2018
GREATER EVANSVILLE NONPROFIT SURVEY

A comprehensive look at the state and health of the Evansville area nonprofit community.

APPENDIX — DATA TABLES

2018 GREATER EVANSVILLE NONPROFIT SURVEY

A SURVEY OF NONPROFIT EXCELLENCE INDICATORS FROM THE WELBORN BAPTIST FOUNDATION

WELBORN BAPTIST FOUNDATION PROJECT TEAM

Elizabeth Tharp, Learning Officer

Candice Perry, Nonprofit Excellence Officer

Jeff Seymore, Communications Officer

SUGGESTED CITATION

Welborn Baptist Foundation, Inc. (2018). Greater Evansville Nonprofit Survey

***

APPENDIX
PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

Table A1. Subsectors Represented by Survey Respondents	
Subsector	**Respondents**
Arts, Culture, and Humanities	9.0% (n=14)
Education and Research	11.5% (n=18)
Environment and Animals	7.1% (n=11)
Health	11.5% (n=18)
Human Services: Food, Nutrition, Clothing, or Meeting Basic Needs	6.4% (n=10)
Human Services: Housing, Homeless, or Community Restoration	10.9% (n=17)
Human Services: Other	16.7% (n=26)
Human Services: Youth Development	5.8% (n=9)
All Human Services	**39.7% (n=62)**
Other	10.9% (n=17)
Public, Societal Benefit	5.8% (n=9)
Religion	4.5% (n=7)
Total	**156**

*Three respondents did not indicate a subsector.

Table A2. Positions Held by Survey Respondents	
Position	**Respondents**
Executive Director or CEO	72.9% (n=113)
Other Senior Management	14.8% (n=23)
Other	12.3% (n=19)
Total	**155**

*Four respondents did not indicate a position. Of those indicating "other," the represented positions included administrative assistants and board members.

Table A3. Counties in Which Responding Organizations are Located

County	Respondents
Gibson, IN	7.6% (n=12)
Posey, IN	7.0% (n=11)
Vanderburgh, IN	73.4% (n=116)
Warrick, IN	12.7% (n=20)
Henderson, KY	11.4% (n=18)
Total	**158**

*The sum of the county percentages exceeds 100% because multiple organizations reported being located in more than one of the targeted counties.

Table A4. Counties Served by Responding Organizations

County	Respondents	County	Respondents
Clay, IL	9	Perry, IN	32
Edwards, IL	16	Pike, IN	39
Gallatin, IL	11	**Posey, IN**	**73**
Hamilton, IL	10	Spencer, IN	48
Hardin, IL	9	**Vanderburgh, IN**	**123**
Lawrence, IL	10	**Warrick, IN**	**88**
Richland, IL	11	Breckinridge, KY	7
Saline, IL	9	Crittenden, KY	7
Wabash, IL	15	Daviess, KY	24
Wayne, IL	14	Grayson, KY	4
White, IL	16	Hancock, KY	9
Crawford, IN	16	**Henderson, KY**	**46**
Daviess, IN	32	Hopkins, KY	21
Dubois, IN	39	McLean, KY	13
Gibson, IN	**63**	Muhlenberg, KY	9
Knox, IN	32	Ohio, KY	11
Martin, IN	20	Union, KY	23
Orange, IN	17	Webster, KY	18
		Total	**158**

*The sum of the county percentages exceeds 100% because multiple organizations reported being located in more than one of the targeted counties.

Welborn Baptist Foundation

DIEHL CONSULTING GROUP
evaluation | analytics | solutions

Table A5. Estimated Annual Operating Budgets of Responding Organizations	
Annual Operating Budget	**Respondents**
<$50K	13.3% (n=18)
$50,000 - $99,999	13.3% (n=18)
$100,000 - $199,999	17.0% (n=23)
$200,000 - $499,999	23.7% (n=32)
Less than $500,000	**67.4% (n=91)**
$500,000 - $999,999	9.6% (n=13)
$1,000,000 - $1,999,999	11.1% (n=15)
$2,000,000 - $4,999,999	5.2% (n=7)
$5,000,000+	6.7% (n=9)
$500,000 or more	**32.6% (n=44)**
Total	**135**

QUANTITATIVE SURVEY RESPONSES

'Human Services' – A group of subsectors under the Charities or Charitable Nonprofits umbrella. This includes meeting basic needs, victim services, housing, public safety, etc.

'Other Subsectors' – A group of subsectors under the Charities or Charitable Nonprofits umbrella. This group includes environment and animals, health/mental health, education and research, international, religion, etc.

