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Executive Summary

- 660 participants, 99% associated with a charitable organization, 89% associated with public charities.
- Participants were asked to compare contribution levels during the first 9 months of 2003 with contribution levels during the first 9 months of 2002.
- All areas of the country and all nonprofit sizes and missions were represented in the responses.
- On the national level, responses indicate a mild economic recovery for the charitable organizations represented by these participants. More respondents (39%) reported that contributions had increased than reported that they had decreased (35%) or stayed the same (21%).
- These results parallel GuideStar’s July 2003 survey, which asked nonprofit respondents to compare contribution levels during the first 6 months of 2003 with the first 6 months of 2002 and showed an improvement over the results of GuideStar’s November 2002 survey, which compared contribution levels during the first 10 months of 2002 with the first 10 months of 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GuideStar Survey</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
<th>Contributions Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2002</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Mild* is the operative term for any recovery indicated by the October survey results; respondents reporting decreased contributions nearly equaled those reporting an increase, and another one-fifth reported stagnant contribution levels.

- New England, the Southeast, and the Great Lakes regions had the greatest percentage of participants reporting increased contributions and the smallest reporting decreased contributions.
- The Plains and Rocky Mountains had the smallest proportion of respondents reporting increased contributions. The Plains, Far West, and Rocky Mountains had the greatest percentage of participants reporting decreased contributions.
• In the Far West, Rocky Mountains, Plains, and Mideast, participants reporting decreased contributions outnumbered participants reporting increased contributions. In other areas of the country, respondents reporting increased contributions outnumbered those reporting decreased contributions.

• Larger organizations represented in this survey fared better than smaller ones. The largest organizations had the greatest percentage of respondents who reported that contributions had increased. This figure dropped steadily as budget levels decreased. The two largest budget levels had the smallest proportion of respondents reporting decreased contributions.

• Organizations in the Medical Research; Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines; and Health—General, Rehabilitation categories were among the “top five” both for greatest percentage of participants reporting increased contributions and for fewest reporting decreased contributions.

• The vast majority of participants (70%) reported that demand for their organizations’ services had increased. The Rocky Mountains had the greatest proportion (80%) of respondents reporting increased demand; the Mideast had the smallest (63%).

• There appears to be no correlation between change in demand and organization size, mission, or change in contribution levels.

Survey Pool

E-mail invitations sent*: 2,858  
Survey participants: 660  
Response rate: 23%  
Responses received from 47 states (no responses from Idaho, Mississippi, or West Virginia), the District of Columbia, Canada, Israel, Uzbekistan, and West Africa  
*To addressees at public charities and private foundations

Nonprofit Type

Survey question: “What type of nonprofit is your organization?”

Total responses 658
• Public charity 89%
• Private foundation/grantmaker 10%
• Not associated with a nonprofit 1%
Contribution Levels, January-September 2003

Survey question: “Does your organization accept contributions?”

Total responses 652
• Yes 96%
• No 4%

Survey question: “Did total contributions to your organization increase, decrease, or stay about the same during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
<th>Contributions Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No location given/ international</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho
### “Best to Worst” by Location and Decreased Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho

### “Best to Worst” by Location and Increased Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho

### Additional Information on Decreased Contributions by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of “Decreased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No location given/international</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho
### Additional Information on Increased Contributions by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No location given/international</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho

### Change in Contributions by Organization Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
<th>Contributions Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### “Best to Worst” by Organization Size and Decreased Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### “Best to Worst” by Organization Size and Increased Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information on Decreased Contributions by Organization Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of “Decreased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information on Increased Contributions by Organization Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area*</td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>Contributions Decreased</td>
<td>Contributions Stayed about the Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
### “Best to Worst” by Subject Area and Decreased Contributions

Note: Subject areas with fewer than 10 responses removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
```
**“Best to Worst” by Subject Area and Increased Contributions**

Note: Subject areas with fewer than 10 responses removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking, Foundations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
```
### More Information on Decreased Contributions by Subject Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of “Decreased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Decreased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
### More Information on Increased Contributions by Subject Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Contributions Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
Reasons for Decreased Contributions

**Survey question:** “What factors caused total contributions to decrease during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002? (Select all that apply.)”

Total responses 220
- Fewer individuals gave 60%
- Gifts from individuals smaller 58%
- Private foundation grants smaller 47%
- Corporate gifts smaller 41%
- Private foundation grants discontinued 28%
- Corporate gifts were discontinued 22%
- Government grants smaller 19%
- Government grants were discontinued 16%
- Government contracts smaller 10%
- Other (see Comments on Decreased Contributions, p. 18) 10%
- Government contracts were discontinued 5%

Demand for Services

**Survey question:** “Did demand for your organization’s services increase, decrease, or stay about the same during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Decreased</th>
<th>Demand Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Demand Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No location given/ international</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia
**No responses received from Idaho
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## Least to Most Increase in Demand by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia

**No responses received from Idaho

## Additional Information on Increased Demand by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Demand Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Demand Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, SC, TN, VA)*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains (CO, MT, UT, WY)**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (AZ, OK, NM, TX)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No responses received from Mississippi or West Virginia

**No responses received from Idaho

## Change in Demand Compared to Change in Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Contributions</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Decreased</th>
<th>Demand Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Demand Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions decreased greatly</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions decreased modestly</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions about the same</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions increased modestly</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions increased greatly</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know about contribution levels/no answer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### More Information on Increased Demand and Change in Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Contributions</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Demand Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Demand Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions decreased greatly</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions decreased modestly</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions about the same</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions increased modestly</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions increased greatly</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know about contributions/no answer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Demand by Organization Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Decreased</th>
<th>Demand Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Demand Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Further Information on Increased Demand by Organization Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Based on Total Annual Expenditures)</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Demand Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$99,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$999,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 mil-$4,999,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 mil-$19,999,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 mil or more</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change in Demand by Subject Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Demand Decreased</th>
<th>Demand Stayed about the Same</th>
<th>Demand Increased</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area
## More Information on Increased Demand by Subject Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area*</th>
<th>No. of “Increased” Responses</th>
<th>Demand Increased Greatly</th>
<th>Demand Increased Modestly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Related</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Legal Related</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases, Disorders, Medical Disciplines</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Job Related</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality, Protection, Beautification</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Nutrition</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health—General, Rehabilitative</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Shelter</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs, National Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health, Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/Membership Benefit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Grantmaking Foundations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, Societal Benefit</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Sports, Leisure, Athletics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Institutes, Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants could select more than one subject area

### Grantmaking

**Survey question:** “Does your organization award grants?”

- Total responses: 644
  - Yes: 18%
  - No: 82%
**Survey question:** “Did the total amount of moneys your organization awarded increase, decrease, or stay about the same during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amounts awarded decreased</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts awarded stayed about the same</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts awarded increased</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Information on Decreased Amounts Awarded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased greatly</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased modestly</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey question:** “Did the number of funding applications/grant requests increase, decrease, or stay about the same during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications decreased</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications stayed about the same</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications increased</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Information on Decreased Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased greatly</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased modestly</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Information on Increased Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased greatly</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased modestly</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents

Survey question: “For classification purposes, what is your primary responsibility with your organization?”

- Total number of responses 653
- Board Member/Board Director/Trustee 5%
- CEO/Executive Director/President 41%
- Chief Financial Officer/Organization Treasurer 6%
- Executive Officer (other than CEO/Executive Director/President or Chief Financial Officer/Organization Treasurer) 6%
- Communications 1%
- Development/Fund-raising 26%
- Fiscal/Finance (other than Chief Financial Officer or Organization Treasurer) 4%
- Marketing 1%
- Other 5%
- Programs and Services 4%
- Technology 1%

Comments on Decreased Contributions

Survey question: “What factors caused total contributions to decrease during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

The following statements were made by individuals associated with public charities. The Comments are organized alphabetically by state and by city within each state. Within each city, attributed comments precede unattributed comments.

