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INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 Pandemic has had devastating effects around the globe since it was first identified in the fall of 2019. The first case in Indiana was confirmed on March 6, the same date Governor Holcomb declared it a public health emergency in the state. On March 12, the Governor ordered restrictions on the size of public gatherings and encouraged social distancing in various facilities. Four days later, he prohibited in-person restaurant and bar services, and cancelled non-essential surgical procedures. More restrictive guidelines followed, directing Indiana residents to stay at home except for essential workers and those engaged in essential activities.1

Since then, COVID-19 has devastated Indiana communities. As of July 2, 2020, almost 46,500 Indiana residents spread across all 92 counties, have been confirmed with COVID-19. Many required hospitalization (currently about 700 are hospitalized, down from more than 1,600 in mid-April), including intensive care and access to respirators. Almost 2,500 have died – declining from 40 per day in mid-April to about 15 per day in mid-June.2

COVID-19 has also devastated the economic health of Indiana communities. Since early March, the number of people filing initial unemployment claims has increased from about 2,300 per week to more than 120,000 by the end of March. Total continued claims reached an all-time high of more than 272,000 in early May, up from less than 20,000 before the Pandemic hit.3 While both indicators have declined since then, the loss of jobs and business income, especially in the retail and hospitality industries, have been profound. Most economists expect recovery to pre-Pandemic conditions to be difficult and slow, and perhaps incomplete.

Even before the COVID-19 Pandemic hit, many Indiana residents were already facing profound challenges. An analysis of the ALICE (Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed) population shows that more than a third (37 percent, 950,000) of Indiana’s 2.6 million households were poor or struggling to make ends in meet in 2018.4 Another 11 percent were on the cusp of, just barely above, the income threshold for ALICE. The Pandemic has further aggravated the challenges faced by these families – they are mainly low-paid hourly workers without savings and/or options to work from home. And many more have joined their ranks because of the Pandemic.

1 The state is currently in Phase 4 of a five-phase effort to reopen the economy. Most of the state entered Phase II on May 4, Phase III on May 22, and Phase 4 on June 12, with plans to move to the final Phase 5 in early July. For more information, see https://backontrack.in.gov/2348.htm.
2 For current details, see https://www.coronavirus.in.gov/2393.htm
3 See http://www.stats.indiana.edu/claims/industry-visualization.asp
4 For information, see https://www.iuw.org/alice.
COVID-19 AND INDIANA NONPROFITS

In the face of these developments, we wanted to examine how the Pandemic was affecting Indiana nonprofits and those they serve. To do so, we launched a survey on April 29, 2020, asking Indiana nonprofits how the impact of the Pandemic was affecting the services they provided, as well as their finances and staff. Appendix A includes a copy of the survey. By May 31, a total of 512 Indiana nonprofits had completed the survey in full or in part.5

We asked local United Way organizations in each county to distribute the survey invitations to all nonprofits on their distribution lists. Because respondents were not randomly selected to participate in the survey, our findings may not be representative of Indiana nonprofits.6 This is confirmed by Appendix B, which shows that respondents are disproportionately large and human service nonprofits: only 12 percent have no paid staff; more than half (52 percent) are human service nonprofits with the rest scattered across 11 other fields. By comparison, a comprehensive survey of Indiana nonprofits conducted in 2017 found that 38 percent had no paid staff and that only 27 percent were human service nonprofits.7

In the analysis that follows, we show how the COVID-19 Pandemic has impacted Indiana nonprofits in terms of services, finances, and staff. We also examine how these patterns vary by size of the organization (measured as the number of full-time equivalent employees, FTEs8) and primary field of activity (focusing on fields that represent at least 5 percent of respondents),9 if the relationships are significant.

---

5 Respondents were recruited by executive directors of United Way organizations in Indiana at the request of Kathryn Habecker, Impact & Advocacy Manager, Indiana United Ways (www.iuw.org). The survey was hosted and managed by the Indiana Nonprofits Sector project (https://nonprofit.indiana.edu/) under the direction of Kirsten Grønbjerg and support by Elizabeth McAvoy. The survey instrument was based in large part on a similar instrument used by United Way of Central Ohio in partnership with the Human Service Chamber of Franklin County and Illuminology. Some questions were based on a survey on “Nonprofit Sector Response to COVID-19” by the Caster Family Center for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Research at the University of San Diego (see https://digital.sandiego.edu/npi-npissues/4/).

