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In fall 2002 the Bayer Center for Nonprofit Management reprised survey research that we originally conducted in 2000 to enhance the understanding of how nonprofits in the region use technology to accomplish their missions. The response was larger in 2002, creating a data set of 266 responses (versus 175 in 2000) from a diverse sample organizations in western Pennsylvania.

Comparing results over the course of a two-year period gives us more than a snapshot of how organizations are currently using technology; we can also draw conclusions about trends and changes in this constantly evolving aspect of nonprofit management. Some of the news is positive and shows progress. In other areas, nonprofit technology use in the region may have slipped slightly in the two years. The responding organizations are definitively unique in their adoption of technology, and although we use the aggregation of their responses to tell a story, our experience demonstrates that individual decision-makers have serious impact in their own organizations.

The Bayer Center is grateful to the Heinz Endowments and the Buhl Foundation for their continued support of the technology initiative. In addition, the members of the Technology Advisory Group contributed key input into the evolution of the survey instrument. Finally, there would be no results to report without the dedicated staff and volunteers at nonprofit organizations in our region. We appreciate all of the organizations that responded to technology survey, particularly the 70 organizations who responded in both years.
RESPONDING ORGANIZATIONS

This section of the report will detail the types of organizations that responded to the survey, including characteristics of organization type, geographic location, budget size, and staff size.

Organization Type

The survey allowed organizations to choose from a top-level list of categories from the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities. Because some organizations work in multiple categories, they were allowed to choose as many options as they considered valid. The overwhelming majority of organizations chose one (58%) or two (27%) categories, several organizations chose more than that, including one that chose seven.

More than half of all survey respondents fall into three categories: Human Services, Education and Public/Societal Benefit. The smallest categories include Environmental, Mutual Benefit and International and Foreign Affairs organizations.

The breakdown of survey respondents aligns in most categories with the regional pool of nonprofit organizations. Notable exceptions include Religion-related organizations, which are represented at twice their proportion in the regional pool (7% of survey respondents versus 3% of all organizations in the region); Mutual/Member benefit organizations, underrepresented with only 3% of survey respondents versus 11% of all organizations in the region; and Health organizations (9% versus 18%).
The 2002 breakdown of organization type differs slightly from the 2000 profile. In 2000, Arts organizations were disproportionately represented. Arts Organizations represent a more right-sized portion of the total in 2002 than 2000. Health and Public Benefit organizations have both increased in proportion.
Geography

While the majority of responding organizations in 2002 (68%) are located in Allegheny County, this represents a decrease from 85%in 2000. Of the remaining organizations, 23% are located in the adjacent counties of Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Washington and Westmoreland. The remaining nine percent come from outside the Pittsburgh metropolitan area.

Organizations by County (2002)

Budget Size

The organizations in the respondent pool tend to be small as are most nonprofit organizations nationally. Forty percent of the organizations have annual budgets of less than $500,000, and 80% have annual budgets of less than $5 million. Still, there is a wide variety of budget sizes from a neighborhood citizens group with a budget of $500 and no staff to a multi-faceted family service agency with a $54 million budget.

Survey Respondents by Budget Size
In comparison to the 2000 respondent pool, survey respondents in 2002 have slightly larger budgets. The median increased from $500,000 to $700,000 with more truly large organizations represented.

**Staff Size**

A similar profile of mostly small nonprofits emerges when the staff size of responding organizations is examined. Two out of five respondents employ 7 or fewer full time equivalent (FTE) employees. An additional 24% of organizations have more than 7 but fewer than 15 employees. Some organizations are run entirely by volunteers or with as little as one part-time staff person. As with budget size, however, the range of staff sizes is immense; the largest organization that responded to the survey employs 900 FTEs.

**All Respondents by Staff Size**

Staff sizes line up fairly closely between the two data sets, although it’s worth noting that there are fewer tiny organizations and more of the largest organizations in 2002.

One of the key reasons why the Bayer Center repeated the technology survey in 2002 was to create a second data set to compare to our baseline data. We were interested in how the technology resources in use in nonprofits in the region is changing over time. The next three sections will not only present snapshot data from 2002 but also differences between the 2000 and 2002 results.
Technology Policy

In addition to facts and figures about hardware, software and networking, several survey questions explored the management of technology in achieving nonprofit missions. Topics such as planning, staffing and technology spending fall under this umbrella.

Technology Planning

One of the most vital ingredients to effective use of technology is organized planning for its acquisition, maintenance and use. Technology planning differs from general strategic planning in that because of the constant development of new hardware and software, technology plans generally have shorter time horizons. The best technology planning grows from a basis of broader strategic planning; new solutions may be an integral part of implementing new strategic directions.

Although our survey indicates that fewer than half of nonprofit organizations plan strategically for the technology function, the proportion increased from 28% in 2000 to 43% in 2002. The majority of these organizations have included technology planning in broader planning processes. The evidence is even stronger in 2002 that larger organizations are more likely to plan; among organizations with more than 20 employees, 62% have a technology plan.