Private, Corporate & Government Grants are not contributing to our cause.

Diana M’Caho, CEO/President/Founder
Southern Arizona Women’s Computer Bank
Marana, Ariz.

Development plan not implemented correctly.

Anonymous participant
Carlsbad, Calif.
Comments on Decreased Contributions—Survey question: “What factors caused total contributions to decrease during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

Less emphasis on fundraising this year.  
Jennifer Fleming, Treasurer  
HHS/ED Children’s Center  
Washington, D.C.

Some foundations lengthened time of decision or denied multi-year requests.  
Anonymous participant  
Atlanta, Ga.

Organizations that had supported us—like Jr. League—contributions were almost cut in half.  
Contracts from other organizations were harder to come by.  
Anonymous participant  
Atlanta, Ga.

Also fundraising for capital initiatives.  
Anonymous participant  
Atlanta, Ga.

Supporting churches experienced decreased income.  
Robert Szoke, Director Development/Church Relations  
Chicago District Evangelistic Association  
Chicago, Ill.

We conducted a capital campaign and have only one Development office staff member.  
Gary N. Rowe, CFRE, Vice President,  
Development/Marketing  
Bethany for Children & Families  
Moline, Ill.

Foundations not giving to new organizations.  
Anonymous participant  
Park Ridge, Ill.

Significant job losses reduced capacity of corporations and individuals to give through payroll deduction.  
Anonymous participant  
Anderson, Ind.

Fewer individuals purchased tickets to attend our annual benefit.  
Anonymous participant  
Boston, Mass.
Comments on Decreased Contributions—Survey question: “What factors caused total contributions to decrease during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

Staff reductions (budget cuts).

Anonymous participant
Salisbury, Md.

A number of new staff and staff changes.

Anonymous participant
St. Paul, Minn.

Event sponsorship and participation down.

Matthew Dillane, President
Junior Achievement of Middle America
Kansas City, Mo.

More competition for grants.

Anonymous participant
Raleigh, N.C.

Other area nonprofits and for-profits are competing more rigorously for donations. Our local radio station and newspaper are also offering both dinner and Internet auctions and hurting our fundraisers.

Anonymous participant
Columbus, Nebr.

We had two major non-renewable grants we were unable to replace.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

Lack of staff.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

We are in need of a grant writer who can donate their time to our organization to assist in fundraising.

G. D. Cuda, Executive Director
(CPUSA Inc) Charity Promotions USA Inc.
Utica, N.Y.

Our deficit budget discouraged some foundations.

Anonymous participant
Comments on Decreased Contributions—Survey question: “What factors caused total contributions to decrease during the first nine months of this year compared to the first nine months of 2002?”

With one exception that is pending, government grants and corporate gifts were all categorically denied.

Valerie Ohle, Chairman/Founder/Acting CEO
Wisdom Keepers, Inc.
Knoxville, Tenn.

Local United Way has problems.

Anonymous participant
Reston, Va.

CRT and Bequests were down. Individual contributions were up in both numbers and amounts.

Anonymous participant
Reston, Va.

General Comments

Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?

Comments from public charities precede comments from private foundations/grantmakers. Within each section, comments are organized alphabetically by state and by city within each state. Within each city, attributed comments precede unattributed comments.

Comments from Public Charities

Arizona

We didn’t fare, is the problem. We have two grant writers, we have tried everything that has been offered to us to receive funding so we may continue our services, and still have yet to receive any in 3 years.

Diana M’Caho, CEO/President/Founder
Southern Arizona Women’s Computer Bank
Marana, Ariz.

We have seen a greater number of smaller donations over the past years. This is largely due to the nature of our organization and the publicity both our organization has received and the tragedy that has faced public safety officers throughout Arizona.

Brian Kilcrease, Operations Manager
100 Club of Arizona
Phoenix, Ariz.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?”


Anonymous participant
Tucson, Ariz.

Arkansas

There has been a trend the last two years toward fewer available dollars, especially from our government funding sources. Additionally, private foundations, hurt by the poor performance of the stock market, have reduced their funding; private foundations, however, are beginning to rebound and offer more help once again.

Jim Allen, Executive Director
Ozark Literacy Council, Inc.
Fayetteville, Ark.

We started out well, but are struggling to find the large individual donors or foundation grantmakers who can help bring our major projects to fruition. Because we are still small, the foundations just won’t give us any substantial grants.

Anonymous participant
Mountain Home, Ark.

California

Received a number of last minute “contract” reductions. We will probably have to cut some services as health insurance, workers comp, etc. increase dramatically while funding decreases.

Anonymous participant
Berkeley, Calif.

Annual fund remained about the same as ‘02, but capital giving increased substantially.

Patricia L. Larsen, Executive Director
Carondelet High School Foundation
Concord, Calif.

It has been a struggle. The demand for services is greater than ever. The demand for reporting is greater than ever and the amount of funds is less. United Way has just cut all its grants by 10%, but not its reporting requirements!

Anonymous participant
Costa Mesa, Calif.

My organization took a nose-dive financially this year due to the devaluation of the arts in California. As a local arts agency representing all of the arts in the county, the perception is that the organization’s purpose is to serve for free all of the artists’ needs and all of the arts organizations requests for funding. Any requests for community support for the services and advocacy is met with derision and hostility. The county provides a paltry $7500 to the
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

organization to provide arts education to the youth-at-risk and to maintain art exhibits in its government buildings and then censors the art without a public policy. When asked to create a public policy with mediation from the California Lawyers for the Arts, the count says “no” and wants the organization to meet behind closed doors in their county offices. Due to the re-emergence of the “Dark Ages of Art” this organization is just about bankrupt.

Penelope Curtis, Executive Director
Nevada County Arts Council
Grass Valley, Calif.

Much better this year because of proceeds of a bequest, a major award, and funding for a new program.

Scott F. Gray, Ed.D., Executive Director
Long Beach Area Literacy Council
Long Beach, Calif.

We’re OK, not great, not horrible.

Anonymous participant
Los Angeles, Calif.

We are close to facing major layoffs shortly.

Anonymous participant
Los Angeles, Calif.

Because we fund programs in our local public schools, parents are still willing to contribute.

Anonymous participant
Mill Valley, Calif.

So far, so good—we’re fortunate to have many loyal, long-term donors.

Cari Karns, Associate Director, Individual Giving
Interplast
Mountain View, Calif.

KVMR is a listener-supported community radio station. February and June pledge drives grew by 24.2% and 49.4% over the previous year, consistent with the station’s experience of the last two years.

Richard Gorman, Development Director
KVMR FM Community Radio
Nevada City, Calif.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?

We saw a modest increase in 2003 in the number of individual donors who gave in previous years, but not in 2002. We continue to see a decline in grants from charitable foundations, both in the size of grants and in the number of foundations who are able to fund our programs.

Duff Axsom, Executive Director
Oakland Public Library Foundation
Oakland, Calif.

We are working to be involved in more community events and extend borders by way of the Internet.

Victoria Angel, CEO
American Pediatric AIDS Project Inc.
Orange, Calif.

While people are genuinely interested in helping, they are much more cautious about donating and are more frugal in the size of their gift. Volunteers also dropped off in addition to donor support. Interestingly enough, planned gift income has increased from previous years.

Nancy E. Garni, Director of Development
Hillsides
Pasadena, Calif.

Compensation rates for state and federally funded services provided generally remained flat, in the face of modest wage increases for line staff, huge increases in benefit costs, liability insurance and workers compensation premiums. This puts increasing pressure on our ability to raise contributed funds from foundations and the general public, which is difficult in a weak economic and stock market environment. Clearly if these forces continue, the only option will be to curtail critically needed services.

