

Institutions of a Public Character (IPCs)

Survey highlights
For public release

Agenda

- Background
- Overview
- Fundraising
- Volunteer Management
- Implications

Background

From Supply to Demand

- NVPC's previous research had focused on the 'supply' side of the non-profit landscape. NVPC initiated a study on the 'demand' side to understand what challenges IPCs face in volunteerism and philanthropy.

- Research areas:

Demographics

- Years of operation
- Size by total receipts
- Financial information (2004)

Fundraising Management

- Framework for fundraising
- Preferred method(s) of fundraising
- Challenges / issues faced during fundraising

Volunteer Management

- Framework for volunteer management
- Challenges / issues faced in managing volunteers

Data Collection

- A two-pronged approach was adopted to collect the information required*.

Data collection method	Primary Research via computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI)	+	Desk Research via NVPC's NPO Directory and IPCs' websites
Purpose	To gather information on demographics, fundraising and volunteer management		To gather IPCs' financial information for year 2004
Sample Profile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPCs from the different sectors, as defined by their Sector Administrator memberships (previously known as Central Fund Administrators) ▪ All interviews conducted with senior management of the organisations 		
Sampling Frame	863 IPCs (primarily based on IRAS' website with additional lists from MOE, NCSS, NAC and SSC)		
Fieldwork Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CATI interviews were conducted from 16 Nov 05 to 27 Dec 05 (n= 287) ▪ First round of financial information collection ended on 10 Feb 06. Follow-up financial information collection and data cleaning completed on 20 Jul 06 (n= 220) 		

*The research was carried out by Taylor Nelson Sofres Singapore Pte Ltd

Sample Profile

- A total of 287 IPCs were interviewed, an overall response rate of 33%.
- Financial information for 2004 was available from 220 IPCs at end of data collection period. 2004 financial information was not available for 23% of IPCs surveyed either because:
 - The organisations did not post 2004 figures on their websites, and attempts to contact them for the information were unsuccessful (n=62) or
 - The organisations were registered only in 2004 (n=5).
- Limitations of study
 - Classification by sectors – respondents were classified primarily by their Central Fund Administrator (CFA) memberships. For IPCs without such memberships, these were classified by their primary activities. During the study, there was a transition from 11 CFA classification to six Sector Administrator (SA) classification. The official SA classification list was unavailable before the close of research and this study uses an “approximate” SA classification.
 - Response rate – there was a relatively lower response rate from the education sector. Respondents in Education sector were mostly government / government-aided primary and secondary schools and the financial information publicly available was that of School Advisory Committees (SACs*). SAC financial information may understate rather than reflect the full financial information of the schools, unlike financials reported by IPCs in other sectors.

**SACs are run by volunteers and support school-related activities e.g. advisories, fundraising, running enrichment programmes, establishing partnerships etc.*

Overview

Years of Operation

- Number of years respondents have been in operation vary from as short as a year to a century.

Sectors	Mean	Shortest	Longest
	No. of years as of year 2006		
Education	26	2	101
Social Services	18	1	74
Health	15	1	48
Arts & Heritage	11	3	38
Community, Youth & Sports	28	6	45
Others	18	1	45
Overall	18	1	101


QFA2. Length of operations: date of establishment _____ (DD/MM/YY)

Base: Respondents with date of establishment stated in non-financial information section of IPC reporting template, n= 236, including 16 IPCs with financial information outside of year 2004

"Others" refers to IPCs that were not members of any central fund and could not be classified based on primary activity e.g. corporate foundations.

Size by Total Receipts

- Respondents with 2004 financial information available were classified by their total receipts reported for that year.
 - An equal proportion (45%) of IPCs surveyed were small and medium sized.



*NB: Total receipts for each respondent was extracted from its 2004 reported financial information comprising donations; grants/ sponsorships; membership fees, investment income; investment gains and others, n = 220 (K= Thousands, M= Million)
The range used to determine size of respondents was based on the total receipts banding used by Council on Governance of IPCs, <http://app.mof.gov.sg/data/CGIReport200505.pdf> (accessed in Jan 2006)*

Financial Performance

- Respondents with deficit tend to be small sized[^].