6 The 512 respondents represent only a small segment of the estimated 60,000 Indiana nonprofits, which include many traditional charities and some 9,000 churches, as well as membership associations and mutual benefit groups, such as fraternal organizations and recreational groups. For more information, see https://nonprofit.indiana.edu/research-results/comprehensive-nonprofit-database.html.

7 For a profile of Indiana nonprofits in 2017, please see “Indiana Nonprofit Survey Data Tool” available here: https://nonprofit.indiana.edu/index.html (bottom of page).

8 As of March 1, 2020, the vast majority (88 percent) have some paid staff, with an average of 46 full-time staff and 18 part-time staff, but the median is only 4 for both full-time and part-time staff.

9 Human service (52 percent), education-related (13 percent), health (other than hospitals, 10 percent), arts, culture, and humanities (5 percent), and religion (5 percent). We excluded public, societal, and mutual benefit (9 percent) because they are not especially relevant for suspending and moving online programs and services.
Impact on Mission and Service Delivery

COVID-19 has had a profound impact on the volume and format of services provided by Indiana nonprofits. As Figure 1 shows, 70 percent say that at least some of their programs operate in a limited or reduced capacity because of the Pandemic. Almost as many (69 percent) say that they are offering more programming via phone or online platforms than before the Pandemic. Moreover, the majority (60 percent) say that they have suspended or ended programs because of the Pandemic.

**Figure 1: Impact on Programming and Service Delivery (n=488-512)**

It is disproportionately larger nonprofits that have reduced programming or are offering more programs via online or phone platforms. Size is not related to having suspended or ended programs.

Changes in service modality (to online or phone platforms) is related to field of activity and is especially prevalent for health nonprofits. So is whether nonprofits have suspended or ended programs (most prevalent for arts and humanities and education nonprofits). Field of activity is not related to limiting or reducing programming.

We asked those that had suspended or ended programs to indicate which types of programs these were from a list of 25 types of services. Respondents checked an

---

10 The median number of programs now operating in a limited or reduced capacity is 3 for those who provided the number of programs (the mean is 5.0).
11 The median number of programs that have been suspended to ended is 3 for those who provided the number of programs (mean is 4.6).
12 In our crosstab test of significance for the relationship between field of service and limiting or curtailing programs, more than 20 percent of cells have expected counts of less than 5.
average of 2.9 different programs (the median count was 2 different programs.) Not surprisingly, as Figure 2 shows, these are disproportionately services that involve close personal interactions over time, such as volunteer programs, after-school, or mentorship programs – all activities that pose high risk of infection from COVID-19.

We also looked at how these curtailments vary by size and field of activity but focus only program changes identified by 15 percent or more of respondents. Size is important for just two program areas: larger nonprofits are more likely to have suspended or terminated programs in volunteering and early learning. Given the programs involved, it is not surprising that education nonprofits are more likely to have curtailed or ended programs related to summer camps (as are arts and humanities nonprofits), after-school, mentorship, early learning, and in-school programs. Additionally, arts and humanities nonprofits are more likely to have curtailed or ended programs related to volunteering.\(^{13}\)

**Figure 2:** Key Programs or Services that have been Suspended or Ended (n=339)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer programs</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camps/programs</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early learning</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot meal service</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprises</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial literacy</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only programs identified by 7 percent or more are included.

We also asked which of the specific services were now being offered via phone or online platforms (see Figure 3). Respondents checked an average of 2.8 different programs (the median was 2). The ones mentioned most frequently were some of the same programs as had been suspended or ended (e.g., mentorship and volunteer

\(^{13}\) In our crosstab test of significance for the relationship between field of service and programs suspended, more than 20 percent of cells have expected counts of less than 5.
programs), but include a broader variety of services.

Larger nonprofits were more likely to make these types of changes in the modality of service delivery for life skills programs, while mid-sized nonprofits were more likely to have done so for advocacy and behavioral health programs. Human service nonprofits were overrepresented among those that had moved services online for advocacy, rental assistance, and housing support, health nonprofits for services involving behavioral health, and education nonprofits for services involving mentorship.