Anonymous participant
San Anselmo, Calif.

Major gifts were down.

Anonymous participant
San Diego, Calif.

We fared fine because we have an income generation mechanism. Other organizations in the Bay Area have cut staff and programs dramatically due to low funds.

Amie Michalek, Outreach Director
Child Family Health International
San Francisco, Calif.

We saw a >20% decline in donations and a sharp increase in demand for services. The spike in giving for disaster services resulting from the Attack on America has flattened.

Nicci Noble, Internet Development Director
The Salvation Army—Golden State Division
San Francisco, Calif.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

Finishing out 2002-2003 federal FY, so income stayed same as previous year. 2003-2004 we lose approximately 15% of federal contract, but increase approximately 15% state revenue (very small contract) for ed div. Actual $ down $15K.

Salle Hayden, Director, Education Division
Immigrant Resettlement & Cultural Center
San Jose, Calif.

We are on a fiscal year, July through June so these questions are hard to answer. Last fiscal year, we ended the year with a deficit, the first one for our organization.

Anonymous participant
San Jose, Calif.

Just to make our current budget, which is approx. 19% less than last year’s, we are submitting grant proposals at a rate three times that of last year and the previous two years.

Anonymous participant
San Jose, Calif.

Most donors continued to give, those some at lesser level. Some new donors came due to publicity re State cuts to education.

Georgi LaBerge, Executive Director
San Mateo County Community Colleges Foundation
San Mateo, Calif.

We are seeing a leveling off of the downward trend and we hope it turns up.

Pete Major, Executive Director
Habitat for Humanity of Orange County
Santa Ana, Calif.

Individual donations were down, but we received a large grant from a foundation that boosted our total income.

Anonymous participant
Santa Barbara, Calif.

We’re still working very hard to bring in the grant revenue we rely on to meet operating expenses. Every dollar secured represents more time and effort than ever before.

Anonymous participant
Santa Clara, Calif.

It has been a difficult year.

Michaela Terrio, Treasurer
Sky Farm Hermitage
Sonoma, Calif.
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General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

Snowboarding is a tough sale to sponsors, we have been beating on as many doors as possible and all we hear is NO.

Tom Collins, Executive Director
USA Snowboarding Association
Truckee, Calif.

We are largely (95%) dependent on state funding on a fee for service basis. Due to the economy, it is becoming more and more challenging to obtain the needed funding to adequately keep up with competitive wages and benefits, to hire and keep good quality staff, and thus to provide the best quality services.

Dan Hulbert, Executive Director
CAPC, Inc.
Whittier, Calif.

Colorado

Individual contributions were about the same, but we have received less funding from grants from private foundations and corporations.

Mario Marchello, Board Member/Secretary
Stephen T. Marchello Scholarship Foundation
Centennial, Colo.

2003 has been good, however, we have received larger contributions from fewer people. We lost a lot of small individual donor contributions.

Jeff Konrade-Helm, Treasurer
Autism Society of Colorado
Denver, Colo.

The demand for emergency financial help increased dramatically because of all the budget cuts in social programs made by the state to balance the budget.

Debora Beck-Massey, Resource Outreach Coordinator
Domestic Violence Initiative
Denver, Colo.

We have seen a drop in foundation funding and increased government funding to offset that.

Lisa Bardwell, Executive Director
FrontRange Earth Force
Denver, Colo.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?”

We had to go out more aggressively to get grants to make up for the turndown in individual donations.

Stephen Krausz, President
Jewish Children’s Adoption Network
Denver, Colo.

We were fortunate to receive a substantial endowment for our sponsored admissions program, which underwrites Title 1 schools and low-income families.

Anonymous participant
Denver, Colo.

We have cut staff hours, and will have to reduce hours of operation if the downward trend continues.

Anonymous participant
Denver, Colo.

Connecticut

Non-profit railroad museum held our first “Day Out With Thomas” fundraising activity in August 2003 featuring Thomas the Tank Engine licensed by Hitt Entertainment. We netted over $100,000 in profits from the 6-day event with almost 15,000 tickets sold. The event was almost entirely a volunteer effort with some paid entertainment and paid security. Gross ticket and merchandise sales were approx. $350M. The event was geared to families with children aged 1-6 years old. We will plan to hold this event again at the same time yearly for the foreseeable future with some expansion of the retail effort and approximately the same number of ticket sales. The proceeds are used for operating expenses and marketing of our tourist railroad, restoration of an historic station building and of vintage rail equipment. We view this event as necessary to establish a stronger financial foundation for the historic railroad museum and railroad run entirely by volunteers.

Celeste Echlin, Trustee
Railroad Museum of New England
Thomaston, Conn.

Organization did well with fees for service, third party payments, government reimbursement and fundraising.

Anonymous participant
West Hartford, Conn.

District of Columbia

United Way donations and foundation grants decreased.

Anonymous participant
Washington, D.C.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?

Less foundation grants, but roughly the same as the previous year overall.
Anonymous participant
Washington, D.C.

Florida

Donations affected what the charity was able to do forcing us to scale back on the number of participants for various activities and/or post-pone other programs.
Klair Snellbaker, Executive Director/Founder
Candlelighters of Southwest Florida Inc.
Fort Myers, Fla.

Based on a new program that addresses significant community needs and is a fundraiser as well, we fared very well in corporate and private contributions. We began planning for its execution in mid-2002, committed necessary staff to make it work right in its inaugural year, worked it very hard, and produced results a third higher than conservative original projection.
Judith A. M. Smith, CEO
Volunteer Jacksonville, Inc.
Jacksonville, Fla.

Very interesting changes. ...We are a music missionary organization. When we started in 1999, the majority of the funding came in through my Gospel music concerts and CD sales. Now, concerts and ministry appearances are “down,” due to so many churches cutting back on “special speakers” as a result of their drop in giving. The interesting part is that our giving is up, way beyond what we are missing in concert revenue. It is the blessing of God, and the interest of people in what we are doing all over the world.
Bobby Michaels, Founder/President
Musicianaries International, Inc.
Jupiter, Fla.

The demands increased for senior services and the added requests for services increased. We will be facing a severe increase in demands for senior services from the “Baby Boomers” soon.
Anonymous participant
Kissimmee, Fla.

Income up 15.6%, expenses up 19.3%, net income decreased by 6.3%.
LeClair Bissell, M.D., Treasurer
Chihuahua Rescue & Transport
Sanibel, Fla.

We managed to maintain charitable gifts but our grant money was affected by statewide cuts.
Anonymous participant
West Palm Beach, Fla.
**General Comments—Survey question:** Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?

**Georgia**

People love the service and EXPECT the services we provide. Very few see fit to donate to keep us going though.

Anne D’Ambrosio, Executive Director  
GROWW, Inc.  
Alpharetta, Ga.

Program services paid 80% of expenses as opposed to the desired 50%.

Ralph Stephens, Theatre Manager  
Athens Little Playhouse, Inc.  
Athens, Ga.

We were lucky. We received a significant cut in United Way and state funding, but many of the organizations we serve were harder hit.

William Matson, Executive Director  
Pathways Community Network  
Atlanta, Ga.

Class revenue was fine, donations were down.

Sandra Bennett, Executive Director  
Spruill Center for the Arts  
Atlanta, Ga.

Just barely surviving.

Deanna Richeson, President  
Train For Change  
Atlanta, Ga.

We have experienced decreased funding from government grants and contracts and United Way.

Anonymous participant  
Atlanta, Ga.

This year has been a tremendous struggle. We have gone through much of a 5-6 month cash reserve. I’m in survival mode right now.

Anonymous participant  
Atlanta, Ga.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?”