Still, technology planning is a minority activity among nonprofit organizations. While fewer than half of respondents plan for technology, nearly two-thirds of organizations function under the guidance of a strategic plan. Strategic planning has been widely used over a longer period of time than technology planning. The process and the outputs of organizational planning are better understood than those of technology planning, but technology planning supports the implementation of those strategic plans. Many organizational planning process would be leveraged much more effectively and immediately if the needed technology improvements were assessed and interwoven into strategic objectives.
Technology Management

The notion of the “accidental techie” has become a commonplace in nonprofit management. One or more employees who demonstrate interest or competency in one area of technology use become the de facto technology person for the organization. Many organizations in our survey pool staff their technology function in this manner.

Technology management is an area in which our survey question evolved from 2000 to 2002. In the original survey, respondents were asked to identify from among the options below “the primary source of technology decision-making; who decides what gets purchased and what gets thrown away?”

- Don’t know/not sure
- MIS Dept. with two or more employees
- Finance Dept.
- A staff person with full-time technology responsibilities
- A designated staff person with part-time technology responsibilities
- Unofficial staff interested in technology
- Other

Despite the fact that it wasn’t a checkbox option in 2000, 19% of organizations indicated that the chief executive is responsible for technology management. This proportion was large enough that we included executive director as an option in 2002.

As the chart below demonstrates, including Executive Director as an explicit option elicited an increase in the number of respondents indicating that the chief executive manages technology. Although one might assume that the executive director manages the technology function only in small organizations, some executive directors of organizations with hundreds of employees and several-million-dollar budgets are still making technology decisions.
The increase in Executive Director responses seems to correlate with a decrease in participants identifying their technology manager as part-time technology staff and accidental techies, identified as “unofficial staff interested in technology”. The presumption is that in some cases, the executive director herself serves as the accidental techie, at least as far as decision-making is concerned.

The proportion of organizations with an MIS department held steady at 7% of organizations, and these organizations tend to be larger. The majority (60%) of respondents with an MIS department have more than 50 employees. Similarly, the number of organizations with a Full-time technology person held steady.

**Technology Spending**

Maintaining an annual budget line item for technology helps to ensure that hardware remains in working order and supports current software. The survey indicates that there was a nominal decline in the proportion of organizations in the region that have a specific technology budget. The organizations that do track technology expenses separately tend to be slightly larger than those that don’t. Median staff size of the former group is 14 FTEs versus 8 for

1 Other responses includes Board/Volunteer (4%), Operations/Admin (3%), Don’t Know (2%), and Outsourced (2%)
the latter. Also, the organizations that have a specific technology budget tend to have larger overall budgets (by a factor of 3).

Survey respondents who do budget for technology retained the same profile relative to technology spending benchmarks. One benchmark is that technology spending should be about 6% of overall annual spending. The survey organizations that have technology budgets tend to spend 1-4% of their annual budget on technology. Guidelines for spending per machine per year vary, but most experts say that organizations should budget $1000 to $1700 per year with some placing the top end of the range at $3000 annually. On average, survey organizations with technology budgets spend approximately $1000 per computer, but the majority (56%) continues to spend less than that. Fewer organizations spent above the benchmark range in 2002 than in 2000.

![Technology Spending per Computer](chart)

**Staff Training**

The survey indicates that more nonprofit employees received formal technology training in 2002 than in 2000. The percentage of organizations sending none of their staff to training dropped nine points, the difference being made up mostly by organizations that indicated that they sent a third or fewer of their employees to training. A weighted average based on the employees and training rates represented in the sample indicates that approximately 23% of employees in Pittsburgh area nonprofits received technology training in 2000 with a fractional increase in 2002.
Technology Skills in Job Descriptions

Including technology skills in job descriptions and performance evaluation is a best practice that, unfortunately, many nonprofits have not adopted. In 2000, the survey posed the question as a simple yes or no. In 2002, the survey adopted the same rate categories as used above in the question about employee training. The 2000 survey results indicated that less than a third (31%) of organizations include technology skills in job requirements. While there is more nuanced data in 2002, the rate has held steady: an estimated 30% of nonprofit jobs in the region have tech skills in their job descriptions.
**Tech Skills in Job Descriptions Related to Training Rate**

The proportion of jobs with technology skills is directly related to the tech training rate. An organization with tech skills in more job descriptions sends more of its staff to formal technology training. Increased professional development in any area, including this one, is intuitively linked to the hiring and evaluation processes that flow from the composition of job descriptions.

![Bar Chart: Job Description Rate vs. Average Training Rate](chart.png)

**Board Involvement**

A key finding from the original survey was that the existence of a board technology committee was highly correlated with best practices in technology management. Based on that, the nominal increase from 17% to 20% of organizations with board technology committees is good news.

In 2000, the organizations that had a board technology committee tended to be smaller than those that didn’t. In 2002 that profile has flipped. The median budget size for organizations with board involvement is $880,000 versus $700,000 for those that do not.
Survey results continue to indicate that board involvement can have a significant positive influence on technology use and policy. Nearly two-thirds of organizations with a board technology committee have a written technology plan; just over a third of organizations without a committee plan for technology. Where the board is involved, 60% of organizations track technology expenses in the budget versus 35% where the board is not involved. In organizations with a board technology committee, 45% have at least part time technology staff positions versus 35% of organizations with no board involvement.
The common perception that all nonprofit organizations have outdated equipment is too simplistic. Just as organizations vary in strategic effectiveness and efficiency in meeting their mission, they vary in the value they place on having appropriate hardware and software. Some survey respondents are still using very outdated hardware, including 486-level machines and even older models. Others regularly replace their hardware and maintain networks that allow tremendous efficiencies.

