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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to the COVID-19 health crisis and its economic fall-out, a coalition of philanthropic grant makers in the nine (9) county Hudson Valley region (Columbia, Dutchess, Greene, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan, Ulster and Westchester counties) joined with the New York Council of Nonprofits, Inc. (NYCON) to survey charitable nonprofits in order to assess the impact of COVID-19 on their financial and organizational stability and to gain insight as to their technical assistance, training and resource needs. The assessment is intended to help strategically inform the capacity-building initiatives of the grant makers as they, individually and collaboratively, respond to the immediate and future recovery needs of nonprofits and the communities they served.

The sponsoring coalition members are the Berkshire Taconic Community Foundation, Community Foundations of the Hudson Valley, Community Foundation of Orange and Sullivan, Dyson Foundation, Foundation for Community Health, and Westchester Community Foundation. This coalition is part of a broader Hudson Valley Funders Group that also includes the Field Hall Foundation, Ralph E. Ogden Foundation, United Way of the Dutchess-Orange Region, United Way of Ulster County, and United Way of Westchester and Putnam, among others.

The sponsors of this report recognize and celebrate the fact that nonprofits in the Hudson Valley Region are relied upon in the direst of times and are essential to the social, health, economic, social justice, and civic fabric of our communities. Nonprofits have been resilient and creative in often challenging times and have proven to make the most out of very little. It is also recognized that their services are dependent on their organizational capacity to be able to plan, deliver and sustainably support those services smartly and strategically. This assessment raises awareness of and insight into their capacity-building needs and what assistance may be needed to preserve and sustain their charitable missions.

Survey data was collected from June 29 - July 14, 2020. This report presents the major findings, an update and analysis of the potential impact on the survey findings of pandemic-induced events that have occurred since the survey’s completion on July 14, and a brief conclusion from the perspective of the sponsoring philanthropic organizations and NYCON. NYCON developed the instrument, administered the survey, conducted the statistical analysis, and drafted the report working with sponsoring coalition members.

The online survey was comprised of three major sections – Financial Health and Related Factors; Knowledge and Capacity-Building Needs; and Organizational Information. The survey link was sent to an unduplicated organizational email list of 1,230 nonprofits. Two-hundred and ninety-one (291) organizations responded representing 41% of the email invitations opened and 24% of the overall emails sent. Of the 291 overall respondents, 217 (75%) answered all the questions.

The respondents represented the continuum of nonprofits and charitable missions and the diverse work that they do. The average nonprofit related their organization to three service areas out of the 37 choices provided. For analysis purposes, these 37 areas were clustered into six broad areas with the following percentage of responses for each - Arts & Culture (38%); Education & Childcare (18%); Human Services (15%); Economic Development, Housing & Employment (10%); and Other (19%).

Dutchess was the predominant county served (46%) by respondents with other top counties being Ulster (30%), Westchester (25%), Orange (24%) and Columbia (23%). Over a third (35%) serve more than one county in the region. The sample reflected a reasonably proportionate distribution among the various budget ranges of less than $500K to greater than $10M. Of note is that over half of the respondents (52%) had annual budgets of
$500K or less and close to half (46%) of these reported budgets of $100K or less. The majority (59%) of those nonprofits serve one or more counties in the region as well.

Nonprofits shared how the people that they serve and/or their mission have been affected by the pandemic. These narratives contain poignant and painful stories about the unmet needs and extreme stress that their clients and the communities that depend on nonprofits are experiencing. Many nonprofits described, for example, how the closing and future uncertainty of schools are adversely threatening their abilities to fulfill their missions, and for health and human service nonprofits especially, threats to the health and safety of their workforces are significant contributors to the impact of the crisis among nonprofits.

Key findings regarding financial health, knowledge and capacity-building needs include:

1. The adverse financial impact of the COVID crisis on nonprofits in the region has been significant, with 79% of respondents projecting a revenue reduction in 2020. Financial risk is shown to be inversely related to budget size, with nonprofits in the lowest budget size categories experiencing the greatest financial risk on average. High levels of financial risk were found for nonprofits in all service sector groupings with higher levels in nonprofits that do not receive government funding.

2. Sixty percent (60%) received government funding. Of those, 73% expect cuts this calendar year, 42% expect cuts of over 20%, including 7% expecting a cut of over 50%.

3. Thirty percent (30%) or 75 nonprofits consider insolvency or dissolution to be very likely, likely, or somewhat likely. Those with higher expectations for insolvency tended not to have endowments, reserve funds, or government funding. Additionally, nonprofits in Education & Childcare have greater expectation for insolvency than other nonprofits.

4. Nonprofits without reserve funds or a credit line report proportionally higher losses than nonprofits with reserve funds, and nonprofits without government operational funds tend to report higher revenue loss percentages than those with government funds.

5. Nonprofits with budgets under $1M tend to report proportionally higher revenue losses than larger organizations.


7. Although Education & Childcare are in the lower tier on revenue loss, these nonprofits are in the higher tier on the financial risk spectrum due to lower availability of endowment or reserve funds.

8. The Payroll Protection Program (PPP) and the Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) federal initiatives were popular among the nonprofits surveyed and provided timely but short-term assistance to their cash needs. A strong majority of respondents (60%) applied for and received PPP loan funding at the time of the survey and less than a quarter (22%) applied and received EIDL support. Of those receiving PPP, over three-quarters (77%) anticipate receiving the maximum loan amount forgiveness.
9. Fundraising is ranked as the highest need category for technical assistance followed by Planning & Strategy, and then Finance, Operations & Technology. All of the individual organizational and capacity items in the Fundraising area were rated as high need.

10. Nonprofits in the Human Services, Education & Childcare, and Economic Development, Housing & Employment sectors tend to express greater interest in pursuing service restructuring strategies than organizations in the Arts & Culture or Other sectors.