There were fewer and small grants available for 2003 and restrictions were tighter (i.e., had to be operating longer). Also, some foundations who were generous in the past have suspended giving programs. Capital funding is nonexistent to small organizations like ours.

Jennifer Francis Henry, CEO
Metro Atlanta Caribbean Cultural Arts Centre, Inc. (MACCA)
Stone Mountain, Ga.

Hawaii

While we fared about the same, grants were smaller in amount but were more numerous, so the cost to administer them was higher. Fortunately for our organization we do have funding that covers many administrative costs.

Anonymous participant
Honolulu, Hawaii

It was more difficult to get government support. We are able to maintain our programs but there is very little expansion.

Anonymous participant
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii

Illinois

While the grants received by our organization in 2003 were much larger than in previous years, the mix of general operating support and project support has left the organization in a more tenuous position than it was a year ago.

Matthew Brockmeier, Executive Director
Chicago Dance and Music Alliance
Chicago, Ill.

Giving from individuals is up and continues to grow. Giving from the institutional church is decreased because of them receiving fewer dollars

Robert Szoke, Director Development/Church Relations
Chicago District Evangelistic Association
Chicago, Ill.

Adaptability has been the key. It has been a roller coaster ride. However, I am optimistic about year end 2003.

Kandee Haertel, Executive Director
Equestrian Land Conservation Resource
Chicago, Ill.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?

People seem to be more interested in giving to local organizations where their dollars stay local. We have been very lucky this period, and our contributions continue to increase.

Suzanne Hoban, Executive Director
Family Health Partnership Clinic
Chicago, Ill.

Our number of donors (both individual and grant-based) has increased significantly, but our overall dollar amount has stayed pretty even. We’re grateful for the new donors, but definitely working harder to raise the same amount!

Ruth Hansen, Director of Annual Giving
Polish American Association
Chicago, Ill.

It’s been a very tough year. We’ve had to lay off 40% of our staff due to budget constraints, but the work load remains the same.

Pauline Saliga, Executive Director
Society of Architectural Historians
Chicago, Ill.

When 9/11 hit, contributions from companies & individuals were diverted, as they should have been. Since then, we have received less & less due to the falling economy. Hopefully we can reach a bottom plateau this fall and turn it around next year.

Anonymous participant
Chicago, Ill.

We were able to secure federal grants.

Anonymous participant
Chicago, Ill.

Earned income from program expansion grew modestly with increased potential in next fiscal year (2004).Received funding from 2 new Foundations and a resumption of funding from 1 for multiple years. We are encouraged.

Anonymous participant
Chicago, Ill.

A little worse than expected.

Anonymous participant
Chicago, Ill.

We faced new financial challenges related to security programs needed, esp. subsequent to the Iraq conflict situation. Thus, we incurred what we anticipate will be over $600,000 per year in unbudgeted costs and we expect that this expense will continue well into the future; looking at ways to recapture the dollars in fees, contributions, etc. Many service recipients are now in need of “scholarship” assistance, as their personal economic situations have deteriorated—service
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

needs are greater, but affordability for them is less. In certain instances, former donors became scholarship recipients! Yet, because we’re celebrating our 100th Anniversary this year, we’ve been able to capitalize and increase contributions rather dramatically. We’ve also implemented even stronger financial controls, and these have been exceedingly productive.

Anonymous participant
Chicago, Ill.

Indiana

Key issue: loss of 1800 jobs in the automotive sector, both blue collar and white collar, in the past 12 months.

Anonymous participant
Anderson, Ind.

Income off by about 10% due to decreased fundraising activity, not due to economic factors.

Rick Lofgren, President
Children’s Organ Transplant Association
Bloomington, Ind.

We are seeing an increase in National and International Tourism that helps with our number of visitors and business in our Museum Gift/Book Store. Income there is up 30%.

W. Brooks Martin, Executive Director
Friends of Angel Mounds, Inc.
Evansville, Ind.

Grant funding was about the same. Individual giving was down very slightly compared to the same period in 2002.

Jeffrey Garrett, Development Director
League for the Blind & Disabled
Fort Wayne, Ind.

Fundraising was much more difficult in 2003 than previous years.

Donald W. Dillman, President & CEO
Heritage of Hope, Inc.
Hope, Ind.

Much of our funding comes from main-line denominations. Many of these are in significant transition and are reorienting services.

Ed Taylor, Executive Director
Ecumenical Stewardship Center
Indianapolis, Ind.
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We did much better than expected, but we attribute that to increased and more sophisticated asks.
Stephanie Mannon, Executive Director
Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation of Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Ind.

We are continually doing more with less, which has impacted our ability to spend time attempting grants. Many of those sources are also hurting.
Anonymous participant
Indianapolis, Ind.

The biggest difference is the lack of stock gifts. People who usually make large stock gifts earlier in the year have not done so, presumably due to the market. We hope that will change by year-end!
Anonymous participant
Indianapolis, Ind.

Cuts in government funding creates need to reduce services as well as seek increased community support and additional grant funding from private/corporate foundations
Anonymous participant
Warsaw, Ind.

Iowa
Funding is becoming more difficult to obtain.
Anonymous participant
Fort Dodge, Iowa

Kansas
It was pretty brutal, but things are starting to look up again.
Anonymous participant
Lawrence, Kans.

After a rocky 2002, we budgeted conservatively for our 2003-2004 FY. Our local economy is quite gloomy so we don’t expect things to begin to turn around for at least another year or two. All that said, we are holding on and looking for new opportunities for income rather than heavy reliance on traditional donations.
Katie S. Lynn, Executive Director
Arts Partners, Inc.
Wichita, Kans.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

Louisiana

Due to a conference held in September, we received a small increase in donations.
Anonymous participant
Baton Rouge, La.

Modest decreases in grants and donations.
C. Blanford, Director of Grants
Lutheran Social Services of the South, Inc.
Various cities in Texas and Louisiana

Maine

Holding our own but plans have been modified to match limited funds.
A. Robert Orsini, Executive Director
American RSDHope Group
Harrison, Maine

Maryland

Everyone involved with this organization is a volunteer. Having no payroll to meet, we can operate on a much smaller budget than other organizations.
Anonymous participant
Chestertown, Md.

About the same as 2002.
Gary Fuhrman, Projects Manager
Western Maryland RC&D
Hagerstown, MD

The giving was down and the service need increased.
Emma White, President
EJ&W Foundation, Inc.
Landover, Md.

Special event fundraising was down.
Anonymous participant
Owings Mills, Md.

State cuts in funding for higher education impacted our ability to raise funds.
Anonymous participant
Salisbury, Md.
**General Comments—Survey question:** Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

---

**Massachusetts**

Financial performance improved over previous years based on increased volume.

John E. Cupples, CEO
Marino Foundation for Integrative Medicine
Cambridge, Mass.

We are trying to finish a capital campaign. Gifts are small and far between, everyone gave less than expected.

Anonymous participant
Cambridge, Mass.

We are close to doubling our revenues from last year—our first year in existence.

Anonymous participant
Chelmsford, Mass.

Three of our four operating divisions received funding cuts.

Anonymous participant
Fall River, Mass.

We remained financially stable.

Deborah Phelps, Director of Development
Greater Lynn Mental Health & Retardation Assoc., Inc.
Lynn, Mass.

Service cuts in home health care have greatly increased demand for non-medical elder home care by our human services agency.

Denise Konicek, Planner and Fundraiser
Greater Lynn Senior Services
Lynn, Mass.

We had an ongoing capital campaign which was successful and brought us good visibility—enabling us to get started on another capital initiative for distance learning so we fared well.

Rachel Ethier Rosenbaum, President/CEO
Carroll Center for the Blind, Inc.
Newton, Mass.

Because of cutbacks in public monies (federal, state and local) I have to spend even more time trying to raise funds, especially from private sources.

