

Under Siege Update:

a follow-up study of non-profit, community based, social service agencies

Produced by:

- Captain William Spry Community Centre
- Community Advocates, and the
- Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers

Halifax, Nova Scotia

April 2004

1. Introduction

The *Under Siege Update* study is a follow-up to the 1998 report *Under Siege: a study of non-profit, community-based agencies in an era of cuts*. In the first *Under Siege* research into community-based, service agencies in Nova Scotia, a number of troubling trends were identified that had implications for the future of individual agencies and the non-profit sector as a whole. To learn about what has happened to non-profit agencies in the intervening five years, this second research project was undertaken.

1.1 Context of the study: the impact of downloading to the community

The impetus for the original *Under Siege* study was the across-the-board funding cuts to agencies from public and private sources¹. The *Under Siege* research confirmed this finding with 83% of the agencies studied experiencing funding cuts from 1990 to 1997. Not only did agencies receive less public money, but their relationship with government departments also became more strained. With the instability of funding, the agencies had to rework the budget and their programs, and scurry for alternate sources of income. Added to this were the cuts to various government services (health, income assistance, justice, education, etc.) making life more of a struggle for individuals and families. Community agencies found that the demand for services was increasing and more people were in crisis.

As a result of the unstable funding and greater demand for services, volunteers and staff were getting burnt-out. For those who needed support services, they were “more desperate, frustrated, hopeless ... living in danger; ... becoming involved in underground/criminal world for money.”²

Other research has confirmed some of these troubling trends. There are one million fewer volunteers³ in Canada. Poverty has increased: more children were living in poverty in 2001 than in 1989⁴. And in Nova Scotia “people with disabilities only receive a dollar more than in 1994 for basic necessities.”⁵ Funding for the non-profit sector is becoming more erratic⁶.

Public policy on social services and the social safety net shifted in the 1990's from a more universal approach to the charity model of assuming that non-profit organizations would provide services to people in need. “There is no question that governments have to rely on volunteerism more than ever in a time of cutbacks...”our now Prime Minister, Paul Martin, was quoted as saying in 1996.

1.2 Sponsoring organizations

The *Under Siege Update* study was a joint project of the Captain William Spry Community Centre, the Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers and the Community Advocates Network. The Captain William Spry Community Centre, located in Halifax, has a mandate to promote community development through facilitating partnerships and encouraging involvement in addressing community issues. The Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers, the professional association for social workers in the province, promotes social policies aimed at improving social conditions. The Community Advocates Network is a grassroots alliance of people on social assistance, their organizations, advocates, and allies.

1.3 Research Method

Research for this study was a two-part process: a focus group and questionnaire. To determine key issues for community-based, social service agencies, seven representatives of community based agencies in the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) participated in a focus group. The focus group participants were chosen because their organizations are located in geographically diverse areas of the HRM and they provide distinct services to different groups of people. Key questions for the representatives were on their struggles and successes in their agencies.

Using the information from the focus group, a five-page questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire was pre-tested with two agencies to make certain that the questions were clear. To ensure a cross-section of experiences, the sample of agencies to receive the questionnaire were chosen by location and mandate (client group and service). Twenty-one questionnaires were returned out of the twenty-six sent out. Respondents provided services to youth, seniors, families, visible minorities, and to persons with disabilities. Agency services addressed health, equity, recreation, crisis, housing, employment, and mental health issues. Seventeen agencies provide services within the HRM only and four agencies provide province-wide services. All but one of the agencies has a budget of under \$250,000.

The identity of the agencies that participated in the study has been kept confidential to enable them to be forthright, without fear of repercussions, on their experiences with funding, fundraising and their relationship with government.

1.4 Glossary of terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are used:

Core funding: Core funding is regular, ongoing funding an agency can generally count on from year to year and is not for one specific program they offer.

Project funding: Special projects and program funding is for a specific purpose for a particular period of time. An agency may receive the money for several years, but the funding does not cover the operational costs of running the agencies. For example, the Community Mobilization grants are for special projects.