11. Although exploring Partnerships & Alliances ranked relatively low in the percentage of perceived priority need for technical assistance, there is a very high interest in the overall strategy. Seventy-seven percent (77%) or 194 nonprofits responded yes or maybe to being interested, involved in, or actively exploring formal affiliations or mergers over the next twelve months. Twenty-one percent (21%) or 61 nonprofits stated a definite yes and eighteen percent (18%) or 53 nonprofits stated maybe to formal affiliations. With respect to mergers, nine percent (9%) or 25 nonprofits stated a definite yes and eight percent (8%) or 23 nonprofits responded maybe to the consideration of mergers.

In this rapidly changing COVID environment, it is important to recognize that this survey is a time-specific snapshot of the actual and perceived organizational and economic conditions and technical assistance needs of Hudson Valley nonprofits in the midst of the fear and recovery uncertainties of the pandemic. Since the survey period, several significant pandemic-induced events have occurred that would likely alter some of the responses and findings if the survey were to be taken in August, just a month later. Events or circumstances highlighted in the report and their impact on the capacity of nonprofits and their technical assistance and resource needs include:

- The considerable improvement in the control of the outbreak, the easing of stay-at-home orders and the implementation of re-opening plans.
- Current and foreseeable state funding policies, withholdings, and cuts, including the lack of a second round of federal relief to the state.
- Declining economic conditions and the highly competitive fundraising and grant environment.
- Historic racial and social injustices have increased the social imperative of nonprofits to address these issues in their mission, values, policies and practices.
- The shift to recovery planning and the likelihood of dramatic corporate, organizational, financial and program changes in the nonprofit landscape occurring.
I. METHODOLOGY

A. Questionnaire Design

An online questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed consisting of 34 questions with 129 individual data elements generated from multiple-choice, ranking, numeric, and open-ended text responses. The major content areas covered in the questionnaire are (1) Financial Health and Impact of COVID-19, (2) Knowledge and Capacity-Building Needs, and (3) Organizational Information. The Financial Health and Related Factors section includes information about revenue loss, financial reserves, endowment, and governmental assistance, as well as expectations for recovery and engagement with new business models. The Knowledge and Capacity-Building Needs section asks nonprofits to rate their organization's specific competencies in six major areas: (1) Planning & Strategy; (2) Partnership & Alliance; (3) Organizational Leadership; (4) Finance, Operations & Technology; (5) Marketing & Communication; and (6) Fundraising. This section also gathered a ranking of the priority the organization placed on these areas. The Organizational Information section includes questions about budget size, service sector, counties served, and primary populations served.

B. Sample and Data Collection

Lists of 501(c)3 nonprofits that included the name and email address of the primary contact person were collected from the grant makers and NYCON. These lists were combined, closely screened and email tested several times to produce a final unduplicated sample list of 1,230 nonprofits.

The questionnaire was converted into an electronic online format (SurveyMonkey) and was pretested. Surveys were collected from June 29 to July 14, 2020. The email recipient was requested to forward the invitation to the individual in the organization best suited to respond. The invitations included a link that ensured only one response set per organization. A second, follow-up email was sent to nonprofits that had either not started the survey or had started but not fully completed the survey.

Among the total of 1,230 invitations emailed, 706 (57%) had been opened, with the remaining 535 either unopened or undelivered. It is important to note that a significant number of these nonprofits may have closed or been effectively non-operational due to the COVID-19 crisis. The final sample of respondents to the survey consisted of 291 organizations representing 41% of the email invitations opened and 24% of the overall emails sent. Of the 291 overall respondents, 217 (75%) completed the survey in full.

C. Data Analysis

Basic descriptive data on individual survey items were produced using SurveyMonkey's analytic capabilities. Responses to open-ended text items were reviewed for contextual or interpretative analysis. An exported dataset was also analyzed using the R/RStudio language and environment for statistical computing and graphics. Several multi-dimensional scores that were created to facilitate the data analysis are described below.

Average scores for each of the areas of Knowledge and Capacity Building were computed using the set of 35 individual technical assistance items, each rated from Very Low (1) to Very High (5). These items were grouped into the six major categories listed above with four to seven items in each. Average category scores were calculated by averaging the items in each category. Scores were coded as missing when more than one item per category was not rated (N/A) or left blank.
A single service sector variable was created that consolidates responses to a question where respondents were asked to check up to four service sectors from a checklist of 37 individual items. The new variable was manually created by examining the frequencies of the individual items along with a calculated matrix of their co-occurrences. The resulting service sector variable consists of the following groups: (1) Arts & Culture; (2) Economic Development, Housing & Employment; (3) Education & Childcare; (4) Human Services; and (5) Other.

A financial risk index was calculated from a number of the Financial Health questions. With a starting point of 1, a response to revenue shortfall of “Yes” added 3 points and a response of “Not Sure” added a value of 1 point. A response of more than 11% to revenue loss added 1 point, a response of more than 21% added 3 points, and a response of more than 31% added 5 points. A response of “No” to having a reserve fund added 4 points and a response of “No” to having an endowment added 4 points. Finally, respondents who indicated they did not have reserve funds and had not received PPP (regardless of whether they applied) added 3 points. The resulting index has a possible range from 1 to 20.

II. DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTIC FINDINGS

A. Individual Survey Respondents

Seventy percent (70%) of the surveys were responded to by staff, 17% by a board member, and 13% by “other” individuals, most of whom appear to be unpaid staff or non-board volunteers. Although the invitation asked that the individual responding be the best person suited to do so, it is reasonable to assume that the individual may not have been sufficiently informed or have felt qualified to accurately answer on behalf of the organization all the questions or necessarily represent the views of organization as a whole. This may account for why 25% of the respondents did not answer every survey question.

B. Organizational Characteristics

1. Services

In response to a question about the services offered by their organization, nonprofits could choose up to four service areas from a list of 37, including an open-ended “Other” choice. The average number of service areas selected by a nonprofit was three, and only two of the 37 service areas listed were not selected at all, indicating a diverse sample in mission and services.