	Respondents with surplus	Respondents with deficit
Size of IPC (in terms of receipts)	Tend to be [^] medium sized (i.e. \$500K to <\$5M)	Tend to be [^] small sized (i.e. <\$500K)
Staff strength	Tend to have >50 staff	Tend to have ≤ 10 staff
Have designated fundraiser	Yes (60%)	No (61%)
Have designated volunteer coordinator* (VC)	Yes (73%)	Yes (63%)

[^]Among respondents with deficit (n=81), 53% are small sized, 43% are medium and 4% are large. Among IPCs with surplus (n=137), 40% are small sized, 45% are medium and 15% are large.

* Also known as volunteer programme manager. For respondents without designated VC, the role of managing volunteers may be undertaken by other staff or volunteers.

Most Preferred Way To Spend Surplus

- Respondents generally prefer to channel any available surplus funds back into the programmes and services they provide, or use it to build their reserves.



QB2: If you had surplus funds in 2004, where would you have most preferred to spend the surplus? (Single answer)
Base: All respondents, n=287

Volunteer Resource Analysis

- 86% of respondents engaged volunteers in 2004.
- Among the pool of volunteers available in the sample, only 53% were active (i.e. participated on a regular or ad-hoc basis during the year)*.

Fundraising

Fundraising Framework

- IPCs that engaged in fundraising activities in 2004 were asked to rate their extent of implementation on the following four stages of a fundraising framework. Each stage has several steps. A scale of 1-5 was used, where **1 = not implemented at all, and 5 = fully implemented**

1. Concept Stage (CS)

- a. Undertook research and analysis of the sector the organisation operates in
- b. Formulated fundraising mission, vision and goals (e.g. quantum to be raised within specific period)
- c. Developed case statements (e.g. reasons for support, programmes and funding needs)
- d. Designed budget for selected fundraising activities

2. Planning Stage (PS)

- a. Designated roles of staff / board members / volunteers (eg. formation of committees, board involvement, staff structure)
- b. Determined governance structure (e.g. accountability & transparency through audits, board reviews)
- c. Formulated communications plan (e.g. publicity strategy for fundraising activities)

3. Implementation Stage (IS)

- a. Set up donor management system (e.g. database for identification, segmenting & monitoring of potential donors, tracking of donations)
- b. Recognised donors (e.g. thank you letters, tokens of appreciation)
- c. Communicated with donors (e.g. regular reports)


4. Review Stage (RS)

- a. Reviewed concept stage
- b. Reviewed planning stage
- c. Evaluated implementation stage
- d. Conducted donor relations audit (e.g. ask donors for feedback)

QC9. Below is a list of fundraising related activities. Please rate the extent of implementation of each activity by your organisation on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being “not implemented at all” to 5 being “fully implemented”).

Fundraising Framework

- Overall, Planning Stage (PS), Concept Stage (CS) and Implementation Stage (IS) received more attention than Review Stage (RS).



QC9. Below is a list of related fundraising activities. Please rate the extent of implementation of each activity by your organisation on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being “not implemented at all” to 5 being “fully implemented”).


Base: All those organisations that engaged in fundraising activities in 2004, n=197

Fundraising Staff

- 69% of respondents engaged in fundraising activities in 2004.
 - 50% of respondents that raised funds had a designated fundraiser. Among those without a designated fundraiser, other staff managed fundraising activities.
 - Among those with designated fundraisers, almost three quarters had financial surplus*.