Table A6. Collaborative Activities of Responding Organizations					
	Respondents				
Collaborative Activity	**All**	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
Obtain funding for programs	58.2% (n=92)	57.4% (n=35)	60.6% (n=57)	53.8% (n=49)	75.0% (n=33)
Share staff with another organization	24.1% (n=38)	21.3% (n=13)	26.6% (n=25)	28.6% (n=26)	20.5% (n=9)
Share space with another organization	30.4% (n=48)	27.9% (n=17)	33.0% (n=31)	26.4% (n=24)	40.9% (n=18)
Advocate on behalf of clients	46.8% (n=74)	65.6% (n=40)	36.2% (n=34)	42.9% (n=39)	61.4% (n=27)
Reduce administrative expenses	22.2% (n=35)	21.3% (n=13)	23.4% (n=22)	23.1% (n=21)	25.0% (n=11)
Reduce program expenses	38.6% (n=61)	41.0% (n=25)	38.3% (n=36)	38.5% (n=35)	38.6% (n=17)
Increase program efficiency or effectiveness	55.1% (n=87)	60.7% (n=37)	53.2% (n=50)	51.6% (n=47)	72.7% (n=32)
None of the above	10.1% (n=16)	4.9% (n=3)	13.8% (n=13)	11.0% (n=10)	4.5% (n=2)
Total	158	61	94	91	44

Table A7. Staffing Structure of Responding Organizations					
	Respondents				
Staff Type	**All**	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
Permanent full time employees (median)	3	4	3	1	17
Permanent full time employees (mean)	44.5	16.3	64.5	1.9	115.0
Permanent part time employees (median)	2	3	2	1	5
Permanent part time employees (mean)	12.3	21.3	6.3	2.5	31.1
Seasonal or temporary workers (median)	0	0	0	0	5
Seasonal or temporary workers (mean)	5.6	9.1	3.4	2.1	18.1
Volunteers (median)	50	60	35	30	100
Volunteers (mean)	227.5	227.2	227.6	81.1	627.5

Table A8. Staffing Demographics of Responding Organizations

Race/Ethnicity	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
African American	8.2% (n=276)	13.4% (n=147)	5.7% (n=129)	6.5% (n=72)	9.8% (n=178)
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.8% (n=26)	0.4% (n=4)	1.0% (n=22)	1.0% (n=11)	0.7% (n=13)
Latino/a or Hispanic	1.6% (n=55)	1.4% (n=15)	1.8% (n=40)	1.7% (n=19)	1.7% (n=31)
Middle Eastern	0.5% (n=18)	0.1% (n=1)	0.7% (n=17)	0.5% (n=5)	0.5% (n=9)
Native American	0.2% (n=8)	0.2% (n=2)	0.3% (n=6)	0.7% (n=8)	0.0% (n=0)
White or Anglo	86.0% (n=2897)	82.1% (n=904)	87.9% (n=1993)	86.4% (n=950)	84.5% (n=1541)
Multiracial	2.4% (n=80)	2.1% (n=23)	2.5% (n=57)	2.8% (n=31)	2.6% (n=47)
Other racial or ethnic identity	0.3% (n=9)	0.5% (n=5)	0.2% (n=4)	0.4% (n=4)	0.3% (n=5)

Table A9. Intentional Service to Specific Groups Served by Responding Organizations

Specific Group	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Racial or ethnic minority groups (i.e., non-white populations)	30.1% (n=46)	37.9% (n=22)	26.1% (n=24)	28.6% (n=26)	36.4% (n=16)
Gender or sexual minority groups (i.e., the LGBT community)	13.1% (n=20)	19.0% (n=11)	9.8% (n=9)	9.9% (n=9)	18.2% (n=8)
Religious minority groups (i.e., non-Christian populations)	16.3% (n=25)	17.2% (n=10)	16.3% (n=15)	16.5% (n=15)	15.9% (n=7)
People with disabilities (i.e., physical or mental impairments that substantially limit one or more major life activities)	37.9% (n=58)	46.6% (n=27)	33.7% (n=31)	33.0% (n=30)	50.0% (n=22)
Aging populations (i.e., individuals age 65 or older)	27.5% (n=42)	29.3% (n=17)	27.2% (n=25)	19.8% (n=18)	38.6% (n=17)
Urban populations (i.e., individuals living in densely populated areas with 50,000 or more residents)	22.9% (n=35)	32.8% (n=19)	17.4% (n=16)	18.7% (n=17)	29.5% (n=13)
Rural populations (i.e., individuals living in less developed areas outside of urban areas)	26.1% (n=40)	22.4% (n=13)	29.3% (n=27)	24.2% (n=22)	31.8% (n=14)
None of the above	38.6% (n=59)	29.3% (n=17)	45.7% (n=42)	42.9% (n=39)	34.1% (n=15)
Total	**153**	**58**	**92**	**91**	**44**

Table A10. Services Provided by Responding Organizations

| Services During Prior Fiscal Year | Respondents | | | | |
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Expanded services	49.7% (n=74)	53.4% (n=31)	47.3% (n=43)	44.4% (n=40)	62.8% (n=27)
Reduced services	6.7% (n=10)	6.9% (n=4)	6.6% (n=6)	8.9% (n=8)	4.7% (n=2)
Stayed the same	43.6% (n=65)	39.7% (n=23)	46.2% (n=42)	46.7% (n=42)	32.6% (n=14)
Total	149	58	91	90	43

Table A11. Financial Status of Responding Organizations

| Finances During Prior Fiscal Year | Respondents | | | | |
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Surplus	43.8% (n=64)	53.7% (n=29)	38.0% (n=35)	39.3% (n=35)	54.5% (n=24)
Deficit	25.3% (n=37)	20.4% (n=11)	28.3% (n=26)	28.1% (n=25)	22.7% (n=10)
Broke even	30.8% (n=45)	25.9% (n=14)	33.7% (n=31)	32.6% (n=29)	22.7% (n=10)
Total	146	54	92	89	44