For analysis purposes, responses to the service area question were consolidated into the following for service areas or clusters: (1) Arts & Culture; (2) Economic Development, Housing & Employment; (3) Education & Childcare; (4) Human Services; and (5) Other. The breakdown of the clusters is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Service Areas

- Arts & Culture: 38%
- Economic Dev., Housing & Employment: 15%
- Education & Childcare: 19%
- Human Services: 18%
- Other: 10%
2. Primary Populations Served and Representation

Respondents were asked to identify what populations they primarily serve from a list of eleven constituencies or beneficiaries. They could select as many as they would like and were also provided the option of choosing “Other” and writing their response. As indicated in Figure 2, the majority served Adults (58%), the General Public (56%) and K-12 Students (52%).

![Figure 2. Primary Populations Served](image)

As a partial measure of the degree that the organization itself reflects the communities served, respondents were asked how representative their boards and staff are of those communities. Responding nonprofits are not, for the most part, particularly representative: just a third (33%) report they are “mostly representative” and half (51%) report they are “somewhat” representative.

3. Counties Served

Nonprofits were asked what counties in the region they served and to check all that apply. Sixty-five percent (65%) served just one county, 11% two counties, and 15% three or four of the counties. Only 3% or one nonprofit served the entire nine county region. As indicated in Figure 3, Dutchess County was the predominant county served with close to half (46%) doing so. Among those serving Dutchess County (46%), the majority (59%) reported they also serve one or more other counties in the region as well. Ulster County was reported being served by 30% of the respondents, followed by Westchester (25%), Orange (24%) and Columbia (23%).
4. Annual Budget Size

As reflected in Figure 4, the sample reflects a reasonably proportionate distribution within the sample among the various budget ranges of less than $500K to greater than $10M. Of particular note is that over half of the respondents (52%) had annual budgets of $500K or less. Of those nonprofits, close to half (46%) report budgets of $100K or less. Sixty percent (60%) of the nonprofits receive government funding.

C. Financial Health and Impact of COVID-19

1. Revenue Loss

The impact of the COVID crisis on the financial condition, risk indicators, and key recovery factors of the region’s nonprofits was a significant focus of the survey. Questions were asked regarding cash reserves, endowments, participation in the Payroll Protection Program (PPP) and/or the Emergency Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL), and government funding. Respondents were also asked directly to rate the likelihood of insolvency.
The findings indicate that the adverse financial impact of the COVID crisis on nonprofits in the region has been significant. The vast majority of respondents (79%) reported that they expected a revenue loss for the remainder of 2020, with another 13% stating they were “uncertain” if there would be a loss. Only 8% projected that there would be no loss expected for the year. The average projected loss reported was 41% and the median loss reported was 36%.

It is of note that 7% (21 nonprofits) projected a revenue loss of at least 70%, including seven that projected losing virtually all (90% or more) of their revenue. Based on responses to open-ended questions, it appears that the inability to conduct planned fundraising activities was a factor leading to anticipated revenue loss for many. Also, there was hope expressed among some that they would be able to regain fundraising momentum in the fall.

Of the 60% that receive government funding, close to three-quarters (73%) expected at the time of the survey that they would receive an overall reduction this calendar year. Forty-two percent (42%) expected a cut of over 20%, including 7% expecting a cut over 50%. Similarly, 32% anticipated receiving late government contracts and/or payments to the extent that it could “threaten” their organization’s financial health.

Some additional key analytical findings with respect to revenue loss are:

- Nonprofits without government operational funds tend to report higher revenue loss percentages than those with government funds.

- The percentage of revenue shortfall is also associated with budget size, with nonprofits under $1M tending to report proportionally higher losses than larger organizations.

- Affirmative responses to receiving government funds, having an endowment, and having reserve funds are all associated with each other and with lower reported revenue loss percentages. In other words, respondents that received government funds, had an endowment, or had reserve funds were less likely to project loss of revenue.

- Nonprofits that received EIDL tend to report higher revenue loss than nonprofits that did not receive EIDL.

- Nonprofits in Human Services, Education & Childcare, and Economic Development, Housing & Employment Sectors report lower revenue loss percentages than those in the Arts & Culture or Other sectors.

- As to be expected, nonprofits without reserve funds, including a credit line, report proportionally higher losses than nonprofits with reserve funds.
2. Impact on Reserve Funds

Close to three-quarters (72%) of the nonprofits reported having reserve or cash funds, including access to a credit line, that could be available to cover operating expenses. Before the pandemic, 22% of the sample had two months or less of reserves to cover operational expenses, and 45% had four months or less (Figure 5). Of those with reserves, 28% experienced a reduction of the months of cash reserves available since the pandemic started with the average decrease being three months. However, the majority did not experience a reduction. This is likely due to the receipt of PPP/EIDL cash and/or stock market increases during this period.

![Figure 5. Reserve Funds Pre-COVID and When Surveyed](image)

3. Utilization of PPP and EIDL Programs

The federal Payroll Protection Program (PPP) and the Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) initiatives were popular initiatives among the nonprofits surveyed and provided timely but short-term assistance to their cash needs. A strong majority of respondents (60%) applied for and received PPP loan funding at the time of the survey and less than a quarter (22%) applied for and received EIDL support. Thirty-five percent (35%) did not apply for either program. Narrative responses cited three primary reasons for not doing so: 1) did not qualify because of no paid employees (including having only independent contractors) or for one nonprofit, too many employees; 2) may have qualified but were advised otherwise; or 3) ethical reasons (i.e. do not want to take government funding or felt they did not need the money).

Of those receiving PPP, over three-quarters (77%) anticipate receiving the maximum loan amount forgiveness. It is important to note PPP is still taking applications and several of the respondents indicated that they were intending to apply. Nonprofits that received EIDL tended to report higher revenue loss than those that did not receive the loan, presumably because the program provided immediate needed cash of a $10K advance on a forgivable loan.