**Figure 3: Types of Programming now Offered Via Telephone or Online Platforms (n=320)**

- Other (please specify): 40%
- Life skills: 26%
- Advocacy: 22%
- Mentorship: 19%
- Volunteer programs: 18%
- Behavioral health services: 17%
- Rental assistance: 16%
- Housing support: 15%
- Physical health services: 11%
- Early learning: 11%
- Senior services: 9%
- Addiction services: 9%
- In-school: 9%
- After-school: 8%
- Summer camps/programs: 8%
- Financial literacy: 8%
- Mentorship: 7%

NOTE: Only programs identified by 7 percent or more are included

**Need for Technology Assistance**

The Governor’s stay at home order and the extensive efforts to move services to phone or online platforms placed a premium on having adequate hardware and software technology to manage delivering and receiving services in this format for both nonprofits and the clients involved. For clients, this involved being IT literate and having access to cameras, microphones, high speed internet, and needed software. For nonprofits, making sure that staff had similar resources, as well as data management systems, IT security, and remote access to office files and equipment, was also needed.

We asked only general questions about whether the nonprofit organization itself or its clients needed hardware equipment, such as tablets or computers, or software
assistance, such as broadband, videoconferencing subscriptions, or computer programs. As Figure 4 shows, less than half (44 percent) indicated no such needs. One third or more said that their clients needed hardware (38 percent) or software (32 percent) assistance. Almost as many said their own nonprofit needed hardware (32 percent) or software (29 percent) assistance.

**Figure 4: Need for Hardware and Software Assistance (n=463)**

![Figure 4](image)

Hardware needs (both for clients and the organizations) were particularly pronounced for larger nonprofits, as were client software needs. Health nonprofits were especially likely to identify client needs for software assistance.

**Impact on Revenues**

The Pandemic has also had a major impact on nonprofit revenues. As Figure 5 shows, 71 percent say they have lost revenue since March 1 because of the pandemic, especially larger nonprofits. Slightly fewer (67 percent) report they have cancelled a fundraising event since March 6. Of those who had to cancel events, the median loss is $11,000.

We also asked those who lost revenue what types of revenues they had lost. As Figure 6 shows, losses in donations and fundraising events were particularly pervasive with two-thirds or more indicating that they had lost this type of revenue (70 and 67 percent respectively). Smaller nonprofits were more likely to indicate losses in donations than larger ones. Almost half (46 percent) also said they had lost fee-for-service revenues, most likely because clients were unable to access services (such as in-school programs). Losses in this type of revenue were most prevalent among larger nonprofits and health nonprofits.
There were losses in other types of revenues as well, such as retail revenues, government funding, reimbursements, or other types of revenues. However, these types of losses affected only about 12-16 percent of respondents, with larger nonprofits more likely to report losses in government funding and reimbursement income than smaller ones and arts and humanities nonprofits more likely to report losses in other revenue.

Moreover, for those with losses in at least one of these types of revenues, 76 percent had losses in two or more types of revenues, 42 percent experienced losses across three or more types, and 14 percent had losses in 4 or more types. The median loss was about 20 percent regardless of type of revenue involved.
**SBA Loans Via CARES Act**

Because of the economic devastations caused by COVID-19, Congress enacted the CARES Act (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act) on March 27, 2020. The act included the Paycheck Projection Program, designed to provide small businesses (500 or fewer employees), including nonprofits, with access to loans to pay up to 8 weeks of payroll costs, including benefits, as well as mortgages, rent, and utilities. The loan is fully forgiven, provided the employer uses the funds primarily for payroll and does not reduce the full-time headcount or salaries and wages.\(^\text{14}\) Competition for the loans was high, and the first round of funds were exhausted within two weeks.

We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they had applied for these loans, and if so, whether their loan was approved with funding. As Figure 7 shows, 49 percent applied and were approved with funding, suggesting that they were able to recoup at least some of the revenues lost due to the Pandemic. These were disproportionately larger nonprofits.\(^\text{15}\) About a quarter (27 percent) did not apply, and 20 percent reported that they were not eligible for the loans. In both cases, these were disproportionately smaller nonprofits. Only 4 percent applied for a loan but were either not approved or funding was not available.

