 periods from 2012 to 2022 and places each endowment into the performance quartile that aligns with their ten-year total return ranking. The top quartile of performers had the highest average allocation across the past decade to private investments (33.6%), with most of that exposure coming from PE/VC (21.8%). The average allocations gradually decline when stepping down the quartile categories, with the bottom quartile reporting the lowest allocations to private investments (5.2%). The inverse was true in traditional bonds and equities, with the combined average allocation to these strategies being just 39.2% for the endowments in the top performance quartile.

**FIGURE 19 10-YR MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION BY PERFORMANCE QUARTILE**

Percent (%) • n = 219




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Asset allocation is averaged across the 11 June 30 periods from 2012 to 2022 for each institution in this analysis.

Of all the asset classes listed in the heat map table, PE/VC is the one that had the strongest relationship with total portfolio performance for the trailing ten-year period. A simple way to visualize this is by plotting data from endowments onto a scatterplot. In Figure 20, each endowment that reported data over the last decade is represented by a dot based on where its ten-year average allocation to PE/VC intersects with its trailing ten-year return. The data do not show a perfect relationship—some endowments that have above-median allocations to PE/VC had below-median total returns and vice versa. However, there is a clear trend from left to right on the scatterplot as endowment performance tends to be higher as the allocation to PE/VC increases.

**FIGURE 20 10-YR PE/VC ALLOCATION VS TOTAL RETURN**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 219



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: The lines that traverse the graph are drawn where the median PE/VC allocation among participants intersects with the median 10-year participant return.

The attribution model further illustrates the impact of different asset allocation structures on the trailing ten-year return. The average asset allocation return over this period for the top quartile of performers was 9.3% (Figure 21). For the bottom quartile of performers, the average asset allocation return was 300 bps lower at 6.3%. This was wider than the gap in the portion of return that is explained by other factors such as implementation. The model estimates the average return from other factors for top performers was 1.0%, which was 130 bps higher than the average of the bottom quartile (-0.3%).

**FIGURE 21 10-YR ATTRIBUTION ANALYSIS BY PERFORMANCE QUARTILE**


As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • n = 219



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

The endowments that reported the highest total returns over the past decade not only had the largest allocations to private investments, but also reported performance that was higher than the overall universe median returns in most of these strategies. This stood out the most in venture capital, where the median IRR for the top-performing endowments was 24.0% over the trailing ten-year period, more than 300 bps higher than the median for the overall endowments universe (Figure 22).

**FIGURE 22 10-YR MEDIAN ASSET CLASS RETURNS BY PERFORMANCE QUARTILE**  
Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their trailing ten-year total portfolio return. For more information, including the number of participants, see pages 69 through 74 in the Appendix.

As is typically the case, there was less variation in the returns reported by participants in marketable asset classes. However, what is remarkable is the lack of blue and red colors in the heat map table on the bottom half of Figure 22. There was only one instance where the median of one of the performance quartiles was 100 bps more or less than the overall universe median. More detail on asset class returns across the trailing three-, five-, and ten-year periods is included in the Appendix of this report.


### INFLATION-ADJUSTED RETURNS

Inflation played a leading role in the macroeconomic story of fiscal year 2022. The rate of inflation in the United States, as represented by the Consumer Price Index, rose by 9.1% for the most recent fiscal year and was the largest annual increase seen since

the early 1980s (Figure 23). Taking into account the beginning of the inflation spike from the previous fiscal year, the two-year annualized rate of inflation was 7.2% as of June 30, 2022. This spike in inflation, along with the negative return environment in fiscal year 2022, means that many endowments lost a significant amount of purchasing power over the last year.

**FIGURE 23 TRAILING 1-YR INFLATION RATE**

Fiscal Years 1977–2022 • Periods Ended June 30



Source: US Department of Labor - Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Note: The inflation rate is represented by the Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers.


A primary objective when managing an endowment is to preserve—and perhaps even grow—the purchasing power of its assets. The volatile nature of investment markets makes this task impossible to achieve on a year-to-year basis, so institutions establish return targets that they aim to meet over the long-term. Most endowments have targeted a 5% real, or inflation-adjusted, return in pursuit of this goal. Meeting the return target allows an endowment to offset the erosion of purchasing power caused by inflation and replenish the annual spending that is drawn from the portfolio.<sup>3</sup>

The task of earning 5% on a real basis became much more challenging with the onset of the GFC in the late 2000s. By 2008, the median ten-year real return for endowments had fallen below 5% and it stayed below this level for much of the ensuing decade (Figure 24). The median 20-year return also took a hit post-GFC and ultimately fell below the 5% level in 2017. While the extraordinary returns of fiscal year 2021 helped the ten- and 20-year median returns surge last year, these figures fell back below the 5% threshold to 4.9% and 4.5%, respectively, as of the end of fiscal year 2022.

<sup>3</sup> See the Investment Policy section of this report, and Figure 27 specifically, for more information on this topic. While 5% has traditionally been the most common real return target, the exact percentage can be higher or lower depending on an institution's specific objectives.

**FIGURE 24 ROLLING MEDIAN REAL RETURNS: TRAILING 10- AND 20-YR**

Years Ended June 30 • Percent (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: The number of institutions included in the median calculation varies from one period to the next and is smaller in earlier years compared to the present day.

Of the endowments that provided spending rate data for the last ten years, 84% reported a real return after spending that was above 0% for this historical period. The significance of surpassing 0% is that an endowment experienced asset growth even after the effects of inflation and spending were removed from the equation. The median real return after spending for the trailing ten-year period was 1.6% (Figure 25). For the trailing 20-year period, slightly more than three-quarters of responding endowments reported a real return after spending that was above 0%, with the median at 1.0%.

**FIGURE 25 10- AND 20-YR REAL RETURNS AFTER SPENDING**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 75 in the Appendix.

## RISK-ADJUSTED RETURNS

The most common approach to measuring risk-adjusted performance is by the Sharpe ratio, which shows how much return


above the risk-free rate (T-bills) the investor has earned per unit of risk (defined as the standard deviation of returns). The higher the Sharpe ratio, the more the investor has been compensated for each unit of risk taken. Risk-adjusted performance comparisons can be complicated when portfolios have significant allocations to private investments. The frequency and timing of private investment valuations can dampen the standard deviation for the returns of these assets. Thus, a portfolio with high allocations to

private investments can yield a lower volatility statistic relative to portfolios that have higher public equity allocations. For this reason, we have split endowments out into subcategories in Figure 26 based on their average allocations to private investments over the trailing ten-year period.

The median Sharpe ratio was 1.02 for endowments that had an allocation of 30% or more to private investments. In comparison, the median Sharpe ratio was just 0.54 for endowments that had less than 10% allocated to private investments. The better Sharpe ratio for the group with the highest private allocations is mostly a function of this group's higher median return, but it is also partly attributable to their lower median standard deviation.

**FIGURE 26 10-YR STANDARD DEVIATION AND SHARPE RATIO**

Periods Ended June 30, 2022



Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.



## Section 2: Investment Policy

An investment policy provides guidelines for trustees, investment committee members, investment staff, advisors, and other relevant parties involved in the endowment's investment management and governance processes. The investment policy statement (IPS) is the formal document that outlines the important components of this policy. Some institutions may have additional informal guidelines that are considered in the investment management process but are not documented in the IPS. Our survey touched on several issues related to endowment investment policies/guidelines and the following section summarizes these responses.

### ROLE OF THE ENDOWMENT

A key issue for any institution to consider is the purpose and role of its investment assets. Most nonprofits don't generate enough revenue to cover the expenses incurred to operate their institutions and rely upon donations and endowed funds to provide additional financial support to their annual budgets. Institutions must balance their annual reliance on endowment spending and the commitment to provide support for their missions in perpetuity.<sup>4</sup>

One term that is often associated with endowment management is intergenerational equity. The concept of intergenerational equity is that future generations should receive financial support from the endowment that is equitable to what is received by today's beneficiaries and programs. To meet this objective, an endowment must earn a return over the long term that replenishes both the spending withdrawals from the portfolio and the purchasing power lost because of inflation.


Of the survey participants that specified the primary role for their endowment, 81% indicated it was to maintain intergenerational equity. The remaining 19% of respondents indicated that the primary role of the endowment was to expand its permanent capital so that the endowment could fulfill a bigger role in the institution's business model in the future. While the overall endowment pool can be expanded by raising new gifts, existing endowment funds would need to earn a long-term return that exceeds the combined rate of spending and inflation if the objective is to grow the purchasing power of those funds.

Our survey asked participants to provide their real return objective for the endowment if one was used. Since endowment returns are volatile from year to year, return objectives should be evaluated from the long-term perspective instead of a goal that must be met each and every year. As has been the case historically, the most common real return objective is 5%, which was cited by more than half of endowments (Figure 27). Approximately 23% of respondents have an objective above 5%, while a similar number (19%) reported an objective of less than 5%.

4 See the Institutional Support section of this report for commentary and analysis on endowment spending.

**FIGURE 27 REAL TOTAL PORTFOLIO RETURN OBJECTIVES**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 134



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

### ASSET ALLOCATION POLICY


The asset allocation component of the investment policy specifies the asset classes allowed in the portfolio and assigns target allocations and/or ranges for those asset class categories. The categories and targets chosen are based on the portfolio's risk tolerance, liquidity needs, and performance objectives. Our survey requests that respondents provide the asset class categories used in their endowment's asset allocation policy.

There are differences in the policy frameworks reported among respondents, with some endowments having more detailed policies than others. Most endowments use separate categories in their framework to distinguish between equities, hedge funds (or diversifying strategies), real assets, and fixed income. For equities, it is the most common practice to have separate targets that split public and private assets into different categories. In addition, some endowments further break out their policy allocations to public equities by separate geographic regions. Similarly, there are often multiple categories used to account for real assets based on the public versus private split and/or to distinguish between the various types of substrategies (e.g., natural resources versus real estate).

Figure 28 shows the distribution of the number of categories that endowments cited in their overall asset allocation policy. The greatest concentration was within a range of four to six categories, with more than one-half (56%) of respondents falling within this range. Slightly more than one-quarter (27%) of respondents reported that they used anywhere from seven to nine categories, while 9% of endowments use ten or more categories. The remaining 8% of respondents cited three categories or fewer in their policy framework.

**FIGURE 28 NUMBER OF CATEGORIES IN THE POLICY ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 280



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


A broad policy approach is most common for public equities, with 69% of respondents reporting a single category that captures their entire public equity allocation (Figure 29). The remaining 31% of respondents assign multiple targets based on geographic regions, although there are various combinations of regions used across endowments. The single-category approach provides the investment management team more flexibility, while the multi-category approach puts more constraints on how the public allocations are implemented. The trend over the last year saw more respondents move toward the broader approach, as the breakdown from the fiscal year 2021 study showed 62% using a single category versus 38% using multiple categories.

A small percentage (15%) of respondents roll PE/VC together with public equity into a single category in their policy framework. In these instances, a name such as “Growth” or simply “Equity” is used to capture the combined exposure. However, most endowments separate categories for public and private equity when constructing their asset allocation policy. The most common approach, which was cited by 50% of respondents, is to have either a dedicated target for PE/VC or break out non-venture private equity and venture capital into two separate categories. Another 35% of endowments include PE/VC together with other private strategies into a single category called Private Investments in their framework.


**FIGURE 29 CAPTURING EQUITIES IN THE ASSET ALLOCATION POLICY**

As of June 30, 2022

**Public Equity (*n* = 280)**



**PE/VC (*n* = 255)**



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## BENCHMARKING


Benchmarking investment performance is an essential piece of a well-functioning governance process for an endowment. The purpose of benchmarking is to answer the question “How are we doing?” in ways that are both accurate and relevant to the objectives of the portfolio being measured. No single benchmark can answer every aspect of that question, so institutions may use a variety of benchmarks in this process.

We asked participants in this study to provide the components of what they consider to be their policy portfolio benchmark. The vast majority (88%) of respondents use a static-weighted policy benchmark that matches or aligns closely with the categories and target weightings in the asset allocation policy framework (Figure 30). This approach can help an endowment evaluate whether it has outperformed a mix of indexes that represents its default or normative position. Such an evaluation not only captures the impact of manager selection decisions, but also the effect of differences between the portfolio’s actual asset allocation and the policy targets. A much smaller percentage (5%) of respondents use a dynamically weighted policy benchmark where the weightings of the indexes update frequently (e.g., monthly) to match the actual asset allocation of the portfolio. This type of benchmark is intended to focus solely on manager selection decisions and neutralizes the effect of over/underweights of asset allocation versus policy targets.

The remaining 7% of respondents use a simple benchmark that incorporates a blend of a broad-based equity benchmark and a bond index. Assuming that a portfolio has diversified into alternative asset classes, a simple benchmark evaluates whether the decision to diversify and actively manage the portfolio paid off for the endowment. The MSCI All Country World Index was used for the equity component by 20 of the 21 endowments that cited this type of benchmark. Similarly, the Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index was the most common index reported for the bond component (13 of 21 respondents).

**FIGURE 30 TYPES OF POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARKS**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 281




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Figure 31 narrows the universe down to the respondents that cited a static-weighted policy benchmark and shows the indexes most frequently used to represent public equity. Almost two-thirds (63%) of this group used a version of the MSCI All Country World Index, which tracks stocks across developed and emerging market countries world-wide. Another 6% of respondents used a blend of the MSCI World Index, which tracks stocks in developed countries, and the MSCI Emerging Markets Index. The remaining 31% of respondents use separate indexes to benchmark exposure to US and global ex US categories.

The latter practice of using a US-specific index and one or more global ex US indexes in the policy benchmark has become less common in recent years. In our study from five years ago, a majority (58%) of respondents used this approach. Among this year's universe, the Russell 3000® Index was overwhelmingly the most common benchmark for those that cited US-specific index. Similarly, a combination of the MSCI EAFE and MSCI Emerging Markets indexes was by far the most prevalent practice used to represent global ex US equity.

**FIGURE 31 COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARK: PUBLIC EQUITY**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 247




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Accounting for private equity in the policy benchmark can be challenging because there is no single index that meets all of the standards of a valid benchmark. Hence, we see different approaches used across endowments in this study. For the overall respondent group, the use of a public index is the most common approach, as 67% of respondents use this method (Figure 32). The public index is most prevalent among endowments less than \$1 billion, as it was cited by 82% of this group. The rationale for using this approach is that the capital would have been invested in public equity markets if it was not invested in private equity. Therefore, the public index can help evaluate whether the decision to invest in private equity paid off for the endowment. The use of a public index can also be a straightforward approach when a portfolio is still in a phase of building its private program and there is an underweight in current private allocations versus the long-term target.