“**We didn’t apply, the banks were too difficult to deal with.**”

“**We had moral and ethical dilemmas with taking a gov’t handout.**”
4. Expectations for and Risks of Insolvency

When asked regarding the likelihood of insolvency and dissolution by the end of 2020, close to one third (30%) replied that a threat was at least “somewhat likely” including 5% stating that was either “likely” or “very likely”. Although this is not a majority, it is considered a substantive number as it represents 75 nonprofits in the region who at the time of the survey are at least considering the possibility of insolvency.

Calculation of the financial risk index resulted in a mean score of 12.2 and a median score of 13.0. As expected, average financial risk scores are lower for nonprofits that perceived financial insolvency to be not likely than for those that reported somewhat to high likelihood of insolvency. Financial risk is shown to be inversely related to budget size, with nonprofits in the lowest budget size categories experiencing the greatest financial risk on average, as shown in Figure 6. High levels of financial risk were found for nonprofits in all service sector groupings. Higher levels of financial risk were found in organizations that do not benefit from government funding. Although Education & Childcare is in the lower tier on revenue loss, these nonprofits are in the higher tier on the financial risk index. This may be due to the fact that these nonprofits tend to operate on thinner financial margins and thus may not be capable of absorbing even relatively modest losses of revenue.

There are higher expectations for the likelihood of financial insolvency among those without endowments, reserve funds, or government funding. Whether or not nonprofits had applied for PPP is not shown to be a factor in expectations of the likelihood of insolvency. Nonprofits delivering Education & Childcare services have greater expectations for insolvency than nonprofits in the Other service sector groups. Although size of budget is associated with some differences in expectations for insolvency, these differences are not linear, with the lowest expectations for insolvency occurring among nonprofits in the smallest and the largest budget categories.

Of the 70% that reported that insolvency was “not likely,” some commented that they can strengthen themselves by becoming smaller and leaner and by pursuing strategies for restructuring. Many expressed optimism regarding the potential of fundraising in the fall and in 2021. A few mentioned their organization has been resilient through other major historical and societal crises and are confident that they can manage through this pandemic.
5. Collaborations, Partnerships and Corporate Restructuring as a Strategy

Service collaborations, partnerships, affiliations, and mergers are potential strategies for preserving or building organizational financial health and preventing insolvency or dissolution. In response to a four-item question about whether nonprofit organizations were involved in, interested in, or actively exploring service collaborations, partnerships, affiliations, and mergers during the upcoming 12 months, more than half (62%) of the respondents answered “yes” to at least one of the four strategies and an additional 22% answered “maybe” to at least one. Responses to each of the organizational strategy items are shown in Figure 7.

The percent of respondents with a “yes” or “maybe” response to the strategies listed showed that partnerships (77%) and collaborations (76%) tend to be of greater interest than affiliations (47%) or mergers (20%). This is as expected as the terms “affiliation” and “merger” have binding legal implications whereby “partnerships” and “collaborations” are less definitive or tangible. Nevertheless, there is a very high interest in collaboration strategies overall and the fact that close to half of the sample would consider or are considering a corporate affiliation or merger is surprisingly high. Nonprofits in the Human Services, Education & Childcare, and the Economic Development, Housing & Employment sectors tend to express greater interest in pursuing service restructuring strategies than organizations in the Arts & Culture or Other sectors.

“**We are looking to streamline services and have a bigger footprint regionally.**”

“**Some partners for which we provide programs have suspended their programs, which in turn suspends our work with them.**”

“**We recognize two things: the need for greater regional planning to create a stronger system and the necessity of partnering to expand services.**”
In an open-ended question, nonprofits shared how the people that they served and/or their mission has been affected by the pandemic. Close to 200 responded in highly concerned and often lengthy narratives. These narratives contain poignant and painful stories about the unmet needs and extreme stress that their clients and the communities that depend upon them are experiencing. Many nonprofits described how the closing and future uncertainty of schools are adversely threatening their abilities to fulfill their missions. For health and human service nonprofits, including those that are reliant on schools being open, painful stories are told of the unmet needs and extreme stress that their clients and communities who depend on them are experiencing, all of which is happening at a time when the nonprofit and the health and safety of its own workforce is in crisis. As a normal course of affairs, nonprofit providers are accustomed to not having sufficient resources to meet and effectively address the needs of those they are dedicated to serve and benefit. The stories shared illustrate that the pandemic is breaking the service system with severe reduction if not closure of programs, services, and organizations at a time when providers struggle to pivot in a policy and regulatory environment that changes daily.

Among Arts & Culture organizations, respondents spoke of program and facility closings, and fundraising events halted. They noted that at a time of social isolation and depressing circumstances, arts and cultural activities are very much needed. Organizations shared their efforts to shift to smaller and compliant venues or gatherings, online platforms, and digital programming as strategies to better serve audiences or constituent needs. Some similar mission impact stories were shared from libraries and environmental organizations.

On the following page, the “word cloud” represents the frequency of keywords (larger size are stated more often) that the respondents’ made as to how their mission and communities were impacted by the pandemic.
Nonprofits were also asked what their “best case realistic scenario” was for their organization’s recovery from the pandemic and recession. There were two hundred and forty-one (241) narrative responses that reflected the gamut of views from hopelessness and pessimism to the sentiment that there will be a return to “normal,” especially once a vaccine is developed. Overall, a tremendous level of uncertainty was threaded throughout the responses. As reflected in the financial data and findings, there was an awareness among many that the situation was “grim” and organizational “survival” this year or next would be considered an indicator of success if achieved. More moderate views were anticipating that workforce reduction and belt-tightening would be sufficient as a “staying the course” strategy to get them through next year.
Despite the pervasive scope and impact of the pandemic, some nonprofits expressed the view that optimism is still warranted. Hope was expressed by some that they may gain new relevance and community support in this time of high needs, that there will be increased funding coming their way from government and philanthropic sources, and that their donors and supporters will remain at levels of pre-pandemic involvement or will step up even more.