**Hardware**

Although it is difficult to assess the features of the hundreds of computers represented by our survey pool, certain indicators of the power and currency of computers – such as processor speed and RAM – can be used. According to these measures, the majority of the computers in our survey pool are using machines that meet current minimum standards (Pentium with 128 mb of RAM). In addition, 3 out of 10 machines are nearing the end of their useful life, having more than 64 MB but less than 128 MB RAM.

The comparison between 2000 and 2002 indicates that organizations are replacing their machines as they age beyond usefulness. The decrease in the number of 486 machines in use is good news, although it’s hard to imagine what nonprofits are using even this small proportion of such obsolete machines for. Viewed through the lens of contemporary standards, the PCs with less than 64 mb RAM that were in the middle of their useful life in 2000 are approaching obsolescence in 2002. Therefore, although current machines increased from 48% in 2000 to 54% in 2002, the proportion of machines that are incompatible with contemporary software also increased from 9% to 13%.

Continuing to use computers that are several generations old is an indicator that an organization may be behind trends across the board. In organizations that still have 486es,
they account for 12% of all computers. In addition, in these organizations, only 34% of their computers are the highest level Pentiums versus 54% in the general survey pool.

Fewer Macintosh computers are in use in area nonprofits in 2002 (2%) than in 2000 (5%). In organizations that use them, however, they account for 7% of all computers. Organizations that use Macs tend to also use current standard PCs (70% versus 54%). In addition, the wider trend of Mac prevalence in educational and arts organizations is borne out; they account for 47% of organizations using Macs.

**Peripherals**

In addition to replacing workstations as new software demands higher performance, nonprofits used additional computer peripherals in 2002 than in 2000. In particular, more organizations are using CD and DVD players and burners. Half of the respondents now have a digital camera, and a third own their own LCD projector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peripheral</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD ROM burner</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital camera</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD player</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD projector</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty printers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connectivity**

Computers become infinitely more valuable when they are linked to each other. Metcalfe’s law states that information increases in value exponentially with the number of computers connected to a network. This law explains the significance of the Internet revolution. Within organizations, it also explains the progress that is possible when desktop computers are networked together.

**Local Area Networks**

Although comparative data was not available in 2000 for the years preceding, observation of the timing of network installations in area nonprofits indicates that preparedness for the Y2K problem had the unexpected consequence that many nonprofit organizations networked their machines as they replaced Y2K-incompatible hardware. In 2000, though, over a quarter of respondents still did not have local area networks.

In the ensuing two years, more organizations have installed networks. The proportion of organizations with entirely stand-alone computers has decreased from 28% to 14%. In addition, the prevalence of peer-to-peer networking has decreased (14% to 9%); some former peer-to-peer networks may have been upgraded to client server to accord with the growth in user demands while other organizations may have jumped from entirely stand-alone to client server networks.

Survey Respondents use a variety of network operating systems. Most of these client-server networks run Windows 2000 (44%) or Windows NT (37%). There appears to have been a migration away from Novell networks, which dropped from 34% to 18% most of the former
Novell networks are likely now running Windows 2000. A very small number of organizations use Linux (1%, down from 4% in 2000).

### Local Area Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure What Kind</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-to-Peer</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-Server</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internet Connection

To get more nuanced data regarding Internet connections, we changed the structure of the question about Internet connectivity. In addition to what types of connections organizations used, we were also interested in the ratio of computers that had always on connections at any speed.

At a very basic level, the comparison between 2000 and 2002 indicates that organizations upgraded their connections. Respondents with broadband connections increased from less than a third (32%) in 2000 to over half (58%) in 2002.

A new option on the 2002 survey is connection via Fixed Wireless connection. Although 3% of organizations is a small portion of the pool, this connectivity is significant because it is largely being provided by a nonprofit consortium called the East End Wireless Project.
The structure of the question also enables us to analyze how many computers are connected to the Internet on demand, even if the connection is dial-up. As expected, the presence of a broadband connection is highly correlated with nearly universal always-on connectivity. Perhaps more interesting, though, is the higher rate of always-on connectivity in cases in which organizations share a dial-up connection. Although bandwidth and connection speed significantly determine the ability of users to integrate Internet use into their daily work, having a dial-up connection that is always-on (or seamlessly on demand) is an intermediate step that can pay dividends.
Internet Use

If more users are connected via always-on and high speed connections, as the above data indicate, we expect to see a similar increase in use of the Internet by employees as part of their work. That expectation is met in the survey responses. Whereas in 2000, over 40% of organizations indicated that few or none of their employees used the Internet in their jobs, that percentage is down to 28% in 2002. Estimates of the total average rate of Internet use among nonprofit employees show an increase from 33% to 47%.

Communication Modes

The Internet is not the only mode of communication that nonprofits use to stay in touch with their constituencies. Telecommunications provided some of the biggest changes in how organizations contact their staff, clients and volunteers. Between 2000 and 2002, one-to-one fax communication was abandoned slightly for broadcast fax, email and even text messaging. Other intriguing findings are the lack of a large increase in interactive web sites and a nominal decrease in video conferencing. While nonprofit’s dreams and visions of the future feature those two modes of communication, the reality of the last few years has been that email and instant messaging are “killer apps” and modes that have existed for years - voice mail and broadcast fax - were apparently not used to their full capacity in 2000.
Software

The survey covered three categories of software: basic productivity, accounting tasks and database or list management tasks. While basic productivity software use is relatively uniform, accounting and database tasks are handled in a variety of ways, including manual systems, spreadsheets and outsourcing.