Fundraising: Fundraising is a specific activity undertaken by the agency to raise money. This can be raffles, special events such as concerts or sales of a product such as a cookbook. For the financial analysis, corporate sponsorships were included since they were usually tied to a special event.

Donations: Donations are cash gifts from individuals.

Fees for service, membership fees, and product sales: This is self-generated income.

1.5 Acknowledgements

The sponsors of the Under Siege Update research would like to thank the agency representatives who attended the focus group and the staff of the twenty-one agencies who took the time to fill out the detailed questionnaire so that we could have this snapshot of how agencies are faring.

2. Community-based, non-profit agencies: who they are, what they do

Non-profit, community-based, social service agencies provide support services to individuals and/or families. These support services can take the form of counselling, material support (e.g., food & clothing), information and referral, programs and activities, financial aid, and advocacy. Frequently the agencies target services to those most in need, but there are rarely income guidelines to qualify. Systemic barriers such as racism and discrimination, and the cycle of poverty mean that some people have a harder time in our society. Examples of the types of services that are provided by community based agencies are parent resource information and programs, youth recreation activities, advocacy for people with disabilities, language programs for newcomers to Canada, crisis counselling services, employment support, or emergency food or clothing.

As an agency, the service has an identifiable location and regular hours. To provide consistent services there are some paid staff but many small organizations augment their services with trained volunteers.

Community-based services usually come about in response to a local need and are governed by local volunteers. The difference between non-profit and private services is the community accountability through the Board of Directors and annual meetings that are a requirement to have non-profit status. Unlike private services in which any profits accrue to the owners, a non-profit agency reinvests any profit into the organization.

Since community-based agencies provide low-cost or no-cost services, to subsidize their programs they need outside funding. Most agencies rely on some mix of government and private funding since they do not provide services that can generate a cost-recovery income. Grants from various levels of government (federal, provincial, municipal) through government departments (e.g., health, justice, community services) have traditionally provided core operational funding to meet the basic infrastructure costs of rent, lights, phone, and wages. Many agencies that receive United Way funding consider it core funding since they receive the grant every year even though the grant is most likely for a specific project. Supplementary funding comes through one-time project grants, fundraising and fees. As governments have cut back funding to non-profit organizations, many organizations have tried to increase their revenues through more and varied fundraising activities.

3. Findings: Focus Group

The focus group was the first part of the two-part research method. Representatives of seven community-based agencies were asked to discuss the struggles and successes of operating a small, non-profit agency. The following are the key themes:

Core funding: A dependable funding source to pay for operational expenses was the major concern of the agencies. There was a lack of stability with year-to-year funding as more funders move to 'project' funding. Many funders now only want to finance new projects, not tried-and-true programs, with a focus on 'seed' (start-up) money, not maintenance money. Targeted funding to a specific population such as youth is at the detriment of other populations. Some funders that provide the primary source of income have kept the grant level the same although costs have increased or in one case decreased the funding with little or no notice. The expectation by public and private funders seems to be that if agencies diversify funding that they will be more self-sufficient. Agencies say that to pursue many different types of funding including fundraising is time consuming with uncertain results.

More and changing requirements: Funders are requiring more accountability in both the type and detail of grant application and reporting. Every funder has different expectations that are often confusing to agencies and are time consuming to learn (e.g., Outcome Measures and functional budgeting) thus increasing administration time on each project.

Operational costs: The costs of providing the same services increase each year with the cost of living and other unexpected expenses such as the tripling of insurance cost.

Fundraising: Some agencies say charging for services is not an option because the people they serve cannot afford to pay a fee-for-service. Because they serve low-income communities, the expectation for how much they can raise is low (e.g., \$500). Competition for charitable dollars is getting more intense as more organizations try to raise money through fundraising. Some organizations have professional fundraisers that give them a head start. Small community agencies are now competing with local schools, high profile institutions like the IWK Children's Hospital, and governments (e.g., HRM Kids) for donations.

