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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March of 2020, Forefront administered a survey open to all Illinois nonprofits inquiring about their needs in light of the COVID-19 outbreak. The response was passionate and detailed. In order to gauge the ongoing needs of the sector, Forefront administered a second survey in November to better understand how the first six months of the pandemic had affected nonprofits and what its continued impact is expected to be in 2021.

Nearly 500 respondents answered this second survey, representing organizations that serve every county in Illinois. Respondents range from organizations with fewer than 5 staff to over 100 and those with annual budgets of less than $100,000 to over $10 million. Forefront also asked respondents to indicate whether the CEO or Executive Director of their organization identified as Black, Indigenous, or a Person of Color (BIPOC) to better understand how the pandemic has affected nonprofits based in and serving BIPOC communities.

All survey responses were clear: organizations are suffering financially, recovery will take time, and flexible resources continue to be lacking and vitally important.

Overall, survey respondents are concerned about the reliability of support as effects of the pandemic continue to be felt. While many did report seeing new funding opportunities as well as simplified, extended, or eliminated reporting requirements, respondents expressed wariness that the sector would soon return to an unsatisfying status quo. Commitment to long-term sector support and improvement is necessary.

When it comes to revenue, organizations are feeling the pinch. Most respondents (53%) have seen fees for services and earned revenue fall by 15% or more, and more than three quarters (77%) report depressed income from special events (51% reported missing their projections by 50% or more).

Access to federal and private relief funds appears to be inconsistent. The Paycheck Protection Program was the only federal relief fund that a significant percentage of overall respondents received support from, though this was not consistent across race or geography. 71% of Chicago area organizations and 60% of those serving Northwest, Central, or Southern Illinois received PPP funding, and 64% of BIPOC-led organizations received PPP funding compared to 72% of all other respondents. Almost half (44%) of respondents reported receiving no funding from a private COVID-19 fund (though this figure drops to 33% for organizations outside the Chicago area).

Job losses at organizations were less stark than some feared, despite felt and projected revenue shortfalls. Overall, 14% of respondents reported that their organization had experienced layoffs, furloughs, or voluntary departures of staff who would not be replaced. Organizations serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois, who tended to have smaller budgets and fewer staff to begin with, were less likely to report layoffs, furloughs, and staff departures who would not be replaced, as well as being less likely to report large losses in revenue.

BIPOC-led organizations were under-represented in this survey sample, making up 25% of total respondents, but their responses tell an important story. They were more likely to have experienced both increased participation in or demand for their services and lost revenue. And while a higher percentage of BIPOC-led survey respondents received unsolicited general operating support during the early months of the pandemic,
they were also twice as likely to report an overall decrease in foundation and corporate grants. Combined, these data points indicate that temporary investments in BIPOC-led organizations are not sufficient to meet the multiple systemic challenges faced by these organizations and their constituents.

Regarding future support and capacity building, nonprofits want to see support for urgent concerns and steps to create a better world in years to come. 72% of respondents indicated that an ideal solution for achieving both is provision of new opportunities for general operating funding. Many respondents worry that, in meeting immediate needs, funders will lose sight of long-term goals. As one commenter stated, “If someone asks what did you do when the rains came, make sure your answer is you built the dam, strengthened the levees and got people to high ground and shelter. Don’t say you just handed out umbrellas.”

**RESPONSE OVERVIEW**

When asked to communicate how best to support their organizations, most respondents turned to issues of funding, policy, and communication.

The importance of flexible, reliable, and diversified financial support for nonprofits cannot be overstated. Other issues related to funding included the need for templates or advice about budgeting and grant writing, aiding organizations in finding or buying locations for their work, supporting organizations that cannot provide services at this time, and thinking long term since there will be long-lasting effects from this year.

In terms of policy, both internal and external, organizations would like to see shared grant applications among funders, more help with collaboration and mergers, aid in obtaining consulting help or information to help keep organizations running in a virtual environment, information about closing out organizations that will not survive, and how to identify and diversify board members.