Table A12. Operating Reserves of Responding Organizations

| Months of Operating Revenue in Reserve | Respondents | | | | |
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Less than 1 month	9.5% (n=14)	8.9% (n=5)	9.9% (n=9)	9.0% (n=8)	13.6% (n=6)
1 month or more, but less than 6 months	40.1% (n=59)	46.4% (n=26)	36.3% (n=33)	39.3% (n=35)	43.2% (n=19)
6 months or more, but less than 12 months	30.6% (n=45)	23.2% (n=13)	35.2% (n=32)	30.3% (n=27)	29.5% (n=13)
12 months or more	19.7% (n=29)	21.4% (n=12)	18.7% (n=17)	21.3% (n=19)	13.6% (n=6)
Total	147	56	91	89	44

Table A13. Board Membership of Responding Organizations

Number of People on Board	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
0-5	8.3% (n=12)	5.4% (n=3)	10.2% (n=9)	10.1% (n=9)	4.7% (n=2)
6-10	29.9% (n=43)	23.2% (n=13)	34.1% (n=30)	31.5% (n=28)	20.9% (n=9)
11-15	26.4% (n=38)	33.9% (n=19)	21.6% (n=19)	31.5% (n=28)	18.6% (n=8)
16-20	15.3% (n=22)	14.3% (n=8)	15.9% (n=14)	12.4% (n=11)	20.9% (n=9)
21+	20.1% (n=29)	23.2% (n=13)	18.2% (n=16)	14.6% (n=13)	34.9% (n=15)
Total	**144**	**56**	**88**	**89**	**43**

Table A14. Open Board Seats of Responding Organizations

Seats to be Filled	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
0	48.2% (n=68)	42.6% (n=23)	51.7% (n=45)	46.2% (n=42)	43.2% (n=19)
1	7.8% (n=11)	9.3% (n=5)	6.9% (n=6)	3.3% (n=3)	18.2% (n=8)
2	17.0% (n=24)	18.5% (n=10)	16.1% (n=14)	19.8% (n=18)	9.1% (n=4)
3	8.5% (n=12)	9.3% (n=5)	8.0% (n=7)	5.5% (n=5)	11.4% (n=5)
4+	18.4% (n=26)	20.4% (n=11)	17.2% (n=15)	19.8% (n=18)	18.2% (n=8)
Total	**141**	**54**	**87**	**91**	**44**

Table A15. Board Gender of Responding Organizations

Gender	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Women	46.3% (n=970)	43.1% (n=384)	48.7% (n=586)	51.1% (n=582)	40.3% (n=320)
Men	53.6% (n=1122)	56.9% (n=506)	51.2% (n=616)	48.8% (n=555)	59.7% (n=475)
Other	0.0% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	0.1% (n=1)	0.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)

Table A16. Board Age of Responding Organizations

Age	Respondents				
	All	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
18-30	3.7% (n=74)	4.4% (n=39)	3.1% (n=35)	3.9% (n=44)	2.7% (n=20)
31-40	18.5% (n=374)	20.2% (n=178)	17.1% (n=196)	19.0% (n=213)	18.0% (n=134)
41-50	26.0% (n=526)	23.6% (n=208)	27.8% (n=318)	26.1% (n=292)	27.2% (n=202)
51-60	26.0% (n=527)	26.4% (n=233)	25.7% (n=294)	22.4% (n=251)	32.3% (n=240)
60+	25.9% (n=524)	25.4% (n=224)	26.2% (n=300)	28.6% (n=320)	19.8% (n=147)

Table A17. Board Race/Ethnicity of Responding Organizations

Race/Ethnicity	Respondents				
	All	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
African American	5.1% (n=98)	6.7% (n=54)	3.9% (n=44)	4.4% (n=46)	6.5% (n=48)
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.3% (n=5)	0.0% (n=0)	0.4% (n=5)	0.1% (n=1)	0.4% (n=3)
Latino/a or Hispanic	1.5% (n=30)	2.2% (n=18)	1.1% (n=12)	1.9% (n=20)	1.2% (n=9)
Middle Eastern	0.3% (n=5)	0.1% (n=1)	0.4% (n=4)	0.1% (n=1)	0.5% (n=4)
Native American	0.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	0.1% (n=1)	0.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)
White or Anglo	92.0% (n=1782)	90.6% (n=727)	92.9% (n=1055)	92.6% (n=963)	90.1% (n=665)
Multiracial	0.4% (n=7)	0.2% (n=2)	0.4% (n=5)	0.6% (n=6)	0.1% (n=1)
Other racial or ethnic identity	0.5% (n=10)	0.0% (n=0)	0.9% (n=10)	0.2% (n=2)	1.1% (n=8)