Mark Alton-Follansbee, Executive Director
Somerville Homeless Coalition, Inc.
Somerville, Mass.
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State wide budget cuts due to the economic down turn affected growth and program stability.

Anonymous participant
Massachusetts

Michigan

Although we opened our second shelter in August, funding for the child sponsorships and operation funding are starting to tighten up as the year is ending.

Anna Beningo, President
Osman Hope, Inc.
Brighton, Mich.

We hope the economy will increase so we can obtain more funding in 2004 and continue to serve our target constituency on a higher scale.

Cathy P. Russell, Executive Director
The Gift Of A Helping Hand Charitable Trust
Detroit, Mich.

Our expenses have risen faster than revenues particularly in the area of insurances and other fixed costs. Our staff have not received an increase in three years and this will be another flat year for them. Contributions could not keep pace.

Jim Goodwin, President/CEO
Whaley Children’s Center
Flint, Mich.

We were lucky to have several community leadership groups take our organization on as a project and help us raise over $13,000 with an auction. The proceeds funded our scholarship fund for disadvantaged children with disabilities who attend summer therapy.

Anonymous participant
Grand Rapids, Mich.

People are spending a longer amount of time to review requests. Both no’s and yes’s are taking a long time which makes planning challenging. Nothing is a done deal anymore—and there are no more expectations—because everything is changing.

Anonymous participant
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Terrible lull in cash donations, but a huge increase of “in-kind” donations.

Anonymous participant
Jackson, Mich.

Increased need for services allowed us to weather flat donations and governmental cuts.

Anonymous participant
Jackson, Mich.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

We have had some very unstable conditions in our area in the job market. We had no idea what to expect. We cut our budget as far as we could (which is hard because we are at bare bones in the first place) and hoped for the best. So far it has not been as bad as we were afraid it would be.

Jean Forrest, Executive Director
Hospital Hospitality House of SW MI
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Minnesota

Thankful to contributors who believe in our mission during a difficult economy.
Anonymous participant
Minneapolis, Minn.

Affected by state budget crunch.
Anonymous participant
Minneapolis, Minn.

Many challenges this year with so many cuts that affected individuals needing healthcare. Mn. unlike most states, is especially penalized in government reimbursements through Medicare and Medicaid ... and due to budget deficits in the state, it is the first time in 30 years the legislature refused to give cost of living rate increases to nursing homes. Larger donors expressed interest in making significant gifts—when their investments improve and the economy becomes more steady.

Anonymous participant
St. Paul, Minn.

We were lucky to maintain and slightly increase donations from individuals. Our main base of contributed revenue is from individuals so we weren’t as impacted as other orgs in the areas of govt, foundation and corporate funding.

Kelly Tollefsbol, Director of Development
Dodge Nature Center
West Saint Paul, Minn.

Missouri

Attempting to stabilize and diversify.
Anonymous participant
Barnhart, Mo.

Shortfall of $350,000.
Matthew Dillane, President
Junior Achievement of Middle America
Kansas City, Mo.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

It is much more difficult to raise funds now than it was a year ago. It is getting more and more difficult.

Anonymous participant
St. Louis, Mo.

Montana

Using unrestricted reserves to cover expenses.

Anonymous participant
Ashland, Mont.

Private foundations who normally supported our efforts sustained great losses on their investments resulting in difficult decisions concerning amounts to be awarded, or even to award grants at all.

Anonymous participant
Helena, Mont.

Nevada

Our income increased slightly, but expenses increased more than income.

Elinor Bugli, President
Carson City Symphony Assoc.
Carson City, Nev.

Part of the reason for decrease in revenues was the fact that Membership Contribution was increased 20% thereby reducing the number of members.

J. Wilson Harper, Jr., Treasurer
USS Chara AKA 58 / AE 31 Association, Inc.
Carson City, Nev.

New Hampshire

Difficult analysis for us given the types of services we offer (particularly some of our educational services) that have low utilization during the summer months. However, we are currently trending toward a significant deficit for the year.

Anonymous participant
Contoocook, N.H.

We have done well, in spite of early signs that we would sustain a loss. However, in order to accomplish this, we had to reduce expenses and make small reductions in staff.

Margaret Franckhauser, Executive Director
Community Health & Hospice
Laconia, N.H.
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Better than anticipated.  
Michael Philbrook, Executive Director  
Humane Society for Greater Nashua  
Nashua, N.H.

August was the first month in which visitation was ahead of 2002 (and thus admissions and retail sales).  
Wendy W. Lull, President  
Seacoast Science Center  
Rye, N.H.

New Jersey

We suffered a double whammy—our earned income from our work in schools suffered because their budgets were decreased due to government cutbacks and at the same time our private support declined due to the economy.  
Anonymous participant  
Englewood, N.J.

We are positive to budget.  
Anonymous participant  
Piscataway, N.J.

Gov’t. support remained the same; individual contributions and memberships were up; Special (Fund) Event income was down.  
Brian Moscatello, Director  
Tenafly Nature Center Association  
Tenafly, N.J.

Spectacular first year.  
Anonymous participant  
Woodbridge, N.J.

New Mexico

Individual gifts and donations have increased slightly, but not enough to offset reduced foundation grants.  
Anonymous participant  
Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Income increased 0.04%; this year is mirroring 2001 in terms of its increase over the previous year.  
Anonymous participant  
Albuquerque, N. Mex.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?”

We have managed to keep staff, but are having difficulty securing enough administrative funds to operate all of our programs. There are several attractive funding sources (Federal Home Loan Bank, state source for HUD HOME funds and FEMA) that don’t give ANY administrative funds—only program dollars. In addition, we are accessing several small private foundation grants, that require quite a bit of work—nearly as much as if it were a large grant.

Sally Moore, Executive Director
Sandoval County Economic Opportunity Corporation
Bernalillo, N. Mex.

Hard work, increasing individual and organizational donations. Increased community awareness, increased donations.

Dwane Durant, Executive Director
Samaritan House and Estrella Native, Inc.
Las Vegas, N. Mex.

New York

Employee benefit costs exceeded budget, necessitating “no expenditures without advance approval” from CEO.

Anonymous participant
Albany, N.Y.

Endowment income down.

Anonymous participant
Blue Mountain Lake, N.Y.

It is within the last 2 months that we are feeling a lack of funding.

Lisa Dennett, President
I.D.E.A.S.
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Clearly, first-time funding from foundations is much less available and even current funders have, in some cases, reduced their support for renewals.

Susan Loeb, Director of Development
South Brooklyn Legal Services
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Just this Fall—city grants were cut, one city grant program was discontinued and several private foundations were one time only, or were discontinued. It has begun to feel as though people have “already given” to take care of the 9/11 problem. Yet, this Fall has hit us the hardest.

Diane Jacobowitz, Artistic and Executive Director
Brooklyn, N.Y.
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Foundation funding was significantly decreased. Programming will be seriously impacted in the coming months if funds cannot be raised to make up for the reduction. Cutbacks were undertaken in areas of promotional and support materials.

Anonymous participant
Long Island City, N.Y.

A small decrease in government contract income, particularly decreases in funding ESL and recreation programs for the elderly.

Fern Hertzberg, Executive Director
ARC XVI Fort Washington, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

Just awful.

Mike Schreibman, Executive Director
Children’s PressLine
New York, N.Y.

In contrast to the difficult economic environment, New Dramatists has enjoyed a year of fiscal stability and programmatic growth. Though we experienced inevitable donor attrition, we were able to fill the resulting funding gap with major grants from new foundations.

Jennie Greer, Director of Development
New Dramatists
New York, N.Y.

Government, foundation and individual giving decreased. The New York Academy of Medicine is committed to enhancing the health of the public with a particular emphasis on urban populations, especially the disadvantaged.