For communication, nonprofits would like to see continued work with the government to advocate for the sector’s needs as well as more communication from funders about their opportunities, including meeting nonprofits to learn about their work. Respondents also requested clarity from funders on their anti-racist or racial equity funding priorities and intentional engagement with communities of color about what terms (for example, BIPOC or ALAANA) are most inclusive and representative.

**GET INVOLVED**

To learn about how you can join Forefront in supporting the social impact sector and access many of the resources requested by nonprofits throughout this report, and to access the raw data set from this survey, go to MyForefront.org/COVID-19.

Have any questions? Reach out to us at info@myforefront.org.
ILLINOIS NONPROFITS NEED:

1. General operating support.
2. Long-term commitments and solutions.
3. Programs that provide connection to experienced peers and professional expertise.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDERS:

1. Provide continued and expanded opportunities for multi-year general operating support. Flexible resources are critical for organizations as they continue to navigate increased demand for services and the ongoing uncertainties of a slow economic recovery.
2. Leverage your advocacy influence. Many nonprofits were unaware of potential support from federal programs. Spreading the word about all funding opportunities is vital.
3. Offer alternatives that will help nonprofits replace revenue lost from special events and services that cannot happen at this time.
4. Leverage opportunities to connect grantees to experienced advice and assistance. Nonprofits are looking for connections to those who are experts in their fields as well as peers who have knowledge to share.
Areas of Service

Respondents included organizations serving every county in Illinois.

- **15%** provide statewide service.
- **27%** provide service in Northwest, Central, or Southern Illinois.
- **25%** serve Cook County exclusively.
**WORK FOCUS AREAS**

- Human Services was the most frequently selected area of work for respondents (47%).
- Organizations serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois were even more likely to choose Human Services as an area of focus (60%).
- BIPOC-led orgs were more likely to check Community Improvement (30%) and Education (45%) as their main areas of focus when compared to respondents as a whole (17% and 30% respectively).

### FIGURE 2: WORK FOCUS AREAS

Respondents were able to select all areas that pertained to their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, fishing, food security, and/or forestry</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community improvement</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Community, economic, housing development; financial services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>29.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and health care</td>
<td>20.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Antidiscrimination, individual liberties, justice rights)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>47.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Emergency aid, family or personal services, job services, shelter &amp; residential care, youth development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Technology, libraries, media, news and public information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Foundations, nonprofits, venture philanthropy, voluntarism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public affairs</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Democracy, public policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abuse prevention, consumer protection, criminal justice, disaster and emergency management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and recreation</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNUAL BUDGET**

While 34% of all respondents were from organizations with budgets of less than $500,000, nonprofits serving outside the Chicago area (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will counties) were more likely to be financially smaller organizations. Nearly half (49%) of respondents serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois had budgets under $500,000 as opposed to 29% of organizations serving the Chicago area.

BIPOC-led organizations were also more likely to be in the lowest annual budget range. 16% of BIPOC-led organizations had annual budgets under $100,000, while only 9% of all other respondents fell into that category.

**ORGANIZATION SIZE**

- 40% of all respondents are from organizations with 5 or fewer employees.

- Nearly half (49%) of organizations serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois reported having 5 or fewer FTE compared to 38% of Chicago area organizations.
DEMAND FOR SERVICES

• 47% of respondents said demand for/participation in their programs has increased by 10% or more since March.

• When later asked about staffing changes (see page 8, Fig. 8), 45% of these organizations said they had added staff during the survey period vs. 25% of those respondents who had experienced flat or decreased interest in their programs.

• BIPOC-led organizations were more likely to have seen an increase in demand for services: 61% reported an increase of 10% or more, compared to 42% of all other respondent organizations.

BIPOC-led organizations are seeing a disproportionately high increase in demand.

- 30% of BIPOC-led groups cited a significant (50% or more) increase in demand for services
- VS. 14% of all other respondents.

IN-PERSON AND REMOTE WORK

• While most respondents (54%) answered that their work was mostly or completely virtual, this way of working was more prevalent in organizations serving the Chicago area.

• Of the respondents who indicated “Other,” three were from organizations that closed their doors, or will soon.

• Other replies included use of a hybrid model that doesn’t prioritize either virtual or face-to-face work.

