

Extension Organizational Development Programming:
Outcome Measurement through a Multi-Program Delivery Model

Paul Roback

University of Wisconsin-Extension

Department of Community Resource Development

May 2017

Contact Information:

Paul Roback

Associate Professor and Community Development Educator

UW-Extension, Washington County

333 E. Washington St., Suite 1200

PO Box 2003

West Bend, WI 53095

Phone: (262) 335-4480

paul.robback@ces.uwex.edu

Abstract

Nonprofit organizations often provide vital services that enhance the quality of life of county residents, such as matching volunteers with elderly residents for transportation to medical appointments, providing positive role models and activities for youth, and protecting natural areas for the enjoyment of future generations. Nonprofits frequently experience increased demand for services while simultaneously experiencing weakening financial strength. Making a positive impact in a resource competitive environment requires nonprofit organizations to be innovative, dynamic, and interconnected. However, nonprofits often lack the knowledge and capacity to focus on their mission and use limited resources strategically.

Through a multi-agency collaboration that included University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension (Extension), over 90 nonprofit organizations were surveyed to determine their fiscal health and educational needs. Results were used to design and implement two multi-year educational programs, including a series of nine nonprofit workshops and direct organizational development programming provided to 41 organizations. Follow-up surveys indicated that because of these educational interventions, organizations were strengthened, became more strategic in fulfilling their mission, and had an increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities.

This paper details program planning and long-term outcome measurement of Extension organizational development programming in Washington County, Wisconsin.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Background.....	4
Program Development.....	5
Program Response, Results, and Findings	6
Program I: Nonprofit Workshops.....	6
Program II: Organizational Development Facilitation	8
Conclusions & Implications.....	10
References	12
Appendix A: 2012 Nonprofit Survey Instrument	14
Appendix B: Nonprofit Workshop Evaluation Result Summary.....	20
Appendix C: Washington County Daily News Article 12/18/2015	22

Background

Extension services across the country have a long history of developing and implementing evaluation tools to measure the outcomes of educational programming. Using a Logic Model as a framework for program planning and evaluation is a standard tool used by Extension educators to articulate the impacts of their educational programs (Arnold, 2002). Through the Logic Model, impacts are measured by the different levels of outcomes that are expected from the educational program. Short-term outcomes can be measured by knowledge gained, medium-term (or intermediate-term) outcomes can be measured by behavior change, and long-term outcomes can be measured by societal change (Taylor-Powell & Henert, 2008). Despite having a framework, program planning and evaluation are challenging for Extension due to the complex funding and varying delivering models for programming (Franz & Townson, 2008). Especially challenging is measuring beyond short-term outcomes. A study of over 1,000 county-based Extension educators in eight states found that few collected evaluation data on behavior change (Lamm, Israel & Diehl, 2013). In an era of increased accountability for federal funding, as evidenced by the Government Performance Results Act of 1993 and the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, it is critical for Extension to measure the intermediate and long-term impacts of programs. This paper details program planning and outcome measurement of Extension organizational development programming in Washington County, Wisconsin.

Organizational Development (OD) is a multidisciplinary approach that is rooted in the social and behavioral sciences. French (1969) defined OD as “a long-range effort to improve an organization’s problem solving capabilities and its ability to cope with changes in its external environment with the help of external or internal behavioral-scientist consultants, or change agents” (p.23). OD practitioners are change agents that carefully diagnosis the organization from a behavioral perspective and then use a variety of skills, processes, and knowledge to accomplish the desired organizational change (Grieves,

2000). Instead of relying on a single methodology, they select an approach that best fits an organization's situation (Piotrowski, Vodanaovich, & Armstrong, 2001). Strauss (1973) observes that OD is different "from traditional consulting in that it is the client who generates the solution to the problem, not the consultant" (p.3). This approach is closely aligned with Extension's role as group process facilitators. According to Franz and Townson (2008), educators using a facilitation approach "excel at bringing a variety of voices to the table to solve multifaceted problems using a number of techniques" (p.11). Extension educators that are skilled process facilitators are often effective OD practitioners.