Basic Productivity Software

Organizations continue to exercise fewer options in basic productivity software. Despite having 90% of the market share in 2000, Microsoft Office managed to increase in pervasiveness in 2002. All but 5% of organizations use Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Access). Some of those organizations also use Corel Office (WordPerfect, Paradox, QuattroPro, Presentations) or the Lotus Suite (Approach, 1-2-3, WordPro), although these combinations were less frequent in 2002 than 2000.
Basic Productivity Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software Type</th>
<th>2000 %</th>
<th>2002 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Only</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft + Corel and/or Lotus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corel or Lotus Only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a notable gap in the lack of adoption of open source office packages. Marking various stops along the open license spectrum, suites such as Open Office and Star Office have not yet made beachheads in nonprofits in our region.

**Accounting Tasks and Software**

In fulfilling the obligations of accounting tasks, organizations use solutions ranging from manual systems to spreadsheets to accounting software. The period from 2000 to 2002 saw greater adoption of specific accounting software to accomplish all accounting tasks.

Organizations tend to use one software package across the accounting functions of general ledger, receivables, payables and cash flow. That said, there are only two packages that have appreciable market share in this pool: QuickBooks (~40%) and Peachtree (10%). Payroll remains the most likely function to be outsourced although there was a nominal decrease in the rate from 2000 to 2002. Inventory remains a function that many organizations don’t see the need to perform.
### Accounting Tasks 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Manually</th>
<th>Manually + Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Specific Package</th>
<th>Outsourced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Ledger</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Flow</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** indicates an increase from 2000.  
Shaded responses in each table indicate the most frequent response.

### Accounting Tasks 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Manually</th>
<th>Manually + Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Specific Package</th>
<th>Outsourced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Ledger</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Flow</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td><strong>19%</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Database/List Tasks

The general category of database and list tasks includes the information management connected to the organization’s programs and support. Ironically, the majority of these tasks, which are perfect database applications, are not managed with databases. First, each task has some group of organizations for which the task does not apply or for which they did not respond in the survey. In the main three tasks – client management, fundraising and volunteer management, roughly 30-40% of organizations indicated that the task didn’t apply to them. In the three additional tasks on the right, 75-85% of organizations indicated that they did not do ticketing, quality assurance or contract performance tracking. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the systems used for these tasks due to the low response rates.

### Database Tasks 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Manually</th>
<th>Manually + Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Database Software</th>
<th>Outsourced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Management</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing/Point of Sale</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA/RA Accreditation</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Performance</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three most common list and database tasks, however, deserve some additional examination. If we remove the organizations for which the task does not apply, we see a more realistic breakdown of how organizations manage vital information.

In client management, use of database software has increased. Organizations are split – 52% vertical market and 48% custom databases – in their use of database software. There is no leading vertical market product used for client management.

In fund-raising, more than half of organizations manage their donor information with database software. Manual and spreadsheet systems have declined proportionally. Again, nonprofits are split between using vertical market (52%, down from 55% in 2000) and custom applications (48%). The market leader in this group is Blackbaud’s Raiser’s Edge (35% of vertical market users), but there are 20 other fund-raising packages also in use.

Manual systems for volunteer management are down to a third from half in 2000. Spreadsheet and database solutions have taken up the slack. More applications for volunteer management tend to be custom-designed (58%).
The survey also gathered information on the perceived needs in the organization for improvement in technology management.

**Improvements to Computer Systems**

Respondents were asked about changes they would like to see their organizations make in computer systems. Only 15% of organizations said that no changes were necessary because everything is under control. With the exception of one organization with 37 employees, the organizations that were content tended to be quite small. Average staff size was under 6, and average budget was approximately $1,000,000.

Most organizations identified changes desired. They could choose minor or major changes to their hardware, software and training and utilization. The largest need was training. The vast majority of organizations (69%) that felt they needed improvements cited training as a need.

There is some evidence that needs for improvements are correlated with organization size. Different-sized organizations find the barrier to better technology use in different places. Larger organizations feel that they need minor hardware improvements and major training improvements. Smaller organizations feel the reverse: major hardware needs and minor training improvements. Just as in human survival, there is a hierarchy of needs. If users don’t have adequate computers, training them to use them is not a pressing issue. Once the machines and networks are in place, organizations suddenly see a new gap in needing to raise their employees’ awareness of what they can achieve with computers and how to achieve it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Budget Size</th>
<th>Staff Size (FTEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$861,237</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biggest Challenge**

While it is difficult to quantify the responses to open-ended questions like “Our biggest challenge with technology is…”, in this case, the number one response is unambiguous: money. In addition to finding the money to implement technology solutions, though, nonprofits are challenged by time constraints and keeping up with the pace of technology change. Other challenges include staffing the technology function and creating and maintaining integrated databases of information about stakeholders, programs and services.