**Figure 7**: Percent Who Applied for SBA Loan (n=444)

\[\text{Have applied for a SBA loan and were approved with funding, 49%}\]

\[\text{Did not apply for a SBA loan, 27%}\]

\[\text{Were not eligible for a SBA loan, 20%}\]

\[\text{Applied for a SBA loan but were not approved or funding was not available, 4%}\]


\(^\text{15}\) In our crosstab test of significance for the relationship between size and SBA loans, more than 20 percent of cells have expected counts of less than 5.
Effects on Staffing

Finally, we looked at the effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on paid staff. We were interested both in whether access to volunteers were affecting staff and whether the organization had laid-off paid staff or was planning to do so.

As Figure 8 shows, under a half (43 percent) of nonprofits responding to the survey say that lack of volunteers is placing greater demand on staff. Mid-sized nonprofits and those in the human service fields were more likely to report this to be the case. It is important to note that this is in addition to challenges posed for staff by having to work from home, telling clients that programs have been curtailed or ended, or moving program delivery systems to online or phone format.

23 percent said that they have laid off or furloughed some paid staff since March 6 because of the COVID-19 Pandemic. This is especially the case for larger nonprofits. Of those that have laid off or furloughed paid staff, almost two-thirds have laid off or furloughed full-time workers (median is one full-time worker) and 89 percent have laid off part-time workers (median is four part-time workers). Only 3 percent say that they are likely to lay off or furlough workers by May 31.

Unfortunately, we did not ask whether the organization had cut hours for workers or reduced wages or salary in other ways, nor did we ask whether the organization had implemented a hiring freeze and was leaving jobs unfilled that would have been filled otherwise. Most likely all of these options were employed by Indiana nonprofits.

Figure 8: Impact on Staff (n=436-444)
CONCLUSION

Indiana nonprofits have been profoundly impacted by COVID-19 across multiple dimensions. They have curtailed or suspended programs and operate other programs in limited or reduced capacity. They have also moved many programs to online or phone platforms, despite widespread technology needs by their clients or for their own operations.

They have also had major revenue shortfalls, although access to the Payroll Protection Plan under the CARES Act is likely to have softened the blow for some, especially larger nonprofits. Finally, staff are facing significant challenges from a variety of source – retooling programs and having to compensate for missing volunteers. While job losses appear to have been modest so far, that may change.

In many ways, these developments suggest that Indiana communities are hit by a triple whammy – not just by the COVID-19 Pandemic itself and the widespread economic disruptions brought about by efforts to curtail it, but by a safety net torn to tatters, just as the need for services is growing. As we noted earlier, more than a third of Indiana households faced significant economic hardship well before the Pandemic hit, just a paycheck, car repair, or medical bill away from disaster. Many more have joined their ranks over the last 3 months.

The impacts have been so dramatic and the need so great in some communities, that key institutions – United Way, community foundations, mayors, county officials, hospitals, universities, schools, chambers of commerce, major employers – have forged coordinated and collaborative responses. We view these developments as silver linings on otherwise very dark clouds. If nurtured and sustained over time, these collaborative efforts may provide the basis for stronger communities with better safety nets going forward.
SUBJECT LINE: Please Complete Survey About COVID-19’s Impact on Indiana Nonprofits (Mid-April 2020)

The Indiana United Way and our partners want to better understand the greatest needs of Indiana’s nonprofit sector during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Your responses will help inform United Way and other community institutions, government officials, funders, media, and other decision makers about the impact of the Pandemic.

Your participation does not present any risk other than the time involved to complete the survey (about 5-7 minutes). All responses are completely confidential and will be anonymous unless you provide an email address. Results will only be shared in aggregate.

This survey is designed to be taken by a senior leader in your nonprofit who has an overall understanding of your operations. If that is not you, please share this survey with an appropriate person at your organization.

If you have questions about the survey or response options, please contact Elizabeth McAvoy by sending an email to nonprof@indiana.edu or call 1-866-726-0030 or 1-812-855-5410, but be sure to leave a call-back number and good time for us to call.