Program Development

In order to gain an understanding of nonprofit educational needs and to measure nonprofit fiscal health, Extension collaborated with representatives from the United Way of Washington County, University of Wisconsin-Washington County, and the Volunteer Center of Washington County to survey Washington County's nonprofit community in 2012. This collaboration is known locally as the Nonprofit Coalition. This coalition researched similar surveys conducted by the Greater Green Bay Community Foundation (2010) and the Community Foundation for the Fox Valley Region, Inc. (2011). For the Washington County survey, Extension assisted in the development of the survey instrument (Appendix A), identified survey contacts, analyzed survey results, and wrote the executive summary of the survey's findings for the survey report. The survey was distributed electronically to 91 nonprofit organizations within the county and 28 responses were received for a response rate of 30.8%. Responses were held in confidence and the data results were shared in aggregate.

The survey found that from 2010 to 2011, demand for nonprofit services increased, while staffing levels and funding remained the same or decreased. The survey also found 85.7% of the nonprofits indicated obtaining funds was challenging, 85.7% indicated recruiting new donors was challenging, 75.0% indicated maintaining donors was challenging, and 82.1% reported that they were not currently undertaking an endowment campaign. Organizations also indicated that their greatest

challenges were obtaining funds and recruiting new donors; enhancing their visibility and reputation; and managing workloads.

These results were presented at a forum that had representatives from 34 nonprofit organizations. After the presentation, Extension facilitated a discussion with forum participants, who suggested that more collaboration is needed amongst the non-profit sector in Washington County and nonprofits need to seek out new and diversified funding sources to sustain and grow services to meet demands. These two identified needs are not mutually exclusive. Collaborations are often helpful in strengthening relationships that may result in cost savings or an increase in revenue (Paik, 2012).

Program Response, Results, and Findings

Two multi-year educational programs were developed to respond to nonprofit needs. First, the Nonprofit Coalition designed and implemented a series of nine nonprofit workshops over three years. Second, Extension provided one-on-one OD facilitation with 41 separate organizations. Delivering two simultaneous programs allowed for broader participation through the workshop format and more in-depth strategy development through the OD facilitation.

Program I: Nonprofit Workshops

The 2012 survey data and forum discussion resulted in the Nonprofit Coalition designing and implementing nine workshops from 2013-2015. These workshops were attended by 264 individuals representing Washington County area nonprofits. Content experts were contracted to deliver content-based training on collaboration, developing a board fundraising culture, finances, logic models, and outcome measurement. Extension assisted with identifying workshop presenters and promoting the workshops. Extension also led evaluation development, implementation, and analysis. At each session, a retrospective post-then-pre design evaluation was used to measure increased understanding of forum topics. The average increase in understanding for the nine sessions went from a 2.9 pre-session to a 4.0

post-session (on a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = no understanding and 5 = a very good understanding).

A summary of workshop evaluations is located in Appendix B.

In 2015, a follow-up survey was conducted to measure the change in nonprofit fiscal health, the longer-term outcomes of the nonprofit educational workshops, and to identify future nonprofit educational needs. There are 147 nonprofits (public charities) located in Washington County (Anderson, Chikoto & Schnupp, 2015). The 75 nonprofits included in the 2015 survey were a convenience sample of nonprofit organizations that were on the contact list used by Nonprofit Coalition to promote their educational workshops and were part of the 2012 survey participant list. Nonprofits included on this list provide services within Washington County. The survey received 35 responses for a response rate of 44.9%. Survey questions were largely the same as the questions used in the 2012 nonprofit survey. A few questions were edited for clarity or updated for relevancy. For the 2015 survey, Extension designed the survey instrument in Qualtrics survey software, implemented the survey, compiled the survey results, authored a report of the survey's findings, and authored a press release, which resulted in an article appearing in the Washington County Daily News on December 18, 2015 (Appendix C).