**Technology Dreams**

In 2002, we added a question to the survey about the organization’s technology dream or next big step. Responses ranged from the pedestrian (working printer, time to learn) to the visionary (improving client access via technology). Many focused on some promises of technology that may not have paid expected dividends in the past. Organizations want to improve the effectiveness of their web sites, create better connectivity through wireless networking or Wide Area Networking, and some hold onto the dream of paperlessness.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Survey Instrument

ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNOLOGY SELF ASSESSMENT

Thank you for participating in this survey. We would like to create benchmarks around different combinations of agency type, size and other factors. We may also wish to contact you to follow up on questions or to let you know about products and services that address problems you’ve noted in your responses. (Please return completed form by October 11, 2002)

718 Fifth Avenue, 4th Floor ● Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3009 ● 412-227-6814
Fax: 412-227-4097 ● www.rmu.edu/bcnm

Organization Name __________________________________________________________________ Date ____________________

Completed by __________________________________________ Title __________________________________________

Address _____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Web Site URL: __________________________________________ E-mail: __________________________________________

Phone: ( ) __________________________ Fax: ( ) __________________________

Part A: About your organization

Please complete this section to the best of your knowledge. For questions 1 through 4, your answers should be consistent with your agency’s IRS Form 990 filing.

1) Our overall agency operating budget is $_______________________ for the fiscal year ending ______________.

2) Our technology budget is $________________________ or ☐ We don’t track technology expenses separately.

3) Number of Full-time Equivalent (FTE) employees (FTE = total hours worked by all staff/40) ______________.

4) Organization can best be classified as: (Check all that apply. These categories are taken from the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE). Additional information is at http://nccs.urban.org/ntee-cc/index.htm)

☐ Arts, Culture, and Humanities  ☐ International, Foreign Affairs
☐ Education  ☐ Mutual/Membership Benefit
☐ Environment and Animals  ☐ Public, Societal Benefit
☐ Health  ☐ Religion Related
☐ Human Services  ☐ Unknown, Unclassified

5) We have a written technology plan that is integrated into the overall strategic plan and mission of the organization. (check only one)

☐ We have a strategic plan that addresses technology
☐ We have a strategic plan, but it doesn’t address technology
☐ We have a technology plan independent of our strategic plan
☐ We have neither a strategic plan nor a technology plan
☐ Don’t know/not sure

6) Internally, technology management in our organization is the responsibility of: (Identify the primary source of internal technology decision making; who decides what gets purchased and what gets thrown away? Check all that apply)

☐ Don’t know/not sure
☐ MIS Dept with two or more employees
☐ Finance Department
☐ A staff person with full-time technology responsibilities
☐ A designated staff person with part-time technology responsibilities
☐ Unofficial staff interested in technology
☐ Executive Director
☐ Other __________________________________________

7) We wish to make the following changes in our computer systems: (check all that apply)

☐ No changes are necessary; everything is under control.
Minor improvement in: ☐ Hardware ☐ Software ☐ Training and utilization
Major improvement in: ☐ Hardware ☐ Software ☐ Training and utilization
8) For what percentage of staff positions are required technology skills listed in job descriptions and included in employee evaluations. (Count positions if the required technology skills are a written part of their job description, and their supervisor regularly – at least annually – evaluates those skills.)

☐ None ☐ 1-33% ☐ 34-66% ☐ 67-100%

9) My organization would be interested in learning more about: (Please indicate the products and services you believe are important to your organization in the future.)

☐ Creating an overall technology plan and budget
☐ Creating a communications/marketing plan addressing issues and opportunities of the Internet
☐ Purchasing hardware
☐ Purchasing specific software packages
☐ Staff training for specific applications
☐ Technical support providers/resources
☐ Creating a networked office
☐ Accessing the Internet
☐ Creating a disaster recovery plan for our Information Technology in case of fire, flood, theft or virus attack
☐ Group purchasing with other nonprofits to leverage costs

10) We have Board involvement in a technology evaluation and planning committee. (Answer Yes if your agency has a technology committee AND at least one board member participates in any capacity.)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know/not sure

11) Our biggest challenge with technology is: (Describe the issues and challenges facing your organization’s use of technology. Indicate anything that you feel is important to your agency.)

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

12) What is your organization’s technology dream or next big step?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

13) Additional comments?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Part B: Technology Inventory and Resources

If you feel that you have a good understanding of how technology is used in your organization, please complete this section. If you are unsure, please place a check mark in question #1 and return the survey.
1) ☐ I am not comfortable answering these questions and am returning the survey at this time.

2) What percentage of staff use the Internet (Web and e-mail) as part of their jobs? (What percentage of staff both require and use Internet access as part of their work for the agency? Check only one.)

☐ None ☐ 1-33% ☐ 34-66% ☐ 67-100%

3) Last year, what percentage of staff received some formal technology training as part of their job? (Training can be classroom or computer based, but there needs to be a curriculum. Check only one.)