“(We hope) to survive on our reserves until we can continue to normal operations and fundraising.”

“Most have lost their jobs and are in dire need of food.”

“They have experienced extreme social isolation.”

“We can’t love and nurture the children as we once did.”

E. Knowledge and Capacity-Building Needs

Respondents were asked to rate the level of their organization’s knowledge and capacities with respect to 34 specific areas organized by six categories of technical assistance. They were then asked to consider the necessity of the six categories of technical assistance and to rank them as to the priority for their organization. The categories are Planning & Strategy; Partnership & Alliance; Organizational Leadership; Finance, Operations & Technology; Marketing & Communication; and Fundraising.

Figures 8-13 on pages 17 – 21 provide the levels of knowledge and capacity ratings within each of the categories. Figure 14 on page 21, displays respondent prioritization of the six categories for technical assistance needs based on necessity.

The two approaches represent different ways of measuring the need for technical assistance. The one based on the ratings can shed light on areas with the lowest levels of knowledge and capacity; the other based on the rankings reveals areas with the greatest self-perceived need. It is important to keep in mind that an organization may have low knowledge and capacity in an area, but still not rate it as a high priority if they don’t think that the area is important to their operations. Some of the most significant overall needs can be found where there are relatively low levels of knowledge and capacity AND a high priority based on necessity.

Average scores calculated for items in each of the areas of Knowledge and Capacity Building are: Fundraising (2.75); Marketing & Communication (3.17); Organizational Leadership (3.25); Partnership & Alliance (3.34); Finance, Operations & Technology (3.38); and Planning & Strategy (3.41). Not surprisingly, nonprofits reporting greater percentages of revenue loss tended to report an even greater need for technical assistance in the Fundraising area than those with lower revenue loss.

Based on the priority rankings, the highest need for technical assistance is also in the Fundraising area. Fundraising is chosen as the top priority by 29%; and Planning & Strategy by 25%. Taking the top three choices into consideration (i.e., respondents ranking them 1-3 among seven), the order of the areas are: Fundraising (65%); Planning & Strategy (60%); and Finance, Operations & Technology (45%).This ordering based on the three top rankings is also confirmed by the average of the items in each of the categories resulting in the ordering of: Fundraising (3.13); Planning & Strategy (3.32); Finance, Operations & Technology (3.81); Organizational Leadership (4.05); Marketing & Communication (4.22); Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion (4.35); and Partnership & Alliance (5.12).
The technical assistance findings show that nonprofits indicate a high need in the Fundraising area, due to relatively low knowledge of and capacity for this area as well as a high degree of perceived priority. The other categories are less clearly demarcated. Marketing & Communication and Organizational Leadership are reported as somewhat higher need areas resulting from relatively low knowledge and capacity. Planning & Strategy as well as Finance, Operations & Technology are reported as somewhat higher need areas resulting from high perceived priority for technical assistance.

In the highest need Fundraising category (Figure 8), the individual item ratings indicate a strong need for technical assistance among all of the organizational knowledge and capacity items. The highest proportion of very low and below average ratings are: planned giving and estate planning (65%), access to flexible funding (43%), and developing digital fundraising campaigns (40%). Knowledge and capacity for the remaining items are rated at very low or below average among one-third or more of the respondents: cultivating and communicating with donors virtually (35%), alternative strategies for fundraising events (38%), access to grant writers and/or grant writing techniques (33%), and strengthening capacities to access government funding (36%).

![Figure 8. Fundraising](image-url)
The individual area of highest need for technical assistance in the Marketing & Communication category (Figure 9) is leveraging customer relations management systems for deep virtual engagement, with 34% of respondents indicating very low to below average organizational knowledge and capacity. The remaining items are rated very low to below average by 17% to 20% percent of nonprofits.

In the category of Organizational Leadership (Figure 10), organizational knowledge and capacity is rated to be very low to below average by about one-quarter or more of nonprofits for the following items: training in DEI for staff and board (35%), periodic executive director or board leader roundtable (peer learning) (28%), and engaging board volunteers and optimizing their skills (24%). Very low to below average ratings were provided by 9% to 20% of nonprofits for the remaining items in this category.

“We need help with strengthening our very early-stage efforts in DEI.”

“We need a younger board that is willing and able to take on key leadership roles.”
In the remaining three technical assistance categories, most of the individual knowledge and capacity items are rated as low to below average by less than 20% of respondents. In the **Planning & Strategy** category (Figure 11), more than 20% of nonprofits rated their organizations as very low to below average in diversification of revenue sources (29%), adapting programs to digital environments (27%), centering recovery and rebuilding efforts around equity (23%), and business continuity and disaster planning for operations (21%).
In the category of Partnership & Alliance (Figure 12), two items are noted: exploring and evolving to a systems-based approach to service delivery (32%) and exploring affiliations, shared services, and/or mergers (20%). Although exploring Partnerships & Alliances ranked relatively low in the percentage of perceived priority need for technical assistance, as was reported earlier, 77% (194 organizations) responded yes or maybe to being involved in, interested in, or actively exploring formal affiliations or mergers over the next twelve months. Twenty-one percent (21%) or 61 nonprofits stated a definite yes and eighteen percent (18%) or 53 nonprofits stated maybe to formal affiliations. With respect to mergers, nine percent (9%) or 25 nonprofits stated a definite yes and eight percent (8%) or 23 nonprofits responded maybe to the consideration of mergers.

![Figure 12. Partnership & Alliance](image)

Finally, in the category of Finance, Operations & Technology (Figure 13), human resources guidance and/or coaching is rated as very low to below average by 19% of nonprofits, but none of the items reach 20%.