The major finding of this survey was that 83.9% of the respondents were confident that they will be able to meet the demand for services in 2015. However, 76.5% indicated demand for services increased; 62.9% indicated total expenses increased; 65.7% have been financially healthy to date, but feel vulnerable in the future; 32.1% had expenses exceed revenues; and 29.0% had three or less months of reserves on hand for operating expenses. Table 1 compares responses between 2012 and 2015.

Table 1:
Fiscal Health Comparative Survey Data from 2012-2015

	2012	2015
Confidence in ability to meet demand for services	95.3%	83.9%
Increase in demand for services	66.7%	76.5%
Increase in total expenses	59.3%	62.9%
Financial healthy to date, but feel vulnerable in the future	42.9%	65.7%
Expenses exceed revenues	42.9%	32.1%
Three or less months of reserves on hand for operating expenses	28.6%	29.0%

The intent of the Nonprofit Coalition workshops was to respond to the educational needs of the nonprofit community, not to directly influence nonprofit fiscal health. Extension presented the survey data related to nonprofit fiscal health to representatives from three area foundations and the United Way. The measured changes in nonprofit fiscal health identified through the survey initiated a community conversation on the sustainability of area nonprofits and their ability to meet the continued increased demand for services in the community.

The survey also measured the longer-term outcomes of participation in the Nonprofit Coalition's educational workshops. Of the 35 that responded to the survey, 26 (74.3%) had attended at least one of the nine educational workshops. The survey identified that as a result of attending at least one workshop, 51.9% of the respondents indicated that their organization had applied knowledge gained from at least one of the sessions, 29.6% had increased the number of tools they can use to strengthen their organization, and 18.5% had an increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities. Although end of session evaluations demonstrated that participants gained knowledge (Appendix B), longer-term outcomes were not as impressive. This data may suggest that attending one or more educational workshops may not be enough of an educational engagement to boost long-term organizational capacity.

Program II: Organizational Development Facilitation

In addition to participating in the Nonprofit Coalition, Extension provided direct organizational development facilitation to 41 separate organizations between 2012 and 2016. Of these organizations, thirty were nonprofits, eight were county/local government entities, and three were schools/school districts. Washington County non-profit organizations provide vital services that enhance the quality of life of county residents. However, they often lack the knowledge and capacity to focus on their mission and use limited resources strategically. Providing education in organizational development was identified as the highest priority through a 2007 visioning session for the vacant UW-Extension

Community Development Educator position and continues to be a programmatic need in Washington County, as measured in the 2015 nonprofit survey and continued demand for this type of programming.

Each facilitated process is designed to achieve the desired outcomes the organization has identified. These processes include pre-planning meetings with the leadership of the organization, developing a work-plan/contract detailing the process and responsibilities, organizational assessment, facilitating meetings, developing a planning report, and measuring outcomes of the process. Facilitated processes frequently include prioritizing goals and developing strategies to accomplish these goals. For many of the organizations, strategies were developed for diversifying funding sources, recruiting board members, and developing collaborations. These directly relate to the needs identified in the 2012 and 2015 nonprofit surveys. Detailed information for each of these processes can be found on-line in the UW-Extension Recording Results System. Reports are entered as either an impact statement, success story, or a results narrative.

Each process was evaluated at the conclusion of the facilitated session(s). Of the 18 facilitated processes that included goal identification, participants strongly agreed that the process of identifying and prioritizing goals increased their ability to identify issues and set priorities (an average of 4.6 on a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). Of the 18 facilitated process that included action plan development, participants strongly agreed that discussing action plans increased their ability to focus goals into future actions (an average of 4.5 on a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). Overall, participants from the 41 organizations evaluated the facilitation as excellent (an average of 4.7 on a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = poor and 5 = excellent).

For the past three years (2014-2016), longer-term outcomes of this program were measured through year-end follow-up evaluations. Cumulatively, 27 organizations have responded to these longer-term evaluations. As a result of Extension's facilitation, 96.5% agreed or strongly agreed that their organization had been strengthened, 93.0% agreed or strongly agreed that their organization had

been more strategic in fulfilling their mission, and 96.6% agreed or strongly agreed that their organization had an increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities (Table 2).