While the use of a public equity index in this way can capture the opportunity cost of investing in private equity, it does not evaluate how well those private allocations are implemented. Approximately 22% of the overall respondent group use the CA private investment indexes, which are calculated by pooling together all of the cash flows and valuation changes for the underlying private funds that are included in a specific strategy's index. Among endowments greater than \$1 billion, there was a nearly even split between the percentage of respondents that used this approach (45%) and the percentage that used a public market index (43%). These indexes are not investable, nor is there transparency into the names and weightings of the private companies included, and, consequently, they don't satisfy the requirements sought for an ideal benchmark. However, these indexes can be custom-weighted by vintage year and provide a better evaluation of private investment fund selection compared to what a public index offers.

**FIGURE 32 COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARK: PRIVATE EQUITY**  
As of June 30, 2022




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Endowments also face similar challenges of selecting an appropriate index when accounting for hedge fund allocations in the policy benchmark. Hedge Fund Research® (HFR) produces indexes that broadly track hedge fund managers that report to their database. The HFR indexes may be defined more granularly by investment substrategies, geographic regions, and other criteria. While endowments may use this approach

to evaluate their own manager selection versus a broad universe of hedge funds, these indexes lack some of the desired qualities of a valid benchmark such as being investable and transparent. Still, more than two-thirds of the respondent group use one or more of the indexes calculated by HFR. The HFRI Fund of Funds (FOF) Composite Index was used by 34% of endowments, while the HFRI FOF Diversified Index was the next most commonly cited (19%). Another 19% of respondents use another index or a combination of indexes provided by HFR. As shown in Figure 33, the remaining respondents use either a beta-adjusted public equity index, a blend of a public equity index and a bond index, or some other type of index.

**FIGURE 33 COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARK: HEDGE FUNDS**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 223




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

The Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index was the most common benchmark for fixed income but was cited by just 40% of endowments (Figure 34). One-quarter of respondents (25%) use a US Treasury or US government bond index, and another 18% of endowments use a version of the Bloomberg Government/Credit Index. There are different versions for each of these indexes based on range of maturity, and many endowments use the specific version that reflects their portfolio's underlying fixed income exposure. The remaining 17% of respondents use some other type of index or a combination of multiple indexes. For real assets, benchmark combinations are even more unique across the participant group due to the wide variety of strategies employed under this category.

**FIGURE 34 COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARK: FIXED INCOME**

As of June 30, 2022



\*Includes subindexes of the overall strategy that have various ranges of maturity.

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


## INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE VERSUS POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARKS

The various approaches to benchmarking we have covered in this section are important to keep in mind when analyzing endowment performance relative to policy benchmarks. This is most evident with the benchmarking of PE/VC. As we detailed in the Investment Portfolio Returns section of this report, the CA Private Equity and Venture Capital indexes performed substantially better compared to the returns of public equity indexes in fiscal year 2022. Endowments that use the private indexes calculated a policy benchmark return that was considerably higher compared to what it would have been if a public index were used to represent PE/VC, thus making it harder to outperform the benchmark.

Figure 35 uses a scatterplot display to illustrate this effect. The horizontal axis represents the actual portfolio return for fiscal year 2022, while the vertical axis represents the spread between that return and the policy benchmark. The dots represent where each respondent lands in this data set and are color-coded based on which method they use to represent PE/VC in the policy benchmark. At virtually all spots along the total return scale, endowments using a public index for PE/VC—as represented by the purple dots—reported more value add versus the policy benchmark compared to those that use the CA private indexes.

**FIGURE 35 FISCAL YEAR 2022 TOTAL RETURN VS POLICY BENCHMARK**

As of June 30, 2022 • n = 280




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Among all respondents, the median spread between the actual return and the policy benchmark return was 1.8 ppts in fiscal year 2022. Approximately 61% of endowments reported that spread was positive, meaning their total return outperformed the policy benchmark. Strong relative returns from fiscal year 2022 and the previous year, where the median spread was 3.8 ppts, boosted results for longer periods. For each of the multiyear trailing periods in Figure 36, more than 75% of participating endowments reported a return that outperformed their policy benchmark.



**FIGURE 36 RANGE OF OUT/UNDERPERFORMANCE OF TOTAL RETURN VS  
POLICY PORTFOLIO BENCHMARK**

Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percentage Points • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Data points represent the difference between the total portfolio return and the policy portfolio benchmark return.

## Section 3: Portfolio Asset Allocation


### 2022 ASSET ALLOCATION

Most nonprofits aim to carry out their missions over a long-term time horizon, if not in perpetuity. This gives the endowments that support these institutions the ability to take on risk in their portfolios. At the same time, exposure to assets that generate asset growth is necessary to replenish the annual spending from portfolios and make up for the loss in purchasing power from inflation. For these reasons, endowments tend to allocate most of their portfolios to equity-oriented strategies.

On average, 39.6% of the long-term investment portfolio (LTIP) was invested in long-only public equities and 20.3% was allocated to PE/VC at the end of fiscal year 2022 (Figure 37). However, the range in allocations reported across respondents was extremely wide within these categories. Even after removing the top and bottom 5% of outliers, public equity allocations were as high as 64% at the top end of the universe and as low as 18% at the bottom end. For PE/VC, allocations ranged from 41% at the 5th percentile to 0% at the 95th percentile.

**FIGURE 37 SUMMARY ASSET ALLOCATION DISTRIBUTION**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • n = 316 • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 75 in the Appendix.

Figure 38 shows the breakdown of detailed categories that fall under public equity and PE/VC in our asset allocation framework. On the public side, we collect data based on the primary geographic region where each fund/manager is invested.<sup>5</sup> The highest allocations among the public categories tend to be in US-focused funds, with 18.0% of


<sup>5</sup> We reference investment managers and their funds in our review of asset allocations in this section. However, some endowments gain exposure to these asset classes via internally managed holdings or derivatives. The Investment Manager Structures section of this report contains analysis on how asset allocations are implemented across various strategies.

the average LTIP invested in these strategies. Endowments have meaningful allocations to equities outside of the United States, with an average of 9.0% allocated to funds primarily invested in global ex US developed regions and another 4.4% invested with dedicated emerging markets funds. Funds invested across multiple geographic regions are included in our global category and make up 8.2% of the average LTIP.

The largest average allocation on the private side was to venture capital (9.4%), while the average allocation to non-venture private equity was slightly lower at 8.6%. Non-venture private equity in our framework consists of buyouts and growth equity, which is aligned with the way these strategies are combined in the CA private equity indexes. There is a third category called “Other Private Investments,” which is reserved for multi-strategy fund-of-funds, secondaries, and other private funds that can’t be allocated solely to either of the aforementioned categories. The average allocation to other PI was just 2.3%.

**FIGURE 38 MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION: PUBLIC EQUITY AND PE/VC**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • n = 316




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Elsewhere in the reporting framework, the average allocation to hedge funds was 17.7% (Figure 37). Real assets, which consist of a diversified group of public and private assets, made up 7.3% of portfolios, on average. Fixed income made up 8.7% of the average LTIP, while private credit accounted for just 1.9%. Rounding out the average asset allocation among participants, 4.1% was allocated to cash, and 0.4% was allocated other miscellaneous assets. Average allocations for the more granular asset classes that fall under these broader categories are included in the appendix of this report.

The total asset size of the LTIP has long been a key factor in the variation of asset allocations among endowments. Smaller endowments continue to maintain higher allocations to fixed income and public equities, while larger endowments have the highest allocations to alternative assets. The differences are most noticeable in the breakdown of public equity versus private equity. Endowments with assets less than \$200 million had an average allocation of 47.9% to public equity, while those with assets greater than \$3 billion had an average of 29.9% (Figure 39). For PE/VC, the largest endowments had an average allocation of 29.7%, while the smallest endowments had an average of 11.9%.

**FIGURE 39 MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION BY ASSET SIZE**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see pages 76 and 77 in the Appendix.

**CHANGES TO ASSET ALLOCATION IN FISCAL YEAR 2022**

Endowments report some degree of changes to their actual asset allocations each fiscal year. Some of the changes can be attributed to how the various asset class strategies perform in relation to each other. Asset classes that earned the best performance over the course of a fiscal year often see their piece of the asset allocation pie get bigger, and vice versa for the categories that produce the lowest returns. Beyond market movements, some asset allocation changes can be attributed to rebalancing activity or annual spending draws from the portfolio. Further, there can be changes sparked by shifts in a portfolio's long-term asset allocation policy.

The asset allocation changes that the respondent group reported in fiscal year 2022 were larger than what we see in most years. Among the 313 respondents that provided data for the last two fiscal years, the largest overall change was in public equity, which declined by an average of 4.8 ppts. More than half of that decrease in public equity was absorbed by a bump up in PE/VC allocations, which increased by an average of 3.0 ppts. Real assets and hedge funds also saw average increases of 1.1 ppts and 0.6 ppts, respectively, while fixed income and cash allocations ticked up just slightly.

## SPECIAL TOPICS IN FISCAL YEAR 2022

Our fiscal year 2022 survey requested information on two special topical areas. First, we asked respondents to report on the exposure to China within their portfolios and whether pausing new investments or divesting altogether was being considered. In addition, we asked endowments what their sentiment was pertaining to investing in blockchain and cryptocurrencies and requested details on their exposure to these assets.

### China Exposure

- Most respondents reported that their total exposure was in the single digits in terms of percent of the overall portfolio.
- The vast majority of exposure came from public equity and PE/VC strategies. On average, exposure via public managers was slightly higher than exposure via private managers.
- A little over half of the average exposure came from funds with a global or regional (i.e., multi-country) strategy, while the remainder came from dedicated China managers.
- Only a small percentage of the respondent group are planning to either pause new investments to China or divest from the region altogether.

### Blockchain/Crypto Exposure


- Only one-quarter of respondents indicated that they did not have an interest in this sector. The remainder of respondents are either already invested or exploring the sector.
- Among the endowments that have made investments, most of the exposure came from private investment funds.
- The vast majority of respondents that have investments reported less than 1% was allocated to these assets.

Recognizing the effort it takes our respondent group to provide this additional information, we are reserving the full recap of data for the institutions that participated in this part of our survey. If you did not provide information but are now interested in the results, please email [cainstitute@cambridgeassociates.com](mailto:cainstitute@cambridgeassociates.com) for instructions on how to participate.

Figure 40 compares these average changes in actual allocations for fiscal year 2022 to the average changes that were reported in target asset allocations. As covered in the Investment Policy section, target asset allocation frameworks vary among endowments and not all respondents have a dedicated target to each category. Still, these comparisons provide some insight into what role asset allocation policy changes and other factors played in the trend in actual allocations over the last fiscal year. Despite the large average decrease in actual public equity allocations, the average target allocation to these strategies declined just slightly in fiscal year 2022. This indicates that other factors, such as the poor performance from global stock markets, were responsible for most of the decrease in actual allocations over the last year. Conversely, the increase in average real assets allocations was probably driven by the robust returns from inflation-hedging strategies in fiscal year 2022, as the average target allocation to these strategies declined slightly over the last year.

**FIGURE 40 1-YR CHANGES IN MEAN ACTUAL AND TARGET ASSET ALLOCATION**

June 30, 2021 – June 30, 2022 • Percentage-Point Increase or Decrease




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: The actual allocation statistics are based on 313 respondents that provided data for each of the last two fiscal years. The number of respondents for the target allocation statistics varies across each category. PE/VC includes institutions that combine these strategies with other private investments in a single category.

Figure 41 shows the percentage of endowments that increased or decreased their target allocations in fiscal year 2022 across the main asset class strategies. PE/VC continues to be the category where endowments are overwhelmingly most likely to increase their policy allocations. More than one-third of respondents (34%) reported an increase to their target, while just 3% reported a decrease. Within each of the other asset classes, there were more endowments that reported a decrease than there were that reported an increase. Public equity and hedge funds were the categories that saw the most decreases, with 20% of respondents lowering their target to both of these categories in fiscal year 2022.

**FIGURE 41 CHANGES IN TARGET ASSET ALLOCATION**

June 30, 2021 – June 30, 2022 • Percentage of Institutions Increasing or Decreasing Targets



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

<sup>1</sup> Total Public Equity excludes institutions that combine public equity together with PE/VC in a single equity category.

<sup>2</sup> Private Equity/Venture Capital includes institutions that include PE/VC together with other private investments in a single category.

## LONG-TERM ASSET ALLOCATION TRENDS

Institutional investors that have adopted the endowment model of investing have seen significant shifts in their asset allocation policies over the last few decades. Exposure to bonds has decreased substantially, while the equity allocation—which once was invested overwhelmingly in US public equities—has become more diversified. The largest endowments pioneered this transition in the 1980s, with the trend spreading among other institutions in the 1990s and early 2000s. Looking back 20 years ago to 2002, the seeds of those diversification trends had already sprouted for many institutions in this study’s universe (Figure 42). In the next few paragraphs, we highlight trends in the average asset allocation of the 133 endowments that have provided data over the last two decades.

**PUBLIC EQUITY.** By 2002, public equity accounted for slightly less than half of the average portfolio for this universe. The average allocation changed little over the next few years before plunging at the onset of the GFC in 2008 and bottoming out in 2010. Allocations to public equities rose for most endowments post-GFC up until 2017 but have been on a downward trend since, including a steep drop during this latest year.

**PE/VC.** Although the trend graph does not show it, PE/VC allocations surged at the height of the dot-com boom in 2000 for institutions that had made investments to these strategies. Allocations pared back a bit with the bursting of the dot-com bubble and the average for this universe was 5% in 2002, where our trend analysis begins. The average allocation more than doubled to 11% by 2010 but remained within a relatively narrow range for a number of years and finished 2017 at the same level. Spurred on by excellent performance and rising policy targets to these strategies among endowments, the average allocation has exploded in recent years and stood at 24% for this constant universe group at the end of the fiscal year 2022.


**HEDGE FUNDS.** Endowments had already established meaningful allocations to hedge funds in 2002, with the average of among this group standing at 14%. These strategies experienced the greatest increase in allocations throughout the 2000s, with the average peaking at 26% in 2010. The average allocation has trended back down since that 2010 peak and has declined year-over-year in nine of the last 12 fiscal years.

**REAL ASSETS.** Allocations to real assets also grew substantially over the first half of this historical period. From 2002 to 2012, the average real assets allocation more than doubled from 5% to 13%. However, that average trended back down over much of the past decade, as a low inflationary period led to mediocre returns and endowments pulled back on targets to these strategies. Of course, the exception from a performance perspective was this past fiscal year, as a spike in inflation boosted the returns of these strategies, and in turn, the allocations of most respondents.

**FIXED INCOME.** Traditional fixed income strategies still made up a significant percentage (24%) of the average portfolio 20 years ago. However, these allocations have trended downward over most of the last two decades and stood at an average of just 7% for the constant group at the end of 2022. Allocations to absolute return hedge funds, credit hedge funds, and private credit strategies have grown over the last 20 years, although not to the magnitude that completely offsets the decline reported in traditional fixed income allocations.