Table A18. Board Personal Plans of Involvement at Responding Organizations

Board members develop personal plans of involvement	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Yes, and the plans are typically followed	**26.0%** **(n=38)**	**26.3%** **(n=15)**	**25.8%** **(n=23)**	**26.7%** **(n=24)**	**25.0%** **(n=11)**
Yes, but the plans are typically not followed	9.6% (n=14)	5.3% (n=3)	12.4% (n=11)	11.1% (n=10)	6.8% (n=3)
No	59.6% (n=87)	66.7% (n=38)	55.1% (n=49)	57.8% (n=52)	61.4% (n=27)
Not sure	4.8% (n=7)	1.8% (n=1)	6.7% (n=6)	4.4% (n=4)	6.8% (n=3)
Total	**146**	**57**	**89**	**90**	**44**

Table A19. Board Attendance of Responding Organizations

Attendance Engagement	Respondents						
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K	Follows Personal Plan of Inv. (PPI)	Formal Recruit. or Orient. Process
Not engaged (1)	0.7% (n=1)	1.8% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	1.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	2.7% (n=1)	1.0% (n=1)
Somewhat engaged (2)	12.5% (n=18)	3.6% (n=2)	18.2% (n=16)	13.5% (n=12)	11.6% (n=5)	2.7% (n=1)	11.7% (n=12)
Engaged (3)	52.1% (n=75)	58.9% (n=33)	47.7% (n=42)	55.1% (n=49)	53.5% (n=23)	40.5% (n=15)	55.3% (n=57)
Very engaged (4)	34.7% (n=50)	35.7% (n=20)	34.1% (n=30)	30.3% (n=27)	34.9% (n=15)	54.1% (n=20)	32.0% (n=33)
Total	**144**	**56**	**88**	**89**	**43**	**37**	**103**
Mean for Scorecard	3.21	3.29	3.16	3.15	3.23	3.46	3.18

Table A20. Board Participation of Responding Organizations

Participation Engagement	Respondents						
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K	Follows Personal Plan of Inv. (PPI)	Formal Recruit. or Orient. Process
Not engaged (1)	0.7% (n=1)	1.8% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	1.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	2.7% (n=1)	1.0% (n=1)
Somewhat engaged (2)	23.8% (n=34)	19.6% (n=11)	26.4% (n=23)	24.7% (n=22)	21.4% (n=9)	2.7% (n=1)	24.5% (n=25)
Engaged (3)	44.1% (n=63)	37.5% (n=21)	48.3% (n=42)	49.4% (n=44)	40.5% (n=17)	43.2% (n=16)	42.2% (n=43)
Very engaged (4)	31.5% (n=45)	41.1% (n=23)	25.3% (n=22)	24.7% (n=22)	38.1% (n=16)	51.4% (n=19)	32.4% (n=33)
Total	**143**	**56**	**87**	**89**	**42**	**37**	**102**
Mean for Scorecard	3.06	3.18	2.99	2.98	3.17	3.43	3.06

Table A21. Board Giving of Responding Organizations

Giving Engagement	Respondents						
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K	Follows Personal Plan of Inv. (PPI)	Formal Recruit. or Orient. Process
Not engaged (1)	5.7% (n=8)	7.4% (n=4)	4.7% (n=4)	8.0% (n=7)	0.0% (n=0)	2.7% (n=1)	2.0% (n=2)
Somewhat engaged (2)	25.7% (n=36)	25.9% (n=14)	25.6% (n=22)	25.0% (n=22)	32.5% (n=13)	16.2% (n=6)	28.0% (n=28)
Engaged (3)	37.1% (n=52)	33.3% (n=18)	39.5% (n=34)	37.5% (n=33)	32.5% (n=13)	24.3% (n=9)	37.0% (n=37)
Very engaged (4)	31.4% (n=44)	33.3% (n=18)	30.2% (n=26)	29.5% (n=26)	35.0% (n=14)	56.8% (n=21)	33.0% (n=33)
Total	140	54	86	88	40	37	100
Mean for Scorecard	2.94	2.93	2.99	2.89	3.03	3.35	3.01

Table A22. Board Oversight of Responding Organizations

Organization Oversight Engagement	Respondents						
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K	Follows Personal Plan of Inv. (PPI)	Formal Recruit. or Orient. Process
Not engaged (1)	5.6% (n=8)	5.4% (n=3)	5.7% (n=5)	7.9% (n=7)	0.0% (n=0)	2.7% (n=1)	1.9% (n=2)
Somewhat engaged (2)	18.1% (n=26)	17.9% (n=10)	18.2% (n=16)	18.0% (n=16)	16.3% (n=7)	2.7% (n=1)	16.5% (n=17)
Engaged (3)	47.9% (n=69)	51.8% (n=29)	45.5% (n=40)	52.8% (n=47)	41.9% (n=18)	54.1% (n=20)	51.5% (n=53)
Very engaged (4)	28.5% (n=41)	25.0% (n=14)	30.7% (n=27)	21.3% (n=19)	41.9% (n=18)	40.5% (n=15)	30.1% (n=31)
Total	144	56	88	89	43	37	103
Mean for Scorecard	2.99	2.96	3.01	2.88	3.26	3.32	3.10