Table 2.

Measured Agreement on Extension’s Direct Facilitation from 2014-2016

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Our organization has been strengthened.	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	24.1%	72.4%
Our organization has been more strategic in fulfilling our mission.	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	31.0%	62.1%
Our organization has an increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities.	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	41.4%	55.2%

Note: N=27

Conclusions & Implications

Through long-term outcome measurement, Washington County nonprofit organizations that participated in Extension organizational development programs, in community workshops or in direct organization-specific trainings led by an Extension facilitator, reported that their organization has been strengthened, are more strategic in fulfilling their mission, and have increased their capacity to address community issues and opportunities. In order to measure these program impacts, it was important to assess the educational needs of the nonprofit community, provide educational programs that respond to the identified needs, and evaluate the outcomes of the programs over several years. Conducting evaluations for both Nonprofit Coalition workshops and direct organizational development facilitation was important for consistent outcome measurement. Measuring the long-term outcomes of this OD program may assist in demonstrating accountability to Extension funding partners.

When comparing the long-term outcomes between the two educational programs, Table 3 illustrates that participants of direct organizational development facilitation more strongly agreed with the outcomes their organization achieved than participants of Nonprofit Coalition workshops. There is

an opportunity to further explore the factors that led to this difference and the implications this may have on future program delivery models for Extension.

Table 3.
Measured Agreement of Outcome Statement

	Nonprofit Coalition Workshops	Direct Organization Development Facilitation
Increased Tools to Strengthen Organization or Strengthened Organization ^a	29.6%	96.5%
Increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities	18.5%	96.6%

a. Coalition Workshops measured increased number of tools to strengthen organizations while Direct Facilitation measured if the organization had been strengthened as a result of the facilitation.

Organizations, either large or small, are complex systems that require a number of engagement strategies. No single strategy may result in strengthened organizations that have an increased capacity to address community issues and opportunities. Extension educators need to be adaptive in their program delivery methods. Although direct facilitation has resulted in impressive outcomes in this research, some organizations may lack the capacity and resources to engage with Extension in this type of programming. Organizations need staff and board leadership that is able to participate in an OD intervention and then implement strategic priorities. Direct facilitation may also be time consuming, which is challenging for smaller organizations with limited staff and for their board members who are often pressed for time. As Joan V. Gallos comments (2006), “there is no one-size-fits all definition or path of organizational health and effectiveness” (p.xxiv). Therefore, it is important for Extension educators to have multiple program delivery methods as well as multiple strategies to measure long-term outcomes.

References

- Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998. Public Law 105–185. Washington, DC. Available at: <https://nifa.usda.gov/resource/agricultural-research-extension-and-education-reform-act-1998>
- Anderson, O., Chikoto, G. & Schnupp S. (2015). Nonprofit Wisconsin in Brief: Size & Scope. *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Helen Bader Institute for Nonprofit Management*. Available at: http://www4.uwm.edu/milwaukeeidea/hbi/research/HBI_NonProfitWI%20Report.pdf
- Arnold, M. E. (2002). Be “Logical” about Program Evaluation: Begin with Learning Assessment. *Journal of Extension*, 40(3) Article 3FEA4. Available at: <https://www.joe.org/joe/2002june/a4.php>
- Franz, N. K., & Townson, L. (2008). The nature of complex organizations: The case of Cooperative Extension. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2008(120), 5-14.
- French, W. (1969). Organization Development Objectives, Assumptions and Strategies. *California Management Review*, 12(2), 23-34.
- Gallos, J. V. (2006). *Organization development: A Jossey-Bass reader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Public Law 103-62. Washington, DC. Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/senate-bill/20>
- Grieves, J. (2000). Introduction: the origins of organizational development. *Journal of Management Development*, 19(5), 345-447.
- Lamm, A., Israel, G. & Diehl, D. (2013). A National Perspective on the Current Evaluation Activities in Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 51(1) Article 1FEA1. Available at: https://www.joe.org/joe/2013february/pdf/JOE_v51_1a1.pdf
- Paik, J. (2012, August 2). Managing in the New Economic Reality. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Available at: <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2012/08/02/managing-in-the-new-economic-reality/>

Piotrowski, C., Vodanovich, S. J., & Armstrong, T. (2001). Theoretical Orientations of Organizational

Development Practitioners. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 29(3), 307-312.