- 63% of Chicagoland organizations are working mostly or entirely remotely
- VS. 38% of Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois organizations.

FIGURE 5: SERVICE DEMAND  Responses: 483

- Increased significantly (up more than 50% over the previous year)
- Increased somewhat (up by 10-49% compared to the previous year)
- Stayed about the same (within +/- 10% of last year)
- Decreased somewhat (down 10-49% compared to the previous year)
- Decreased significantly (down more than 50% compared to the previous year)

FIGURE 6: CONDUCTING WORK  Responses: 482

- Completely in person (all work done onsite)
- Completely virtual (all work done remotely)
- Mostly in person (majority of staff and volunteers working onsite)
- Mostly virtual (majority of staff and volunteers working remotely)
- Other
Flexible working hours were the most common form of support offered to nonprofit employees. Organizations also provided PPE, hazard pay or bonuses, and technology support (in the form of provided equipment, supplies, stipends, or reimbursement for home office setup).

Respondents indicated that some of these supports were one time offers or temporary at the beginning of the pandemic, which may raise concerns about sustainability and eventual staff burnout.

Changes in Staff Composition

Staffing changes at organizations were less stark than some feared, despite felt and projected revenue shortfalls (see figure 9). Overall, 14% of respondents reported that their organization had experienced layoffs, furloughs, or voluntary departures of staff who would not be replaced. 43% of that group were organizations that had only experienced voluntary departures of staff who would not be replaced.

Organizations serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois were less likely to see any staffing change, with 43% reporting no staffing changes. 33% of Chicago area serving organizations had no changes in staff size.

BIPOC-led organizations were more likely to have added staff, with 42% reporting adding staff compared to 32% of all other respondents. This could correlate to the increased demand for programs and services seen by BIPOC-led organizations (see page 7).

For the near future, most organizations (79%) anticipate adding staff or holding steady regarding staffing. One third of respondents plan to add staff (for BIPOC-led organizations, this rises to 43%) with another 47% planning no staffing changes. 56% of respondents serving Northwest, Central, or Southern Illinois reported no anticipated staffing changes as compared to 42% of Chicago area organizations who reported the same.
When it comes to revenue, organizations are feeling the pinch. Responding organizations have experienced decreases in many of their revenue streams compared to pre-pandemic budgets or projections. Most (53%) have seen fees for services and earned revenue fall by 15% or more. More than three quarters (77%) of respondents report depressed income from special events (51% reported missing their projections by 50% or more).

These revenue trends are more apparent in BIPOC-led organizations. 60% of BIPOC-led organizations reported revenue at 15% or more below anticipated levels compared to 51% of all other respondents. BIPOC-led organizations were twice as likely to report that individual giving was down 50% or more (20% vs. 10% of all other respondents), and were also more than twice as likely to report decreases of 50% or more in foundation grants (14% of BIPOC-led organizations compared to 6%) and corporate grants (24% compared to 11%).

Government grants represent the steadiest area of income, with 59% of respondents reporting they are within 15% of anticipated levels, and a further 29% of respondents reporting an increase of 15% or more.

With the exception of special event revenue, most organizations hope that revenue will approach 15% of previously projected levels for November 2020 through June of 2021. However, 70% expect special event revenue to remain depressed by 15% or more, 48% predict fees for services will stay down 15% or more, and 42% anticipate individual giving will remain at 15% or more below budgeted levels.

For data regarding all revenue streams, see Figures 10-15 in the Appendix.