“How can we be an effective and helpful partner in the midst of these challenges when the front-line demands are so severe and while we still work to advance our shared goals on other fronts?”

“How do we get employees who are not tech savvy up-to-date on technology?”
Just more than half participated with an open-ended response to the follow up of what other knowledge and capacity building needs or additional supports would be helpful at this time. Many were similar responses to the prior question, but included planned giving, branding, and HR (staff development, workforce management, technology and support for virtual programming and working remotely).

“Ensuring that the virtual platforms that we are using are efficient and their capability are being maximized.”

“Figure 13. Finance, Operations & Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for fiscal health and adapting revenue generation goals</th>
<th>Financial assessment, planning and budgeting (including cash flow management, scenario planning and debt management)</th>
<th>Navigating the PPP loan forgiveness process</th>
<th>Leveraging technology to optimize remote operations</th>
<th>Human resources guidance and/or coaching (e.g., employment decisions, caring for staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>23.42%</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>34.23%</td>
<td>21.17%</td>
<td>28.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>43.69%</td>
<td>36.94%</td>
<td>27.48%</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Priority of Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity, Equity and Inclusion</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>18%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Communication</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Operations &amp; Technology</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership &amp; Alliance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A - 0.45% Very High - 9.01% Above Average - 33.33% Average - 43.69% Below Average - 11.71% Very Low - 1.80%
III. COVID-19 Impact Update and Conclusions

In this rapidly changing COVID environment, it is important to recognize that this survey is a time specific snapshot of the actual and perceived organizational and economic conditions and technical assistance needs of Hudson Valley nonprofits in the midst of the fear and recovery uncertainties at that time of the pandemic. Since the survey period, several significant pandemic-induced events have occurred that would likely alter some of the responses and findings if the survey were to be taken in August, just a month later.

First and foremost, COVID-19 conditions have greatly improved in the region (and state), and regional and local recovery planning is underway. Although plenty of uncertainty remains, particularly with respect to the possibility of a second wave, the easing of stay-at-home orders and the re-opening of nonprofits, businesses, schools, colleges and other workplaces are eagerly welcomed developments that bring both opportunities as well as new capacity challenges for nonprofits. For example, childcare, education, and school-based or school contracted nonprofits, who have been impacted greatly by the pandemic and face high insolvency risks, are now more able to resume or ramp up. In the survey, moreover, nonprofits shared their struggles with shifting to and operationalizing remote working while the crisis was at hand, and while trying to envision what their future would be, and for some, if they were to have a future. Now, re-opening plans are being developed and implemented, and nonprofit boards and management are dealing with all the health, safety, human resource, and program delivery changes in business models and other associated challenges, within a resource scarce environment.

State funding is perhaps the most significant and impactful change that has taken shape since the survey. Shortly after the survey data collection, the Governor issued a 30-day Executive Order suspending prompt payment and contracting laws. The Order was later extended for another 30 days and remains in effect at this time. Along with this Order, the state has frozen all new and renewed nonprofit contracts and is withholding or reducing advanced and invoiced payments to nonprofits by a minimum of 20%. In addition, the state has declared that these withholdings may be converted to permanent reductions, depending on the availability, size and timing of new federal aid. The state has also since reduced local aid payments (municipal and school aid) by 20%. This across-the-board cut is deepening the deficits of local governments and schools and is rippling down in further cuts to nonprofit providers.

These policies, along with the anticipation that there are “more shoes to drop” by the state, are having immediate and profound adverse effects on the cash flow and fiscal integrity of nonprofits providing services on behalf of government and on their ability and capacity to deliver those services. It is reasonable to assume that their financial condition has deteriorated further than measured herein, and that conditions will worsen for the foreseeable future, especially given the extent of the projected New York State Fiscal Year 2021 budget deficit. Federal relief has not yet arrived and there is increased pessimism as to the amount of aid to be received and the extent to which it will be distributed in such a way to make nonprofit contractors whole.

An additional financial threat looming from the state concerns PPP loans. It is clear from the survey data that the PPP loans have been lynch pins in financially shoring up the cash position and stabilizing the workforce of nonprofits during the height of the crisis and for the remainder of the year. Securing maximum forgiveness or having as much of those funds as possible converted from loans to grants is vital to the fiscal viability and sustainability of many. Several state agencies have advised nonprofits that they may or will lay claim to these dollars where they believe “double dipping” applies. If this occurs, it will be a significant and sudden financial blow that compounds the withholdings and reductions that are underway.

For obvious reasons, Fundraising was identified as a critical capacity and technical assistance priority. Some of the respondents, especially those addressing basic needs, felt buoyed by the outpouring of cash support
provided by donors and various COVID response funds. Although there were many respondents who expressed a level of despair regarding their prospects to generate the revenue they were losing, there were a surprising number of respondents that expressed that a “realistic scenario” come fall would be that they would be able to regain fundraising momentum to make-up for revenue losses. These nonprofits were looking to reschedule fundraising events in the last quarter of the year, expecting donors to give at the same or greater than pre-pandemic levels, hoping to pivot quickly and successfully to digital fundraising platforms, and/or receiving additional or new funding from philanthropic and government sources. It is very difficult, however, to see such strategies as realistic to meet the goals and needs of most nonprofits given the expected, continued economic decline; the uncertainties as to a second wave of the virus; the health and safety concerns of the workforce, constituents and the public; the financial condition of state and local governments and schools; and the very limited financial capacity of local philanthropy. With respect to overall nonprofit revenue, philanthropic dollars are a “drop in the bucket” when compared to government and fee generated dollars. The competition for donor and philanthropic grant dollars is going to be significantly greater. The overall resources are simply not available to meet the longer-term or sustained revenue needs and the heightened expectations of many, if not most, of the nonprofits surveyed, even if they measurably improved their capacity or infrastructure to fundraise in what is an increasingly resource-scarce and competitive environment.