Volunteers: Attracting and keeping members for the Board of Directors was a major issue for small agencies. The concern about liability was one factor cited as an emerging issue for potential volunteers. Screening volunteers has become a major task. Volunteer commitment and motivation are issues as there is an increased expectation by funders that volunteers can staff programs, thereby reducing costs.

People we serve: The "daily lives of clients [are] in survival mode...their lives are more tenuous, more crises calls, people are trying to find programs that used to be there." "There are fewer community resources than 5 years ago. Clients are having a harder time finding supports/services. Agencies want to fill the gaps, but they do not have the resources." "Clients expect agencies will do everything because there is no other place to go."

Government relations: Generally relationships with the provincial departments of Health and Community Services have been good. Federal money has been project money, but applications are getting harder to fill out because they are more detailed. The Halifax Regional Municipality has been weaning agencies off core funding creating both good and bad relationships with community agencies concerning money for grants.

United Way: The United Way raises a lot of money in the community and has traditionally provided core funding to a number of agencies. Concerns were raised about Outcome Measures that has increased the complexity of the funding proposal and expectations. On the positive side, the United Way is willing to work with agencies on developing proposals. If agencies have their grants cut they are given little or no notice that means they have to slash programs and services in a hurry. Another concern by some was that the United Way was moving into providing services that is a shift away from their mandate and is a conflict of interest with their funding role. As a major funding source, agencies are not willing to raise concerns with the United Way about their policies.

4. Findings: Questionnaire

The five-page questionnaire, based on themes from the focus group, was organized into eight sections.

4.1 Service and Program delivery

The purpose of this question was to determine if the need for the agencies services over the past five-year period has changed. For 60% of the respondents (12), the need for their services has increased significantly with another 25% indicating that the need has increased slightly. Two agencies (10%) indicated that the need remained the same and for one agency, the need has declined significantly.

Correspondingly, the number of clients has increased significantly for 60% of the agencies with another 15% of agencies reporting a slight increase. For 10% of the agencies the number of clients remained the same with 10% of agencies reporting a slight and only one agency reporting a significant decline.

To meet the increased needs, 28% of the agencies (6) expanded significantly while another 38% (8) expanded slightly. In 24% of the agencies the programs remained the same. Only 9% (2) of the agencies reported a slight reduction in programs.

4.2 Circumstances of clients

Agencies were asked if the overall circumstances of their clients had changed over the past 5 years, and if so, what factors have impacted on that. 76% of the agencies reported that the circumstances had changed for their clients while 24% indicated “no” or “not significantly.” The factors influencing the change in circumstances for their clients were changes to Social Assistance identified by 6 agencies (number of agencies noted in parenthesis), increased cost of living (5), poverty (4), waiting lists/increased demand for services (4), more awareness of services (3), more transient population (3), decrease in resources (3), unemployment (2), and changes to health/mental health system (2).

This is summed up by the response from one agency:

decrease in income support has placed individuals in more need, programs are being asked to provide services that are not part of their mandate, i.e. crisis intervention, food distribution, support transportation needs, etc.

4.3 Major challenges facing the agency

Funding (57%) and lack of resources (57%) were the biggest challenges for more than half of the agencies. The lack of funding and resources led to agencies being unable to meet client needs (48%). Staff shortage (28%) and volunteer shortage and burnout (28%) were also major problems. Their physical space was an issue for 24% of the agencies. Fundraising was cited as a problem for 19% of the agencies. Other problems were discrimination their client group faced, program awareness, an aging population, lack of information (research), and a lack of respect by government for the work of community agencies.

4.4 Staffing and Volunteers

To understand how agencies provide services and operate, one question focussed on staffing.

Full-time staff: Twenty percent (4) of the agencies operate on only part-time staff. Most agencies (45%) in this study function with two or less full time staff while 25% (5 agencies) had four full time staff. The other 10% of agencies had three full time staff.