**FIGURE 42 HISTORICAL MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION TRENDS**

Years Ended June 30 • Percent (%) • n = 133



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 78 in the Appendix.

### UNCALLED CAPITAL COMMITMENTS TO PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

One of the core principles of the endowment model is the use of private investments that, in part due to their illiquid nature, offer the potential for higher long-term returns than those of public or marketable assets. As our analysis has shown, endowments have been allocating an increasingly significant portion of their portfolios to private investments. As of the end of fiscal year 2022, the average total private investment allocation for the overall participant group was 27%. For endowments greater than \$3 billion, the average allocation was even larger at 42%.


Uncalled capital commitments represent the amount of capital that endowments have agreed to pay into private investment funds in the future. While annual spending distributions have traditionally made up the biggest liquidity need for endowments, growing allocations to private assets have resulted in uncalled capital also representing an important piece of the liquidity picture. Whether an endowment is ramping up private allocations or simply maintaining an already high allocation, the amount of uncalled capital is significant when measured versus the total value of the portfolio for most participants in this study.

Uncalled capital commitments as a percentage of the total LTIP tends to be higher for larger endowments than it is for smaller endowments. The median ratio for endowments greater than \$3 billion was 18.6%, which was almost double the median ratio (9.6%) calculated for endowments less than \$200 million (Figure 43). The difference was even more stark when combining the amount of uncalled capital with the actual private investment allocation and expressing that as a percentage of the LTIP. For endowments greater than \$3 billion, the median ratio for this equation was 64.1%. In contrast, the median ratio was 28.4% for endowments less than \$200 million.



**FIGURE 43 UNCALLED CAPITAL COMMITTED TO PRIVATE INVESTMENT FUNDS**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


Note: For more information, see page 78 in the Appendix.

Figure 44 shows the trend in these two ratios over the last five fiscal years for the various asset size cohorts. There were large swings in the ratio of uncalled capital to the LTIP market value over the last two fiscal years. In fiscal year 2021, the ratio decreased sharply because the rate of asset growth was much higher than the growth in uncalled capital for most endowments. Essentially, the amount of uncalled capital, although growing for most institutions, became smaller in relation to the overall portfolio value after the extraordinary performance of 2021. The opposite dynamic was in effect fiscal year 2022, a period where endowments lost value, but most continued to see their uncalled capital commitments grow.

The ratio that combines the actual private investment allocation with the amount of uncalled capital has seen more of a steady increase over time. For most endowments, the actual private allocations make up the majority of the combined amount that represents the numerator in the ratio equation. The boom in illiquid allocations in recent years, especially in PE/VC, meant that this particular ratio did not experience the dip in fiscal year 2021 that the former ratio did. Across all asset size cohorts, the combined amount of the current private allocation plus uncalled capital commitments was substantially higher at the end of fiscal year 2022 than it was five years earlier.

**FIGURE 44 TREND IN UNCALLED CAPITAL COMMITMENTS TO PRIVATE INVESTMENT FUNDS**

Years Ended June 30 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

More than half of respondents (54%) reported their private investment program was cash flow positive, meaning that the amount of distributions from private funds exceeded the amount of new capital paid in. The smallest endowments were the least likely report that their programs were cash flow positive, with 46% of those less than \$200 million falling in this camp. The largest endowments—which generally have more mature private programs—were the most likely to answer “yes” to this question. Two-thirds (67%) of endowments greater than \$3 billion reported that their programs were cash flow positive.

## Section 4: Investment Manager Structures


### NUMBER OF EXTERNAL MANAGERS

Most of the assets under management at endowments are invested via external investment managers. There are multiple factors that contribute to the number of managers employed within an endowment's portfolio. The scale of total assets under management is the primary factor, as larger endowments generally spread their assets across a greater number of managers compared to smaller endowments. Among endowments greater than \$3 billion, the median number of investment managers was 131 (Figure 45). At the opposite end of the asset size spectrum, the median for endowments less than \$200 million was just 29 managers.

Our survey also asked about the number of vehicles invested in by endowments. For the purposes of our analysis, an investment vehicle represents a fund, product, or separate account that is managed by an investment manager. Endowments often invest in multiple investment vehicles of the same manager, particularly when it comes to private investment funds. Therefore, the number of vehicles endowments are invested in is much higher than the number of managers. The median number of vehicles ranged dramatically from 270 for endowments greater than \$3 billion to 41 for endowments less than \$200 million.

**FIGURE 45 NUMBER OF EXTERNAL MANAGERS AND INVESTMENT VEHICLES**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


Note: For more information, see page 79 in the Appendix.

Even within the broad asset size groups, the range of managers employed can be wide. Among the smallest endowments, the number of managers employed at the 25th percentile (41) is double the number used at the 75th percentile (20). For portfolios greater than \$3 billion, 278 managers are employed at the 5th percentile, compared to just 74 at the 95th percentile. Much of the variation can be attributed to the management of alternative asset classes. Figure 46 shows the range in number of managers across endowments for a several asset classes. The dispersion in the number

of alternative asset managers employed, particularly within private investments, is much wider than that of the more traditional equity and bond asset classes. Further detail on these and other asset classes are provided for the five broad asset size groups in the Appendix of this report.

**FIGURE 46 DISPERSION IN NUMBER OF MANAGERS FOR SELECTED ASSET CLASSES**

As of June 30, 2022 • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Only those institutions with an allocation to the specific asset class have been included. Funds-of-funds are counted as one manager. For more information, see page 79 in the Appendix.

## ASSET CLASS IMPLEMENTATION


**HEDGE FUNDS.** There are two primary types of investment vehicles that endowments use when implementing their hedge funds allocations. A single manager fund is a type of investment vehicle where the investment manager makes the decisions for the securities and assets held within the fund. In contrast, a fund-of-funds is a type of strategy where the investment manager invests in a collection of other investment funds. On average, more than 90% of the average hedge fund allocation is implemented via single manager funds. The implementation approach for hedge funds varies little across the various asset sizes, as both larger and smaller endowments alike overwhelmingly use single manager hedge funds.

**PRIVATE INVESTMENTS.** Endowments also have single manager funds and fund-of-funds at their disposal when implementing private investment allocations. In addition, some endowments make direct investments in private strategies. Direct investments can take the form of co-investments that are made alongside a general partner or solo investments that are originated by the endowment itself.

Compared to hedge funds, implementation practices are a little more varied across private investment asset classes. This is most evident in venture capital and private natural resources where fund-of-funds are far more common among smaller endowments than they are for larger C&Us. On average, more than half of the average venture capital and natural resources allocations for endowments less than \$200 million are implemented via fund-of-funds. In contrast, fund-of-funds make up just a tiny percentage of the average allocations for endowments greater than \$3 billion. Figure 47 shows the average breakdown of allocations by implementation category for other private strategies. Private credit strategies are not included in this exhibit, as endowments across all asset sizes rely almost exclusively on single manager funds to implement these allocations.

**FIGURE 47 PORTFOLIO IMPLEMENTATION: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS**

As of June 30, 2022 • Equal-Weighted Means (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Analysis shows the average allocation of assets across the implementation categories for each peer group.


**PUBLIC EQUITIES AND BONDS.** For traditional bonds and equities, endowments primarily use external managers to implement their allocations. These assets are invested either through active or passively managed investment vehicles. Some endowments also manage assets internally or use derivatives to achieve desired exposures.

When considering the average breakdown of US equity allocations, the majority of assets are invested via active managers (Figure 48). The proportion of US allocations invested through active managers is similar across all asset size groups. For global ex US equities, the average proportion of allocations invested through active managers is higher. In bonds, passive management was most common among endowments between \$200 and \$500 million, as more than 40% of the average allocation was invested under this approach. The percentage was lowest for endowments greater than \$3 billion at 17%.


**FIGURE 48 PORTFOLIO IMPLEMENTATION: TRADITIONAL EQUITIES AND BONDS**

As of June 30, 2022 • Equal-Weighted Means (%)


**US EQUITY**




**GLOBAL EX US EQUITY DEVELOPED MARKETS**



**EMERGING MARKETS EQUITY**



**BONDS**



■ Active Management ■ Passive Management ■ Derivatives and Internally Managed

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Analysis shows the average allocation of assets across the implementation categories for each peer group.


## Section 5: Institutional Support

### ENDOWMENT DEPENDENCE

Since few nonprofit institutions generate enough revenue from their core operations to break even on their annual operating budgets, many depend on endowment distributions and gifts for additional support. Public universities, which receive financial support from state appropriations, generally rely less on the endowment to fund the operating budget compared to other nonprofits. For the 12 public universities that provided data, the median amount support from the long-term investment pool as a percentage of operating expenses was 3.8% in 2022 (Figure 49). The median endowment support ratio was much higher at private C&Us (14.1%), independent schools (24.6%), and cultural and environmental institutions (30.8%). The level of endowment support varies considerably among these latter groups, supporting just a fraction of the budget at some institutions, while for others it is the single largest source of revenue.

**FIGURE 49 ENDOWMENT DEPENDENCE**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 81 in the Appendix.

### SPENDING POLICIES


An institution's endowment spending policy serves as a bridge that links the investment portfolio and the enterprise. The policy provides a basis for the calculation of the annual distribution from the endowment. Spending policies are designed to balance the needs of current and future generations of stakeholders, with the goals of providing appropriate levels of support to operations and preserving, or even growing, endowment purchasing power.

The majority (72%) of responding institutions continue to use a market value-based rule, which dictates spending a percentage of a moving average of endowment market values (Figure 50). By using a target spending rate, this rule type links the spending distribution amount directly to the endowment's market value. The annual distribution

will grow in periods where portfolio values trend upward and decrease after periods where portfolio values experience significant declines. By curtailing spending after the market value declines, this rule type places an emphasis on preserving the endowment's purchasing power.

**FIGURE 50 SPENDING RULE TYPES**

Fiscal Year 2022 • n = 246



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Approximately 7% of respondents use a constant growth rule. This rule type increases the prior year's spending amount by a measure of inflation and/or a prespecified percentage. Institutions tend to use this rule type when the endowment is a significant source of operating revenue and volatility in annual spending distributions is less tolerable. Though the strict application of a constant growth rule produces predictable spending, most institutions using this rule type impose a spending cap and floor based on a percentage of the endowment's market value, or a moving average of market values. Spending collars essentially transform the constant growth rule to a market value-based rule in times of significant endowment growth or contraction to avoid a complete disconnect between spending and the endowment market value.

Another 17% of respondents use a hybrid spending rule, which blends the more predictable spending element of a constant growth policy with the asset preservation principle of a market value-based policy and allows an institution to set the appropriate mix that best meets its needs. The rule is expressed as a weighted average of a constant growth rule and a market value rule. A hybrid rule essentially has the effect of spending a percentage of an exponentially weighted average market value that is adjusted for inflation.


The level of endowment dependence seems to be a key factor that institutions consider when setting an appropriate spending policy. A market value-based rule was used by the vast majority (83%) of respondents with endowment dependence ratios below 20% (Figure 51). However, practices are a bit more varied among institutions with



endowment support ratios above 20%. A market value–based rule was still the most commonly cited rule type among this latter group (39%), while a hybrid rule was used by a similar percentage (37%). In addition, 13% of institutions with higher endowment dependence ratios use a constant growth rule types. The more predictable stream of spending dollars presumably makes the constant growth and hybrid rules appealing to many institutions that have higher endowment dependence.

**FIGURE 51 SPENDING RULE TYPES BY ENDOWMENT DEPENDENCE**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


**TARGET SPENDING RATES.** A market value–based rule dictates spending a percentage of the endowment’s market value, which is most often represented by a moving average over a smoothing period. A prespecified target spending rate is applied to the average market value to determine how much of the endowment should be distributed on an annual basis. Some institutions with a market value–based policy allow some discretion by setting a prespecified range within which the target spending rate may fall. For the purposes of comparing target spending rates in our analysis, we assume the midpoint for institutions that use a discretionary range.

The target spending rate for most endowments in this study lies somewhere between 4% and 5%. The most common spending rate continues to be 5% and was reported by a little more than one-third of respondents. A slightly smaller percentage of institutions (27%) use a rate that falls between 4.5% and 4.99%, while another 26% of respondents use a rate that falls between 4% and 4.49%. On the outer ends of the distribution, just 7% of respondents reported a spending rate above 5% and even fewer (3%) reported a target spending rate below 4% (Figure 52).

Most endowments with a market value–based rule keep their target spending rate consistent from one year to the next. However, there are many that do make changes over the long term. Of the 77 institutions that reported policy data in both 2011 and 2021, 43% used a different target spending rate in 2022 compared to ten years prior. Approximately one-third (31%) of respondents decreased their target spending rate over this time period, while 12% have increased their rate.

**FIGURE 52 TARGET SPENDING RATES FOR MARKET VALUE–BASED RULES**

Fiscal Year 2022 • n = 174



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


### NET FLOW RATE

The combination of the total outflows (spending and other appropriations) and inflows (gifts and other additions) for the portfolio constitutes the net flow rate. The net flow rate is calculated as a percentage of the LTIP market value at the beginning of the fiscal year. Net flow can lend insight into the liquidity needs of the portfolio. As is typically the case, the average net flow rate among participants was negative (-1.4%) in fiscal year 2022, meaning the amount of withdrawals from the portfolio surpassed the amount of additions for most respondents. The average outflow rate was -3.7%, while the average inflow rate was 2.3%.

Inflows are mainly driven by endowed gifts and are represented by the dark green shading in Figure 53. On average, gifts represented 77% of total inflows received among participants in fiscal year 2022. Some institutions receive additional inflows from operations or other sources, represented by the light green shading. The endowment spending policy distribution (dark pink shading) represents the biggest portion of outflows, while other recurring spending and one-time appropriations (lighter pink shadings) make up a smaller portion. On average, spending policy distributions represented 91% of total outflows in fiscal year 2022.

**FIGURE 53 NET FLOW RATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022**

Percent (%) • n = 118



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


The evaluation of endowment health is often focused on the relationship of investment performance and endowment spending, which is also known as the payout or outflow rate. A key objective has been to achieve real investment returns that exceed the average annual payout rate over the long term. However, institutions often expand programs and facilities so that budgets grow at a faster rate than inflation, thus necessitating additional endowment growth to maintain the endowment's role in the enterprise. Evaluating the net flow rate along with traditional investment performance metrics is important to ensuring that the portfolio keeps up with enterprise growth and maintains its role in supporting the institution.

Figure 54 is based on median data for the group of participants that provided returns, LTIP market values, and spending rates over the last decade. It demonstrates the overall upward trend in portfolio values over the full period, but also the volatility of the most recent years. Using median investment performance and starting with an initial investment of \$100 in 2012, the portfolio would have increased by 85% on an inflation-adjusted basis by the end of fiscal year 2022. This overall growth is notable, but lower than the peak logged in 2021. After deducting the annual spending distributions from real investment performance, the investment would have ended the ten-year period with \$117. The real after spending value is much smaller than the statistic based purely on performance, but it would have resulted in significant real growth over this period.