The second highest priority area, Planning & Strategy, is over-arching in organizational scope and encompasses business and revenue models, recovery planning, equity, digital platforms, etc. Moving forward, the pandemic caused nonprofits to focus on the “what ifs” of various scenarios playing out and the need to be better prepared, adapt, and to make the difficult and critical decisions needed. As clearly indicated in the narrative responses provided, the game has dramatically changed as most all assumptions and practices are being re-examined for what may lay ahead three months, six months, or a year from now.

It is important to recognize that historic racial and social injustices have become even more pronounced during this pandemic and at a time when many nonprofits were placing diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) at the forefront of their agendas and plans. Survey responses and other sources suggest that the capacity disruption of the pandemic has delayed nonprofits from moving forward on further imbedding DEI into their organizations as intended. As nonprofits work to stabilize their boards and staff, it is expected that their DEI efforts will be renewed with even greater importance given the societal imperative to address racial and economic injustice.

With a clear-eyed view, this assessment and the current and foreseeable conditions all point to the fact that there will be substantial corporate and service delivery changes in the region’s nonprofit landscape, including program divestments and closures, service integration, collaborations of substance, mergers and affiliations, and dissolutions.

The sponsors of this report recognize and celebrate the fact that nonprofits in the Hudson Valley Region are relied upon in the direst of times and are essential to the social, health, economic, social justice, and civic fabric of our communities. Over time, nonprofits have been resilient and creative in changing and often challenging times and have proven to make the most out of very little. It is also recognized that their services are dependent on their organizational capacity to be able to plan, deliver, and sustainably support those services smartly and strategically. This assessment raises awareness of and insight into their capacity-building needs and what assistance may be needed to preserve and sustain their charitable missions.
IV. APPENDIX A

HV Nonprofit Capacity-Building Questionnaire
A Hudson Valley Collaboration: Supporting Nonprofit Capacity Building

The Challenge: The Impact of COVID-19
The COVID-19 health crisis and its economic and social fall-out has affected us all, but our nonprofit community has been disproportionately impacted in significant ways. For some, services and programs have halted causing great financial strains. For others who serve the most vulnerable, they have been asked to do more or adapt to new ways of service delivery, all with limited resources. All of this as longstanding structural inequities have been exacerbated under the crisis, especially among communities of color, immigrants, and lower-income individuals and families (among others).

The Opportunity: Emerging Stronger Together
The nonprofit landscape in our communities is changing dramatically. As we move forward, there are new opportunities before us to shape that future and to emerge from this crisis from a position of mission and organizational strength, in a more connected way. Embracing the changes this health crisis presents and operating with new and different models will require new skills to be developed and, in some cases, new learned competencies to be adopted by staff and boards of nonprofits. And for some, collaborations and partnerships have been and could be forged to better meet the needs of people in the Hudson Valley region.

While communities across our region face different post-pandemic challenges, we believe there are commonalities among us all. We see this as an opportunity to bring together the nonprofit sector for learning and sharing, and in the process, strengthen the vital work of nonprofits in achieving their mission.

The Approach: A Regional Approach
Funders involved in the Hudson Valley region have joined forces: Berkshire Taconic Community Foundation, Community Foundations of the Hudson Valley, Community Foundation of Orange and Sullivan, Dyson Foundation, Field Hall Foundation, Foundation for Community Health, Ralph E. Ogden Foundation, United Way of the Dutchess-Orange Region, United Way of Ulster County, United Way of Westchester and Putnam, and Westchester Community Foundation. We have joined with the New York Council of Nonprofits (NYCON) to better understand the needs of nonprofits and collectively deliver resources and trainings that can build capacity and strengthen the social sector in this region.

The Needs of Nonprofits: Data Survey
This survey is intended to help identify the high-level impact of COVID-19 on the nonprofit community and unveil the knowledge and skills needed by the sector to emerge from COVID-19 as a stronger, more effective, and resilient system.
SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

- Responses to the survey are encouraged by Tuesday, July 7 at 5 pm.*
- We seek 1 completed answer per organization. If there is an individual at your organization that is best suited to respond, please forward this survey to them.
- The estimated time to complete this survey is about 15 minutes.
- All individual answers will be kept confidential, and response data will be shared in aggregate.
- The survey is divided into three sections: Financial Picture, Knowledge & Capacity Building Needs, and Organizational Information.
- The survey instrument allows you to start filling it out and return to where you left off on the same computer/device at a later date, if you wish, without losing your responses. Once you click “submit” at the end, the survey is completed and you cannot go back to change your responses.

*NOTE: This survey will be unavailable from Friday, July 3 from 11 am to 11 pm due to scheduled SurveyMonkey site maintenance.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you need assistance or have questions, please contact NYCON at surveys@nycon.org.
FINANCIAL PICTURE

1. For the remainder of this calendar year, are you expecting less revenue than budgeted?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
2. If yes, what is the percentage of revenue loss? [Scale 1%-100%]

3. Does your organization currently have reserve funds, including a credit line, that you can access to cover operating expenses if needed?
   - Yes
   - No
4. If yes, how many months of operation would these reserve funds cover your expenses before the pandemic? [Pick one]
   - Less than 1
   - 1-2
   - 3-4
   - 5-6
   - 7-8
   - 9-10
   - 11-12
   - More than 12

5. How many months of reserve do you currently have available? [Pick one]
   - Less than 1
   - 1-2
   - 3-4
   - 5-6
   - 7-8
   - 9-10
   - 11-12
   - More than 12

6. Does your nonprofit have an endowment with permanently restricted funds?
   - Yes
   - No
7. What is the dollar amount of your endowment?
   - Below $1,000,000
   - $1,000,000 - $4,999,999
   - $5,000,000 - $9,999,999
   - $10,000,000 - $24,999,999
   - $25,000,000 and above

8. Approximately how much do you rely on endowment income to cover annual operations?
   - 0% - 9%
   - 10% - 19%
   - 20% - 29%
   - 30% - 39%
   - 40% - 49%
   - 50% - 59%
   - 60% - 69%
   - 70% - 79%
   - 80% - 89%
   - 90% - 100%

9. Please share your Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) status. [Pick one]
   - We have applied for PPP and have received it.
   - We have applied for PPP and are awaiting results.
   - We have applied for PPP and were denied.
   - We did not apply for PPP.