---

**FIGURE 9: IMPACT ON REVENUE SINCE MARCH 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizations serving Northwest, Central, and Southern Illinois</th>
<th>Organizations within Chicagoland</th>
<th>BIPOC-Led Organizations</th>
<th>Non-BIPOC-Led Organizations</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees for Service / Earned Revenue</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 17.04%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 17.04%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 28.41%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 24.41%</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 26.89%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 21.23%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 31.82%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 26.38%</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 5.93%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 1.48%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 12.79%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 3.49%</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 14.09%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 4.81%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 6.14%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 4.55%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grants</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 14.07%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 8.89%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 16.83%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 5.69%</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 19.25%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 7.11%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 13.86%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 7.85%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Grants or Sponsorships</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 19.26%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 11.11%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 24.47%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 11.47%</td>
<td>27.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 34.32%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 10.59%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 24.47%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 14.62%</td>
<td>27.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Revenue</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 27.41%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 42.22%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 20.21%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 51.38%</td>
<td>26.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 35.71%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 35.29%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 48.94%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 50.76%</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Giving (not related to special events)</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 29.63%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 12.59%</td>
<td>Down 15-49%: 26.73%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 9.80%</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 29.51%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 9.84%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 19.80%</td>
<td>Down 50% or more: 12.65%</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIVATE FUND ACCESS AND USE

Almost half (44%) of respondents reported receiving no funding from a private COVID-19 fund (though this figure drops to 33% for organizations outside the Chicago area). In addition to the funds listed in the survey question, 163 respondents noted support they received from their local United Way, a community or private foundation, and/or government entity.

For a complete list of private funds used by responding organizations, please see Figure 17 in the Appendix.

FEDERAL FUND ACCESS AND USE

The Paycheck Protection Program was the only federal relief fund that a significant percentage of overall respondents received support from, though this was not consistent across race or geography. 71% of Chicago area organizations and 60% of those serving Northwest, Central, or Southern Illinois received PPP funding, and 64% of BIPOC-led organizations received PPP funding compared to 72% of all other respondents. However, there was no notable difference in the numbers of organizations across race or geography that did not qualify for the fund.

For the other federal relief programs referenced, a majority of respondents either did not qualify for or were unaware of them. Depending on the program, anywhere from 22% to 35% of respondents indicated they did not qualify, while 18% to 29% said they were unaware. With only 2% of respondents reporting they were unaware of the PPP, it appears that outreach for other federal funding opportunities may have been less effective.

For data regarding all federal funding options, please see Figures 17-20 in the Appendix.
Almost all respondents found the supports offered by foundations or corporate funders during the survey period helpful. New funding opportunities and extensions on reporting deadlines were seen especially favorably. However, anywhere from 28% to 61% of respondents noted that any given support mentioned in the survey question was not made available to them.

BIPOC-led organizations found “changes in funding priorities” more helpful than other responding organizations (41% of BIPOC-led organizations found this helpful, as opposed to 27% of all other respondents). There was a notable difference in recipients of “unsolicited general operating funding”: 51% of BIPOC-led orgs indicated that they received (and found helpful) unsolicited gen ops funding, while 37% of BIPOC-led organizations indicate that this type of support was not offered to them.

Conversely, 37% of non-BIPOC-led orgs reported receiving unsolicited general operating funding, and 51% of the same population indicated that this type of support was not offered.

SUPPORT PROVIDED BY FUNDERS

72% of respondents indicated that new opportunities for general operating funding are both urgent and important. BIPOC-led organizations were more likely to mark a type of support as urgent and important, especially in regards to early payments on pledged grants (36% said it would be urgent and important compared to 21% of all other respondents) and new opportunities for project funding (67% of BIPOC-led orgs and 50% of other respondents selected this as urgent and important).

Commenters on this question also raised the importance of multi-year grants, mental health support, support for organizations not providing direct services, and connection. Specifically, respondents asked grantmakers to be responsive, to give feedback, to think about common or universal grant applications, and to be flexible.

For data regarding other desired funding support moving forward, see Appendix, Figures 32-38.

FUTURE SUPPORT NEEDS

For data regarding other forms of funding support between March and October 2020, see Appendix, Figures 25-31.
Fundraising support was the capacity building area most likely to be rated as “urgent and important,” with 52% of all respondents and 67% of BIPOC-led organizations finding it urgent and important. 86% of respondents found it “urgent,” “important,” or both.

Fundraising was very closely followed by collaborations or strategic partnerships, with 85% of respondents finding it an area to be “urgent,” “important,” or both.

BIPOC-led organizations were twice as likely to rate communications as an area both “urgent” and “important” (40% vs. 20% of all other respondents) and considered Human Resources management to be of more interest as well, with 76% rating it as “urgent,” “important,” or both, as compared to 54% of all other respondents. 46% of BIPOC-led organizations rated racial equity capacity building as an area both “urgent” and “important” while 29% of all other respondents did so.