Table A23. Board Recruitment Criteria of Responding Organizations					
	Respondents				
Criteria	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Willingness to give time to the organization					
Not important (1)	2.8% (n=4)	3.6% (n=2)	2.2% (n=2)	2.2% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)
Somewhat important (2)	17.9% (n=26)	21.4% (n=12)	15.7% (n=14)	16.9% (n=15)	25.0% (n=11)
Very important (3)	79.3% (n=115)	75.0% (n=42)	82.0% (n=73)	80.9% (n=72)	75.0% (n=33)
Total	145	56	89	89	44
Mean for Ranking	2.77	2.71	2.80	2.79	2.75
Specialized skill (finance, marketing, law, IT, etc.)					
Not important (1)	6.9% (n=10)	5.4% (n=3)	8.0% (n=7)	10.2% (n=9)	0.0% (n=0)
Somewhat important (2)	42.4% (n=61)	33.9% (n=19)	47.7% (n=42)	46.6% (n=41)	36.4% (n=16)
Very important (3)	50.7% (n=73)	60.7% (n=34)	44.3% (n=39)	43.2% (n=38)	63.6% (n=28)
Total	144	56	88	88	44
Mean for Ranking	2.44	2.55	2.36	2.33	2.64
Prior knowledge of the organization's mission					
Not important (1)	16.0% (n=23)	21.4% (n=12)	12.5% (n=11)	13.6% (n=12)	18.2% (n=8)
Somewhat important (2)	49.3% (n=71)	50.0% (n=28)	48.9% (n=43)	50.0% (n=44)	50.0% (n=22)
Very important (3)	34.7% (n=50)	28.6% (n=16)	38.6% (n=34)	36.4% (n=32)	31.8% (n=14)
Total	144	56	88	88	44
Mean for Ranking	2.19	2.07	2.26	2.23	2.14
Relationship with current board members					
Not important (1)	37.2% (n=54)	37.5% (n=21)	37.1% (n=33)	36.0% (n=32)	40.9% (n=18)
Somewhat important (2)	52.4% (n=76)	53.6% (n=30)	51.7% (n=46)	52.8% (n=47)	47.7% (n=21)
Very important (3)	10.3% (n=15)	8.9% (n=5)	11.2% (n=10)	11.2% (n=10)	11.4% (n=5)
Total	145	56	89	89	44
Mean for Ranking	1.73	1.71	1.74	1.75	1.70
Access to personal and/or donor resources					
Not important (1)	20.7% (n=30)	17.9% (n=10)	22.5% (n=20)	23.6% (n=21)	13.6% (n=6)
Somewhat important (2)	45.5% (n=66)	44.6% (n=25)	46.1% (n=41)	42.7% (n=38)	47.7% (n=21)
Very important (3)	33.8% (n=49)	37.5% (n=21)	31.5% (n=28)	33.7% (n=30)	38.6% (n=17)
Total	145	56	89	89	44

Mean for Ranking	2.13	2.20	2.09	2.10	2.25

Table A24. Funding Sources of Responding Organizations

Funding Source	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Government	14.2%	15.8%	12.9%	9.6%	23.7%
Private donors	44.2%	38.2%	48.7%	52.3%	28.5%
Private grant making institutions	12.6%	19.7%	7.9%	14.4%	8.2%
Programs and fees	18.8%	15.4%	20.5%	16.4%	23.4%
Other	10.2%	10.7%	10.0%	7.4%	16.2%

Table A25. Indicators of Excellence among Responding Organizations

Indicator	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
External audit	58.2% (n=82)	61.8% (n=34)	57.8% (n=48)	42.9% (n=39)	93.2% (n=41)
Written conflict of interest policy	70.2% (n=99)	80.0% (n=44)	66.3% (n=55)	60.4% (n=55)	97.7% (n=43)
Formal process for employees to report complaints without retaliation (whistle-blower policy)	57.4% (n=81)	69.1% (n=38)	51.8% (n=43)	46.2% (n=42)	84.1% (n=37)
Document destruction and retention policy	56.7% (n=80)	72.7% (n=40)	48.2% (n=40)	44.0% (n=40)	88.6% (n=39)
Board orientation process	63.8% (n=90)	70.9% (n=39)	60.2% (n=50)	49.5% (n=45)	77.3% (n=34)
Program evaluation process	57.4% (n=81)	63.6% (n=35)	55.4% (n=46)	49.5% (n=45)	77.3% (n=34)
Board member recruitment process	57.4% (n=81)	60.0% (n=33)	56.6% (n=47)	47.3% (n=43)	81.8% (n=36)
Risk management	40.4% (n=57)	43.6% (n=24)	38.6% (n=32)	26.4% (n=24)	68.2% (n=30)
Total	**141**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Table A26. Planning by Responding Organizations

Plan	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Succession plan	20.6% (n=29)	20.0% (n=11)	21.7% (n=18)	15.4% (n=14)	34.1% (n=15)
Strategic plan	64.5% (n=91)	67.3% (n=37)	63.9% (n=53)	56.0% (n=51)	84.1% (n=37)
Fundraising plan	63.8% (n=90)	60.0% (n=33)	67.5% (n=56)	60.4% (n=55)	75.0% (n=33)
Communication plan	41.1% (n=58)	32.7% (n=18)	48.2% (n=40)	35.2% (n=32)	52.3% (n=23)