Part-time staff: In addition to the full-time staff, 45% of the agencies had no part-time staff and 45% of the agencies had two or fewer part-time staff. One agency had three part time staff and another agency had six part-time staff.

Special project staff: As funding has moved to projects, some agencies have hired staff on a temporary basis to implement the programs. Thirty five percent of agencies had two or less staff as full-time project staff and 40% of agencies had two or less part-time staff to help with projects. Most agencies did not have special project staff either full-time (50%) or part time (65%). Frequently agencies assign existing staff to implement projects.

Volunteers: Volunteers assist the work of agencies through their involvement on the Board of Directors, core operations and special projects. All the agencies had volunteers on the Board of Directors although the number of people on the boards varied. For core programs, 40% of the agencies reported up to twenty volunteers to help out with another 25% of the agencies managing a volunteer base of between 21-40 volunteers. Three agencies organize between 71 -120 volunteers in their core programs.

Volunteers also are recruited for special projects. In 55% of agencies, there are up to 10 volunteers assisting the special projects. Between 11-30 volunteers help out in special projects for 15% (3 agencies).

Most volunteers give up to 5 hours per month (65% of board members with another 15% highly variable in terms of hours, 10% in core programs, 30% in special projects). A few volunteers give up to 10 hours per month (15% as board members, 25% in core programs, 20% in special projects). Twenty-five percent (5) of agencies reported volunteers donating 11-20 hours per month in core programs.

Change in volunteer component over the past 5 years: Eighty one percent (81%) of agencies noted that volunteerism within their organization had changed due to: expanded/changes in their programs(41%), more volunteers (35%), more time needed for recruiting, training, mentoring volunteers (18%), staff have less time (18%). Other agencies had less time for recruiting and training volunteers, more volunteers with disabilities, more reliance on volunteers, and more difficulty finding volunteers.

Recruiting of volunteers continues to get harder as people have more demands on their time and more organizations need help.

Agencies cited the increased need for agency services, the changing role of volunteers, increased agency profile and connections, competition for volunteers from schools and other agencies, and less time to recruit and train volunteers as making matters worse with their volunteer component.

4.5 Financial

To provide background information on the source of the income to operate community-based services, agencies were asked to provide financial information for the 2002-03 year. For a perspective on how things had changed financially, if at all, in five years, agencies were asked to provide financial information for the 1997-98 fiscal year as well as the 2002-03 fiscal year. Financial information was broken down by *core operational funding* (regular, ongoing funding the agency can generally count on from year to year and is not for one specific program offered) and *special projects and program funding* (grant for a specific purpose for a particular period of time).

Financial conditions from 1997-98 to 2002-03: Two agencies (9%) experienced a drop in funding in both core operation funding and special project funding between the two-benchmark years. Sixteen agencies (89%) had increases in funding over the five-year period spanning the range of \$6,000 to \$370,000. Ten agencies (59%) hovered about the same in core funding (slight

decrease to slight increase). Special project funding increased for 71% of the agencies that received grants. In dollars, this meant an increase of \$17,000 to \$318,000. For 29% of the agencies, there was a drop in project funding from a loss of \$12,750 to \$147,000. These increases and decreases indicate the volatility of short-term grants.

Sources of funding: Most agencies funded their operations through a mix of funding sources. This is the breakdown of funding sources by number of agencies:

Core Operational Funding Sources	1997-98	2002-03
Federal government	5	4
N. S. Department of Community Services	8	9
N. S. Department of Health	2	2
Other provincial government grants	1	1
Halifax Regional Municipality	5	5
United Way	5	8
Corporate sponsors	2	3
Foundation grants	2	0
Fundraising	7	8
donations	6	6
Other: fees for service, membership fees	6	7

Special Project Funding Source	1997-98	2002-03
Federal government	5	10
N. S. Department of Community Services	0	3
N. S. Department of Health	3	2
Other provincial government grants	0	0
Halifax Regional Municipality	2	5
United Way	1	2
Corporate sponsors	1	3
Foundation grants	0	3
Fundraising	7	6
donations	6	6
Other: fees, membership fees, sale of merchandise	8	8

Note: There was no consensus by agencies as to what comprises core and project funding especially as it relates to United Way. Even though a definition of Core Operational Funding was provided, most agencies considered United Way to be operational funding even though United Way has, in recent years, moved to funding more specific projects for shorter durations.