Aid in finding building space, professional development, board training, and further assistance with technology were further suggestions for needed supports from the comments.

**FIGURE 39: NEEDED FUTURE CAPACITY-BUILDING SUPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Urgent and important</th>
<th>Important, not urgent</th>
<th>Urgent, not important</th>
<th>Not needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-racism or racial equity</td>
<td>32.61%</td>
<td>35.04%</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>26.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board engagement</td>
<td>26.23%</td>
<td>33.61%</td>
<td>10.11%</td>
<td>30.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement or advocacy</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>39.12%</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
<td>28.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations or strategic partnerships</td>
<td>28.53%</td>
<td>44.27%</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>20.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and evaluation</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>36.94%</td>
<td>12.22%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Budgeting</td>
<td>51.89%</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management</td>
<td>17.21%</td>
<td>27.87%</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td>14.56%</td>
<td>30.22%</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
<td>41.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Risk management</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>42.93%</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
<td>26.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>17.81%</td>
<td>39.73%</td>
<td>17.53%</td>
<td>24.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
<td>24.73%</td>
<td>36.56%</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td>27.15%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
<td>44.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizations were asked how they would prefer to engage in capacity building programs. For the most popular option, “consulting from an outside expert,” BIPOC-led organizations were even more likely to rate it as “Very Beneficial” with 51% reporting it so as compared to 30% of all other organizations. Only organizations serving outside the Chicago area did not rate outside consulting as the most beneficial item. Instead, their preference was for webinar series taught by experts, with 31% of respondents rating it as “Very Beneficial.”

BIPOC-led organizations were nearly twice as likely to find a peer learning group based on issue area or an organizational capacity assessment “Very Beneficial” (40% compared to 22% of all other respondents for the peer group and 36% vs. 19% for the assessment option).

**FIGURE 40: DELIVERING RESOURCES TO NONPROFITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Very beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat beneficial</th>
<th>Not beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting from an outside expert:</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
<td>42.78%</td>
<td>22.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity assessments:</td>
<td>22.89%</td>
<td>46.87%</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning/networking group based on issue area:</td>
<td>25.67%</td>
<td>49.73%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning/networking group based on role:</td>
<td>24.25%</td>
<td>50.95%</td>
<td>24.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short technical assistance session with an experienced peer:</td>
<td>28.42%</td>
<td>40.21%</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single webinar taught by expert(s):</td>
<td>28.18%</td>
<td>50.14%</td>
<td>21.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar series taught by expert(s):</td>
<td>30.87%</td>
<td>48.63%</td>
<td>20.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar/workshop series with built-in peer learning over 1-3 months:</td>
<td>25.67%</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar/workshop series with built-in peer learning over 4-6 months:</td>
<td>19.78%</td>
<td>48.24%</td>
<td>31.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURES 10-15: IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL REVENUE

- **FIGURE 10: FEES FOR SERVICE / EARNED REVENUE**
  - Responses: 351
- **FIGURE 11: CORPORATE GRANTS & SPONSORSHIPS**
  - Responses: 352
- **FIGURE 12: GOVERNMENT GRANTS**
  - Responses: 395
- **FIGURE 13: FOUNDATION GRANTS**
  - Responses: 395
- **FIGURE 14: INDIVIDUAL GIVING (unrelated to special events)**
  - Responses: 351
- **FIGURE 15: SPECIAL EVENT REVENUE**
  - Responses: 396
FIGURE 17: ALL PRIVATE FUNDS USED (AS SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENTS)