There is one more important part of the asset growth picture. The LTIP market value and purchasing power is also driven by inflows that come in as gifts and other funds designated for long-term investment. In the same figure, the median real growth of

the LTIP value, which includes both investment performance and total net flows, is tracked by the middle line and grew by 56% over the ten-year period. Because of the steady inflow from gifts and other additions that most institutions experienced, the actual growth in the portfolio was substantially higher than growth based on returns after spending only. Since maintaining the purchasing power of existing endowment gifts is a key objective in endowment management, the traditional return after spending statistic should not be dismissed. However, this statistic can understate the actual extent of asset growth and the endowment's capacity to support a growing enterprise. By incorporating real investment performance with the overall net flow rate, an institution can better evaluate the trajectory of the LTIP's role in its business model.

**FIGURE 54 CUMULATIVE DOLLAR GROWTH AFTER INFLATION, NET FLOWS, AND SPENDING**  
Years Ended June 30 • Base Year 2012 = \$100 • n = 82



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


## ASSET COMPOSITION

While the terms “long-term investment pool” and “endowment” are often used interchangeably, they are not synonymous. Understanding the types of assets that come together in the LTIP is important to understanding the portfolio's role and investment profile.

**LONG-TERM INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO.** The LTIP is the group of assets for which institutions report their asset allocation and returns in this study. Endowment assets comprise all or the vast majority of the LTIP for most respondents. On average, 92% of the LTIP were endowment assets as of June 30, 2022. In addition to endowment assets, many institutions invest a portion of their operating funds and/or other assets in the LTIP. On average, operating funds and other assets represented 5% and 3% of the LTIP, respectively. Examples of other assets in the LTIP include life income and annuity funds, special purpose funds, and assets invested by external organizations.

**FIGURE 55 COMPOSITION OF LONG-TERM INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO**

Equal-Weighted Means as of Fiscal Year-End 2022 • Percent (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

**OPERATING FUNDS AND OTHER LIQUIDITY SOURCES.** For many institutions, the LTIP is not the only investment pool or source of liquidity. Assessing liquidity sources outside of the LTIP can help to inform liquidity needs within the LTIP. Operating funds and lines of credit are the two most common sources of short-term liquidity for our clients.


Less than half of respondents (40%) that provided data on the composition of their LTIP invest a portion of their operating reserves in the portfolio. The median percentage of reserves invested in the LTIP was 37.8%, but this percentage varies considerably across respondents (Figure 56). The remaining 60% of respondents hold all operating reserves outside of the LTIP. Operating funds held outside of the LTIP tend to be the first source of liquidity when immediate funding is needed.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Please see Tracy Abedon Filosa, “Disruption, Liquidity Sources, and the Role of the Endowment,” Cambridge Associates LLC, September 2020, for a more in-depth discussion on this topic.

**FIGURE 56 OPERATING FUNDS**


Fiscal Year End 2022

**Operating Funds Invested in the LTIP**  
(n = 97)



**Percentage (%) of Operating Funds Invested in the LTIP**

(n = 52)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

In addition to operating funds, many nonprofits have access to extra liquidity through a line of credit. Of the 93 institutions that provided data, 14 had outstanding amounts drawn against their credit line as of fiscal year end. There are many enterprise and balance sheet factors that may determine the sizing of a line of credit. Among the respondents to this study, the size of credit lines varied considerably, ranging from a less than \$1 million on the low end to more than \$1 billion on the high end.

**DEBT.** Figure 57 shows the range of endowment-to-debt ratios for separate asset size groups. The median ratio was lowest for endowment less than \$1 billion at 3.9 times and highest for endowments over \$5 billion at 5.4 times. The decline in endowment market values in fiscal year 2022 pushed this ratio lower for most institutions year-over-year.

**FIGURE 57 ENDOWMENT TO DEBT**

As of June 30, 2021 • n=118



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: For more information, see page 81 in the Appendix.

## Section 6: Investment Office Staffing and Governance

### INVESTMENT OFFICE STAFFING AND OUTSIDE RESOURCES


The primary mission of an investment office is to assume day-to-day responsibility for the endowment and other investment assets. This mission will be defined by the set of functions that internal investment office staff will carry out or oversee. Since both the investment philosophy and the demands on the office will vary among institutions, each office will have its own unique profile. Therefore, when evaluating the current structure or anticipated growth of an investment office, it is important to consider not only the size of the asset base, but also the portfolio complexity (whether handled by internal or external resources), the secondary demands on the staff (i.e., treasury functions), the use of outside consultants or advisors, and the level of involvement by boards and committees. Both the number of internal professional investment staff and the depth of specialization required to successfully manage the asset base will fluctuate based on these characteristics.

**CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER.** The presence of a dedicated chief investment officer (CIO) correlates with asset size and is most common at larger endowments. The vast majority (93%) of the respondents with endowments greater than \$1 billion have a full-time CIO, while 60% of respondents with assets between \$500 million and \$1 billion indicated they had a CIO in place. Only 5% of endowments less than \$500 million had a CIO. For the respondents that do have a dedicated CIO, it is most common for the position to report directly to the CEO or president of the institution (Figure 58).

Organizations with smaller asset sizes rely more heavily on outside advisors or a chief financial officer to oversee investment assets. In these cases, the chief financial officer might work closely with external investment advisors to develop an investment strategy and monitor investment managers. It is also becoming more common place for endowments of this size to outsource some or the entire portfolio to an OCIO.

**FIGURE 58 CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER REPORTING LINES**

Fiscal Year 2022 • n = 104




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

**STAFFING LEVELS.** Investment office personnel are typically divided into investment management and investment operations. Investment management staff is responsible for implementing the investment policy of the committee and can include: a CIO, risk officer(s), investment director(s), investment officer(s), portfolio manager(s), and analyst(s). Investment operations staff is responsible for the management of custodian and broker relationships, transaction processing, capital call management, endowment accounting, performance measurement, and, in some cases, conducting operational due diligence on investment managers.

Our survey shows that investment office staffing typically correlates with asset size. This is perhaps not surprising, as larger portfolios tend to invest with more fund managers and favor a more active investment approach, which can require more resources. Endowments that oversee more than \$7 billion in assets employ a total of 24.0 full-time equivalent (FTE), on average (Figure 59). The average total FTE is split approximately two-thirds to investment management staff (16.0) and one-third (7.9) to operations staff. On the opposite side of the asset size spectrum, endowments less than \$500 million have much smaller in-house investment resources (if any) and use outside professionals to manage or assist in managing the investment portfolio. Endowments with assets between \$3 billion and \$7 billion employed an average of 9.1 FTE as of fiscal year end 2022.

**FIGURE 59 AVERAGE STAFFING LEVELS**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Number of FTEs



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Personnel consists of a mixture of senior-, mid-, and junior-level positions. Senior investment professionals typically carry the title of investment director, managing director, or VP and have more than ten years of professional experience. Mid-level professionals can hold the titles of investment officer or associate and bring five to ten years of experience. Junior-level positions are usually recent graduates or those with a few years of experience. Junior positions usually carry the title of investment analyst or associate. Figure 60 provides the average FTEs by asset size and position levels for investment management and operations positions.



**FIGURE 60 AVERAGE INVESTMENT STAFF BY FUNCTION**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Number of FTEs

	Investment Management			Investment Operations		
	Senior	Mid	Junior	Senior	Mid	Junior
More Than \$7B	6.3	4.4	6.1	1.5	2.7	5.6
<i>n</i>	26	20	25	17	23	24
\$3B–\$7B	2.6	2.2	1.9	1.0	1.2	2.1
<i>n</i>	19	9	16	11	18	16
\$1B–\$3B	1.7	1.3	1.8	0.9	1.0	1.1
<i>n</i>	40	14	31	12	27	22
\$500M–\$1B	1.3	1.0	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.7
<i>n</i>	11	3	6	6	7	8


Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Office leadership positions (CFO/CIO), IT, and legal support are not included in the analysis. Only institutions with personnel at the specific staffing level are included in each category. Therefore, the sum of the personnel across each category will not equal the total investment office FTEs. The Less than \$500M cohort was not included due to insufficient observations.

**RELIANCE ON OUTSIDE ADVISORS AND CONSULTANTS.** Endowments engage external advisors and consultants in varying degrees and across a wide variety of functions. Based on survey responses and our understanding of how each survey participant engages with CA, Figure 61 broadly illustrates how the 316 participants in this study work with outside advisors or consultants. Endowments with assets less than \$1 billion rely more heavily on external advisors to manage or help manage their investment portfolios, while larger endowments will seek outside support in the form of research, data, or asset class specialization.

**FIGURE 61 USE OF EXTERNAL ADVISORS AND CONSULTANTS**

Fiscal Year 2022 • *n* = 316



Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC and CA's service contract records.

Discretionary portfolio management, also known as OCIO, allows institutions to fully delegate portfolio management decision making to an outside firm. These firms are accountable for portfolio strategy, implementation, day-to-day management, and operations. Managing the portfolio within agreed upon policy guidelines, the outsourced investment team makes manager selection, manager termination, tactical asset allocation, and portfolio rebalancing decisions. A relatively small proportion of the respondent group (15%) use CA under this management model.

Approximately 41% of institutions in our study use advisors for non-discretionary portfolio management services for the total endowment. These institutions work with an outside team of investment professionals who provide day-to-day oversight of their portfolios, while retaining final decision making on portfolio investments. This model provides resources and expertise to contribute to portfolio management alongside an institution's staff.

Most larger endowments have built their own internal investment teams and are much less likely to use advisors for investment management services. Almost one-quarter (24%) of participants use external resources for a range of consulting services including asset allocation reviews, manager searches, alternative assets management, ESG/MRI consulting, and performance reporting. The average asset size for this group of endowments is \$3.8 billion. The remaining 20% of respondents use outside support for research, manager, peer, and benchmarking data. The average market value of endowments using consultants in this fashion is \$8.1 billion.


## **GOVERNANCE**

Good governance is one key factor to a successful investment program. To create the conditions for good governance, endowments should assess whether they have in place the appropriate model for portfolio oversight and management, are upholding their fiduciary responsibilities, and are learning about peer best practices in committee structure, process, and policies.

**GOVERNING BODY/OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.** Regardless of endowment size, an investment committee of the board most often has oversight over the investment office and/or outside advisors who manage the portfolio. In much smaller numbers, other governing bodies cited by respondents were a finance committee of the board and management company/independent board of trustees/directors (Figure 62).

**FIGURE 62 GOVERNING BODY OF OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE BY ORGANIZATION TYPE**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent of Institutions (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

**DECISION-MAKING RESPONSIBILITY.** To help quantify the dynamic between the governing body (hereafter referred to simply as investment committee) and those managing the endowment (internal investment office or outside advisor), we asked who possessed decision-making responsibility for four integral investment functions: asset allocation policy development, portfolio rebalancing, manager selection, and manager termination. The resulting data show certain trends in the balance of authority between investment committees, staff, and advisors.

There is a strong relationship between asset allocation policy development and size of the portfolio. For nearly all participating endowments more than \$3 billion (95%), asset allocation policy is developed by committees acting on staff recommendations (Figure 63). In contrast, committees at endowments less than \$500 million depend far more on the recommendations of outside advisors or drive the policy autonomously. When it comes to rebalancing, both the investment committee's role and the advisor's role in portfolio rebalancing is steadily diminished as endowment size increases. Among endowments less than \$500 million, 75% rely on advisors to make rebalancing decisions and 18% have their investment committee control this function. For endowments greater than \$500 million, total staff discretion is most common (Figure 64).

**FIGURE 63 DECISION-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY FOR KEY INVESTMENT FUNCTIONS: ASSET ALLOCATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent of Institutions (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Investment Committee (IC) is shorthand for governing body.

**FIGURE 64 DECISION-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY FOR KEY INVESTMENT FUNCTIONS: PORTFOLIO REBALANCING**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent of Institutions (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

The process of manager selection and termination also involves committees, advisors, and staff, but with different degrees of discretion (Figure 65). Advisors and OCIOs play a significant role in both selection and termination of investment managers at endowments less than \$500 million. Among the investment committees involved in manager selection, the predominant role is to approve managers, but not interview them. Staff recommendations are increasingly relied upon from \$500 million to \$3 billion, and staff discretion (with and without guidelines) accounts for most of the decision making at endowments greater than \$3 billion.

**FIGURE 65 DECISION-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITY FOR KEY INVESTMENT FUNCTIONS: MANAGER SELECTION AND TERMINATION**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent of Institutions (%)



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Investment Committee (IC) is shorthand for governing body. "Other" includes IC approval based on staff and advisor recommendations.


**INVESTMENT COMMITTEE COMPOSITION.** Two types of investment committees emerged from our survey data. We found that responding institutions were split between those that have fully voting committees (67) and those that have investment committees that include non-voting members (54). While mandatory voting encourages accountability, there can be good reasons to include non-voting members. Organizations should weigh the benefit of these advisory members against the prospects of an oversized committee.

The average size of voting committees is 9.0 members, while those that include non-voting members average 11.3 members (Figure 66). Investment committee members include trustees, non-trustees, and officio members. Examples of ex officio

committee members include the president of the college or chairman of the board or of another committee, whose investment committee membership is included in the official duties of the position.

**FIGURE 66 PROFILE OF INVESTMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Number of Voting Committee Members



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.


Note: Investment Committee is shorthand for governing body.

Investment committee members can bring a diverse set of experiences to assist in overseeing institutional investment assets. At least some committee members should have professional, institutional investment experience—not just experience managing their own money—and if the organization lacks sufficient trustees with such qualifications, many times the committee includes non-trustee members with investment expertise to fulfill this role.

On average, respondents indicated that 67% of their committee members have investment experience. This percentage tends to be greater as asset size increases. Organizations with assets less than \$500 million reported an average of 59% of committee membership having professional investment experience. At endowments greater than \$3 billion, the percentage of committee members that were investment professionals was 70% (Figure 67).

**FIGURE 67 PERCENT OF INVESTMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO ARE INVESTMENT PROFESSIONALS**

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent of Committee Members (%)




Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

**COMMITTEE TERM LENGTH AND LIMITS.** Setting guidelines for terms can help manage member turnover and mitigate committee stagnation. The use of term lengths for investment committee members was cited by 74% of respondents, with the average term being 3.8 years (Figure 68). A similar percentage of respondents (75%) use term limits for committee members and the average limit is 3.4 terms. The prevalence of these guidelines for investment committee chairs was lower, with term lengths and limits being used by 54% and 50% of respondents, respectively. The lack of policies around term limits and lengths at some endowments could suggest that these institutions value the stability of a long-standing committee or chair and view turnover as disruptive to long-term investment policy.