☐ None ☐ 1-33% ☐ 34-66% ☐ 67-100%

4) We use the following types and quantities of computer(s): (Indicate the number of machines in use in any administrative or program delivery capacity – including client-oriented computer lab.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Computer</th>
<th>Desktops</th>
<th>Laptops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC: 486 or older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC: Pentium with less than 64 mb RAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC: Pentium with 64 mb - 128 mb RAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC: Pentium with 128 mb or more RAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) What type of Internet connection does your organization have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection Type</th>
<th># of computers with always-on access</th>
<th># without always-on access</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We don't have an Internet connection at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-up modem on individual machine(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared modem (multiple staff share modem from their desks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed wireless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband (ISDN, DSL, Cable, T1, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a firewall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) We use the following Local Area Network (LAN) Network Operating System(s): (How are computers connected for file and print sharing? If more than one fixed site, indicate number of sites that use the particular NOS)

- None
- Novell Netware
- Windows peer-to-peer
- Windows 2000
- Linux
- Other ____________________________

7) What hardware does your organization use? (Check all that apply)

- Telephone system with voice mail (Check if your organization uses voice mail)
- Telephone call management/automation (Call center, automated attendant, or other advanced telephone system features.)
- Fax machine (At least one stand-alone fax machine – combination printer/fax machines qualify.)
- Scanner (Any scanner for Optical Character Recognition (OCR) or imaging.)
- CD ROM burner (Can you make your own CDs anywhere in the agency?)
- Single bin laser printer (Any laser printer that uses only one tray at a time.)
- Multi bin laser printer – including envelope feeders (Users can specify one of several available paper trays for their print jobs.)
- Ink jet or other color printers (Any ink jet or bubble jet type printer)
- Specialty printers (Any ticket printing, label or other printers built for a specific task.)
- Networked copier (Copier that allows printing capability from users desk)
- LCD projector (Any projectors for computer or video)
- Digital camera (Any still or motion picture camera producing electronic images)
- Jazz/Zip drives (Any removable high-density storage)
- Tape backup (The ability to back up data from one or more computers to tape)
- DVD (Digital Video Disk burner or player)
- Other (please specify) ____________________________

8) We regularly use the following communication channels to maintain contact with key constituent groups (organization members, donors, clients, board, staff, advocates, etc.). (Check all that apply for both incoming and outgoing communications. ICQ, Chat, IM are Internet-based real time text based meetings.)

- Print
- Fax
- Voice Mail
- Web page
- ICQ, Chat, IM, etc.
- Conference calls
- Other ____________________________
- Phone
- Broadcast Fax (one fax to many people)
- E-Mail
- Interactive or e-commerce oriented Web page
- Video Conferencing
- Text Messaging

9) Do you provide remote access for truly mobile staff members? (Those who work the majority of their time in the field, not in a satellite office).

- Laptop
- Citrix
- Terminal Services
- PDA
- Outside ASP
- PCAnywhere
- Other ____________________________
10) What kinds of basic productivity software packages are in regular use? (Check all that apply – if you have standardized on a specific package, check only one.)

- Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, etc.) version: _____________
- Corel Office (WordPerfect, Quattro, etc.) version: _____________
- Lotus Office (WordPro/AmiPro, 123, etc) version: _____________
- Other ___________________________________________________

11) How does your organization manage the following accounting tasks? (Indicate how your organization handles accounting issues. If you don’t do a task, place an “X” in N/A; Xs are appropriate for manual (paper and pencil) and spreadsheet solutions. Please indicate the software or vendor for Accounting Software and Outsourced solutions. Common software packages include Quicken, QuickBooks, American Fundware, Fund EZ, and others.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Manually</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Accounting Software (specify)</th>
<th>Outsourced (specify)</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Ledger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) How does your organization manage the following database/list management tasks? (Indicate how your organization handles database management issues. If you don’t do a task, place an “X” in N/A; Xs are appropriate for manual (paper and pencil) and spreadsheet solutions. Please indicate the software or vendor for Database Software and Outsourced solutions. Common software packages include Raisers Edge, GiftMaker, Anchor, MS-Access, and others. The task QA/RU refers to Quality Assurance/Resource Utilization; Contract Performance refers to any performance-based or other contractual reporting tasks.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Manually</th>
<th>Spreadsheet</th>
<th>Database Software (specify)</th>
<th>Outsourced (specify)</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing/point of sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA/RA accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) We use the following resource(s) for technology training: (Where does staff go for training on the technology they use in their jobs?)

- We don’t have a formal training plan; people learn on their own.
- Peer support
- Commercial classroom-based providers (specify: ____________________________)
- Internet-based or distance learning training providers (specify: ____________________________)
- Computer Based Training (CBT) or video (specify: ____________________________)
- Books, periodicals, self-paced learning (specify: ____________________________)

14) What Technical Support Providers do you use? (What’s the go-to solution for any problems with technology?)

- We have no formal approach to support; staff do the best they can.
- We contract for technical support on an as-needed basis.
- Technical support contracts with one or more providers (specify: ____________________________)
- In-house MIS staff
- Volunteers to our agency
- Friends and family of staff

Please return completed survey by October 11 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope or via fax to 412-227-4097.

Thank you for your assistance.
Appendix B: Respondent Organizations
Organizations in **bold print** responded in both 2000 and 2002.