Adams County United Way  
AgeOptions  
ARC of Illinois  
Arts for Illinois  
Arts Relief Illinois  
Aurora CDBG  
AWE  
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois  
Capital One COVID-19 Relief Fund  
CCT/UW COVID-19 Funding Program  
Central Illinois Community Foundation  
CFRNY  
Champaign County United Way  
Chicago Area Region Fund Initiative  
Chicago Community Trust - A Better Chicago  
Chicago Education Equity COVID-19 Response Fund  
Chicago Foundation for Women  
Chicagoland Area Food Depository  
Chicago Cares Fund  
Chicago Community Trust  
Chicago Community Trust - Fox Valley Region  
Chicago Community Trust - Northern Illinois  
Chicago Community Trust - Quad Cities  
Chicago Community Trust Serving West Central Illinois & Northeast Missouri  
Community Foundation of Central Illinois  
Community Foundation of Fox Valley Collaborative  
Community Foundation of the Land of Lincoln  
Community Foundation of the Quad Cities  
Community Foundation Serving West Central Illinois & Northeast Missouri  
CRA  
DeKalb County Community Foundation  
Deloit and Murphy  
Downtown Aurora C-19  
DuPage County  
DuPage County Community Services  
DuPage Foundation  
Edwardsville Community Foundation  
Elgin Covid Response Fund  
Evanston Community Foundation  
Family Independence Initiative  
Federal Independent Living Funds  
Fox Valley Community Foundation  
Fox Valley United Way  
GCFD  
Grand Victoria Foundation  
Healthy Communities Foundation  
Heart's United Fund  
HFCC Chicago  
Highland Park Community Foundation  
ICFRR  
Illinois Arts Council  
Illinois Children's Healthcare Foundation  
Illinois Immigration Fund Collaborative  
Illinois Association of Free and Charitable Clinics  
Illinois Department of Agriculture  
Illinois Humanities Council  
Illinois Prairie Community Foundation  
INCRAA  
Jack Miller Foundation  
Jewish United Fund  
Julian Grass Foundation  
Kane County Continuum of Care  
Kane County COVID-19 Relief Fund  
Kane County Health Department  
Kankakee County  
Lake County Community Foundation  
LaSalle County Community Foundation  
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation  
Madison County Community Development  
McHenry Community Foundation  
McHenry County 708 Board  
Nature Conservancy and Environmental Conservation Group  
NKC Family Foundation  
Northern Illinois Food Bank  
Northernwestern University Medical Community  
Oak Park Forest Park Community Foundation  
ProHealth Foundation  
REstore Illinois  
Rochelle Area Community Foundation  
Rock River Valley United Way  
Rotary Club  
Scott Health Trust  
Sherry Foundation  
Spencer Foundation  
St. Clair County  
St. Louis Community Foundation  
State Prison Early Release Response  
Surge Institute  
Taiwan Foundation  
United Way Aurora  
United Way BET Relief Fund  
United Way for Spoon River Country  
United Way GMC  
United Way McBET  
United Way McHenry  
United Way Metro Chicago  
United Way of Boone County  
United Way of Central Illinois  
United Way of Decatur and Mid-Illinois  
United Way of Greater St. Louis and St. Clair County  
United Way of Lake County  
United Way of McDonough County  
United Way of Will County  
University of Chicago Medicine  
Up Together  
Verizon Foundation  
Walter Foundation  
Wheaton CDBG  
Wellington Management Foundation  
Wells Fargo COVID-19 Relief Fund  
West Cook United Way  
West Side United  
WorkNet DuPage  
YWCA

FIGURES 19-22: FEDERAL FUND ACCESS AND USE

FIGURE 19: FEDERAL TAX CREDITS FOR EMPLOYEES  
Responses: 406

FIGURE 20: ECONOMIC INJURY DISASTER LOANS (EIDL)  
Responses: 407

FIGURE 21: COVID-19 SICK TIME OR FAMILY LEAVE  
(FAMILIES FIRST CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE ACT)  
Responses: 405

FIGURE 22: CARES ACT EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT  
Responses: 405
FIGURES 25-31: PAST SUPPORT PROVIDED BY FUNDERS

- **Helpful** (reduced stress and/or freed up staff time)
- **Neutral** (offered, but did not change much)
- **Unhelpful** (added stress and/or took additional time)
- **Not offered by any of our funding partners**