**FIGURE 68 INVESTMENT COMMITTEE TERM LENGTHS AND LIMITS**

As of June 30, 2022

**Investment Committee Member**



**Investment Committee Chair**



Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

**INVESTMENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS.** Our survey responses show that the majority of endowments (74%) hold quarterly meetings. Few institutions hold meetings on a more, or less, frequent schedule, but ad hoc conference calls are a frequently cited occurrence. Regular attendance of investment committee members is critical to proper oversight. Participants indicated that average attendance was strong at 85%.

**REIMBURSEMENT AND CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST POLICY.** Only 29% of respondents provide committee members with expense reimbursement, which generally includes travel-related and other out-of-pocket expenses.

Except for nine respondents, all participants have a conflict-of-interest policy for investment committee members. These policies require disclosure (38%), recusal (19%), both disclosure and recusal (41%), or other policies (2%). Policies may differ by asset class, with institutions requiring disclosure for long-only equity conflicts and recusal for private equity conflicts, for example. Most institutions (85%) also have a conflict-of-interest policy in place for investment staff; 53% of policies require disclosure only, 20% require recusal, and 27% require disclosure and recusal.



## Notes on the Data

The notation of  $n$  denotes the number of institutions included in each analysis.

Returns for periods greater than one year are annualized.

The simple portfolio benchmark consisting of 70% MSCI ACWI Index/30% Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index is calculated assuming rebalancing occurs on the final day of each quarter.

The MSCI indexes contained in this report are net of dividend taxes for global ex US securities.

Private indexes are pooled horizon IRRs, net of fees, expenses, and carried interest.

### PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

This report includes data for 316 endowed institutions. When the overall group is broken out by industry type, 158 are colleges and universities, 51 are cultural and environmental institutions, 33 are hospitals, 30 are independent schools, and 44 are other endowed institutions. All participants provided investment pool data as of June 30, 2022. The notation of  $n$  denotes the number of institutions included in each analysis.

The 316 participants in this study reported long-term investment portfolio (LTIP) assets as of June 30, 2022, totaling \$894 billion. The mean LTIP size was \$2.8 billion, and the median was \$548.1 million.

Forty-four participants have an LTIP size below \$100 million, while 128 have an asset size above \$1 billion. The remaining 144 participants have an LTIP size between \$100 million and \$1 billion. The participants with LTIP sizes greater than \$1 billion controlled 94% of the aggregate LTIP assets.

### CALCULATION OF THE SHARPE RATIO

The Sharpe ratio shows how much return above the risk-free rate (T-bills) the investor has earned per unit of risk (defined as standard deviation of returns). The higher the Sharpe ratio, the more the investor has been compensated for each unit of risk taken. The ratio is a measure of reward relative to total volatility. The formula is:

$$\frac{R_p - R_f}{S_p} = \text{Sharpe Ratio}$$

Where:

- $R_p$  is the arithmetic average of composite quarterly returns,
- $R_f$  is the arithmetic average of T-bill (risk-free) quarterly returns, and
- $S_p$  is the quarterly standard deviation of composite quarterly returns.

### **MODIFIED PUBLIC MARKET EQUIVALENT (MPME) INDEXES**

Under Cambridge Associates' mPME methodology, the public index's shares are purchased and sold according to the private fund cash flow schedule, with distributions calculated in the same proportion as the private fund and mPME NAV is a function of mPME cash flows. The mPME analysis evaluates what return would have been earned had the dollars invested in private investments been invested in the public market instead. ■

## Appendix: Investment Portfolio Returns

### FISCAL YEAR 2022 TOTAL RETURN PERCENTILES

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	All Endowments	Colleges & Universities	Cultural & Environmental	Independent Schools	Healthcare	Other Endowments
5th %ile	1.6	1.6	2.7	4.4	-0.1	-1.5
25th %ile	-4.5	-3.3	-6.3	-7.9	-5.4	-6.9
Median	-7.8	-6.6	-8.5	-9.8	-9.5	-9.3
75th %ile	-10.8	-10.0	-12.5	-13.2	-10.6	-12.4
95th %ile	-15.4	-13.7	-17.4	-17.6	-14.2	-15.1
Mean	-7.6	-6.4	-8.7	-9.1	-7.9	-9.2
<i>n</i>	316	158	51	30	33	44
70/30 Index	-13.8					

Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

### FISCAL YEAR 2022 TOTAL RETURN PERCENTILES

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking

	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
5th %ile	-1.5	-2.2	-1.3	2.1	4.4
25th %ile	-8.0	-6.5	-4.3	-3.4	-0.8
Median	-10.3	-8.9	-7.2	-6.6	-4.4
75th %ile	-14.1	-11.3	-9.9	-9.1	-7.6
95th %ile	-17.4	-15.1	-14.8	-12.8	-11.6
Mean	-10.4	-8.8	-7.2	-6.1	-4.1
<i>n</i>	93	60	35	67	61

Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data are provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited and MSCI Inc. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

## EXAMPLE OF 1-YR ATTRIBUTION ANALYSIS: ALL ENDOWMENT MEAN

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • n = 313

Asset Class	Breakdown of Return From Asset Allocation			
	Beginning Year Mean Asset Allocation	Asset Class Benchmark Return	Contribution to Asset Class Return	Index
Non-Venture Private Equity	7.4	6.6	0.7	CA US Private Equity
Private Oil & Gas / Natural Resources	2.0	27.1	0.6	CA Natural Resources
Private Real Estate	2.2	19.6	0.5	CA Real Estate
Venture Capital	8.1	2.5	0.4	CA US Venture Capital
Public Energy / Natural Resources	0.8	18.3	0.1	MSCI World Nat Res (N)
Other Private Investments	1.7	5.4	0.1	CA US PE/VC
Distressed-Private Equity Structure	0.6	13.3	0.1	CA Distressed Securities
Commodities	0.3	24.3	0.1	Bloomberg Commodity
Private Credit	1.0	4.9	0.1	CA Private Credit
Cash & Equivalents	4.1	0.2	0.0	91-Day T-Bill
Global ex US Bonds	0.1	-21.9	0.0	FTSE Non-US\$ WGBI
High-Yield Bonds	0.2	-12.8	0.0	BBG High Yield
Inflation-Linked Bonds	0.5	-5.1	0.0	BBG US TIPS
Distressed-Hedge Fund Structure	1.1	-2.8	0.0	HFRI ED: Dist/Rest
Public Real Estate	0.4	-12.7	-0.1	FTSE NAREIT Composite
Global Bonds	0.4	-16.8	-0.1	FTSE WGBI
Other	0.6	-13.8	-0.1	70% Global Eq / 30% Bond
Absolute Return (ex Distressed)	8.8	-3.3	-0.3	HFRI FOF Diversified
US Bonds	8.0	-10.3	-0.8	BBG Agg Bond
Long/Short Hedge Funds	7.3	-12.0	-0.9	HFRI Equity Hedge
Global ex US Equity-Emerging Mkts	5.4	-25.3	-1.4	MSCI Emg Mkts (N)
Global Equity	9.4	-15.5	-1.5	MSCI ACWI
Global ex US Equity-Developed Mkts	10.2	-17.8	-1.8	MSCI EAFE (N)
US Equity	19.5	-13.9	-2.7	Russell 3000
<i>Return From Asset Allocation (Sum of Contributions)</i>			-7.0	
<i>+/- Return From Other Factors</i>			-0.7	
<b>Mean Total Portfolio Return</b>			<b>-7.7</b>	

Sources: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC. Index data provided by Bloomberg Index Services Limited, BofA Merrill Lynch, Cambridge Associates LLC, Frank Russell Company, FTSE Fixed Income LLC, FTSE International Limited, Hedge Fund Research, Inc., J.P. Morgan Securities, Inc., MSCI Inc., National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, and the National Council of Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries. MSCI data provided "as is" without any express or implied warranties.

Note: To be consistent with the methodology in which private investment returns are incorporated into the total portfolio composite calculation, private investment benchmark returns are linked quarterly horizon returns.

## DISPERSION OF PARTICIPANTS' 1-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total PE/VC	Venture Capital	Non- Venture Private Equity	Private Distressed Securities	Private Credit	Total Private Real Assets	Private Real Estate	Private Natural Resources
<b>All Endowments</b>								
5th %ile	29.9	38.5	29.2	58.7	21.3	50.0	48.8	57.7
25th %ile	17.7	18.5	18.3	37.5	13.6	32.2	25.3	40.7
Median	10.3	5.5	10.1	18.5	7.6	24.7	17.4	30.0
75th %ile	2.1	-3.9	3.3	6.5	2.1	17.4	6.2	20.7
95th %ile	-9.4	-24.5	-7.7	-10.4	-9.1	5.5	-13.4	9.4
Mean	9.9	7.3	10.7	20.8	8.3	25.0	16.5	31.4
<i>n</i>	242	219	236	109	162	210	190	199
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>								
Less Than \$200M	13.6	14.1	13.2	29.2	8.2	20.3	6.4	24.2
<i>n</i>	72	57	72	15	42	56	33	46
\$200M–\$500M	12.4	7.2	9.7	23.2	8.4	24.7	9.7	27.8
<i>n</i>	58	55	58	27	45	54	45	48
\$500M–\$1B	8.8	4.5	8.7	15.8	7.3	26.2	15.7	31.4
<i>n</i>	29	29	29	25	24	30	30	26
\$1B–\$3B	6.6	2.5	5.1	14.2	7.0	28.2	19.9	34.8
<i>n</i>	50	44	44	25	33	44	47	46
More Than \$3B	3.9	4.6	10.0	4.9	6.2	26.9	23.6	33.0
<i>n</i>	33	34	33	17	18	26	35	33
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>								
C&U	9.0	4.9	9.1	15.2	7.2	24.9	18.1	30.7
<i>n</i>	120	111	113	64	74	106	109	108
Cult & Env	14.0	13.8	9.3	16.3	7.0	31.1	10.5	32.2
<i>n</i>	43	36	43	14	32	35	29	33
Ind School	10.0	-2.1	11.4	24.4	8.2	20.9	9.0	25.5
<i>n</i>	28	22	28	10	21	21	14	18
Healthcare	9.3	3.3	8.9	34.4	8.8	19.3	17.8	30.7
<i>n</i>	21	21	22	13	18	19	19	15
Other End	12.0	9.0	12.7	45.5	6.7	24.7	14.7	27.0
<i>n</i>	30	29	30	8	17	29	19	25
<b>Median by Total Performance Quartile</b>								
Top Quartile	14.7	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.2	28.5	22.7	36.4
<i>n</i>	52	45	46	28	35	41	50	50
2nd Quartile	9.7	5.3	9.3	15.8	10.1	26.4	17.6	29.2
<i>n</i>	64	66	66	33	48	63	54	58
3rd Quartile	10.2	3.8	10.0	23.7	6.7	22.6	16.3	24.8
<i>n</i>	69	62	68	30	47	63	56	61
Bottom Quartile	9.4	2.4	11.1	22.7	8.4	19.0	5.5	22.8
<i>n</i>	57	46	56	18	32	43	30	30

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their fiscal year 2022 total portfolio return. The Top Performers subset is based on institutions that were in the top quartile for total portfolio performance for the fiscal year 2022 period. Private investment return statistics are reported as horizon IRRs.

## PARTICIPANTS' 1-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: MARKETABLE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 1-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total Public Equity	Global Equity Managers	US Equity	Dev Mkts ex US Equity	Emg Mkts Equity	Fixed Income	Hedge Funds	Commodities and Natural Resources	Public Real Estate
<b>All Endowments</b>									
5th %ile	-12.1	-6.5	-7.4	-11.8	-12.6	-1.3	3.5	24.9	23.7
25th %ile	-15.6	-14.0	-11.6	-16.6	-17.4	-5.4	-3.4	14.6	-5.1
Median	-18.0	-21.7	-14.5	-18.9	-21.5	-7.9	-7.9	8.0	-8.0
75th %ile	-20.9	-28.7	-17.7	-22.2	-25.6	-9.5	-12.2	1.7	-12.5
95th %ile	-28.0	-42.0	-29.7	-28.4	-32.5	-12.0	-21.3	-8.8	-15.0
Mean	-18.2	-22.1	-15.1	-19.3	-21.6	-7.4	-8.2	8.1	-4.6
<i>n</i>	266	193	257	240	248	262	268	98	48
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>									
Less Than \$200M	-17.7	-21.4	-14.1	-19.1	-21.9	-8.4	-8.8	2.7	-8.0
<i>n</i>	91	66	89	80	83	90	86	41	10
\$200M–\$500M	-17.2	-17.6	-14.2	-19.4	-20.8	-7.9	-7.0	10.2	-8.0
<i>n</i>	58	47	59	55	58	55	57	18	7
\$500M–\$1B	-17.7	-22.1	-12.9	-19.5	-19.6	-7.7	-8.2	8.6	-12.4
<i>n</i>	30	23	29	29	30	32	32	11	9
\$1B–\$3B	-19.6	-23.4	-15.5	-18.4	-22.0	-6.9	-8.0	9.2	-7.1
<i>n</i>	54	33	48	45	44	49	58	12	13
More Than \$3B	-20.1	-23.4	-16.8	-17.5	-25.4	-7.0	-7.0	15.3	-4.2
<i>n</i>	33	24	32	31	33	36	35	16	9
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>									
C&U	-18.3	-22.0	-14.7	-18.9	-22.6	-7.6	-8.5	10.6	-8.0
<i>n</i>	125	78	116	109	112	123	128	42	31
Cult & Env	-18.4	-23.9	-13.4	-19.3	-20.8	-7.6	-9.3	1.7	-7.6
<i>n</i>	47	37	47	43	45	47	48	15	5
Ind School	-18.5	-21.7	-14.2	-18.1	-21.4	-6.7	-8.7	3.4	29.9
<i>n</i>	29	25	29	24	27	25	28	16	1
Healthcare	-17.7	-18.0	-15.1	-18.9	-22.0	-9.3	-7.3	11.2	-8.0
<i>n</i>	27	23	28	28	28	28	26	10	7
Other End	-17.0	-20.8	-13.8	-19.8	-21.3	-8.4	-6.7	2.2	-11.5
<i>n</i>	38	30	37	36	36	39	38	15	4
<b>Median by Total Performance Quartile</b>									
Top Quartile	-18.0	-17.6	-13.7	-17.8	-21.3	-6.2	-3.1	16.0	-6.3
<i>n</i>	51	30	47	45	44	53	55	18	14
2nd Quartile	-17.2	-19.7	-13.1	-18.8	-21.3	-7.5	-7.8	9.0	-7.3
<i>n</i>	66	51	61	56	63	64	69	21	12
3rd Quartile	-17.7	-18.0	-14.2	-19.0	-21.4	-8.4	-8.1	9.4	-8.0
<i>n</i>	73	57	73	68	69	70	72	29	13
Bottom Quartile	-19.4	-29.8	-15.6	-19.6	-22.6	-8.6	-10.9	2.1	-8.0
<i>n</i>	76	55	76	71	72	75	72	30	9

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their fiscal year 2022 total portfolio return. The Top Performers subset is based on institutions that were in the top quartile for total portfolio performance for the fiscal year 2021 period.