Lorraine A. LaHuta, Director Development and Communications
The New York Academy of Medicine
New York, N.Y.

Our organization was able to weather the first nine months rather well because our main State contracts remained static, some with a slight increase. Unfortunately, good programs outside that main funding stream were hurt by discontinued grants as the State and corporate donors redirected their giving elsewhere. We’ve seen in significant drop in grants and amounts awarded from the previous year, perhaps a 40% drop.

David LoTempio, Grants Administrator
People Inc.
New York, N.Y.
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Poorly. Vastly less unearned income has been received.

David Platzker, Executive Director
Printed Matter, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

Between reduced earned income and reduced contributions this year was somewhat challenging.

Maria Venuto, Executive Director
Standby Program
New York, N.Y.

Wish it were better.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

We lost several funders because of their funding cycles. When we applied to new funders, we often were told that due to limited finances, they could not take on anyone new. When we applied for renewals from funders already supporting us, several replied that they could not fund us again because they needed to fund new organizations. Almost every foundation we worked with took longer than usual to announce their grant recipients.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

We are always right on the edge for balancing income & expenses. Although we have done all right in the first 9 months, there are more unpredictable factors in every revenue category. Nothing can be taken for granted any more, if we were ever tempted to do so in the past!

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

Modestly lower.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

Contract Budget with City for salaries and office supplies and services have remained stagnant since 1999.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

Badly, but partly my fault for not having focused the first quarter 2003 on fund raising. Many private foundations did most or all of their giving in the first half of the year.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.
Major gifts were stronger in this period than the low to modest level giving among individuals. The first quarter of 2003 was very slow for our most modest donors but they began to pick up again in the second and third quarters.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

Overall, we fared well this year in comparison to the last. We are relatively young so we are experiencing growing pain.

Jamal Briggs, President and CEO
The SafeChild Foundation, Inc.
Rochester, N.Y.

Our investments are looking up; gifts are starting to recover as well; grantmaking is holding its own because our donors put money aside when times were good so that we can keep giving regardless of ups and downs in the economy.

Anonymous participant
Rochester, N.Y.

Challenge of increasing numbers of NGOs seeking grants, together with larger needs for NGO services, made it difficult to function properly.

Dr. Kathy Winings, Vice President, Board of Directors
IRFF
Tarrytown, N.Y.

During the first nine months (Feb-Nov 2003) our organization has been in incubation. The corporate image and structure has been developed, and the internet presence has begun: http://www.bikersforbabies.net. We are developing a good plan and we are in need of professional services, such as: grant writing, CPA, and other professional services.

G. D. Cuda, Executive Director
(CPUSA Inc) Charity Promotions USA Inc.
Utica, N.Y.

We thank those who helped even though it was a struggle for them.

Dr. John D. Christesen, CEO
Alpha Beta Gamma Honor Society
Valhalla, N.Y.

Our primary source of new funds, NYs ofc.mental healths’ reinvestment$$, was discontinued by the gov. We’re reaching out to a few universities & corporations to partner in an innovative business oriented employment prgm for our ms cert.students.

Don Fitch, M.S., Executive Director
Center for Career Freedom
White Plains, N.Y.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?”

North Carolina

We were very aggressive in our “asks” during this time period.

Frank Mansfield, Associate Executive Director for Resource Development
Uptown Men’s Shelter
Charlotte, N.C.

Ohio

Given the economy, we budgeted very conservatively for both earned and contributed revenue, as well as expenses. Results in all areas we slightly better than expected.

Anonymous participant
Cincinnati, Ohio

We have had to reduce expenditures to maintain a balanced budget; thereby reducing services slightly.

Anonymous participant
Dayton, Ohio

Need has increased to a tremendous volume—donations have not kept pace.

Phyllis Fischer, Pastor
Church of the Angels
New Albany, Ohio

It was tough. Money was very tight, but we are in better shape now

Tammy Brown, Executive Director
Mercy Unlimited
Wapakoneta, Ohio

Oklahoma

Considering the number of non-profits in our service area (the county), I feel like we had positive results with our fundraising.

Diane Murphree, Executive Director/CEO
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Cleveland County
Norman, Okla.

Ended FY03 with nominal surplus (0.1%).

Edward Walker, Executive Director
Oklahoma City Philharmonic
Oklahoma City, Okla.
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Oregon

We expected a downturn in revenues but have held revenues at or above last year.

Anonymous participant
Salem, Ore.

Our annualized funding held steadier than we had projected given the budget battles in our state. That was good news.

Anonymous participant
Salem, Ore.

Pennsylvania

We are very dependent on the United Way and they have advised us that future funding will decrease.

Anonymous participant
Bethlehem, Pa.

We are having a good year due primarily to a few very large gifts and a few large bequests.

Peter A. Caputo, VP, Development
Main Line Health System
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

We are in a period of growing pains, short on staff volunteers, paper work is ever increasing, hot line phone support increasing, in the last 6 months we has 15,000 people visit our web site. Since we are an all volunteer organization getting people to work for free is the most difficult part of our organization. I feel Jack Welch of GE would not have been able to do what I have done. When I was in the corporate world it was much easier to get people to work, due to the fact you had a pay check over their head, no work—no pay?

Howard Kindred Sr., Founder & CEO
NEPATSG Inc.
East Stroudsburg, Pa.

Expenses related to medical care greatly increased.

Mike Davin, Co-Founder
With A Golden Spirit, Inc. (WAGS)
Irwin, Pa.

Donors, private and corporate, do not feel as wealthy in 2003 as they did in 2002.

Marialice Stanzeski, Director of Development
Manor College
Jenkintown, Pa.
General Comments—Survey question: Do you have any comments about how your organization fared financially during the first nine months of 2003?"

The clinic’s biggest fundraiser is planned for November 26. Our solicitation for program sponsors has resulted in less dollars than last year. We attribute this to the poor state of the economy in our community, with many businesses struggling to survive. Although the clinic provides a service that is critical in the community, we have had to work much harder this year to generate donations.

Becky Catelinet, Executive Director
Johnstown Free Medical Clinic
Johnstown, Pa.

We maintained a stable asset base of approximately $35 million. As a start up foundation, the comparative responses noted above relate to our operations during our initial year of grantmaking. Because it was our first year, giving was up because we had no prior year baseline.

Russell Johnson, Executive Director
North Penn Community Health Foundation
Lansdale, Pa.

Survived without layoffs.

Charles Moore, CEO
Opportunity Access Inc.
Media, Pa.

We are faring well. We are increasing at a rate of $500,000 a year, due to new federal contract. Private giving is about the same. The growth of 12% a year causes some cash flow difficulties.

Kevin R. Conare, Executive Director
ActionAIDS

No immediate growth, but did not anticipate any community response until our current development program is unveiled.

Anonymous participant
Pittsburgh, Pa.

FY 2002-2003 was the first year the agency posted a loss—however, it wasn’t due to economic circumstances as much as due to political maneuvering through the county children & youth agency.

Anonymous participant
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Due to the politics of PA state budgeting process we saw our county’s allocation of Health and Human Services cut from $2.4 Million to $50,000.00. All because our governor wants to hold those funds hostage to get his income tax increase and slot machine legislation passed.

Anonymous participant
Pottstown, Pa.
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We worked harder than ever for a modest increase which was really due to the fact that we were completing a building project. Our fundraising volunteers did more work than ever before, and I can’t help feeling that in different times the rewards would have been much greater.

  Anonymous participant
  Rosemont, Pa.

Contributions were down 5% and we relied more heavily on income from our rental properties to stay in the black.

  Anonymous participant
  Souderton, Pa.

During the first 9 months, we continued to experience falling gift sizes and numbers. We are seeing fewer individual donors willing to give sizable gifts. A number of our donors are not fulfilling pledges made earlier.