Crisis action plan	26.2% (n=37)	21.8% (n=12)	30.1% (n=25)	15.4% (n=14)	47.7% (n=21)
Total	**141**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Table A27. Funding Priorities of Responding Organizations

Priority	Respondents				
	All	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
Support for specific programs	2.76	2.57	2.88	2.71	2.82
Overhead and operations (salaries, benefits)	3.22	3.62	2.93	3.46	2.86
Supplies	5.11	5.32	4.97	4.60	6.14
Facilities (maintenance, upgrade)	4.67	4.62	4.69	4.94	4.02
Developing reserves for long term	4.91	5.18	4.73	4.73	5.25
Flexible capital for organizational change/growth (including impact investing)	4.67	4.44	4.82	4.76	4.39
Planning and governance	5.40	5.08	5.59	5.28	5.64
Leadership/staff professional development	5.02	4.80	5.13	5.13	4.89
Total	**130**	**52**	**77**	**84**	**44**

*Mean rankings are presented where 1 = "Most Important" and 8 = "Least Important."

Table A28. Outcome or Impact Evaluation at Responding Organizations

Written process to measure the outcomes of impacts of programs	Respondents				
	All	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
Yes	62.0% (n=85)	76.4% (n=42)	53.1% (n=43)	55.6% (n=50)	76.7% (n=33)
Total	**137**	**55**	**81**	**90**	**43**

Table A29. Utility of Outcomes/Impact Measurement among Responding Organizations

Utility	Respondents				
	All	**Human Services**	**Other Subsect.**	**Annual Budget <$500K**	**Annual Budget ≥$500K**
Very useful, needs little or no improvement	16.5% (n=14)	19.0% (n=8)	14.0% (n=6)	10.0% (n=5)	27.3% (n=9)
Useful, but needs improvement	76.5% (n=65)	78.6% (n=33)	74.4% (n=32)	78.0% (n=39)	72.7% (n=24)
Not very useful, needs much improvement	5.9% (n=5)	2.4% (n=1)	9.3% (n=4)	10.0% (n=5)	0.0% (n=0)
Misleading, needs to be totally redesigned	1.2% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	2.3% (n=1)	2.0% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)
Total	**85**	**42**	**43**	**50**	**33**

*Only respondents indicating that a written outcomes/impact measurement process is in place at their organization are included in analyses.

Table A30. Frequency of Use of Outcomes/Impact Measurement among Responding Organizations

Frequency	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Very often	54.1% (n=46)	52.4% (n=22)	55.8% (n=24)	46.0% (n=23)	66.7% (n=22)
Sometimes	42.4% (n=36)	42.9% (n=18)	41.9% (n=18)	48.0% (n=24)	33.3% (n=11)
Rarely	3.5% (n=3)	4.8% (n=2)	2.3% (n=1)	6.0% (n=3)	0.0% (n=0)
Never	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)
Total	**85**	**42**	**43**	**50**	**33**

*Only respondents indicating that a written outcomes/impact measurement process is in place at their organization are included in analyses.

Table A31. Investment in Professional Development among Responding Organizations

PD Investment	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Yes	65.2% (n=92)	65.5% (n=36)	63.9% (n=53)	48.4% (n=44)	100% (n=44)
No	22.0% (n=31)	20.0% (n=11)	24.1% (n=20)	34.1% (n=31)	0.0% (n=0)
Not sure	0.7% (n=1)	1.8% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)	1.1% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)
Does not apply/do not have employees	12.1% (n=17)	12.7% (n=7)	12.0% (n=10)	16.5% (n=15)	0.0% (n=0)
Total	**141**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Welborn Baptist Foundation

DIEHL CONSULTING GROUP
evaluation | analytics | solutions

Table A32. Barriers Preventing Professional Development at Responding Organizations

Barrier	Respondents
	All
Lack of funds	
Not a factor	34.5% (n=10)
A small factor	13.8% (n=4)
A significant factor	10.3% (n=3)
The primary factor	31.0% (n=9)
The only factor	10.3% (n=3)
Total	**29**
Lack of time	
Not a factor	32.1% (n=9)
A small factor	21.4% (n=6)
A significant factor	35.7% (n=10)
The primary factor	7.1% (n=2)
The only factor	3.6% (n=1)
Total	**28**
Unsure where to go for training	
Not a factor	55.2% (n=16)
A small factor	20.7% (n=6)
A significant factor	17.2% (n=5)
The primary factor	6.9% (n=2)
The only factor	0.0% (n=0)
Total	**29**

*Only respondents indicating that their organization *does not* invest in professional development are included in analyses. Sample size prevented further disaggregation.