## TOTAL RETURNS SUMMARY: TRAILING 3-, 5-, 10-, AND 20-YR

Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Nominal AACRs			
	3-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	20-Yr
<b>All Endowments</b>				
5th %ile	14.1	12.2	11.0	9.9
25th %ile	9.9	9.1	8.7	8.1
Median	8.0	7.3	7.6	7.1
75th %ile	6.0	5.9	6.7	6.4
95th %ile	3.5	4.3	5.4	5.5
Mean	8.2	7.7	7.8	7.3
<i>n</i>	312	308	291	231
<b>Less Than \$200M</b>				
5th Percentile	9.4	8.6	8.4	7.7
25th Percentile	7.6	7.0	7.4	6.8
Median	5.6	5.9	6.7	6.3
75th Percentile	4.1	4.8	6.1	5.7
95th Percentile	2.0	3.4	4.9	5.0
Mean	5.9	5.9	6.7	6.3
<i>n</i>	92	91	83	53
<b>\$200M–\$500M</b>				
5th Percentile	10.3	9.4	9.1	8.3
25th Percentile	9.3	8.2	8.0	7.5
Median	7.4	7.1	7.2	6.8
75th Percentile	6.2	5.9	6.3	6.3
95th Percentile	4.2	4.8	5.7	5.6
Mean	7.5	7.1	7.3	6.9
<i>n</i>	60	59	58	47
<b>\$500M–\$1B</b>				
5th Percentile	10.6	9.3	8.6	8.3
25th Percentile	9.3	8.4	8.1	7.4
Median	7.9	7.5	7.8	6.9
75th Percentile	6.9	6.5	7.1	6.6
95th Percentile	5.1	5.3	6.0	6.1
Mean	8.0	7.4	7.6	7.0
<i>n</i>	35	35	34	29
<b>\$1B–\$3B</b>				
5th Percentile	15.2	12.7	11.0	9.2
25th Percentile	11.4	10.4	9.5	8.3
Median	9.4	8.8	8.4	7.4
75th Percentile	7.0	6.6	7.5	6.9
95th Percentile	4.2	5.2	6.3	6.2
Mean	9.4	8.7	8.5	7.7
<i>n</i>	65	63	59	50
<b>More Than \$3B</b>				
5th Percentile	15.7	13.3	12.0	10.9
25th Percentile	13.3	11.6	10.6	9.6
Median	11.6	10.3	9.2	8.7
75th Percentile	8.9	7.9	8.6	7.8
95th Percentile	6.5	6.5	7.1	6.7
Mean	11.1	9.9	9.4	8.7
<i>n</i>	60	60	57	52

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## DISPERSION OF PARTICIPANTS' 3-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 3-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total PE/VC	Venture Capital	Non- Venture Private Equity	Private Distressed Securities	Private Credit	Total Private Real Assets	Private Real Estate	Private Natural Resources
<b>All Endowments</b>								
5th %ile	38.6	50.6	38.2	29.4	22.2	23.0	31.1	20.8
25th %ile	31.9	37.7	30.2	18.5	14.3	13.0	15.8	11.7
Median	28.4	32.8	25.5	12.7	9.8	9.3	11.0	8.3
75th %ile	24.1	25.4	20.7	7.5	7.5	5.7	5.7	4.4
95th %ile	17.0	15.0	12.5	-5.5	0.0	-1.8	-11.6	-1.4
Mean	27.8	31.9	25.6	13.5	10.3	9.6	9.9	9.0
<i>n</i>	233	207	227	93	141	202	185	194
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>								
Less Than \$200M	29.2	33.9	26.3	14.7	10.4	8.0	7.4	7.7
<i>n</i>	66	50	66	11	31	51	30	43
\$200M–\$500M	28.8	30.8	26.2	14.9	10.7	9.0	7.7	8.3
<i>n</i>	57	51	56	19	40	52	44	46
\$500M–\$1B	26.4	29.9	24.3	10.3	12.0	11.3	13.1	9.0
<i>n</i>	29	29	29	24	23	30	29	26
\$1B–\$3B	26.9	32.8	25.5	13.5	8.1	9.9	11.9	8.6
<i>n</i>	48	43	43	22	30	43	47	46
More Than \$3B	29.4	34.3	24.2	9.4	8.8	10.8	13.3	9.4
<i>n</i>	33	34	33	17	17	26	35	33
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>								
C&U	28.7	33.2	25.5	12.0	10.1	9.3	12.6	7.7
<i>n</i>	118	108	112	57	68	104	109	107
Cult & Env	28.5	31.6	25.4	10.6	9.8	9.9	7.5	10.0
<i>n</i>	40	35	39	12	27	32	27	31
Ind School	26.4	27.0	27.0	15.9	10.6	9.2	7.4	8.5
<i>n</i>	26	20	26	8	16	19	13	16
Healthcare	26.2	29.9	24.6	18.5	9.4	11.3	13.3	10.7
<i>n</i>	20	19	21	11	14	19	19	15
Other End	28.9	34.0	24.7	12.9	9.3	7.6	14.6	6.2
<i>n</i>	29	25	29	5	16	28	17	25

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Private investment return statistics are reported as horizon IRRs.



## DISPERSION OF PARTICIPANTS' 5-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 5-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total PE/VC	Venture Capital	Non- Venture Private Equity	Private Distressed Securities	Private Credit	Total Private Real Assets	Private Real Estate	Private Natural Resources
<b>All Endowments</b>								
5th %ile	33.8	40.6	32.2	26.8	17.6	17.0	18.1	15.8
25th %ile	27.3	31.2	25.8	14.7	12.7	10.6	13.3	9.5
Median	24.4	28.2	22.4	10.5	9.4	7.3	11.1	5.8
75th %ile	21.0	23.9	18.2	6.8	6.3	4.2	5.9	2.4
95th %ile	13.9	12.7	10.4	-0.7	2.9	-4.1	-9.7	-3.1
Mean	24.1	27.2	22.1	11.1	12.3	7.3	8.6	6.6
<i>n</i>	222	187	216	81	121	195	171	190
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>								
Less Than \$200M	23.9	28.0	22.5	10.8	10.6	6.0	5.1	5.5
<i>n</i>	60	38	59	8	24	49	27	42
\$200M–\$500M	24.9	27.6	23.1	10.6	9.4	7.2	7.1	5.7
<i>n</i>	53	47	53	15	33	47	37	43
\$500M–\$1B	22.8	26.4	22.7	8.4	11.9	8.0	12.7	4.0
<i>n</i>	29	26	29	20	22	30	28	26
\$1B–\$3B	24.2	28.5	22.4	10.9	8.7	7.5	11.6	6.5
<i>n</i>	47	42	42	21	28	43	45	46
More Than \$3B	25.4	30.7	21.8	9.9	8.1	9.3	11.7	7.2
<i>n</i>	33	34	33	17	14	26	34	33
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>								
C&U	24.6	28.7	22.6	9.8	9.7	8.0	11.5	5.6
<i>n</i>	117	106	111	52	58	102	105	106
Cult & Env	24.7	27.7	23.0	8.8	9.8	7.3	8.7	8.0
<i>n</i>	37	29	37	11	24	31	26	30
Ind School	22.5	25.4	22.6	10.8	9.5	7.1	6.1	5.0
<i>n</i>	23	16	23	6	14	18	11	15
Healthcare	23.8	27.5	22.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	11.4	7.1
<i>n</i>	19	16	20	9	12	16	14	14
Other End	24.1	29.1	20.5	10.9	9.3	5.9	7.3	4.5
<i>n</i>	26	20	25	3	13	28	15	25

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Private investment return statistics are reported as horizon IRRs.

## DISPERSION OF PARTICIPANTS' 10-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 10-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total PE/VC	Venture Capital	Non- Venture Private Equity	Private Distressed Securities	Private Credit	Total Private Real Assets	Private Real Estate	Private Natural Resources
<b>All Endowments</b>								
5th %ile	24.4	30.9	23.6	21.2	62.1	14.6	16.3	10.1
25th %ile	21.0	24.6	19.6	13.2	13.2	9.5	14.0	6.0
Median	18.5	20.8	16.8	10.6	10.3	6.6	11.7	3.5
75th %ile	16.1	18.1	14.7	7.8	8.6	4.3	9.0	1.4
95th %ile	11.3	10.3	10.2	3.5	5.1	0.3	5.4	-2.9
Mean	18.5	20.7	17.2	10.9	19.5	6.9	11.2	4.0
<i>n</i>	193	158	189	56	74	165	144	154
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>								
Less Than \$200M	17.1	19.2	14.7	10.4	10.8	5.5	9.5	3.2
<i>n</i>	45	28	45	4	10	32	17	25
\$200M–\$500M	18.5	20.1	17.8	11.8	9.8	6.4	10.5	3.4
<i>n</i>	47	34	46	7	15	41	29	34
\$500M–\$1B	19.0	20.7	18.0	9.1	11.7	6.5	12.6	2.8
<i>n</i>	27	24	27	10	15	27	23	24
\$1B–\$3B	18.4	21.2	17.3	8.8	10.0	7.3	12.3	4.0
<i>n</i>	46	42	42	18	23	41	44	41
More Than \$3B	20.4	23.6	16.8	10.9	9.7	8.5	11.1	4.9
<i>n</i>	28	30	29	17	11	24	31	30
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>								
C&U	18.9	21.1	17.3	10.2	10.0	6.8	12.1	3.7
<i>n</i>	109	95	105	40	37	96	95	93
Cult & Env	17.7	21.9	16.5	9.8	10.7	6.4	12.0	3.5
<i>n</i>	30	21	29	5	15	25	22	21
Ind School	16.1	16.6	16.0	8.4	9.2	6.1	10.6	5.5
<i>n</i>	21	14	21	3	7	16	7	14
Healthcare	18.0	21.3	16.5	15.6	10.6	7.9	12.0	3.0
<i>n</i>	13	14	14	7	6	12	12	11
Other End	18.1	18.9	16.9	16.8	11.0	4.1	8.4	2.7
<i>n</i>	20	14	20	1	9	16	8	15
<b>Median by Total Performance Quartile</b>								
Top Quartile	21.0	24.0	17.8	9.9	10.5	7.1	12.4	4.3
<i>n</i>	47	46	48	19	21	40	46	43
2nd Quartile	18.5	20.7	18.1	11.4	10.1	6.7	12.3	3.2
<i>n</i>	51	44	48	18	23	44	45	44
3rd Quartile	18.1	19.0	16.8	7.7	11.3	6.4	9.3	2.9
<i>n</i>	51	40	51	11	17	46	31	37
Bottom Quartile	14.8	15.9	15.0	10.1	9.4	5.8	10.1	2.8
<i>n</i>	35	22	35	4	10	30	16	23

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their total portfolio return for the trailing ten-year period. Private investment return statistics are reported as horizon IRRs.

## PARTICIPANTS' 3-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: MARKETABLE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 3-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total Public Equity	Global Equity Managers	US Equity	Dev Mkts ex US Equity	Emg Mkts Equity	Fixed Income	Hedge Funds	Commodities and Natural Resources	Public Real Estate
<b>All Endowments</b>									
5th %ile	7.7	9.8	12.4	5.9	7.2	1.8	8.6	15.6	14.5
25th %ile	6.2	6.2	10.4	3.3	3.6	0.4	5.8	10.7	4.8
Median	5.3	3.9	8.9	2.1	1.9	-0.3	4.4	7.0	3.8
75th %ile	4.1	1.4	7.3	0.7	0.1	-0.8	2.5	3.6	-0.5
95th %ile	1.9	-3.5	3.2	-3.1	-4.0	-2.0	-1.7	-3.9	-1.1
Mean	5.2	3.5	8.6	1.9	1.8	-0.2	4.0	7.1	3.7
<i>n</i>	255	169	248	231	235	248	259	87	40
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>									
Less Than \$200M	5.3	3.6	8.6	2.2	1.3	-0.5	4.2	5.9	4.8
<i>n</i>	87	53	86	77	77	85	82	37	10
\$200M–\$500M	5.6	4.0	9.3	1.7	1.8	-0.3	4.4	7.5	4.8
<i>n</i>	58	42	59	55	58	53	57	17	3
\$500M–\$1B	5.6	5.1	9.5	1.7	2.0	-0.3	4.1	8.7	-0.6
<i>n</i>	29	19	27	27	28	31	31	10	8
\$1B–\$3B	5.0	4.0	8.7	1.8	2.2	-0.1	4.5	8.1	2.5
<i>n</i>	49	33	45	42	40	44	55	9	11
More Than \$3B	4.7	3.7	8.3	2.6	2.9	0.2	5.3	11.7	5.6
<i>n</i>	32	22	31	30	32	35	34	14	8
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>									
C&U	5.3	3.9	9.0	2.2	1.9	-0.1	4.4	7.0	2.5
<i>n</i>	121	69	113	106	108	118	125	41	25
Cult & Env	5.1	4.1	9.3	1.7	2.2	-0.4	4.4	7.7	2.3
<i>n</i>	46	36	47	43	44	45	48	14	4
Ind School	5.1	3.6	8.7	2.3	2.3	-0.1	3.9	8.1	7.9
<i>n</i>	29	21	29	24	25	25	28	12	1
Healthcare	6.0	4.8	8.8	2.0	1.9	-0.7	4.5	11.2	4.8
<i>n</i>	24	18	25	25	25	25	23	7	6
Other End	5.1	1.4	8.7	2.2	1.5	-0.5	4.3	4.2	1.9
<i>n</i>	35	25	34	33	33	35	35	13	4

