

Re: Pick.Click.Give. Sustainability – Statewide Coordination Survey Results

In August 2013, after five years of steady program growth, Pick Click Give (PCG) polled its participating nonprofits on a number of issues, the most important of which was rating various scenarios for creating an ongoing, sustainable revenue stream to support the statewide coordination, education, and marketing of the campaign. Out of 471 organizations, 194 participated in the survey. What was learned is that nonprofits overwhelmingly said the statewide campaign was an essential component of the PCG (85.6% positive) and that PCG organizations endorse adjusting the annual participation fee to cover costs of a statewide coordinator and annual outreach campaign.

The poll presented several sustainability scenarios for consideration and feedback (the results are found on Table 1, following page). Participants were allowed to endorse more than one option. In order of preference, they were:



- 52% -- Collect a percentage of funds donated to each organization.
- 47% -- Collect a flat fee with a sliding scale based on the size of an organization's budget.
- 24% -- Increase the filing fee organizations pay to be part of the program.




The primary sentiment was that collecting a percentage of donations was the most fair and equitable method. Whether they felt a percentage, sliding scale or user fee was the best method, most made some comment as to utilizing an easy and evenhanded approach (verbatim comments are pasted at the end of this summary). After these results were tallied, nonprofits were invited to two separate teleconferences to provide input into a coordinator fee would work. The survey and the teleconferences were advertised widely among participating PCG nonprofits.

Note: Although a specific percentage fee was not identified in the poll, a 7% statewide coordination fee would generate \$350,000 in a year when \$5 million is raised through Pick Click Give, which would match the scope of the program's current statewide effort. In 2013 \$2.4 million was donated to participating nonprofits through PCG, and 2014 is on track to yield approximately the same amount. PCG organizers project the program will eventually grow to \$5 million annually.

Participating organizations currently pay an eligibility filing fee of \$250 per nonprofit, which covers day-to-day costs at the PFD Division and other basic program functions. However, philanthropic funds still pay for PCG statewide coordination and outreach – approximately \$350,000 per year – and project management costs are borne by implementation partners. A statewide coordinator, based at the Alaska Community Foundation, oversees training and outreach for participating nonprofits, and coordinates the broad-based statewide education campaign on behalf of the program participants. This coordinator provides expertise and serves as primary point-of-contact for the programs 500+ participating nonprofits. In support of this year's 2014 dividend cycle, for example, the PCG program manager launched a series of training webinars, designed and delivered a statewide information campaign, and oversaw the placement of paid media.

Table 1: Pick Click Give sustainability questions and results

15. Do you think a statewide marketing campaign is essential for Pick.Click.Give. to continue to succeed?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		85.8%	151
No		14.2%	25
answered question			176
skipped question			18

16. For the past 5 years, the statewide marketing campaign has been funded through grants made by corporate sponsors and philanthropic organizations. In the future, other forms of revenue will be needed to sustain a basic marketing campaign. Nonprofit leaders have discussed the following possible funding sources. Please select any of the methods you would support and use the comment field to tell us which is most preferred.			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Collect a percentage of funds donated to each organization.		52.0%	77
Increase the filing fee organizations pay to be part of the program.		24.3%	36
Collect a flat fee with a sliding scale based on the size of an organization's budget.		47.3%	70
Preferred method: Show replies			59
answered question			148
skipped question			46

Here's how sustainability via the statewide coordination fee would work:

- Modify the eligibility filing fee language -- Preserve the current annual \$250 filing fee per nonprofit *and*, later in the year, when checks to nonprofits are cut, assesses a 7% look-back surcharge upon each organization's PCG donation total – this modified fee is used to cover the cost of PCG's statewide coordination and public outreach.
- The new fee language would not affect this year's PCG list. Nonprofits filing in the spring of 2015 to be listed in 2016 would be the first to participate. In the fall of 2016 when checks to nonprofits are calculated, the statewide coordination fee would be collected by the PFD Division's contractor (United Way of Anchorage) and re-directed to the PCG Project Fund at the Alaska Community Foundation for statewide coordination and public outreach. An organization that received \$100,000 in donations would receive a \$93,000 check; and organization that received \$1,000 in donations would receive a \$930 check.
- This change would resolve the long-term PCG self-sustainability question.