Strauss, G. (1973). Organizational development: Credits and debits. *Organizational Dynamics*, 1(3), 2-20.

Taylor-Powell, E., & Henert, E. (2008) Developing a Logic Model: Teaching and Training Guide. *University of Wisconsin-Extension Program Development and Evaluation*. Available at:

<https://fyi.uwex.edu/programdevelopment/files/2016/03/lmguidcomplete.pdf>

Appendix A: 2012 Nonprofit Survey Instrument

Washington County: "Nonprofits and the Economy" Survey
March 2012

1. Which sector best describes the work your organization does? (Please select one.)

- Arts & Culture
 Health Care
 Environment
 Human Service
 Youth & Family
 Community Development

2. What was your organization's operating budget in its most recently *completed* fiscal year?

- Less than \$100,000
 \$101,000-\$250,000
 \$251,000-\$500,000
 \$501,000 -\$1 million
 More than \$1 million

3. What is the geographic range of your organization's services? (Please select one.)

- The municipality in which we are based
 County-wide
 Regional

4. Is your organization based in Washington County? (Please select one.)

- Yes
 No

5. What is your *primary* responsibility within your organization? (Please select one.)

- Director
 Board President
 Program Staff
 Other

6. Programs/Services: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Attracting new members or clients				
Meeting needs/interests of current clients or members				
Competition with other nonprofits				
Collaborating with other nonprofits to maximize impact				
Assessing community need/demand for services				
Evaluating outcomes or impacts of programs				

7. Communications: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Enhancing our visibility and reputation				
Communicating with clients or members				
Communicating with donors				
Communicating with other nonprofits/partner organizations				
Managing or improving board-staff relations				

8. Human Resources: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Volunteers- recruiting, retaining and managing				
Recruiting or keeping qualified staff				
Covering employee benefit/insurance costs				
Providing training/professional development opportunities				
Managing workload				

9. Fundraising/Donations: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Obtaining funding				
Recruiting new donors				
Retaining current donors				
Accountability to donors				
Reliance on special events				

10. Operations Management: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Managing finances and accounting				
Managing facilities				

11. Board Management: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently? (Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Board Recruitment				
Strategic Planning				
Board Training				
Board Retention				

12. Technology: To what extent are the following activities challenges for your organization currently?
(Please select one option per row.)

	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge	Not Applicable
Hardware				
Social Media				
Website				
IT Support				

13. During the calendar year 2011, how have the following changed or compared to calendar year 2010? (Please select one option per row.)

	Increased	Unchanged	Decreased	Unsure
Demand for organization's services				
Total revenue				
Total expenses				
Total revenue from donations				
Overall staffing level				

14. Which statement best describes your organization's outlook for the next 3 years?

- We will expand services in certain key areas.
 We will examine existing assumptions, likely emerging as a different organization.
 Our services will remain unchanged.
 We will need to reduce key program budgets and services.

15. Which statement best describes your organization's current financial health?

- We are financially healthy and not currently vulnerable.
 We have been financially healthy to date but feel vulnerable in the future.
 We are experiencing chronic financial problems but expect to survive.
 We don't know how we will survive through 2012.

16. What is your organization's annual fund development goal for your current fiscal year?

\$_____

17. Is this fund development goal an increase, decrease, or similar amount to your most recently completed fiscal year?

- Increase
 Decrease
 No substantial change

18. Is your organization planning a capital campaign in the next 9 months?

- Yes
 No

IF YES, What is the campaign goal? \$_____

19. Is your organization currently undertaking an endowment campaign?

- Yes
 No

20. If you are undertaking an endowment campaign, what is the campaign goal? \$_____

21. Has your organization changed its endowment campaign strategy as a result of the current economic conditions?

- Yes
 No
 Not applicable

22. How did your organization's funding from each of the following sources changed during calendar year 2011 compared to calendar year 2010? (Please select one option per row.)