In terms of acquiring the funding, some agencies noted that the grant applications were more time consuming, complex and considered to be unreasonable in terms of the amount of time it takes to write and administer the grant. United Way was cited by 25% of the respondents as being particularly difficult and prolonged to put the proposal in the framework of their Outcome Measurement model. There was less predictability of receiving a grant with more scrutiny.

More focus is being placed upon how reporting is being done and on evaluations of programs. Less focus on the overall projects itself.

Expectations of funding organizations have changed due to complexity in reporting process.

United Way requirements are more stringent with the introduction of the Outcome Measurement model. The process is very labour intensive and onerous for small organizations.

Financial stability: Funding for their agency was a concern, but “within reason”, for 43% of the agencies, a “significant concern” for 28% and a “major concern” for 28%. Ironically, 66% of agencies considered themselves to be somewhat financially secure.

Fundraising: The most common description of fundraising efforts were:

- Too much time, energy and resources for too little return
- Increased competition for public funds
- Difficult issue to fundraise
- Businesses and service clubs are getting tapped out
- Fundraising dollars have increased as the agency has become better at it

Over the past five years, 35% of agencies increased their fundraising efforts significantly, 25% increased their efforts slightly, 30% remained the same, and 10% decreased their efforts slightly or significantly.

We often feel caught in a catch-22 situation: if we had more money, we could do more, but there is not time or money to look for more money.

We do not have the ability to compete against organizations that are quite good at fundraising. We also have to compete against other government fundraising (i.e. schools, hospitals) events. Simply stated, fundraising has become very competitive and often an exercise in futility.

4.6 Agency support

To determine if agencies have enough support from each other, they were asked if they would be interested in meeting together 2-4 times a year. Eighty percent replied yes, 0% replied no, 15% were not sure, and 5% already do meet with other agencies.

4.7 Summary observations (last questions)

Major changes: When asked to name the major changes in their organization over the past five years, by far the greatest response was changes in their programs followed by funding and staffing.

- The program changes included expansion, cutbacks, program composition, and program development. This was in keeping with the observation that there was an increased need for services due to changes in the community and client needs. The negative side of the program change was that funding was too insecure or did not keep up with the increasing costs or meeting community needs.
- The insecurity of funding was related to decreased funding and cuts by the core funders.
- Staffing was cited as a major change that affected the organization either through increased staff or decreased staff and volunteers.
- Other changes were increased fundraising and fund development, increased and more formal administration, increasing information technology usage, and increased competition for resources among agencies.

Hopes and wishes: Over the next four years most agencies would like controlled growth of services and to maintain existing services. To do this they hope for stability in operational funding and an increase in funding to keep pace with the demands for services and the cost of living. This would mean maintaining current staff, hiring more staff and increasing their volunteer

component. Recognition and respect for the work of community-based agencies is another major theme cited.

Funding stability and controlled growth. No more wondering if we will be open next year.

5. Summary

The Under Siege Update gives a snapshot of small, community-based agencies and the changes to how they operate over the past five years. The twenty-one agencies that participated in this study provide a broad range of local services from food to employment and social support services to diverse populations in the Halifax Regional Municipality.

Local services: This research reinforces the need for a variety of local, community-based, non-profit social service agencies. Community-based agencies provide unique services based on the local need and are supported by the local community financially and through volunteers. What this study highlights, however, are the tensions and tenuousness of their continued survival.