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## PARTICIPANTS' 5-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: MARKETABLE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 5-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total Public Equity	Global Equity Managers	US Equity	Dev Mkts ex US Equity	Emg Mkts Equity	Fixed Income	Hedge Funds	Commodities and Natural Resources	Public Real Estate
<b>All Endowments</b>									
5th %ile	8.2	11.0	12.3	5.4	5.7	2.6	7.6	10.9	13.7
25th %ile	6.8	6.8	11.2	3.7	3.5	1.6	5.4	7.4	6.5
Median	6.1	5.2	10.0	2.6	2.5	1.0	4.2	4.4	4.3
75th %ile	5.1	3.5	8.8	1.6	1.3	0.8	3.2	1.6	2.3
95th %ile	3.7	-0.3	5.3	-0.6	-1.2	0.0	0.8	-4.7	1.9
Mean	6.0	5.3	9.7	2.6	2.4	1.2	4.2	4.6	5.5
<i>n</i>	248	139	238	219	220	234	251	79	32
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>									
Less Than \$200M	6.0	4.9	10.0	2.8	2.0	1.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
<i>n</i>	85	42	83	72	69	81	79	32	8
\$200M–\$500M	6.3	4.8	10.3	2.1	2.4	1.1	4.1	3.7	6.4
<i>n</i>	55	31	56	52	55	49	54	17	1
\$500M–\$1B	6.2	6.5	10.4	2.3	2.2	1.0	4.1	5.5	2.5
<i>n</i>	29	17	26	26	27	28	31	9	7
\$1B–\$3B	6.0	5.4	9.9	2.5	2.9	1.0	4.4	2.5	4.8
<i>n</i>	47	29	42	39	37	41	53	9	9
More Than \$3B	5.6	4.9	8.8	3.0	3.0	1.4	5.4	7.8	6.5
<i>n</i>	32	20	31	30	32	35	34	12	7
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>									
C&U	6.1	5.2	9.7	2.6	2.8	1.1	4.2	3.5	4.1
<i>n</i>	120	59	112	104	104	114	124	38	18
Cult & Env	6.0	5.2	10.3	2.2	2.7	0.9	4.6	5.9	3.8
<i>n</i>	44	29	44	40	41	41	46	14	4
Ind School	6.4	5.2	10.7	2.8	3.1	1.1	3.8	4.1	6.5
<i>n</i>	27	16	25	21	19	21	26	9	1
Healthcare	6.6	6.4	9.8	2.6	2.2	1.0	4.2	5.7	6.5
<i>n</i>	22	14	23	23	23	23	21	7	5
Other End	5.8	4.7	9.9	2.9	2.1	1.0	4.2	3.8	4.0
<i>n</i>	35	21	34	31	33	35	34	11	4

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## PARTICIPANTS' 10-YR ASSET CLASS RETURNS: MARKETABLE INVESTMENTS

Trailing 10-Yr as of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Total Public Equity	Global Equity Managers	US Equity	Dev Mkts ex US Equity	Emg Mkts Equity	Fixed Income	Hedge Funds	Commodities and Natural Resources	Public Real Estate
<b>All Endowments</b>									
5th %ile	10.1	10.9	14.2	8.0	6.7	2.9	7.4	4.3	16.1
25th %ile	9.2	9.7	13.1	7.0	4.6	2.0	5.7	1.4	7.4
Median	8.6	8.8	12.1	6.3	3.6	1.6	4.9	-0.1	6.6
75th %ile	8.0	7.7	11.2	5.6	2.5	1.2	4.1	-1.4	5.7
95th %ile	7.0	6.0	9.4	4.4	1.4	0.5	2.8	-4.2	4.1
Mean	8.6	8.6	12.0	6.3	3.7	1.7	4.9	0.1	8.1
<i>n</i>	228	79	215	192	189	206	220	64	16
<b>Median by Asset Size</b>									
Less Than \$200M	8.6	8.4	12.1	6.0	3.1	1.7	4.6	-0.1	4.9
<i>n</i>	73	22	70	59	52	65	60	28	3
\$200M–\$500M	8.7	8.6	12.2	6.3	3.6	1.5	4.8	-0.2	7.3
<i>n</i>	54	17	54	49	52	47	53	13	1
\$500M–\$1B	8.7	9.1	12.7	6.5	3.2	1.5	4.5	-0.1	6.7
<i>n</i>	29	8	26	26	26	26	28	9	3
\$1B–\$3B	8.5	9.1	12.3	6.5	3.7	1.6	5.2	-0.7	6.3
<i>n</i>	43	21	39	34	33	40	50	7	6
More Than \$3B	8.5	8.4	11.3	6.9	4.3	1.9	5.7	2.7	7.4
<i>n</i>	29	11	26	24	26	28	29	7	3
<b>Median by Institution Type</b>									
C&U	8.6	8.7	12.0	6.5	3.7	1.6	5.0	-0.1	6.7
<i>n</i>	113	38	104	94	96	104	113	31	11
Cult & Env	8.7	8.8	12.3	6.3	3.8	1.6	5.0	0.9	5.7
<i>n</i>	41	19	41	37	36	39	39	10	2
Ind School	8.6	7.7	12.0	6.6	4.0	1.7	4.2	0.0	7.4
<i>n</i>	24	7	22	18	17	14	23	8	1
Healthcare	8.8	9.6	12.1	5.5	3.5	1.5	4.8	0.3	4.9
<i>n</i>	20	7	20	17	18	20	19	6	1
Other End	8.3	8.9	11.9	6.1	3.2	1.6	4.7	-0.2	7.1
<i>n</i>	30	8	28	26	22	29	26	9	1
<b>Median by Total Performance Quartile</b>									
Top Quartile	8.7	9.1	12.0	6.9	4.3	1.7	5.7	-0.1	7.4
<i>n</i>	44	20	44	38	41	39	50	13	7
2nd Quartile	8.9	8.9	12.5	6.5	3.6	1.5	4.6	0.1	6.3
<i>n</i>	57	23	54	51	48	56	56	16	4
3rd Quartile	8.6	8.8	12.2	6.1	3.2	1.7	4.9	-0.9	5.4
<i>n</i>	57	14	53	46	48	48	54	13	2
Bottom Quartile	8.3	8.0	12.0	6.0	3.3	1.6	4.6	0.9	6.0
<i>n</i>	63	19	60	55	49	58	55	22	2

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Institutions are assigned to performance quartiles based on their total portfolio return for the trailing ten-year period.

**REAL RETURNS AFTER SPENDING: TRAILING 3-, 5-, 10-, AND 20-Yr**  
 Years Ended June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking

	3-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	20-Yr
<b>All Endowments</b>				
5th %ile	6.0	5.2	4.6	3.6
25th %ile	3.0	2.6	3.0	1.6
Median	0.3	0.7	1.6	1.0
75th %ile	-1.5	-0.7	0.4	0.1
95th %ile	-3.7	-2.6	-1.0	-1.1
Mean	0.7	0.9	1.7	1.0
<i>n</i>	108	95	83	70

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## Appendix: Portfolio Asset Allocation

**SUMMARY ASSET ALLOCATION DISTRIBUTION**

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • *n* = 316 • By Percentile Ranking

	Public Equity	PE/VC	Hedge Funds	Assets & ILBs	Fixed Income	Private Credit	Cash	Other
5th %ile	64.3	41.0	32.1	16.8	20.8	5.9	11.9	2.6
25th %ile	49.4	29.2	22.8	10.4	12.0	2.7	5.4	0.0
Median	38.9	20.2	17.2	6.1	8.2	1.3	2.8	0.0
75th %ile	28.8	10.9	12.1	3.5	4.1	0.0	1.2	0.0
95th %ile	18.2	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean	39.6	20.3	17.7	7.3	8.7	1.9	4.1	0.4

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION BY ASSET SIZE

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Asset Size					
	All	Less Than	\$200M–	\$500M–	\$1B–	More Than
	Endowments	\$200M	\$500M	\$1B	\$3B	\$3B
	(n = 316)	(n = 93)	(n = 60)	(n = 35)	(n = 67)	(n = 61)
<b>Public Equity</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>29.9</b>
Global	8.2	10.3	9.4	6.0	7.5	5.9
US	18.0	22.0	20.7	19.7	14.1	12.5
Global ex US Developed	9.0	11.6	9.4	10.2	7.1	5.8
Emerging Markets	4.4	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.0	5.7
<b>PE/VC</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>29.7</b>
Non-Venture Private Equity	8.6	3.6	7.0	9.9	12.3	12.8
Venture Capital	9.4	5.1	7.5	8.3	12.3	15.3
Other Private Investments	2.3	3.2	3.2	2.2	0.9	1.6
<b>Hedge Funds</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>16.8</b>
Long/Short	7.1	7.1	7.1	5.4	8.0	7.2
Absolute Return	9.5	10.4	9.1	9.6	9.5	8.6
Distressed	1.1	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.8	1.0
<b>Private Credit</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.2</b>
Distressed - Control Oriented	0.6	0.3	0.6	1.0	0.7	0.8
Private Credit ex Distressed	1.2	0.8	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.4
<b>Fixed Income</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Global	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.1
US	8.2	11.0	9.2	8.6	6.1	5.0
Global ex US	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
High-Yield Bonds	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.5
<b>Real Assets &amp; ILBs</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>11.9</b>
Private Real Estate	2.5	0.6	1.2	2.9	3.3	5.6
Public Real Estate	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.4
Commodities	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.6
Inflation-Linked Bonds	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.4
Private O&G/Nat Resources	2.7	1.3	2.1	2.3	3.5	4.6
Public Energy/Nat Resources	0.8	1.3	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.3
<b>Cash &amp; Equivalents</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Other Assets</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION BY INSTITUTION TYPE

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%)

	Institution Type				
	Coll & Univ	Cult & Env	Ind Schools	Healthcare	Other End
	(n = 158)	(n = 51)	(n = 33)	(n = 30)	(n = 44)
<b>Public Equity</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>47.4</b>
Global	6.9	9.1	7.4	10.1	11.1
US	16.1	19.3	18.8	20.1	21.0
Global ex US Developed	8.1	9.4	10.1	8.5	11.1
Emerging Markets	4.7	3.9	4.9	3.9	4.2
<b>PE/VC</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>12.0</b>
Non-Venture Private Equity	11.2	6.4	6.6	6.7	4.2
Venture Capital	12.1	8.9	7.3	5.5	4.8
Other Private Investments	2.3	2.0	1.5	2.5	3.1
<b>Hedge Funds</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>18.8</b>
Long/Short	6.5	7.6	6.6	11.0	6.4
Absolute Return	8.6	10.3	10.1	10.3	11.1
Distressed	1.1	1.0	1.4	0.3	1.3
<b>Private Credit</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>
Distressed - Control Oriented	0.8	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.3
Private Credit ex Distressed	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.2	0.5
<b>Fixed Income</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>
Global	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.9
US	6.8	8.3	12.8	6.6	10.5
Global ex US	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
High-Yield Bonds	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0
<b>Real Assets &amp; ILBs</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>5.5</b>
Private Real Estate	3.4	1.5	1.9	1.8	1.6
Public Real Estate	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.4
Commodities	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.1
Inflation-Linked Bonds	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.8
Private O&G/Nat Resources	3.6	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.6
Public Energy/Nat Resources	0.7	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.1
<b>Cash &amp; Equivalents</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>Other Assets</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.



## HISTORICAL MEAN ASSET ALLOCATION TRENDS

Years Ended June 30 • Percent (%)

Constant Universe (n = 133)								
	Public Equity	PE/VC	Hedge Funds	Private Credit	Fixed Income	Real Assets & ILBs	Cash & Equivs	Other
2002	48.7	5.0	13.6	--	23.5	5.3	3.3	0.5
2003	48.9	5.0	15.6	--	20.1	6.2	3.5	0.7
2004	49.6	5.1	17.5	--	16.1	6.4	4.1	1.3
2005	48.1	5.6	19.2	--	14.7	8.3	3.8	0.3
2006	47.6	6.1	20.3	--	13.1	9.4	3.2	0.3
2007	47.3	6.9	21.0	--	11.6	10.3	2.4	0.3
2008	39.9	8.8	23.4	--	12.3	12.9	2.3	0.5
2009	33.9	9.8	23.9	--	14.2	11.7	5.7	0.7
2010	33.9	10.7	25.8	--	13.6	12.4	3.2	0.5
2011	36.2	11.2	24.7	--	11.4	13.1	2.8	0.6
2012	34.5	12.0	25.2	--	11.6	13.3	3.1	0.3
2013	37.8	10.9	23.1	1.9	10.1	12.6	3.2	0.4
2014	39.9	10.9	22.7	1.7	8.8	12.1	3.6	0.3
2015	39.9	11.3	23.5	1.5	8.9	10.5	4.2	0.2
2016	39.7	11.6	22.8	1.6	9.1	11.1	3.9	0.2
2017	42.7	11.4	21.2	1.4	8.3	10.2	4.1	0.7
2018	42.3	12.4	20.9	1.4	8.4	10.3	3.5	0.9
2019	41.9	14.4	19.9	1.5	8.6	9.1	3.5	1.1
2020	41.0	16.5	19.6	1.7	7.8	7.6	4.6	1.1
2021	40.7	21.1	17.3	1.7	7.0	7.2	4.0	1.0
2022	35.8	23.6	18.0	1.9	7.3	8.7	4.1	0.6

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Analysis is based on a constant universe that includes 133 institutions that provided asset allocation data for each year from 2002 to 2022.

## UNCALLED CAPITAL COMMITTED TO PRIVATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking

### Uncalled Capital Commitments as a Percentage of the Total LTIP

	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
5th %ile	19.7	26.2	23.4	23.4	25.9
25th %ile	13.5	14.5	17.7	18.6	20.3
Median	9.6	12.1	13.9	14.7	18.6
75th %ile	5.4	9.0	12.1	11.6	15.0
95th %ile	0.3	3.8	5.5	3.7	7.0
Mean	9.6	12.4	14.5	14.7	17.9
n	79	57	34	61	41

### Actual PI Allocation + Uncalled Capital Commitments as a Percentage of the Total LTIP

	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
5th %ile	55.9	56.4	62.2	69.0	82.7
25th %ile	39.2	45.3	53.0	59.8	69.8
Median	28.4	34.4	41.5	51.5	64.1
75th %ile	14.5	24.7	34.8	42.7	52.9
95th %ile	2.1	12.9	20.0	13.0	28.3
Mean	27.2	35.8	42.5	48.9	60.9
n	79	57	34	61	41

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Uncalled capital is the amount committed, but not yet paid in, to private investment funds.

## Appendix: Investment Manager Structures

### NUMBER OF EXTERNAL MANAGERS AND INVESTMENT VEHICLES

As of June 30, 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking

#### Number of External Managers

	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
5th %ile	54	76	90	118	278
25th %ile	41	62	76	98	176
Median	29	44	66	75	131
75th %ile	20	34	52	60	103
95th %ile	12	23	39	32	74
Mean	31	47	66	77	148
<i>n</i>	93	59	34	59	39

#### Number of Investment Vehicles

	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
5th %ile	74	115	162	276	626
25th %ile	53	79	128	190	380
Median	41	65	99	144	270
75th %ile	23	47	84	96	213
95th %ile	13	33	57	44	115
Mean	41	66	105	147	321
<i>n</i>	93	59	33	59	37

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

### DISPERSION IN NUMBER OF MANAGERS FOR SELECTED ASSET CLASSES

As of June 30, 2022 • By Percentile Ranking

	Global Equity	US Equity	DM ex US Equity	EM Equity	US Bonds	Long/Short Hedge Funds	Ab Return Hedge Funds	Private Equity	Venture Capital
5th %ile	8	8	6	7	4	12	12	41	34
25th %ile	5	5	4	4	3	8	8	19	15
Median	3	4	3	2	2	5	6	11	8
75th %ile	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	6	4
95th %ile	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mean	4	4	3	3	2	6	6	15	11
<i>n</i>	230	277	258	258	252	254	266	255	250

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Note: Only those institutions with an allocation to the specific asset class have been included. Funds-of-funds are counted as one manager.