A Second Chance, Inc.
Achieva
Adams Memorial Library
Addison Behavioral Care, Inc.
**Affordable Comfort, Inc.**
Alcoa Foundation
Aliquippa Alliance for Unity & Development
Allegheny County Bar Foundation
**Allegheny Valley Association of Churches**
Alle-Kiski Area HOPE Center, Inc.
Alzheimer's Association
American Red Cross/ New Kensington Vandergrift Chapter
Anonymous (4)
**APEX Consortium**
ARC Manor
ASSET, Inc.
Azania Heritage, Inc.
Beaver County AIDS Service Organization
Beaver County Humane Society, Inc.
Beaver County Lighthouse
Beaver County Rehabilitation Center
**Beginning With Books**
Belieffield Area Citizens Association
Bethany College
Bethlehem Haven
Better Business Bureau
Big Brothers, Big Sisters Of Beaver County
Blazing Star Choral Society
Borough Of New Stanton
Boys & Girls Club of Western Pennsylvania
Braddock's Field Historical Society
Brashear Association, Inc.
Breezewood Child Care Task Force
Brownsville Area Revitalization Corp.
**Brushton Family Learning Center**
Burger King Cancer Caring Center
Butler County Federated Library System
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh
Center For Independent Living Of SC PA
Center for Organ Recovery & Education
Center for Urban Biblical Ministry
Center for Victims of Violent Crime
Children's Advocacy Network
Clearfield County Area Agency On Aging
Cleanwater Conservancy
CLOH.org
Coalition for Christian Outreach
Communities in Schools
**Communities in Schools**
Community Action Southwest
Community Design Center of Pittsburgh
Community Foundation for the Alleghenies
Conflict Resolution Center International
Consumer Credit Counseling Service
Cool Space Locator
**CORD Center for Civic Leadership**
Corporation for Owner-Operator Projects
Cranberry Township
DeBence Antique Music World
Department of Transportation
**Early Learning Institute**
East Suburban Citizen Advocacy, Inc.
Emmanuel Christian Church
EMMCO East, Inc.
Erie County Health Department
**Every Child, Inc.**
Executive Service Corps of Western PA
Faith In Action Caregivers
Family Guidance, Inc.
Family Planning Services of Mercer County
**Family Resources**
Family Services of Western PA - Pittsburgh
Fayette Chamber of Commerce
Fay-Penn Economic Development Council
First Step Recovery Homes, Inc.
**FISA Foundation**
Flying Mammal Wildlife Rehabilitation Center
Frick Art & Historical Center
Frick Environmental Center
Friendship Development Association
Friendship Ridge
Gabriel Project
**Gateway to the Arts**
Generations Together
Girl Scouts of Beaver and Lawrence Counties
**Girl Scouts of South Western PA**
Glenshaw Public Library
**Grantmakers of Western PA**
Greater Pittsburgh Arts Alliance
**Greater Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau**
**Greater Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau**
**Greater Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau**
**Greater Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau**
Greensburg Central Catholic High School
Habitat For Humanity
Habitat for Humanity of Beaver County
Hazelwood Initiative, Inc.
Holy Family Child Care Center
Hope Network
Institute for Entrepreneurial Excellence
**Intestinal Disease Foundation**
Jefferson/Clarion Head Start
Jewish Association on Aging
Kingsley Association
Kuntu Writers Workshop
Lark Enterprises, Inc.
Lawrence County Tourist Promotion Agency
| Leadership Pittsburgh, Inc.                  | Pittsburgh Foundation          |
| Lifespan, Inc.                              | Pittsburgh Irish & Classical Theatre |
| Lifesteps                                   | Pittsburgh Mediation Center     |
| Ligonier Valley YMCA                        | Pittsburgh Opera, Inc.          |
| **Little Lake Theater Company**             | Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development |
| Long Run Children's Learning Center         | Pittsburgh Police American Legion Post 710 |
| Lutheran Service Society of Western Pennsylvania | Pittsburgh Public Theater    |
| Mars Home for Youth                         | Pittsburgh Region Clean Cities, Inc. |
| Marshall County Schools                     | **Pittsburgh Vision Services**  |
| Mary Miller Dance Company                   | Point Park College              |
| Maurice Falk Medical Fund                   | POISE Foundation                |
| Mental Health Association In Beaver County  | Pregnancy Care Centers          |
| **Mentoring Partnership of Southwestern PA** | Presbyterian Church (USA) Foundation |
| Meridian Area United Presbyterian Church    | Presbyterian Senior Care        |
| Meridian U.P. Church Day Care               | **Pressley Ridge Schools, Inc.** |
| Metro Pittsburgh Youth for Christ CampusLife, Inc. | Prime Time Adult Care |
| **Mom's House, Inc. of Pittsburgh**         | ProArts                        |
| Mon Valley Unemployed Committee             | Rainbow Kitchen Community Services |
| Montour Trail Council                       | **Reading is Fundamental Pittsburgh** |
| Mountain Watershed Association, Inc.        | Residential Care Services       |
| Mt. Lebanon Extended Day Program            | **River City Brass Band**       |
| Mt. Nazareth Center, Inc.                   | Robert Morris University       |
| **Mt. Washington Community Development**    | **Schenley Heights Community Development** |
| Corporation                                 | Sewickley Borough               |
| **Murrysville Community Library**           | **Shady Lane**                  |
| NAMI Southwestern Pennsylvania              | Shakespeare in the Schools      |
| National Congress for Fathers and Children  | Shaler Area EMS                 |
| Nationality Rooms And Intercultural Exchange| Sharon Lifelong Learning Council|
| NEED                                       | Sisters Place, Inc.             |
| Neighborhood Legal Services Association     | **Society for American Music**  |
| **Neighbors In The Strip**                  | **Society for Contemporary Craft** |
| North Hills Community Outreach              | **Society of St. Vincent de Paul** |
| **North Hills Youth Ministry**              | Sojourner House                 |
| North Side Saints                           | **Southern Alleghenies Conservancy** |
| North Versailles Parks And Recreation       | **Southwestern Pennsylvania Human Services, Inc.** |
| **Northside Common Ministries, Inc.**       | Specialty Outreach Services, Inc.   |
| Our Lady Of Sacred Heart High School        | Spectrum Family Network          |
| **PA Cleanways**                           | Spina Bifida Association of Western PA |
| PA Cleanways Westmoreland County           | Sauanton Farm Foundation         |
| PACE School                                 | Steel Industry Heritage Corporation |
| Parental Stress Center                      | Steel Valley Authority          |
| Penn Trafford Area Recreation               | **Stepping Stones Children's Center** |
| Pennsylvania Environmental Council          | Summerbridge Pittsburgh         |
| Pennsylvania Legal Services                 | Sustainable Pittsburgh           |
| **Pennsylvania Resources Council**          | **TeamPA Career Link**          |
| Pennsylvania West Soccer Association        | **The Allegheny Regional Asset District** |
| Pennsylvania Women Work!                    | The Buhl Foundation             |
| Peoples Library                            | The Community Builders          |
| Peoples Oakland                            | **The Emmaus Community of Pittsburgh, Inc.** |
| Phipps Conservatory                        | The Grable Foundation           |
| **Pittsburgh Action Against Rape**          | The Lazarus Center              |
| Pittsburgh AIDS Task Force                  | The Pittsburgh Project          |
| **Pittsburgh Ballet Theatre**               | **The Presbyterian Church, Sewickley** |
| **Pittsburgh Cares**                       | **The Wellness Alliance**       |
| Pittsburgh Children's Museum               | Three Rivers Adoption Council   |
| Pittsburgh Council For International Visitors | **Three Rivers Center for Independent Living** |
Three Rivers Community Foundation