**FIGURE 25:** CHANGES IN FUNDING PRIORITIES
March - October 2020. Responses: 363

**FIGURE 26:** ELIMINATED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
March - October 2020. Responses: 365

**FIGURE 27:** EXTENDED REPORTING DEADLINES
March - October 2020. Responses: 368

FIGURES 32-38: FUTURE SUPPORT DESIRED FROM FUNDERS

- **Urgent and important** (this would address an immediate, systemic need)
- **Important, not urgent** (this will address systemic needs, but not immediately)
- **Urgent, not important** (needed soon, but would not address systemic needs)
- **Neutral** (not needed at all)
- **Harmful** (please do not do this)

**FIGURE 32:** CHANGES IN FUNDING PRIORITIES
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 347

**FIGURE 33:** ELIMINATING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 357

**FIGURE 34:** EXTENDING REPORTING DEADLINES
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 359
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### FIGURES 25-31 (CONTINUED): PAST SUPPORT PROVIDED BY FUNDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpful (reduced stress and/or freed up staff time)</th>
<th>Neutral (offered, but did not change much)</th>
<th>Unhelpful (added stress and/or took additional time)</th>
<th>Not offered by any of our funding partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FIGURE 28:** EARLY PAYMENTS ON PLEDGED GRANTS  
March - October 2020. Responses: 359

- Helpful: 60.72%
- Neutral: 13.93%
- Unhelpful: 1.11%
- Not offered: 24.23%

**FIGURE 29:** RELEASED RESTRICTIONS ON GRANTS  
March - October 2020. Responses: 362

- Helpful: 48.49%
- Neutral: 14.52%
- Unhelpful: 1.37%
- Not offered: 35.62%

**FIGURE 30:** SIMPLIFYING APPLICATIONS  
March - October 2020. Responses: 355

- Helpful: 34.78%
- Neutral: 17.93%
- Unhelpful: 1.36%
- Not offered: 45.92%

### FIGURES 32-38 (CONTINUED): FUTURE SUPPORT DESIRED FROM FUNDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urgent and important (this would address an immediate, systemic need)</th>
<th>Important, not urgent (this will address systemic needs, but not immediately)</th>
<th>Urgent, not important (needed soon, but would not address systemic needs)</th>
<th>Neutral (not needed at all)</th>
<th>Harmful (please do not do this)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FIGURE 35:** EARLY PAYMENTS ON PLEDGED GRANTS  
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 351

- Urgent and important: 41.03%
- Important, not urgent: 24.50%
- Urgent, not important: 23.08%
- Neutral: 11.11%

**FIGURE 36:** RELEASED RESTRICTIONS ON GRANTS  
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 359

- Urgent and important: 19.50%
- Important, not urgent: 49.86%
- Urgent, not important: 8.08%
- Neutral: 22.28%

**FIGURE 37:** SIMPLIFYING APPLICATIONS  
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 359

- Urgent and important: 15.88%
- Important, not urgent: 44.85%
- Urgent, not important: 10.03%
- Neutral: 29.25%
FIGURES 25-31 (CONTINUED): PAST SUPPORT PROVIDED BY FUNDERS

- Helpful (reduced stress and/or freed up staff time)
- Neutral (offered, but did not change much)
- Unhelpful (added stress and/or took additional time)
- Not offered by any of our funding partners

FIGURES 32-38 (CONTINUED): FUTURE SUPPORT DESIRED FROM FUNDERS

- Urgent and important (this would address an immediate, systemic need)
- Important, not urgent (this will address systemic needs, but not immediately)
- Urgent, not important (needed soon, but would not address systemic needs)
- Neutral (not needed at all)
- Harmful (please do not do this)

FIGURE 31: UNSOLICITED ADDITIONAL FUNDING
March - October 2020. Responses: 364

- 47.80%
- 39.56%
- 10.16%
- 2.47%

FIGURE 38: OPPORTUNITIES TO FUND PROJECTS
November 2020 - June 2021. Responses: 364

- 10.03%
- 8.67%
- 26.83%
- 53.39%

LEARN MORE

If you have questions about any of the data presented in this report, please reach out to us at info@myforefront.org.


GET INVOLVED

To learn about how you can join Forefront in supporting the social impact sector and access many of the resources requested by nonprofits throughout this report, go to MyForefront.org/COVID-19.