	With a designated fundraiser	Without a designated fundraiser
Staff strength	>50 staff	≤10 staff
Financial standing	Surplus in 2004 (73%)	Surplus in 2004 (53%)
Fundraising target	Yes, average target \$1.35M	Yes, average target \$0.43M
No. of fundraising methods	More methods	Fewer methods, mainly using direct mailers
Extent of implementing fundraising framework	More steps of framework rated 4-5	Fewer steps of framework rated 4-5
Key issues	Donor fatigue; donor restrictions on funds	Limited resources for dedicated** fundraising staff; difficulty in raising funds for specific programmes; lack of awareness on fund / media support

Fundraising Methods




- Overall, direct mailers (e.g. appeal letters, newsletters) were preferred by over half of respondents.
- Special events (events for specific target audience e.g. gala dinners, charity auctions, charity golf) were used by almost half of respondents.
- Mass events (events open to general public e.g., fun fairs, marathons, walkathons) were the third most preferred method with 42% of respondents using it.
- Among the respondents, 36% used only one method:
 - mass events (29%)
 - direct mailers (27%)
 - special events (20%)

QC6: What methods did your organisation use to raise funds in 2004? (Multiple answers)
Base: All those organisations that engaged in fundraising activities in 2004, n=197

Multiple Fundraising Methods - Effectiveness


- Among respondents that used more than one method, organising special events was rated as the most effective method in terms of the absolute dollars raised.



QC7: Which method helped your organisation raise the highest amount in absolute dollars? (Single answer)
Base: All organisations using more than one fundraising method, n=127

Multiple Fundraising Methods - Efficiency


- Direct mailers were considered most efficient, in terms of costs incurred per dollar raised.



QC8: Which method was the most cost effective in per dollar raised? (Single answer)
Base: All organisations using more than one fundraising method, n=127

Fundraising Issues

- Majority of issues faced during fundraising relate to internal capacity and knowledge, followed by issues with donors.




QC5: What was the main issue your organisation faced in your fundraising efforts? (Single answer)

Base: All those organisations that engaged in fundraising activities in 2004, n= 197

NB: Organisation related issues (e.g. limited resources for dedicated fundraising staff) may adversely affect donor behaviour (e.g. fatigue)

Fundraising Issues



QC5: What was the main issue your organisation faced in your fundraising efforts? (Single answer)
 Base: All those organisations that engaged in fundraising activities in 2004, n=197

Volunteer Management

Volunteer Management Framework

- IPCs that engaged volunteers in 2004 were asked to rate their extent of implementation on the following four stages of a volunteer management framework. Each stage has several steps. A scale of 1-5 was used, where **1 = not implemented at all, and 5 = fully implemented.**

1. Concept Stage (CS)

- a. Has clearly defined vision, mission and goals for the volunteers
- b. Assessed volunteer needs
- c. Designed a budget for volunteer involvement

2. Planning Stage (PS)

- a. Has written job description & policies
- b. Has a recruitment plan and procedure for volunteers
- c. Designed database and record keeping system for managing volunteers' information, activities, hours etc
- d. Identified potential risks faced by volunteers and ensuring that these risks are minimised

3. Implementation Stage (IS)

- a. Has a screening procedure to identify suitable volunteers
- b. Conducted orientation and training for volunteers
- c. Supervised volunteers
- d. Has recognition activities for volunteers


4. Review Stage (RS)

- a. Reviewed performance/ reasons for exit of volunteers
- b. Assessed impact of volunteer programme

QD9. Below is a list of volunteer management practices. Please rate the extent of implementation of these activities by your organisation on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being “not implemented at all” to 5 being “fully implemented”).

Volunteer Management Framework

- Greater emphasis was placed on the Implementation Stage (IS) compared to the other stages.



QD9. Below is a list of volunteer management practices. Please rate the extent of implementation of these activities by your organisation on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being “not implemented at all” to 5 being “fully implemented”).

Base: All those organisations that engaged volunteers in 2004, n= 247

Volunteer Management Staff


- 65% of respondents that engaged volunteers had designated VC.
 - Among those with designated VC, majority (71%) were paid staff.
 - On average, fewer staff were involved in volunteer management (average 1.7 effective full-time (EFT) staff) compared to fundraising (average 12.0 EFT staff).