	Increased	Unchanged	Decreased	Don't Know	Does Not Apply
Individual donations (excluding bequests)					
Donations from businesses/corporate foundations					
Bequests/planned gifts					
Government grants/contracts					
Foundation grants					
United Way					
Fees for services and other earned income					
Membership's dues					
Special events/fundraisers					
Income from Investments/endowments					
Time given by volunteers/in-kind donations					

23. Do you anticipate that the support your organization receives from each of the following sources will increase or decrease from the calendar year 2011 to 2012? (Please select one option per row.)

	Increased	Stayed the Same	Decreased	Don't Know	Does Not Apply
Individual donations (excluding bequests)					
Donations from businesses/corporate foundations					
Bequests/planned gifts					
Government grants/contracts					
Foundation grants					
United Way					
Fees for services and other earned income					
Membership's dues					
Special events/fundraisers					

Income from Investments/endowments					
Time given by volunteers/in-kind donations					

24. If total expenses exceeded total revenue for your organization in the past 12 months, how have you responded? (Check all that apply.)

- Our total expenses did not exceed revenues
- Used prior-year cash reserves
- Borrowed money
- Cut nonessential expenses
- Delayed payment of bills
- Eliminated programs
- Increased fundraising activities
- Turned away clients
- Laid off staff
- Collaborated with other nonprofits
- Continued operating in deficit
- Applied for competitive funding such as public grants and private foundations
- Greater reliance on volunteers

25. How many months of operating expenses does your organization have available in cash reserves?

- One month
- Two months
- Three months
- Four months
- Five months
- Six or more months

26. Do you offer direct services to clients?

- Yes
- No

27. Compared to last year, the demand for your services has:

- Increased a great deal
- Increased somewhat
- Stayed about the same
- Decreased somewhat
- Decreased a great deal
- Not sure

28. Compared to this time last year, what change have you experienced in your staffing levels and ability to provide services:

- Increased
- Decreased
- No change
- Not sure

29. If staffing levels have changed, has the change in staffing been due to:

- Increased revenue
- Decreased revenue
- Increased demand for services
- Decreased demand for services
- Unsure
- Not applicable

30. Does your organization currently have a waiting list for your services?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

31. How confident are you that you can meet the demand for services in 2012?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Not confident at all
- Not sure

32. What do you think are the three most pressing issues facing the nonprofit sector in Washington County?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please click on the "Submit" button to record your responses.

Appendix B: Nonprofit Workshop Evaluation Result Summary

Date	Topic	Knowledge	
		Before	After
1/22/2013	Power of Collaborations		
	Grant funders views on collaboration	3.3	4.3
	Other non-profit organization's missions, visions, clientele served & goals	3.1	4.1
	Identifying potential collaborators	3.2	4.3
	Overall Knowledge	3.2	4.2
9/17/2013	Planned Giving		
	Components of a planned giving policy	2.8	4.1
	Legal considerations for planned giving	2.8	3.8
	Implementing a planned giving program	2.9	4.1
	Overall Knowledge	2.8	4.0
2/11/2014	Financial Training for Board Members		
	Overview of financial statements and basic accounting	3.7	4.1
	Controls and fraud	3.1	4.3
	Ratios for nonprofit organizations	1.9	3.0
	Preparing for your next audit or review	2.0	2.7
	Overall Knowledge	2.7	3.5
3/11/2014	Building a Board Fundraising Culture		
	Developing org. policies for fundraising	3.2	4.1
	Understanding board & staff roles in fundraising	3.2	4.2
	Building a compelling case statement	2.8	4.1
	Understanding donor motivations	3.4	4.3
	Overall Knowledge	3.2	4.2
11/18/2014	Outcome Basics		
	How to use outcomes	2.7	3.8
	The difference between the components of a logic model: inputs, activities, outputs & outcomes	2.5	4.0
	The different levels of outcomes change/improvement: knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, behaviors and conditions/status	2.5	3.8
	The difference between community level and program level outcomes	2.6	3.8
	What an outcome indicator is	2.3	3.0
	Overall Knowledge	2.5	3.7
12/4/2014	Indicators & Measuring Outcomes		
	Why measure outcomes	2.7	4.6