## APPENDIX EXTERNAL MANAGERS AND VEHICLES BY STRATEGY

As of June 30, 2022

Strategy	Median Number of Managers					Median Number of Vehicles				
	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B	Less Than \$200M	\$200M–\$500M	\$500M–\$1B	\$1B–\$3B	More Than \$3B
<b>Traditional Equity</b>										
Global Equity	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4
US Equity	3	3	4	4	6	3	4	4	4	7
Developed ex US Equity	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4
Emerging Markets Equity	2	2	3	3	6	2	2	3	3	7
<b>Traditional Bonds</b>										
Global Bonds	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
US Bonds	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	3
Global ex US Bonds	--	1	1	1	1	--	1	1	1	2
High-Yield Bonds	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
<b>Hedge Funds</b>										
Long/Short Hedge Funds	3	5	4	6	8	3	5	4	6	8
Absolute Return	4	6	7	6	9	4	6	7	7	9
Distressed Securities	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	3
<b>Private Credit</b>										
Distressed - Control Oriented	1	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	8
Private Credit ex Distressed	2	2	4	4	7	2	2	7	5	12
<b>Private Equity</b>										
Non-Venture Private Equity	4	7	13	17	36	6	13	24	33	67
Venture Capital	3	5	8	12	27	7	9	17	29	99
Other Private Investments	2	3	3	2	5	5	5	7	4	10
<b>Real Assets &amp; ILBs</b>										
Private Real Estate	2	2	5	7	16	2	3	8	11	31
Public Real Estate	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3
Commodities	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3
Inflation-Linked Bonds (TIPS)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Private Oil & Gas/Nat Res	2	3	5	6	12	3	5	8	13	26
Public Energy/Nat Res	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Cash</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Other</b>	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	3

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

Notes: Only those institutions with an allocation to the specific asset class are included in each category. As a result, the sum of the individual asset classes should not be assumed to equal the total number of managers or vehicles.

## Appendix: Institutional Support

### ENDOWMENT DEPENDENCE

Fiscal Year 2022 • Percent (%) • By Percentile Ranking

	Public C&U	Private C&U	Ind School	Cult & Env
5th %ile	9.2	53.5	84.2	52.9
25th %ile	6.4	29.1	54.3	37.4
Median	3.8	14.1	24.6	30.8
75th %ile	2.7	7.9	15.8	23.5
95th %ile	1.8	2.3	9.2	10.5
Mean	4.8	19.8	36.9	31.1
<i>n</i>	12	80	8	8

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

### ENDOWMENT TO DEBT

As of June 30, 2021 • *n* = 118

	Less Than \$1B	\$1B–\$5B	More Than \$5B
5th %ile	16.7	12.7	28.2
25th %ile	8.5	7.2	8.4
Median	3.9	4.1	5.4
75th %ile	2.5	2.4	3.8
95th %ile	1.2	1.5	2.0
Mean	9.3	5.6	8.2
<i>n</i>	41	48	29

Source: Endowment data as reported to Cambridge Associates LLC.

## PARTICIPANTS

### COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

University of Alaska Foundation  
Allegheny College  
American Coll of Greece & American Univ of Greece  
Amherst College  
University of Arkansas Foundation Inc.  
College of The Atlantic  
Bentley University  
Berkeley Endowment Management Company  
Boston College  
Boston University  
Bowdoin College  
Brown University  
Bryn Mawr College  
University at Buffalo Foundation  
University of California  
California Institute of Technology  
The UCLA Foundation  
University of California, San Francisco  
Canisius College  
Carleton College  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Case Western Reserve University  
Centenary College of Louisiana  
Chapman University  
The University of Chicago  
University of Cincinnati  
Claremont McKenna College  
Clemson University Foundation  
The Colburn School  
Colby College  
Colgate University  
Columbia University  
Connecticut College  
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science & Art  
Cornell University  
College For Creative Studies  
Curry College  
Dartmouth College  
Davidson College  
University of Delaware  
Denison University  
Duke University  
Duquesne University  
Emory University  
Florida State University Foundation Inc.  
University of Florida Investment Corporation  
Georgia Tech Foundation Inc.  
Gettysburg College  
Goucher College  
Grinnell College  
Hampton University  
Harvard Management Company, Inc.  
Haverford College  
University of Hawaii Foundation  
Hollins University  
Hope College  
University of Houston System  
Howard University  
University of Idaho Foundation, Inc.  
University of Illinois Foundation  
Indiana University Foundation  
Iowa State University Foundation  
Jewish Theological Seminary of America  
Johns Hopkins University  
Kalamazoo College  
KU Endowment  
Kentucky, University of  
Lafayette College  
University of Louisiana at Lafayette Foundation  
Lebanese American University  
Lehigh University  
Lewis and Clark College  
Louisiana State University Foundation  
Loyola University of Chicago  
Luther Seminary  
Lycoming College  
Macalester College  
The University of Maryland Foundation  
MIT Investment Management Company  
Mercy College  
University of Michigan  
Michigan State University  
Mount Holyoke College  
Mount St. Mary's University  
National University  
NC State Investment Fund, Inc.  
University of Nevada, Reno Foundation  
Nevada System of Higher Education  
New York University  
Northeastern University  
Northwestern University  
Norwich University  
University of Notre Dame  
Oberlin College  
Occidental College  
Ohio State University  
Ohio Wesleyan University  
The University of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc.  
Pace University  
University of the Pacific  
University of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania State University  
Pepperdine University  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pomona College  
Princeton University  
Providence College  
Purdue Research Foundation  
Reed College  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
University of Rhode Island Foundation  
Rice University  
University of Rochester  
The Rockefeller University  
University of San Diego  
San Francisco State University Foundation  
Santa Clara University  
Scripps College  
Seattle University  
Simmons College  
Smith College  
Soka University of America  
University of Southern California  
Southern Methodist University  
Southern New Hampshire University  
Spelman College  
Stanford University  
St. Lawrence University  
Swarthmore College  
University of Tennessee  
Texas Christian University  
Texas Lutheran University  
Texas State Univ. Dev. Fdn.

The University of Texas Investment Management Co.  
 Trinity University  
 Tufts University  
 Tulane University  
 UNC Management Company, Inc.  
 UNCG Endowment Partners, LP  
 Union Theological Seminary  
 Vanderbilt University  
 Villanova University  
 University of Virginia Investment Management Co.  
 Virginia Tech Foundation  
 Washburn University Foundation  
 University of Washington  
 Washington College  
 Washington and Jefferson College  
 Washington University in St. Louis  
 Wellesley College  
 Wesleyan University  
 Western New England University  
 Wichita State University Foundation  
 William & Mary Foundation  
 Williams College  
 University of Wisconsin Foundation  
 Yale University  
 Yeshiva University

## **CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL**

American Red Cross  
 Animal Rescue League of Boston  
 Appalachian Mountain Club  
 The Vivian Beaumont Theater, Inc.  
 Boston Symphony Orchestra Inc.  
 The Brookings Institution  
 Carnegie Institution for Science  
 Science History Institute  
 The Children's Museum of Indianapolis  
 Conner Prairie Foundation  
 Conservation International Foundation  
 Council on Foreign Relations  
 Cypress Lawn Endowment Care Trust  
 The Edison Institute  
 The Evergreens Cemetery  
 Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe  
 The Frick Collection  
 Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum  
 GBH Educational Foundation  
 The J. Paul Getty Trust  
 Jeremy and Hannelore Grantham Environmental Trust  
 Huntington Library and Art Gallery  
 Institute for Advanced Study  
 Linda Hall Library Trusts  
 Longwood Gardens, Inc.  
 Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation Endowment Trust  
 Minnesota Orchestral Association  
 Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals  
 Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles  
 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston  
 Museum of Fine Arts, Houston  
 Museum of Science, Boston  
 National Gallery of Art  
 National Geographic Society  
 NPR Foundation  
 National Wildlife Federation  
 Nature Conservancy;The  
 New York Philharmonic  
 The New York Public Library  
 New York Public Radio  
 Peabody Essex Museum  
 Philadelphia Museum of Art

Ravinia Festival Association  
 Scenic Hudson Land Trust Inc.  
 Seattle Art Museum  
 Smithsonian Institution  
 Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra Foundation, Inc.  
 The Trustees of Reservations  
 Two River Theatre Company Inc.  
 Wildlife Conservation Society  
 The Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Inc.

## **HOSPITALS**

Baylor Scott & White Health  
 Beth Israel Lahey Health Investment Partnership, LLP  
 Blythedale Children's Hospital  
 Cedars-Sinai Medical Center  
 Children's HealthCare of Atlanta, Inc.  
 The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia  
 The Children's Institute  
 Children's Medical Center  
 Cleveland Clinic Fdn;The  
 W. I. Cook Foundation, Inc.  
 Dana-Farber Cancer Institute Inc.  
 Essentia Health  
 Exeter Health Resources Inc.  
 Franciscan Missionaries of Our Lady Health System  
 Hawaii Pacific Health  
 Holy Redeemer Health System Inc.  
 Inova Health System  
 Lifespan Corporation  
 Maine Medical Center  
 Main Line Health Foundations  
 Mayo Clinic  
 Memorial Hermann Health System  
 Children's Mercy Hospital Foundation  
 Mount Sinai School of Medicine  
 South Nassau Communities Hospital  
 New York Presbyterian Hospital  
 Northwestern Memorial HealthCare  
 Ochsner Clinic Foundation  
 Partners HealthCare System, Inc.  
 Phoebe Putney Health System  
 Saint Francis Foundation  
 Shore Regional Health  
 University Hospitals Health System

## **INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS**

Auditory Learning Foundation  
 The Blake School  
 Boston College High School  
 The Brearley School  
 Buckingham Browne & Nichols School  
 Castilleja School  
 Collegiate School  
 The Episcopal School of Dallas  
 The Fessenden School  
 Greenwich Country Day School  
 Groton School  
 Milton Hershey School Trust  
 Hockaday School  
 The Hotchkiss School  
 Kamehameha Schools  
 Lakeside School  
 The Lawrenceville School  
 The Loomis Institute  
 Park Tudor Trust  
 Phillips Exeter Academy  
 The Pingry School  
 Punahou School

The Roxbury Latin School  
Saint Ignatius College Prep  
St. Mark's School of Texas  
Salisbury School  
St. Bernard's School  
Western Reserve Academy  
The Winsor School  
Xaverian Brothers High School

#### **OTHER NONPROFITS**

American College of Surgeons  
The American Society of Hematology  
Armenian Church Endowment Fund  
The Boston Home Inc.  
Catholic Church Extension Society  
Catholic Education Scholarship Trust  
Catholic Investment Trust of Washington  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
Children's Investment Fund Foundation  
Christ Church Cathedral Foundation  
The Church Pension Fund  
Claremont University Consortium  
Episcopal Society of Christ Church  
Episcopal Divinity School  
Ex-Students' Association of the University of Texas  
Greater New York Hospital Association  
Howard Hughes Medical Institute

The Ignatius Fund  
Isidore and Van Gerwen Charitable Trusts  
Jewish Child Care Association  
Maine Coast Heritage Trust  
Mission Diocese Fund  
Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health  
The PGA of America, LP  
Diocese of Providence  
The REACH Healthcare Foundation  
Robin Hood Foundation  
The Rose Hills Foundation  
Schott Foundation for Public Education  
The Sealy & Smith Foundation  
Soka University of America EEF  
Southern Poverty Law Center  
Southwest Research Institute  
Spastic Children's Endowment Foundation  
Sunflower Foundation Health Care for Kansans  
Texas Biomedical Research Institute  
Trinity Church Wall Street  
United Methodist Health Ministry Fund  
United Negro College Fund  
United States Tennis Association  
Willett Advisors  
Catholic Diocese of Wilmington  
Woodward Hines Education Foundation  
Xaverian Brothers USA

---

Copyright © 2023 by Cambridge Associates LLC. All rights reserved.

This report may not be displayed, reproduced, distributed, transmitted, or used to create derivative works in any form, in whole or in portion, by any means, without written permission from Cambridge Associates LLC ("CA"). Copying of this publication is a violation of US and global copyright laws (e.g., 17 U.S.C. 101 et seq.). Violators of this copyright may be subject to liability for substantial monetary damages.

This report is provided for informational purposes only. The information does not represent investment advice or recommendations, nor does it constitute an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any securities. Any references to specific investments are for illustrative purposes only. The information herein does not constitute a personal recommendation or take into account the particular investment objectives, financial situations, or needs of individual clients. Information in this report or on which the information is based may be based on publicly available data. CA considers such data reliable but does not represent it as accurate, complete, or independently verified, and it should not be relied on as such. Nothing contained in this report should be construed as the provision of tax, accounting, or legal advice. PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT INDICATIVE OF FUTURE PERFORMANCE. Broad-based securities indexes are unmanaged and are not subject to fees and expenses typically associated with managed accounts or investment funds. Investments cannot be made directly in an index. Any information or opinions provided in this report are as of the date of the report, and CA is under no obligation to update the information or communicate that any updates have been made. Information contained herein may have been provided by third parties, including investment firms providing information on returns and assets under management, and may not have been independently verified.

The terms "CA" or "Cambridge Associates" may refer to any one or more CA entity including: Cambridge Associates, LLC (a registered investment adviser with the US Securities and Exchange Commission, a Commodity Trading Adviser registered with the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission and National Futures Association, and a Massachusetts limited liability company with offices in Arlington, VA; Boston, MA; Dallas, TX; Menlo Park, CA; New York, NY; and San Francisco, CA), Cambridge Associates Limited (a registered limited company in England and Wales, No. 06135829, that is authorized and regulated by the UK Financial Conduct Authority in the conduct of Investment Business, reference number: 474331); Cambridge Associates GmbH (authorized and regulated by the Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht ('BaFin'), Identification Number: 155510), Cambridge Associates Asia Pte Ltd (a Singapore corporation, registration No. 200101063G, which holds a Capital Market Services License to conduct Fund Management for Accredited and/or Institutional Investors only by the Monetary Authority of Singapore), Cambridge Associates Limited, LLC (a registered investment adviser with the US Securities and Exchange Commission, an Exempt Market Dealer and Portfolio Manager in the Canadian provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Québec, and Saskatchewan, and a Massachusetts limited liability company with a branch office in Sydney, Australia, ARBN 109 366 654), Cambridge Associates Investment Consultancy (Beijing) Ltd (a wholly owned subsidiary of Cambridge Associates, LLC which is registered with the Beijing Administration for Industry and Commerce, registration No. 110000450174972), and Cambridge Associates (Hong Kong) Private Limited (a Hong Kong Private Limited Company licensed by the Securities and Futures Commission of Hong Kong to conduct the regulated activity of advising on securities to professional investors).