  Anonymous participant
  Upper Darby, Pa.

The willingness for private foundations to give towards operating funds is a great need. Most have some popular theme designated for giving and those with the greatest needs for continued operational support are left to scrape for funds.

  Anonymous participant
  Willow Grove, Pa.

**Rhode Island**

We were really unaffected by the economy, to all appearances, until suddenly, all our corporate sponsors (and there weren’t many to begin with) ditched out on us—all in a sort of offhand way, no moaning about the economy, just “Oh no, not this year.”

  Dominique Alfandre, Executive Director
  Island Moving Co.
  Newport, R.I.

We were fairly successful in raising individual donations for the fiscal year ended June 2002. But we were far less successful in obtaining grant funds. The first few months of this fiscal year have not shown a strong level of either grant funds or individual donations.

  Anonymous participant
  Warren, R.I.
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**South Carolina**

We are very pleased with our continued ability to raise funds to support our mission, regardless of market fluctuations and the economy. We attribute our success to our clear, consistent, strong mission. It has not changed in 17 years, and the need for our service has grown.

Shelli D. Quenga, Executive Director
Carolina Children’s Charity
Charleston, S.C.

Large increase in assets owned & managed, due largely to one large bequest ($34 million).

Richard Hendry, VP of Programs
The Community Foundation Serving Coastal SC
Charleston, S.C.

Donations to the International Primate Protection League are running 15% behind last year’s. We have been forced to cut back on our overseas grant programs and are searching for new sources of revenue. Meanwhile, the Bush administration is engaged in major assaults on wildlife protective and environmental laws and policies which we must work harder to try to defeat despite public preoccupation with other issues. In addition, we are concerned about the long-term effects on the non-profit sector of efforts to eliminate the estate tax.

Shirley McGreal, Chairwoman
International Primate Protection League
Summerville, S.C.

**South Dakota**

Contributions continue to be slow; however, we are also running a capital campaign so that complicates things.

Anonymous participant
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

**Tennessee**

Struggled to maintain cash flow.

James A. Dickens, Chief Operating Officer
United Methodist Neighborhood Centers, Inc.
Chattanooga, Tenn.
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Due to the formal receipt of our 501-c-3, we were anticipating a more promising year. At this point, we are extremely discouraged. It would appear that only the long-established national organizations are "worthy" of attention and assistance from granting organizations and sponsors, that innovation and creativity are not nearly as important as following the established models of social change agendas to the "t." and that small, grass-roots-founded non-profits are stuck in a catch-22—you can’t get funding unless you have a history. You can’t have a history unless you get funding to build the history.

Valerie Ohle, Chairman/Founder/Acting CEO
Wisdom Keepers, Inc.
Knoxville, Tenn.

Donations are definitely down.

Anonymous participant
Knoxville, Tenn.

Texas

State institution of higher ed—cuts in state funding have seriously pressured the university. Greater emphasis on fundraising will result.

Anonymous participant
Arlington, Tex.

In the last 18 months, human service agencies have experienced significant losses in almost all revenue streams. The Arc of the Capital Area is no exception. Shortly after 9/11, we noticed decreases in donations from individuals. We were not overly concerned, because we had three months of operating reserves, wisely set aside by our Board of Directors when the economy was flourishing. As 2001 ended and 2002 began, we experienced alarming reductions in our entrepreneurial revenue—specifically, our bingo funds and the proceeds from a salvage/household-recycling program managed by our state affiliate. Both of these funding sources are unrestricted, allowing us to pay for essential staff positions not tied to contracts. At the same time, we experienced large reductions in funding from outlying United Ways by over 50% (as did all of their partner agencies), where we provide services to people outside of Austin/Travis County. A family foundation that had funded us for six years was unable to provide help this year. Their gifts had ranged from $50,000 to $170,000. Additionally, we received a 62% increase in our health insurance premiums. In the 2nd quarter of 2003, United Way/Capital Area reduced their funding to all partner agencies by 20.5%, due to a decrease in their campaign donations. Our bingo and salvage revenue continues to decline steadily. In addition, given the cuts from the Legislature, and the passed down costs to local cities and counties, we are expecting at least a 10% reduction in both our City of Austin and Travis County contracts.

Jessica Lindley-Spencer, Director of Grants
The Arc of the Capital Area
Austin, Tex.

© 2003, Philanthropic Research, Inc./GuideStar
Grants increased from $72,500 to $80,634. Membership income more than doubled from $3035 to $7700. Underwriting of concerts stayed stable at $11,000. What was interesting was that one donor who has regularly given us $20,000 annually had to decrease the gift to $10,000 this last year. Fortunately, a new large donor covered the deficit. Thank goodness for good development by the board members.

Anonymous participant
Austin, Tex.

We are conducting a capital campaign and are ahead of schedule—we expected a slowdown but it has not materialized.

Anonymous participant
Dallas, Tex.

We were in a building campaign. Donations held fair. The need for uncompensated services increased.

Anonymous participant
Fort Worth, Tex.

We lost a couple of corporate donors but were lucky that we’ve been able to replace them.

Anonymous participant
Fort Worth, Tex.

As is the case with any nonprofit, we could have benefited greatly from increased donations. Our primary target population is Veterans w/substance abuse and additional mental health issues. Demand for services has GREATLY increased and is only expected to rise from this point.

S. G. Lewis, Executive Director
Housing & Recovery, Inc (A NEW LIFE)
Houston, Tex.

Many of our foundation donors were faced with declining resources caused by their portfolios’ declines. Same trend affected our private donor’s capabilities.

Randy W. Ray, Executive Director & CEO
John P. McGovern Museum of Health & Medical Science
Houston, Tex.

We had two months that our income increased greatly then it declined each month there after.

Ann Brewer, Director
North Channel Assistance Ministries
Houston, Tex.
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Better than 2002.

Christina Velgakis, Vice President/Secretary
Saint Sophia’s Helping Hands, Inc.
Houston, Tex.

Despite the state government cutbacks and decreased foundation and individual giving, we have continued to run a balanced budget. We have, however, accomplished this primarily through workforce reductions. It certainly hasn’t been fun.

Todd A. Landry, President and CEO
Spaulding for Children
Houston, Tex.

We were finishing a capital campaign. The campaign experienced a longer time line due to the stock market downturn.

Anonymous participant
Houston, Tex.

January through June were favorable.

Anonymous participant
Houston, Tex.

Barely struggling, we are new and have just started receiving funding.

Anonymous participant
Mercedes, Tex.

More time and energy spent attempting to develop funding, but with regrettable results.

Ivanne Farr, Chair, Board of Governors
The Alliance for Justice Foundation, Inc.
Meridian, Tex.

We saw a decrease in individual giving; however, we recovered these losses from other areas.

Anonymous participant
Midland, Tex.

We have enough money to do some of the work but had hoped for more and bigger grants to finish a preservation project of St. Joseph School Museum which is a history museum and helps school children from 4th grade to college graduates plus genealogists etc.

Loretta Niestroy, Treasurer & Funds Coordinator
Panna Maria Historical Society
Panna Maria, Tex.
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The area we are in is economically depressed anyway, and donations and grants were off by about 18%.

Jack T. Ward Jr., Assistant Chief for EMS
Carancahua Community Vol. Fire and EMS Dept.
Rural South Eastern area of Jackson County, Tex.

Modest decreases in grants and donations.

C. Blanford, Director of Grants
Lutheran Social Services of the South, Inc.
Various cities in Texas and Louisiana

Utah

We saw a significant reduction in grants from foundations and government agencies because of the stagnant economy. We covered this by increasing individual contributions, but I don’t know how much individual contributions can be milked to cover for loss of grant funds.

Don S. Anderson, Executive Director
Wasatch Community Gardens
Salt Lake City, Utah

Our increase in overall donations was due to a capital campaign. Operating donations decreased slightly during this time.