**Transitional Employment Consultants**
Transitional Services, Inc.
Troy Hill Senior Center

**Try - Again Homes, Inc.**

**Tuesday Musical Club**
Turtle Creek Valley MH/MR Inc.
United Cerebral Palsy Association of Pittsburgh
United Cerebral Palsy of Western PA, Inc.
United Way of Allegheny County
United Way of Armstrong County
United Way of Butler County
United Way of Mon Valley
United Way of Westmoreland County
University of Pittsburgh - Office of Child Development
Upward Bound Project
Urban League of Pittsburgh
Urban Youth Action, Inc.

**Valley Care Association**
Valley Players of Ligonier, Inc.
Victim Outreach Intervention Center
Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program of Western PA, Inc.
Villa St. Joseph
Vintage, Inc.
VNA - Hospice Foundation, Inc.
Volunteer Pilot's Association
West Penn Hospital Foundation
Western Allegheny Community Library
Western PA Field Institute
Western PA Watershed Program
Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
Western Pennsylvania Golf Association Trust Fund
Westinghouse Valley Human Services Center
Westmoreland Human Opportunities, Inc.

**Westmoreland Museum of American Art**
Westmoreland Symphony
Whitehall Camp and Conference Center
Wilkinsburg Community Ministry
With A Golden Spirit
Women's Center and Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh
Woodlands Foundation
World Affairs Council of Pittsburgh

**YMCA Sewickley Valley**
YMCA/Camp Kon-O-Kwee/Spencer

**YWCA of Westmoreland County**
Appendix C: Bayer Center Advisory Board, Tech Advisory Group, Staff

BAYER CENTER FOR NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT
ROBERT MORRIS UNIVERSITY

ADVISORY BOARD
CHAIR
Peter Lucas
Maya Design Group

Doreen E. Boyce
The Buhl Foundation

James V. Denova
The Claude W. Benedum Foundation

Judie Donaldson
Grantmakers of Western PA

Carolyn Duronio
Reed Smith LLP.

Karen Farmer-White
WQED

Robert S. Foltz
Goodwill Industries of Pittsburgh

Scott Izzo
Richard King Mellon Foundation

Mark S. Lewis
POISE Foundation

Rebecca Lucore
Bayer Foundation

William J. Meyer
United Way of Allegheny County

Mildred E. Morrison
Allegheny County Department of Human Services

Edward Nicholson
Robert Morris University

Donnie Day Pomeroy
The Denali Initiative

James A. Rudolph
McKnight Development Company

William S. Stein
Michael Watson
Richard King Mellon Foundation

Laura Richeson Zinski
Mon Valley Initiative

Technology Advisory Group
CHAIR
Doreen E. Boyce
The Buhl Foundation

Laurie S. Anderson
Executive Service Corps of Western PA

Gerald Balbier
The Heinz Endowments

Bethann Casar
Jewish Family & Children’s Service

Gene Hastings
Information Renaissance

Peter Lucas
Maya Design Group

Tom Mazzo
United Way of Allegheny County

Joseph Mertz
Carnegie Mellon University

STAFF

Samuel E. Coleman
Office Manager

Jeff Forster
Director of Technology Services

Lisa Kuzma
Director of Consulting

Ayana Ledford
Nonprofit Management Fellow

Peggy Morrison Outon
Executive Director

Jonathan Paslov
Program Administrator

Yvonne Van Haitsma
Collaboration Project Director

Sallie Wormer
Technology Services Analyst