	Evaluation indicators and tools to measure progress toward desired Outcomes	2.8	3.8
	How key stakeholders will know the success of a program	3.0	3.8
	How to write indicators and how indicators differ from Outcomes	2.7	3.9
	Eight steps to success in measuring program Outcomes	2.3	3.9
	Overall Knowledge	2.7	4.0
3/19/2015	Logic Models		
	The difference between the components of a logic model: inputs, activities, outputs & outcomes	3.1	4.3
	How to create a Logic Model that effectively tells what your program services accomplish	2.9	4.3
	How to use a Logic Model to identify outcomes to measure that matter to the community	3.1	4.2
	Overall Knowledge	3.0	4.3
5/13/2015	Techniques to Effectively Measure Outcome Results		
	How to effectively measure outcomes	3.4	4.3
	How to identify data sources for indicators	3.5	4.4
	How to design & pretest data collection methods (program records, surveys, interviews, observations)	2.9	4.1
	Overall Knowledge	3.3	4.3
6/10/2015	Outcome Measurement		
	Different tools to measure the outcomes of your programs	3.1	4.1
	How to use data sources to measure indicators for your programs	2.9	3.9
	How to design & pretest data collection methods (program records, surveys, interviews, observations) for your programs	3.3	4.1
	Overall Knowledge	3.1	4.0
2013-2015	Average Overall Change in Knowledge	2.9	4.0

Challenge ahead for nonprofits

Washington County nonprofits say there is more demand and dwindling resources

By KEN MERRILL
Daily News

A recent survey by the Nonprofit Coalition of Washington County found 77 percent of the county's nonprofits are facing increased demand for services at the same time their financial health — and the area economy — has weakened.

More demand for services sparked by a decline in household income and an increase in the county's poverty rate challenge nonprofits to pick up the pace.

"In Washington County there is growth of new agencies and programs from nonprofits to school foundations that weren't fundraising 10 years ago," said Kristin Brandner, executive director of the United Way of Washington County. "There is a lot more competition each year and the pool of resources is limited."

Paul Roback, associate professor and Community Development Educator with University of Wisconsin-Extension Washington County, conducted the survey of 75 Washington County nonprofits. A similar survey was undertaken in 2012 and results were analyzed for changes or trends.

Roback, Brandner, Mary Kurer, director of Continuing Education at the UW-Washington County, and Sue Millin, executive director of the Volunteer Center of Washington County, make up the coalition.

Roback, who authored the report, said the survey was a cross section of the nonprofits the coalition has worked with.

"It does include, I would say, the bigger nonprofits you would think of in the county, everything from The Threshold down to a smaller nonprofit like Chix 4 A Cause," Roback said. "It's a fairly good representation."

Roback's analysis determined

that 77 percent of the local agencies surveyed saw increased demand for services since the previous year, compared to 68 percent in 2012. Further, 32 percent had waiting lists in 2015, compared to 11 percent in 2012.

At the same time, while the median household income in Washington County increased to \$67,65 from \$64,694 in 2009, according to the U.S. Census American Community Survey, when adjusted for inflation, it's about a 5.2 percent decline.

And the county's poverty rate, at 5.3 percent in 2009, increased to 6.2 percent in 2014.

Still, fully 84 percent of the survey's respondents said they were "very confident" or "somewhat confident" of their ability to meet the demand for services.

Brandner said retaining and attracting donors is key.

"There is a heavy reliance on donors in the West Bend area where majority of the countywide nonprofits are headquartered," Brandner said. "Nonprofits are going to have to appeal to the new generation of donors — the millennials.