Increasing needs: The number of people needing the services of the local agencies has increased significantly. People needing the services were experiencing more financial hardship and agencies cited that there were fewer resources available to help them.

Volunteers: Change in the volunteer component of non-profit agencies has accelerated over the five-year period. Volunteers are a key component of most non-profit services but little understood in terms of the administrative costs, impact of turnover, and the increasing competition for volunteers. They are not free labour and we need to know more about the changing role of volunteers.

Funding: Community-based agencies are struggling to cope with the new funding regime of project funding and fundraising. Most agencies in this study have had a static increase in core operational funding but significant increases in their budgets over the past five years due to project grants. Project funding is short-term for specific activities. With many sources of funding, the varied grant applications and reporting requirements take a huge amount of administrative time. Funding for projects means more short-term programs that can be good and bad. Short-term programs can respond to a specific need, but are very difficult to sustain after the project funding has ended even though they may be needed. For people who need the service, it may set them up for failure when the support is no longer there. People get disoriented and confused about programs coming and going. Agencies also have difficulty knowing what is available and where they can refer people who are looking for services and support.

United Way: The local United Way plays a key role as a funding source for a growing number of agencies. In this study additional agencies received a grant and the total amount to the agencies more than doubled in the five-year benchmark periods. In 1997-98 five agencies in this study received a United Way grant but this increased to eight agencies by 2002-03. The total amount of grants rose from \$101,427 to \$245,417. The downside to this source of funding cited by the agencies, however, is the incredibly complicated application process that is both time consuming and worrisome to agencies because some still don't fully understand the Outcome Measures approach. The uncertainty of receiving a grant compounds the level of distress for member agencies: little notice is given (less than a month) if the agency is to receive a cut or to be denied funding altogether. It was also observed that with the United Way applying for grants for projects,

it was competing with community-based agencies for grant money and changing its role from funder to agency.

Fundraising: Fundraising by agencies has increased by 38% between the two benchmark years for a total increase of \$103,556. To mount events and activities that raise money also has administrative costs. Some agencies point out that the ratio of effort-for-cash-raised is disproportionately high. Other agencies are able to do a better job at fundraising but we don't know why and we don't know about the viability of organizing fundraising activities over a sustained period of time.

Major challenges: The major challenges facing non-profit agencies were funding and lack of resources, and the subsequent frustration of being unable to meet client needs. Staff and volunteer shortages and burnout are the result of the funding instability. Inadequate funding also led to a host of other problems including inadequate space and the catch-22 of fundraising (you need to have money and resources to earn more money and resources).

Conclusion: This study shows that there was a substantial increase in funding for most agencies, but it was through short-term project grants and fundraising. Core funding stayed about the same or decreased for 14 of the 18 agencies (78%). Total funding increased by 47% while project funding increased by 106%. This reliance on project funding has implications for security of funding, administration costs and service to clients.

Project funding from private and public sources tend to be one-time grants that focus on new activities or services. Applying for a variety of grants on speculation is time consuming with uncertain outcomes. For grants that are received, the various reporting requirements become an administrative quagmire. Chasing short-term grants because that is all that is available starts to erode the agency's ability to respond to what the community needs as they try to fit into funders' criteria. This new project structure may encourage different activities and approaches to service delivery but the short-term nature means that agencies may be moving from project to project with core programs and consistency being sacrificed. There are also few resources to sustain successful projects if they become integral to and needed in the community for a longer term. As the project approach starts to dictate service delivery, agencies are probably less able to respond to community needs because they may not fit into rigid criteria for project funding.

It appears that the period of funding cuts from 1990-96 as identified in the Under Siege Report was not sustainable so more money was put into the system but as project money. What we need to know is how this tenuous, short-term grant funding regime impacts on the long-term viability of local agencies. The advantage of local, non-profit agencies is their flexibility to respond to community needs but with a short-term future for many agencies and project-driven services, this advantage may be squandered.