Verbatim responses to Question 16:

- Leave it to internal promotion to avoid becoming only a self-paying promotion. If
1. individual n-p's are splitting the bill, they will have a much stronger opinion (all disparate) about how that money is spent.
 2. Collect a percentage of funds donated to each organization
 3. % would be ok but only if marketing is fairly applied to all organizations. (i.e., stop highlighting some but not all organizations)
 4. I prefer the increased filing fee.
 5. I think donors love that their contribution goes directly to the organization, so step one to me would be to increase the filing fee.
 6. % of funds donated, just nothing onerous or the purpose is defeated.
 7. After the final numbers, we may be open to other options, but flat fee would be better right now.
 8. We have found that if you do not stay forefront in the minds of people, they forget about you, collecting a percentage would seem to be the least combersome on administering the fee both for Pick.Click.Give. and the non profit
 9. This would be the fairest way to do this for all involved.
 10. Our organization does not have monies and when we pay \$250 to participate that is a lot for us.
 11. % of funds minimizes the barrier to entry for small orgs
 12. Those who use the program should pay the cost.
 13. None
 14. None of the above. We could get an advertising/marketing grant to cover costs.

15. I think tax dollars should support this.
16. Needs no funding. People understand the concept and will continue to give with organizations campaigning for themselves.
Our donations are low; if you add a flat fee or increase the filing fee, we may lose money on the deal! So taking a % of our donations at least keeps us in the black.
17. Maybe start collecting the fee above a minimum, like \$1,000 in donations? If the fees go up much, we may opt out of participating in PCG.
18. You already got about 100% of our donations!
19. This will be tough. Good luck deciding :)
20. stay with the 250.00 we can't afford much more
21. I think we would be willing to donate a dollar amount that we choose.
22. Percentage of funds donated
23. Flat fee with sliding scale based on organization's budget
24. I think off-hand that a percentage of funds collected would be the most fair. Even the smallest collectors can pay a percentage.
25. Increase filing fee to organization by 10 to 15 %
26. As I feel we have received no benefit to the marketing campaign, I think only those who choose to partake should be charged.
27. That seems to be the most logical idea, direct ROI
28. Percentage of funds
29. Progressive percentage of funds donated
30. Flat fee with sliding scale
31. Charge based on the size of corp. We are tiny compared to someone like KSKA and we pay the same. We are an all volunteer group.
32. None.
33. Have the State of AK pay for it
34. A percentage would be most fair.
35. For small organizations the current filing fee is already a large amount.
36. % of funds collected
37. Percentage
38. flat fee with a sliding scale
39. Seems a fair and equitable way to distribute costs
40. I think bigger organizations should pay more.
41. The checked box, since our organization is not huge.
42. Flat fee - we are small.
43. This is the most fair.
44. percentage of funds donated to each organization
45. flat fee with sliding scale
Maybe a little of all? I'd hate to see the filing fee get too big for newer organizations, but I think it could also help weed out groups that are not as serious about the program.
47. I don't feel any of these is a good idea
not sure - increased filing fee hurts small and may not bring in much cash, sliding scale may not be worthwhile to larger non-profits who still don't make a lot from the program (like ours)
49. percentage of funds donated

- 50.flat fee w/sliding scale
- 51.Increase filing fee
- 52.Bad idea--do not charge nonprofits any more for this program!!!
- 53.collecting a percentage is most fair
- 54.Preferred method would be that all money raised goes to organizations
- 55.None
- 56.% of funds collected
- 57.Increasing the filing fee as that is a known quantity
- 58.A percentage of funds collected.
- 59.Percentage of Funds donated most equitable method.

###