   If you DID NOT apply, please comment why you did not apply.
10. Do you anticipate being able to maximize PPP loan forgiveness?
- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

11. Did you apply for and receive Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) funding?
- Yes
- No

12. Do you receive government (federal, state and/or local) funding?
- Yes
- No
13. What overall reductions of government funding, if any, do you anticipate for this calendar year?

- No Reduction
- Less than 10%
- 10% - 19%
- 20% - 29%
- 30% - 39%
- 40% - 49%
- 50% - 59%
- 60% - 69%
- 70% - 79%
- 80% - 89%
- 90% - 100%

14. Are you experiencing or do you anticipate experiencing late government contracts and/or payments that will or could threaten your organization’s financial health?

- Yes
- No
15. This tumultuous nonprofit landscape can challenge business models, organizational relationships and abilities to deliver and sustain programming. Collaborations can be part of the response. Are you involved in, interested in, or actively exploring partnerships, affiliations and/or mergers during the next 12 months? [Check one per row]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(collaborative efforts, shared services, non-binding MOU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formal partnerships, parent-subsidiary, often have formal MOU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(organizations that formally come together under one organizational structure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes to any of the above, for what reason? (e.g., preserve or sustain mission, for growth). What opportunities or barriers are you encountering?


16. In your mind, what is the “best case realistic scenario” for your organization’s recovery from the pandemic and recession?


17. How concerned are you about the likelihood of insolvency and dissolution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (optional)


**KNOWLEDGE & CAPACITY BUILDING NEEDS**

18. To help us understand technical assistance that could help your organization recover and rebuild over the next year, please rate the level of your organization's knowledge and capacities in the following areas:

**PLANNING STRATEGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business continuity and disaster planning for operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing/preserving mission, program viability &amp; organizational priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing and adapting our business model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centering recovery and rebuilding efforts around equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating/adjusting our current strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification of revenue sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting programs to digital environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTNERSHIP & ALLIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convening and collaborating with other organizations doing similar work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring affiliations, shared services and/or mergers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing: nonprofits learn from each other about impact and responses to the pandemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring and evolving to a systems-based approach to service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### **20. ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading change for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more diverse, equitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in DEI for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance in a time of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapid change: role of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board (role of full board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and role of board officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimizing their skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading and managing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of crisis and into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change/change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director or board leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roundtable (peer learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### **21. FINANCE, OPERATIONS & TECHNOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for fiscal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health and adapting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue generation goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assessment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning and budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management, scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning and debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating the PPP loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgiveness process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to optimize remote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaching (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment decisions,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring for staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### *22. MARKETING & COMMUNICATION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing your mission and services in the digital world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating social media platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging customer relations management systems for deep virtual engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing brand messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### *23. FUNDRAISING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating and communicating with donors virtually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing digital fundraising campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative strategies for fundraising events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to grantwriters and/or grantwriting techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening capacities to access government funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to flexible funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned giving and estate giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. As you consider the necessity of these major categories of technical assistance, please rank them from 1-7, with 1 being the highest priority to your organization, and 7 being the lowest.

*Note: You may drag the categories in the order preferred or choose the drop down menu to rank them.

- Planning & Strategy
- Partnership & Alliance
- Organizational Leadership
- Finance, Operations & Technology
- Marketing/Communication
- Fundraising
- Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

25. Please comment on your highest priority technical assistance areas.

26. What other knowledge and capacity building needs does your organization have, and/or what additional supports would be helpful at this time?
ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

27. Who (what role) is completing this survey for your organization?
   - Staff leader (e.g., ED, CEO)
   - Board leader (e.g., President, officer)
   - Other (please specify)

28. Please select the county service area(s) that your organization supports with programs/services.
   - Dutchess
   - Columbia
   - Greene
   - Orange
   - Putnam
   - Rockland
   - Sullivan
   - Ulster
   - Westchester

29. Please indicate your organization’s budget size.
   - Under $50K
   - $50 - $100K
   - $101 - $250K
   - $251 - $500K
   - $501K - $1M
   - $1M - $2.5M
   - $2.5M - $10M
   - Greater than $10M
30. Please select the primary populations served by your organization. [Can pick more than one]

- Pre-school children
- K-12 students
- Young adults 18-24
- Postsecondary students
- Adults
- Other (open-ended)

31. Please share how the people you serve and/or the mission that you fulfill have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.

32. How representative of the communities you serve is your staff and board?

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Mostly
- 100%
33. Please select your sector(s). [Pick up to four]

*Note: If you pick more than 4, your response will not be accepted. Please limit to no more than 4.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector / Specialization</th>
<th>Sector / Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy, Public Policy &amp; Research</td>
<td>First Responder (Medical and/or Fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Gallery/Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare &amp; Care</td>
<td>Grantmaker - Foundation, United Way, Federation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>Housing (ER, Transitional &amp; Permanent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care/Child Development</td>
<td>Human/Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>Immigrant/Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Social Justice</td>
<td>International/Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center/Settlement House</td>
<td>Land/Conservancy Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Management Support/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Disabled</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Community Development</td>
<td>Performing Arts/Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Primary/Secondary School)</td>
<td>Recreation/Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Workforce Training</td>
<td>Religious/Faith-based/Spiritual Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Email of Person Completing the Survey (OPTIONAL & CONFIDENTIAL). *This will only be used if the survey is not completed or corrections need to be made.*

Email Address