Table A33. Priority of Investment in Professional Development among Responding Organizations

Priority of PD Investment	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
High priority	24.6% (n=34)	25.9% (n=14)	22.9% (n=19)	26.4% (n=24)	22.7% (n=10)
Priority	46.4% (n=64)	51.9% (n=28)	43.4% (n=36)	37.4% (n=34)	65.9% (n=29)
Probably not a priority	19.6% (n=27)	11.1% (n=6)	25.3% (n=21)	23.1% (n=21)	11.4% (n=5)
Definitely not a priority	9.4% (n=13)	11.1% (n=6)	8.4% (n=7)	13.2% (n=12)	0.0% (n=0)
Total	**138**	**54**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Table A34. Benefits Offered by Responding Organizations

Benefit	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Group healthcare plan	30.9% (n=43)	34.5% (n=19)	28.9% (n=24)	9.9% (n=9)	72.7% (n=32)
Dental plan	30.2% (n=42)	30.9% (n=17)	30.1% (n=25)	12.1% (n=11)	65.9% (n=29)
403(b) or other retirement plan	35.3% (n=49)	40.0% (n=22)	32.5% (n=27)	15.4% (n=14)	75.0% (n=33)
Paid family leave	20.1% (n=28)	27.3% (n=15)	15.7% (n=13)	8.8% (n=8)	40.9% (n=18)
Paid time off (vacation days, sick days, etc.)	64.7% (n=90)	78.2% (n=43)	56.6% (n=47)	48.4% (n=44)	100% (n=44)
Does not apply/no employees	25.9% (n=36)	18.2% (n=10)	30.1% (n=25)	37.4% (n=34)	2.3% (n=1)
Other	10.1% (n=14)	7.3% (n=4)	12.0% (n=10)	7.7% (n=7)	13.6% (n=6)
Total	**139**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Table A35. Access to Funders and Policymakers among Responding Organizations

Access to Group	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Local funders	85.6% (n=119)	92.7% (n=51)	80.7% (n=67)	82.4% (n=75)	93.2% (n=41)
Local policymakers	71.2% (n=99)	74.5% (n=41)	69.9% (n=58)	63.7% (n=58)	86.4% (n=38)
State funders	48.9% (n=68)	50.9% (n=28)	48.2% (n=40)	40.7% (n=37)	65.9% (n=29)
State policymakers	51.8% (n=72)	52.7% (n=29)	51.8% (n=43)	44.0% (n=40)	68.2% (n=30)
Federal funders	28.8% (n=40)	23.6% (n=13)	32.5% (n=27)	20.9% (n=19)	43.2% (n=19)
Federal policymakers	28.1% (n=39)	32.7% (n=18)	25.3% (n=21)	15.4% (n=14)	52.3% (n=23)
Total	**139**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Table A36. Intentional Contact and/or Communication with Funders and Policymakers among Responding Organizations

Intentionally Plan Contact and/or Communication	Respondents				
	All	Human Services	Other Subsect.	Annual Budget <$500K	Annual Budget ≥$500K
Yes	50.4% (n=70)	56.4% (n=31)	47.0% (n=39)	47.3% (n=43)	56.8% (n=25)
No	41.0% (n=57)	40.0% (n=22)	41.0% (n=34)	44.0% (n=40)	36.4% (n=16)
Not sure	8.6% (n=12)	3.6% (n=2)	12.0% (n=10)	8.8% (n=8)	6.8% (n=3)
Total	**139**	**55**	**83**	**91**	**44**

Qualitative Survey Responses

Table A37. Biggest Challenge other than Funding Faced by Survey Respondents

Challenge Code	Respondents
Staffing	26.8% (n=37)
Volunteers	21.0% (n=29)
Marketing/Awareness	17.4% (n=24)
Participants	10.1% (n=14)
Scaling/Reach	5.8% (n=8)
Facilities/Equipment	5.1% (n=7)
Other	5.1% (n=7)
Board	3.6% (n=5)
Mission/Vision	2.9% (n=4)
Partnerships/Collaboration	2.2% (n=3)
Total	**138**

Table A38. Biggest Challenge other than Funding Faced by Survey Respondents (Verbatim Comments)

Verbatim Comment	Code
Volunteers to serve on the BOD	BOARD
getting good board members; good volunteers	BOARD
Engaged Board Members & Volunteers	BOARD
Board Recruiting/Development	BOARD
Board Member engagement	BOARD
We are constrained by our physical plant - it is too small.	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
too many beds for the population	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
Services/Equipment/Facility upkeep	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
Maintenance on equipment	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
Maintenance cost, payroll expense, office supplies	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
Keeping up with technology	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
Data base	FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT
visibility	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Sustaining a presence online and for social media.	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Recognition, Advertising	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Recognition of the need/the growing health consequences of not receiving supports needed	MARKETING/AWARENESS
recognition in the community	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Potential donors understanding the need for our services	MARKETING/AWARENESS