We understand your time is precious and we THANK YOU for participating.

EFFECTS ON MISSION/SERVICE DELIVERY

Governor Holcomb declared a state of emergency on March 6, 2020, which was the date of Indiana’s first diagnosed COVID-19 case.

1. Since March 6, 2020, how many of your organization’s key programs or services…
   a. Continue to operate WITHOUT ANY CHANGES _____ [NUMERIC RESPONSE]
   b. Continue to operate in a LIMITED OR REDUCED capacity _____ [NUMERIC RESPONSE]
   c. Have been suspended or ended _____ [NUMERIC RESPONSE]

[DISPLAY IF PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN SUSPENDED OR ENDED]

2. Which key programs or services have been suspended or ended? Select all that apply.
   a. Addiction services j. Hot meal service s. Refugee/Immigration services
   b. Advocacy k. Housing support t. Rental assistance
   c. After-school l. In-School u. Senior services
   d. Behavioral health m. Job training v. Social enterprises
      services
   e. Childcare n. Legal services w. Summer camps/programs
   f. Early learning o. Life skills x. Volunteer programs
   g. Emergency shelter p. Mentorship y. Other (please specify)
   h. Financial literacy q. Physical health services
3. Is your organization now offering more of its programming via telephone or online platforms?
   a. YES, my organization is offering more of its programming via telephone or online platforms
   b. NO, my organization is not doing this [SKIP TO Q5]

[DISPLAY IF PROGRAMMING HAS MOVED TO TELE/ONLINE]
4. What types of programming are now offered via telephone or online platforms? Select all that apply.
   a. Addiction services
   b. Advocacy
   c. After-school services
   d. Behavioral health services
   e. Childcare
   f. Early learning
   g. Emergency shelter
   h. Financial literacy
   i. Food pantry
   j. Hot meal service
   k. Housing support
   l. In-School
   m. Job training
   n. Legal services
   o. Life skills
   p. Mentorship
   q. Physical health services
   r. Reentry services
   s. Refugee/Immigration services
   t. Rental assistance
   u. Senior services
   v. Social enterprises
   w. Summer camps/programs
   x. Volunteer programs
   y. Other (please specify)

5. Does your nonprofit organization and/or your clients currently need assistance with hardware technology (equipment like tablets, computers, etc.) or software technology (broadband, videoconferencing subscriptions, computer programs, etc.) to deliver more programming via telephone or online platforms? Please select all that apply.
   a. My nonprofit organization needs hardware assistance
   b. My nonprofit organization needs software assistance
   c. My clients need hardware assistance.
   d. My clients need software assistance.
   e. No, we do not need these types of assistance at this time

EFFECTS ON BUDGET AND REVENUE

6. Since March 6, 2020, has your nonprofit organization lost revenues due to the COVID-19 crisis?
   a. YES, my nonprofit organization has lost revenues
   b. NO, this has not happened [SKIP TO Q12]

7. Has your nonprofit organization LOST REVENUES due to the COVID-19 crisis from any of the following sources? Select all that apply.
   a. Contributions / Donations
   b. Fee-for-services
   c. Government Funding
   d. Fundraisers
   e. Reimbursements
   f. Retail revenue
   g. Other (please specify) [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]
8. What percent of YOUR TOTAL BUDGET do the lost revenues represent? If you are not sure, please provide your best guess.
   a. [LOST Contributions/Donations] _____ %
   b. [LOST Fee-for Services] _____ %
   c. [LOST Government Funding] _____ %
   d. [LOST Fundraisers] _____ %
   e. [LOST Reimbursements] _____ %
   f. [LOST Retail revenue] _____ %
   g. [LOST Other Revenues] _____ 

9. Since March 6, 2020, has your organization cancelled a fundraising event(s) because of the COVID-19 crisis?
   a. YES, cancelled a fundraising event
   b. NO, this has not happened [SKIP TO Q14]

10. About how many dollars (gross) was your nonprofit organization expecting from the cancelled fundraising event(s)? If you are not sure, please provide your best guess. _____ [NUMERIC RESPONSE]

11. What fundraising actions are you planning to take in May 2020, considering traditional methods may not be possible? [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