APPENDIX A: Detailed financial information

Total Budget and Core funding (less United Way & HRM)

Agency #	Total Budget 1997-98	Core	Total Budget 2002-03	Core
#13	20,000	5,000	26,000	0
#17	20,000	20,000	40,000	40,000
#3	27,873	10,800	62,462	59,650
#9	33,686	32,500	104,824	33,150
#1	47,583	0	92,257	0
#18	48,473	0	242,800	0
#16	49,460	22,000	74,800	20,000
#7	50,200	50,000	96,000	50,000
#20	64,630	50,630	181,548	85,873
#10	65,000	65,000	75,000	65,000
#8	95,000	0	69,000	0
#12	98,718	98,718	175,000	175,000
#2	126,256	57,468	166,788	58,616
#21	152,000	58,000	178,000	58,000
#5	172,000	0	208,000	0
#15	187,248	69,325	245,202	70,700
#14	291,533	237,147	663,611	239,000
#6	456,000	180,000	259,000	150,000
TOTAL	2,005,660	956,588	2,960,292	1,104,989

47.7% increase in total budget; 15.5% increase in core funding

Project funding – grants (including HRM; excluding UW) & fundraising*

Agency #	Grants 1997-98	% of budget	Fundraising * 1997-98	% of budget	Grants 2002-03	% of budget	Fundraising 2002-03	% of budget
#1	28,843	61%	18,748	39%	53,823	58%	38,434	42%
#2	2,145	2%	14,479	11%	41,436	25%	12,738	8%
#3	12,750	46%	4,323	16%	0	0%	2,812	5%
#5	90,000	52%	21,000	12%	73,000	35%	24,000	12%
#6**	176,000	39%	100,000	22%	29,000	11%	80,000	31%
#7	200	.003%	0	0%	45,100	47%	900	.009%
#8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
#9	0	0%	1,078	3%	17,299	17%	3,373	3%
#10	0	0%	0	0%	10,000	13%	0	0%
#12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
#13	0	0%	10,000	50%	0	0%	8,000	31%
#14***	47,000	16%	3,206	.0005%	364,957	55%	15,244	2%
#15	21,000	11%	56,347	30%	17,246	7%	68,936	28%
#16	14,517	29%	1,000	2%	38,800	52%	0	0%
#17	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
#18	0	0%	22,700	47%	86,500	36%	104,500	43%
#20	0	0%	9,000	14%	25,000	14%	9,500	5%
#21	16,000	10%	8,000	5%	41,000	23%	5,000	3%
TOTAL	408,455		269,881		843,161		373,437	

* includes corporate sponsors; does not include sales, user fees or membership fees

** hot topic in 97-98 but not so front page in 02-03

*** large agency to begin with (97-98 budget of 291,533; 02-03 budget 663,611)

ENDNOTES

¹ *More Crises, Less Resources*. (December 1996). Halifax, Nova Scotia: Captain William Spry Community Centre, Metro Community Services Network, and the Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers.

² *Under Siege: A study of community-based agencies in an era of cuts*. (1998) Halifax, Nova Scotia: Captain William Spry Community Centre, Metro Community Services Network, Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers. P. 7.

³ *National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating 2000*. (August 17, 2001). Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada Available: <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/010817/d010817c.htm> (January 1, 2004)

⁴ Raven, P. and Frank, L. (November 2003). *Promises to Keep: The Nova Scotia Child Poverty Report Card 1989-2001*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Nova Scotia. Available: <http://www.campaign2000.ca/rc/pdf/ns-childpoverty-2003.pdf> (January 1, 2004)

⁵ *Impact! The effect of Nova Scotia's new income assistance system on people who need assistance*. (November 2003) Halifax, Nova Scotia: Community Advocates Network.

⁶ Scott, K. (2003). *Funding Matters: The Impact of Canada's New Funding Regime on Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Council on Social Development. Available: <http://www.ccsd.ca/pubs/2003/fm/index.htm> (January 1, 2004)