Outreach/Marketing	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Marketing who we serve and reaching new people.	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Marketing	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Marketing	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Marketing	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Marketing	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Getting the word out about us and what we do.	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Educating the public about philanthropy	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Community perception about what we do and for whom	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Community Knowledge /Support for inclusion of people with intellectual /developmental disabilities	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Community Awareness	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Community Awareness	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Communication	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Communicating our existence to those who might benefit	MARKETING/AWARENESS
awareness of our impact for community service	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Awareness	MARKETING/AWARENESS
awareness	MARKETING/AWARENESS
awareness	MARKETING/AWARENESS
Transitioning into a city development mentality	MISSION/VISION
Navigating in a healthy way through the course change resulting from clarified vision. How do we communicate and educate our donors? How do we more to more sustainable models of ministry, funding, etc. How to we operate in light of who we are becoming vs who we used to be.	MISSION/VISION
Moving to an impact model and staying true to strategic giving areas.	MISSION/VISION
move to collective impact	MISSION/VISION
We are only 1-year old, just now building our strategic map	OTHER
Weather	OTHER
Specialty care in the area for Multiple Sclerosis	OTHER
Recruitment of new Orchestra & Chorus members	PARTICIPANTS
recruiting students	PARTICIPANTS
participation	PARTICIPANTS
Obtaining and Maintaining enthusiastic participants with the time to devote to our projects	PARTICIPANTS
Member Engagement and Retention	PARTICIPANTS
Maintaining student enrollment	PARTICIPANTS
Improvement in those men we assist	PARTICIPANTS
Getting people who need the service to come to the program	PARTICIPANTS
gathering a younger crowd	PARTICIPANTS
Finding WWII era military Veterans	PARTICIPANTS
Finding qualified families for our program.	PARTICIPANTS
Enrollment	PARTICIPANTS
Client engagement	PARTICIPANTS
Attendance	PARTICIPANTS
Sustaining collaborative partnerships (i.e. working through systems challenges and differing values to create permanent, positive changes that better serve our mutual clients.)	PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATION

Welborn Baptist Foundation

DIEHL CONSULTING GROUP
evaluation | analytics | solutions

Making and growing greater connections within our local community on all levels and seeing greater collaboration opportunities come to light and result development of collaborative efforts	PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATION
Collaboration and coordination with other services	PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATION
Serving all who need our expertise. (So we also are working to help community orgs stretch and improve knowledge base/quantity/quality/access services.)	SCALING/REACH
Scaling	SCALING/REACH
Reaching out and providing services to the elderly and disabled.	SCALING/REACH
Patient volume	SCALING/REACH
Operating in developing nations.	SCALING/REACH
Managing rapid growth	SCALING/REACH
Managing healthy growth and scaling	SCALING/REACH
Increasing outreach	SCALING/REACH
Team member exhaustion from wearing too many hats. You see this form the ED, to administrative assistant. Non-profits are IT, HR, grant writers, leaders, listeners, marketing, fundraising, facilities, and the list continues. :):) We do what we do because we love it but I do see strain on staff being pulled to put on events to data entry, to everything. Too many hats.	STAFFING
Staffing limitations	STAFFING
Staffing	STAFFING
Staffing	STAFFING
Staffing	STAFFING
Staffing	STAFFING
staff size	STAFFING
Staff members are wearing too many different organizational hats.	STAFFING
Staff Capacity, Being seen as needed service for children and families	STAFFING
Recruiting front-line staff who are paid $10/hr.	STAFFING
Recruiting and Maintaining Quality Human Resources	STAFFING
Qualified staff	STAFFING
Qualified administrator willing to work for limited pay	STAFFING
Professional employees	STAFFING
personnel	STAFFING
Paying employees what they're worth	STAFFING
Not having enough full-time staff members to manage all the various functions of the organization	STAFFING
Long-term, having credentialed, qualified early childhood educators.	STAFFING
Lack of staff, a need to increase awareness, more focused strategic planning	STAFFING
Lack of staff	STAFFING
IT support	STAFFING
Infrastructure	STAFFING
Hiring trained instructors	STAFFING
Hiring quality front line staff in a tight labor market	STAFFING
Hiring direct support staff, offering competitive wages in all positions, health care costs	STAFFING
Finding/Retaining Employees	STAFFING
finding qualified staff and retaining staff	STAFFING
Finding employees who can work for what we pay.	STAFFING

Finding dependable entry level employees, reducing turnover, providing leadership development opportunities as a retention tool	STAFFING
Executing a seamless transfer of leadership	STAFFING
employment	STAFFING
Building capacity of human capital to address need	STAFFING
Attracting and retaining quality staff	STAFFING
Attracting and retaining licensed personnel	STAFFING
administrative infrastructure	STAFFING
Adequate staffing	STAFFING
Adequate affordable housing, Lack of staff	STAFFING
Volunteers resources	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteers are aging; recruiting younger volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteer time	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteer Recruitment	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteer numbers.	VOLUNTEERS
Volunteer Engagement and Retention	VOLUNTEERS
Staffing volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Retaining trained volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Recruitment of volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Recruiting Volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
recruiting volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
obtaining volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Number of volunteer leaders	VOLUNTEERS
lack of volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
identifying effective volunteer management	VOLUNTEERS
Having enough volunteers and vehicle expenses	VOLUNTEERS
Getting new volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Getting folks to volunteer	VOLUNTEERS
finding volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Finding volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
Finding Foster families to save more animals.	VOLUNTEERS
Finding committed volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
volunteers	VOLUNTEERS
all volunteer organization- keeping volunteer's	VOLUNTEERS
long-term sustainability	OTHER
Growing critical community needs	OTHER
Documentation	OTHER
availability of affordable housing for our clients	OTHER