"This generation has a strong desire to support the community but they do it differently — short term, cause at a time approach versus steadfast longevity in giving to one organization. They want hands on engagement that utilizes their skills and passion. The United Way, along with our partner the Volunteer Center, continues to look at projects that will appeal to this new generation of donors."

Brandner pointed to the "United Against Hunger" project, a one-night event in September when volunteers packaged 68,000 meals for the county's food pantries. The event served as the kickoff for the United Way's annual campaign.

"A number of our nonprofits have seen reduced funding from county and state grants," Brandner added. "It has been challenging for organizations to quickly rebound from these big losses."

Brandner pointed to a holiday letter from the Friends of Abused Families. Over the past five years the organization has provided

Survey of Washington County nonprofits 2015 vs. 2012

Nonprofits' survey answers from 2015 and 2012 were compared:

	2015	2012
What increased in the last year?		
Demand for services	77%	68%
Revenue?	43%	40%
Expenses?	63%	52%
Revenue from donations	32%	32%
Number of staff	20%	25%

What's your organization's outlook for the next three years?

	2015	2012
We'll expand services	66%	64%
Services unchanged	17%	32%
Reduce programs/services	6%	0%
Differnet/merged organization	11%	NA

How does your fundraising goal compare to your most recently completed fiscal year?

	2015	2012
Increase	65%	44%
Decrease	3%	8%
No change	32%	48%

Source: Nonprofit Coalition of Washington County

new demand of accountability — but it is tough to focus on funders' requirements when they need to focus on fundraising to keep their lights on."

Brandner noted that the goal of United Way has evolved, too.

"We are much more than a fundraising organization," she said. "We updated our mission a few years ago to be a community impact organization. Fundraising and our campaign is one of our biggest activities and strategies to get to the end result, and that's community change."

Brandner said the organization's annual fund drive raised \$1.3 million last year and has a nearly \$1.4-million goal for this year's drive, which ends this month.

"I think it's United Way's responsibility to continue to set our sights high and to deliver on successful campaigns," Brandner said. "There's a lot of organizations that rely on our funding and we fill a lot of gaps."

Whereas United Way formerly acted as a clearinghouse for donations collected in its annual campaign, the organization's changing role means more programs and greater expenses.

Brandner said the latest audit put her organization's overhead at "about 20 percent."

"We need to do business a little differently," Brandner said. "We center a lot of our efforts around the West Bend area, but we're the United Way of Washington County so we've put forth efforts to grow our organization, to be the countywide United Way to build new relationships, to get new donors."

"This year's campaign, being headed up by Tom and Pat Strachota, is really about increased participation," Brandner said. "When we benchmark our United Way with United Ways of similar size, we have a lot more opportunity. We growing and we hope to garner some new support."

The numbers from Roback's report detail the difficulties nonprofits face.

The survey found that respondents' confidence in meeting demand for services has fallen from 95 percent in 2012 to 84 percent in 2015, 66 percent feel

"It does look challenging with demand for services increasing and fiscal strength weakening for the nonprofits. We're hoping that the results of this study will help inform the community conversation around this topic."

— Paul Roback
UW-Extension-Washington County



financially vulnerable in 2015 compared to 40 percent in 2012 and 39 percent had a greater than six-month cash reserve in 2015, compared to 56 percent in 2012.

Roback said it's an "unsustainable model" for nonprofits.

"It does look challenging with demand for services increasing and fiscal strength weakening for the nonprofits," he said. "We're hoping that the results of this study will help inform the community conversation around this topic."

"People are surprised. I think, at the economic condition of the county," Roback said. "We hear so much about the unemployment rate going down but the fact that the poverty rate has increased and median income has decreased when you adjust for inflation — those stories don't get out there as much."

Roback said he was surprised by the survey's finding that two-thirds of the nonprofits were anticipating to expand services in the next few years.

"We were like, 'Well, how are you going to do that?'" he said. "When you talk to nonprofits, my experience is that they're usually pretty optimistic in meeting demand and they find a way to make it work."

Reach news editor Ken Merrill at kmerrill@conley.net.com.