Elaine M. Gause, CEO
Salt Lake City, Utah

Large, unrestricted donations were greatly decreased this year, while individual contributions increased slightly.

Anonymous participant
Salt Lake City, Utah

Vermont

Individual donations are down slightly. We increased our direct mail solicitation by 50% and experienced a 3% return from new contacts. But overall donation totals are below our 2002 figures.

Barbara Stewart, Development Officer
Rutland County Humane Society
Pittsford, Vt.
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**Virginia**

Although we increased our revenue we are nowhere near our optimum level and are constantly looking for new streams of donors.

John Veldhuis, Vice-chancellor  
Central Buganda University Foundation, Inc.  
Annandale, Va.

Individual contributions increased substantially, corporate and foundations increased somewhat due to increased applications. Ticket revenues were not as much as hoped for.

Carol Dunlap, Managing Director  
The Metropolitan Chorus  
Arlington, Va.

In March of 2003 we brought on our first Director of Development who implemented several new strategies that helped to increase our overall contributions in 2003. We did not have a development plan prior to that time.

Anonymous participant  
Arlington, Va.

During the past two months our average donation has dropped from a high of $22.64 in August 2002 to a low of $16.84 in September 2003.

Paul Krizek, Executive Director  
Christian Relief Services  
Lorton, Va.

Drastic reductions STILL—which if the trend continues on a decline, will most definitely lead to discontinuation of much needed/vital services to impoverished, elderly, at risk community members

Lynne Finding, Executive Director  
LINK of Hampton Roads, Inc  
Newport News, Va.

Our organization maintained our financial position while beginning a cultural focus for the organization.

Anonymous participant  
Richmond, Va.

**Washington**

Even in a climate of fiscal uncertainty our clientele chooses to support our mission—the children of this community and the music they accomplish.

Ruth Brewster  
Bellevue, Wash.
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We held our own with diligence and difficulty.

Cyndi Upthegrove, Trustee  
Highline Historical Society  
Burien, Wash.

We worked harder to maintain our income level.

Anonymous participant  
Lummi Island, Wash.

 Ended fiscal year June 30th with expenses exceeding income.

Anonymous participant  
Renton, Wash.

Our annual contributions were up by 10 percent and a branch capital campaign went over goal significantly. Many donors indicated that they are shifting dollars away from the arts and other “soft” causes and giving more to organizations that deal with basic needs.

Anonymous participant  
Seattle, Wash.

The increase was from one major donation as a specific request. Otherwise, there would have been a slight decrease.

Anonymous participant  
Vancouver, Wash.

**Wisconsin**

We did okay due to several successful special event fundraisers.

Anonymous participant  
Green Bay, Wis.

We are on a July 1-June 30 FY. In January of 03 we found ourselves having to review our 02-03 budget and to reforecast our income to reflect a decrease of approximately 15%. Fundraising & ticket sales environments seem to be much improved in 03-04. We anticipate increasing our number of performances by 30% in 04-05.

Anonymous participant  
Madison, Wis.
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Not well. Despite the billions being spent by the government, we are not eligible for a cent, yet we are the only rescue team of its kind in our state. People seem to support our cause in thought, but not financially as they rely on the government to meet their rescue needs from fire/police departments. Unfortunately, 90+ % of our state departments are not trained or equipped to do the type of rescue our team does.

Mark Spencer, Team Leader
Wisconsin Search & Rescue (WISAR)
Oshkosh, Wis.

We made modest gains due to cutbacks in expenses. Increase in income even though we had a cost freeze.

John M. Gerber, Executive Director
Kinnic Falls Alcohol-Drug Abuse Services, Inc.
River Falls, Wis.

Wyoming

We’re having our fall campaign now. Indications are that we’ll be up 10% from last year.

Jerry Egge, Board Member
United Way of Laramie County
Cheyenne, Wyo.

International

Our organization is new type of not-for-profit organization. We have a small budget and we are doing not so bad.

Mahmud Ruzmetov, Executive Director
Center of Youth Support
Uzbekistan

Comments from Private Foundations/Grantmakers

We’re mainly funded by the federal government. As a result, we did not lose any funding.

Anonymous participant
Berkeley, Calif.

Better.

Anonymous participant
Long Beach, Calif.

The endowment is recovering, but as a foundation, the grant budget was reduced due to declining returns in previous years.

Anonymous participant
San Francisco, Calif.
Visit www.itsASureBet.net. We have strong programs in need of future support to help the kids learn English.

Robert Abdul, President
CLASS, Costa Rica Latin America School Supplies Inc
Palm Bay, Fla.

We also operate in Phoenix, Arizona. Although our grants budget decreased slightly, we decided to consider and make the same number of grants, but they would be smaller dollar amounts.

Anonymous participant
Indianapolis, Ind.

Income generation for the first nine months of 2003 was steady, matching income for 2002. September income pulled the agency ahead of this time last year, and we expect that we’ll close the year slightly more than 2002 in fundraising.

Tereza Byrne, Bureau Chief for Marketing and Development
ADRA International
Silver Spring, Md.

Struggled to maintain obligations.

Ron George, International Director
Win Intl. Associates
Holland, Mich.

Very poorly.

Murray Hill, President
A.E.P.I.F.-ARC
Fordland, Mo.

Our organization has been in the endowment-building phase for the last several years. In 2003, we achieved the base endowment needed to begin making grants and awards.

Joyce Hrouda, President of the Board
Montana BPW Foundation, Inc.
Great Falls, Mont.

Endowment is experiencing modest growth during first nine months of 2003.

Anonymous participant
Lincoln, Nebr.

Ran up debt and personal loans.

Yitzie Pretter, President
Jrl Outreach Program
Brooklyn, N.Y.
Our investments were down for the first quarter of the year and have slowly increased since.

Anonymous participant
New York, N.Y.

State funding decreased for this Fiscal Year (7/01/03-6/30/04) by 7%. In past 3 years we have lost over 30% of our funding.

Anonymous participant
Charlotte, N.C.

We initiated our first formal fundraising campaign in October of 2002 and that is why our efforts in 2003, which have continued the rollout of cultivation and solicitation activities, have been far more successful in securing contributions.

Anonymous participant
Greensboro, N.C.

Investment portfolio rose by 15%.

Anonymous participant
Columbus, Ohio

We did fairly well all things considered.

Anonymous participant
Tulsa, Okla.

Not very well—we had to take approximately $400,000.00 from principal to pay out the grants as required by the IRS’s 5% rule. Also, in September we sold 22 securities that were yielding 1% or less and are currently searching for higher yield securities to invest in.

Anonymous participant
Oil City, Tenn.

Our major foundation funding is not being continued.

Anonymous participant
Ogden, Utah

Saw a modest increase in the foundation’s assets as the stock market recovered. Due to the way foundations develop budgets, positive news on this front is more likely to affect giving in 2004, just as some of our limitations in 2003 had more to do with the depths of the stock market decline in 2002 rather than 2003 conditions.

Anonymous participant
Tacoma, Wash.
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Our organisation has had many difficulties to achieve the mission which it gave itself this year to knowing the regrouping of the agricultural groupings and their provisioning of the materials and seeds of the biological food products for a project of culture of biological soya and arrachide whose currently project remained has a phase of waiting for can be the next year if any time we manage to find backers.

Kokou Djrovi, Executive Director
Africa Bio Trade
Kpalime Togo/West Africa

Unidentified Nonprofit Type

Our organization did not increase our funding sources, but did maintain current funding status. Demand for our programs was unchanged, and program revenues were consistent with expectations.

Anonymous participant
Winter Park, Fla.

Difficult economically. Membership is down. New donors/increased giving is difficult to find.
Anonymous participant
Overland Park, Kans.