## SNAPSHOT OF COVID-19's IMPACT ON PENNSYLVANIA NONPROFITS

As told by 190 nonprofits providing services in all 67 counties in Pennsylvania.
Current Level of Impact
$N=190$


Anticipated Level of Impact
$N=190$


CLIENT AND COMMUNITY IMPACT $67 \%$ (127 of 190) report that 817,860 clients are experiencing a reduction in services.

## Top 5 Ways Pennsylvania Nonprofits Are Experiencing Impact

- 93\% (176) Cancelled Programs or Events
- 84\% (159) Disrupted Services to Clients and Communities
- $71 \%$ (135) Reported Budgetary Implications Related to Individual Donors
- 61\% (115) Reported Increased and Sustained Staff and Volunteer Absences
- 50\% (90) Reported Increased Demand for Services/Support from Clients and Communities

All Impact Experienced by Reporting Nonprofits


Additional Impact Reported included reductions in:

- Fees for Service
- Membership Fees
- Ticket Sales


## REVENUE IMPACT

$77 \%$ (146 of 190) report a collective $\$ 41,812,625$ in revenue is at risk.
Average $=\$ 286,388$
Range = \$100-\$9 M
$19 \%$ (37) indicate that it is too early to tell
Only 4\% (7) do not anticipate an impact on revenue.
Table 1: Anticipated Revenue Loss by Type

| REVENUE TYPE | AMOUNT | \# ORGS | AVE/ORG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program Fees* | \$11,679,400 | 43 | \$271,614 |
| Individual Donations | \$3,284,167 | 41 | \$80,102 |
| Fundraising Events | \$2,943,300 | 30 | \$98,110 |
| Government Contracts | \$2,798,667 | 9 | \$310,963 |
| Grants* | \$1,629,750 | 21 | \$77,607 |
| Sales | \$547,600 | 15 | \$36,507 |
| Corporate Sponsorships | \$398,000 | 10 | \$39,800 |
| Membership Dues | \$167,370 | 4 | \$41,843 |
| Ticket Sales/Event Admission | \$156,000 | 7 | \$22,286 |

[^0]45\% (85 of 129) report a collective $\$ 2,755,523$ increase in expenses.
Average $=\$ 32,418$
Range $=\$ 300$ to $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$
$24 \%$ (45) indicate that it is too early to tell
$32 \%$ (60) participants anticipate $\$ 0$ in increased expenses, with a few indicating a decrease in expenses
Table 2: Anticipated Expense by Type

| EXPENSE DESCRIPTON | AMOUNT | \# ORGS | AVE/ORG |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase Payrol/Maintain Payroll <br> w. Decreased Production | $\$ 604,722$ | 14 | $\$ 43,194$ |
| Move Operations Online | $\$ 324,600$ | 37 | $\$ 8,773$ |
| Increased Program Support* | $\$ 303,950$ | 9 | $\$ 37,994$ |
| Increased Supplies* | $\$ 116,600$ | 19 | $\$ 6,137$ |
| Other Operational Support | $\$ 15,950$ | 7 | $\$ 2,279$ |
| *See notes about the data. |  |  |  |

*See notes about the data.

## STAFFING IMPACT <br> 61\% (115 of 190) report that 9,583 staff are or will be expecting a reduction in pay, including furloughs and lay-offs. <br> Another 8\% (15) report that additional staff reductions are likely if this crisis continues.

## NOTES ABOUT THE DATA:

1. Data was collected between March 18 and April 6, 2020.
2. 194 individuals participated; 190 worked for nonprofit organizations.
3. The survey was administered by PANO, and pushed out by multiple community partners including United Way of Pennsylvania, PA Council of Children, Youth and Family Services, the United Way of Lehigh Valley, the Community Foundation of the Lehigh Valley and more.
4. Because every nonprofit is different, the results only represent the viewpoint of those who participated.
5. Client Data Notes:
a. If a range was reported, the analysis only included the lowest amount in the range.
b. All $\%$ of staff were excluded as the total number of staff was unknown.
6. Revenue Data Notes:
c. If potential dollars lost included a monthly estimate, only included one month of data.
d. If a survey participant reported total annual revenue as being at risk, this amount was divided by 12 to get to a monthly amount, which is the amount included in this data. The exception to this is event-related income, as this time-limited.
e. Program fees include: program fees, fees for services, contracts (not specified as government), and tuition.
f. Grants include: private foundation, United Way, and unspecified
g. One organization reported an additional loss of endowment income.
7. Expense Data Notes:
a. If a range was reported, the analysis only included the lowest amount in the range.
b. If potential dollars lost included only a weekly or monthly estimate, only included the weekly/monthly data.
c. Supplies include: cleaning supplies, cost of deep cleaning, personal protective equipment.
d. Program support includes: Food supplies, sheltering at a hotel
8. Staff Data Notes:
a. The intention of this question was to capture the number of lives impacted vs. an exact count, as an early indicator. Thus, the data does not differentiate between full and part-time staff, nor report in FTEs.

## ABOUT SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Participants by Organizational Budget


Counties Served by Survey Participants
Some nonprofits serve multiple counties.

| County Name | \% | County Name | \% | County Name | \% | County Name | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All 67 Counties | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 10 \% \\ & (19) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Clearfield | $4 \%$ <br> (7) | Juniata | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2\% } \\ & \text { (3) } \end{aligned}$ | Philadelphia | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \% \\ & (27) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Adams | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Clinton | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \end{aligned}$ | Lackawanna | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pike | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (13) \end{aligned}$ |
| Allegheny | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7 \% \\ & (13) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Columbia | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \% \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Potter | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Armstrong | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \% \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | Crawford | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \% \\ & (3) \end{aligned}$ | Lawrence | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \% \\ & (4) \end{aligned}$ | Schuylkill | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ |
| Beaver | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \% \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cumberland | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7 \% \\ & (14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Lebanon | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \% \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Snyder | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4\% } \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Bedford | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & \hline(5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Dauphin | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11 \% \\ & (21) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Lehigh | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & (75) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Somerset | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \% \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Berks | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (38) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Delaware | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \% \\ (28) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Luzerne | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ (18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sullivan | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Blair | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \% \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Elk | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Lycoming | $6 \%$ <br> (11) | Susquehanna | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6 \% \\ & (11) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Bradford | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Erie | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | McKean | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Tioga | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Bucks | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \% \\ & (30) \end{aligned}$ | Fayette | 4\% <br> (7) | Mercer | $4 \%$ <br> (7) | Union | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Butler | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (9) \end{aligned}$ | Forest | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \% \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Mifflin | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Venango | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & \text { (3) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Cambria | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Franklin | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \% \\ & (10) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Monroe | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \% \\ & \text { (25) } \end{aligned}$ | Warren | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Cameron | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fulton | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (4) \end{aligned}$ | Montgomery | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & (29) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Washington | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (13) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Carbon | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17\% } \\ & \text { (32) } \end{aligned}$ | Greene | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (4) \end{aligned}$ | Montour | $\begin{gathered} 13 \% \\ (6) \end{gathered}$ | Wayne | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \% \\ & (10) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Centre | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Huntingdon | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Northampton | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & (75) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Westmoreland | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 7 \% \\ (14) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Chester | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & (28) \end{aligned}$ | Indiana | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Northumberland | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \% \\ & (10) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Wyoming | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Clarion | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Jefferson | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Perry | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \% \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | York | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 13 \% \\ & (25) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |


[^0]:    *See notes about the data.