	With a designated VC	Without a designated VC
Staff strength	>10 staff	≤10 staff
Volunteer strength	>100 volunteers	≤25 volunteers
Volunteer resource*	Sufficient volunteers (42%) Surplus volunteers (29%) Shortfall in volunteers (30%)	Sufficient volunteers (46%) Surplus volunteers (13%) Shortfall in volunteers (42%)
Volunteer budget	Yes (45%)	Yes (21%)
Extent of implementing volunteer mgmt framework	More steps of framework rated 4-5	Fewer steps of framework rated 4-5
Key issues	Sustaining interest / retaining volunteers	Lack of commitment from volunteers

* Based on difference between number of volunteers available and volunteers needed. Number of volunteers available would be larger than number of active volunteers.

Volunteer Management Issues

- Main volunteer management issue respondents faced was lack of commitment from volunteers.
- Some respondents also cited limited resources for a designated volunteer coordinator as top issue.



QD14: In your opinion, what was the most critical problem area faced in managing volunteers? (Single answer)

Base: All respondents, n =287

NB: Organisation related issues (e.g. limited resources for dedicated staff) may adversely affect volunteer behaviour (e.g. lack of commitment)

Volunteer Management Issues



QD14: In your opinion, what was the most critical problem area faced in managing volunteers? (Single answer)
Base: All respondents, n =287

Implications

Volunteerism and Philanthropy

- Among the respondents, a smaller proportion raise funds compared to those which engage volunteers. However, fewer staff were involved in volunteer management (average 1.7 effective full-time (EFT) staff) compared to fundraising (average 12.0 EFT staff).
- The top issues faced by respondents are donor fatigue and lack of volunteer commitment. They should place more emphasis on donor relations audit and volunteer exit review.

	Volunteerism	Philanthropy
Participation rate	86% engage volunteers	69% raise funds
Manpower	65% have designated VC*, with average 1.7 EFT staff	50% have designated fundraiser*, with average 12.0 EFT staff
Top issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Volunteer related: <i>lack commitment</i> ▪ Organisation related: <i>sustaining interest / retaining volunteers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor related: <i>donor fatigue</i> ▪ Organisation related: <i>limited resources for dedicated fundraising staff</i>
Framework	Implementation stage better implemented, concept and review stages lower rated, with few rating volunteer exit review as better implemented	Planning stage better implemented, review stage lower rated, with few rating donor relations audit as better implemented

* Among those which raise volunteers or funds respectively.

Recommended Actions

	IPCs
Fundraising	<p>Carry out donor relations audit as one way to reduce donor fatigue</p> <p>Be more transparent (#1 factor to encourage increased giving by individual donors is “More information about how the organisation receiving my money is using my donation to help the community”*)</p>
Volunteering	<p>Respondents generally devote more manpower to fundraising than to volunteer management; to consider more manpower for volunteer management. Carry out volunteer exit review as a way towards improving volunteer commitment.</p> <p>Overall, to pay more attention to volunteer management (current volunteers donate more than former and non volunteers*)</p>

* *Individual Giving in Singapore, 2006*

For consideration

	Examples from Room to Read, an organisation that has donated more than 1.2 million books, established more than 2,600 libraries and 200 schools, ultimately touching the lives of 875,000 children in Nepal, India and elsewhere in Asia
Fundraising	“Some people don’t like to give money to charity because they don’t know where their money will go. In our case, we can show them <i>exactly</i> where their money went. It’s so tangible that we can send them photos, or they can visit ... in person ... One guy said to me today that when he gives money to a big charity, he has no idea of whether the money goes to pay the light bill, the rent, or finds its way to the programs the charity runs. He likes our model so much that he’s going to try convince a few of his friends to also endow ...”.
Volunteering	“We’ve grown from two part-timers to a paid staff of 50 and over 1,000 volunteer fundraisers.”*

*In six and a half years.

Examples from Wood J, “Leaving Microsoft to Change the World”, HarperCollins, New York, 2006