12. Looking ahead to the Summer or Fall of 2020, what fundraising opportunities are being considered by your nonprofit organization? [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

13. Did your nonprofit organization apply for an SBA loan via the CARES Act?
   a. YES, applied for an SBA loan and was approved with funding
   b. YES, applied for an SBA loan, but was not approved or no funding available
   c. NO, did NOT to apply for an SBA loan
   d. N/A – my agency is ineligible for an SBA loan

EFFECTS ON STAFFING

14. On March 1, 2020 (before Governor Holcomb declared a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 crisis), about how many people were employed by your organization? If you are not sure, please provide your best guess.
   a. Full-time employees (number) ______
   b. Part-time employees (number) ______

15. Since March 6, 2020, has your nonprofit organization laid off or furloughed staff due to the COVID-19 crisis?
   a. YES, laid off or furloughed staff
   b. NO, this has not happened [SKIP TO Q20]

16. About how many employees has your organization laid off or furloughed since March 6, 2020 due to the COVID-19 crisis? If you are not sure, please provide your best guess.
   a. Full-time employees: number laid off or furloughed since March 6 ______
   b. Part-time employees: number laid off or furloughed since March 6 ______
17. Is your nonprofit organization likely to lay off or furlough employees before May 31, 2020 due to the COVID-19 crisis?
   a. YES, likely to lay off or furlough employees before May 31, 2020
   b. NO, this is not likely to happen [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]

18. About how many employees is your organization likely to lay off or furlough before May 31, 2020 due to the COVID-19 crisis? If you are not sure, please provide your best guess.
   a. Full-time employees: number likely to be laid off or furloughed by May 31 ______
   b. Part-time employees: number likely to be laid off or furloughed by May 31 ______

19. Recognizing that many volunteer activities needed to be stopped, has a lack of volunteers placed greater demand on full-time and part-time staff?
   a. YES, a lack of volunteers placed and is placing a greater demand on staff
   b. NO, this is not affecting us at this time

20. Recognizing that many volunteer activities needed to be stopped, what volunteer needs do you have currently (or need to initiate) that are not being filled? [OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE]

A FEW FINAL QUESTIONS

21. Which of the following subsectors best represent your nonprofit organization's primary mission and programmatic focus? (select one)
   a. Animal welfare (1)
   b. Arts, culture, and humanities (2)
   c. Environment (3)
   d. Higher education (4)
   e. Education (i.e., in school and after-school) (5)
   f. Hospitals (6)
   g. Health (other than hospitals) (7)
   h. Human services (i.e., housing/shelter, food, employment, etc.) (8)
   i. International (9)
   j. Mutual, public, and societal benefit (i.e., civil rights and community development, advocacy groups, neighborhood associations, public grantmaking, etc.) (10)
   k. Religion (11)
   l. Other (please specify) (12)

22. Which Indiana county or counties do you serve? Select all that apply.
   [Check list of all counties in Indiana]

23. Please select the job title that most closely aligns with your job functions.
   a. Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer/President (1)
   b. Chief Operating Officer or Administrative Manager (2)
   c. Chief Financial Officer or Finance Director (3)
   d. Management Team Member (e.g., Development Director, Program Director, etc.) (4)
   e. Board Chair (5)
   f. Other (please specify) (6)
23. Your responses to this survey are completely confidential. They will also remain anonymous, unless you provide your email address below. If you wish to receive a copy of your own responses to the survey, please enter your email address here: __________________

We’re collecting this information to better understand how to support your organization’s work, which is more important than ever. By sharing your experiences and opinions, you are helping us to serve you in the most meaningful way. **THANK YOU!**

Thank you to Dr. Kirsten Grønbjerg and her research assistants from the O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University for donating the time and resources necessary to input and analyze this survey.

And with special thanks to the United Way of Central Ohio, the Human Service Chamber of Franklin County, and Illuminology for partnering on this survey, sharing resources, and providing support.
Appendix B

Figure B.1: Distribution of Respondents by FTE (n=431)

Note: We computed the number of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE) as the number of full-time employees plus one-half the number of part-time employees that the organization reported having on March 1, 2020.

Figure B.2: Distribution of Respondents by Primary Service Field (n=436)