



A guide to the changes
sweeping non-profit
marketing and communications

By John C. Stuart



About The Author

John Stuart is one of Canada's foremost experts in non-profit marketing and communications.

Based in both Kingston and Toronto, he is the author of the Non-Profit Marketer Blog, the moderator of the Canadian Non-Profit Marketing Group at LinkedIn, a guest blogger at the Guardian Newspaper in London and the creator of NP Humour, the world's only non-profit comedy website.



He is the author of four influential marketing communications white papers:

- The 2010 Non-Profit Marketing Year-in-Review
- Page Not Found: Canadian Hospitals & Their Websites
- The 3% Give or Take Marketing & Communications Budget Benchmark
- Reforging the Bond – A new approach to Alumni Communications

He operates JohnSuart.Com, his own non-profit consulting group. He is also the Non-Profit Director at the Wright Agency, one of Canada's leading national marketing agencies. In his 15 year career in marketing he has worked for or with hospitals, universities, governments, charities, social service agencies, arts groups and for-profit businesses in the energy, pharmaceutical, agriculture and tourism sectors.



JohnSuart.Com





Introduction

Marketing and communications is a unique function at most non-profit organizations. That's because it is the one place where skills are the lowest, where strategy is the thinnest and where measurement is smallest. Because of that, it's also the function which has the greatest risk of wasting money. Spending money on useless out-of-date and inefficient methods would not be tolerated in IT, HR or program delivery, but it seems to be acceptable in marketing as long as there is a shiny ad or cool logo at the end of the process.

I have spent 15 years in this sector as a marketing and communications professional. Through my own successful non-profit consultancy, my many white papers and articles and contacts throughout the sector in Canada, the US, the UK and Australia I find the same thing over and over again. Non-profit leaders don't understand why their marketing and communications aren't working the way they used to.

These are smart people. They know the world is changing around them. However, they can't seem to translate that understanding to their own marketing and communications. Most of them are in small and medium-sized non-profits. The bigger institutions and charities tend to be able to afford people with more skills and sophistication. However, even in the largest of non-profits, there is still an appalling lack of understanding of these issues. There is a disconnect.

I've written this book because there doesn't seem to exist a short, simple and clear explanation of the revolution that is sweeping marketing and communications, especially for non-profits. There are many books that push one communications channel or another. There are many more that present laundry lists of activities. All of these fail to deliver a real understanding of the forces at work and how they relate to one another.

I've attempted to put down in this one book everything a non-profit leader needs to understand the revolution. I have not covered some of the innovative and exciting solutions that my consultancy, partners and others have come up with to take advantage of the revolution. That is for future publications.

Take this book as a guide to the big picture questions that face non-profit marketing and communications.



Power to the People

There's a revolution going on in non-profit marketing and communications. But it's not the revolution that you think.

We all know something about the changes. Just look at what's happened in the last five years. Websites have become more powerful. Networks have become faster. Email has become an essential service in most work places. We now have social media that connects to our friends, our work colleagues, people who share interests with us and even complete strangers. We all carry mobile devices that can listen, talk, play games, send messages, watch videos and more. We're more connected than ever before.

It's easy to think that the revolution then is just about technology. It's much more than that.

Yes, things like social media have opened up opportunities for us. Yes, more and more of what we do and who we are, as people or as organizations, is now online. But the real change is not in the fancy gadgets or the cool online applications, it is in the way all of these things have changed the way people think and act.

The *real* revolution is that *we* are different, not just our technology. We are not the same as we were five years ago. The way we work, the way we play, the way we live have all changed. And that is more important than the changes in technology itself.

The biggest change is choice. Everywhere there is more choice than ever before. We see that in entertainment such as movies, music and books. But we also see that in other things, too – business, food, finances, transportation, games and more. Part of the change is that technology has made it easier to find things that we want and need. So, an online search now can find every roofer in town when we have a leak or every dentist when we have a tooth ache.

But other things are at play, too. One is reach. Big organizations that used to be too far away to matter now can beam into almost every community, nearly everywhere. So, you can go to the bookstores in town or you can order books online and have them shipped to you. Your local health charity is asking you for a donation, but so, too, is the regional one and the national one. The regional and national charities can now easily project



into the local charity's community. Closely related to this is the phenomenon of the "storefront" – a local face on a bigger organization. We're now used to seeing the same restaurants, hotels, banks and hardware stores in every community. That's because those organizations have put a store in every community. Many of them are franchises. The same is true for charities. Many regional and national charities have a local office which acts as a national franchise.

The other factor in choice is that the barriers to entering a market are steadily lowering. Technology has made it easier for anyone to get into the exact same business as you and to project into your community. Starting a business or a charity is now easier than ever. Unfortunately, it is often easier than maintaining it. As a result, the natural selection that comes in any marketplace has gone wonky. More and more organizations are asking for donations but the overall market has remained the same. The result is that each charity gets less or, more often, a few dominate and the rest suffer.

With choice comes power. There has been a fundamental shift if the power relationship between marketers and the audiences they market to. The marketing relationship most of us grow up with was one in which the marketer ruled. There were fewer of them and they faced less competition. There was Coke and Pepsi. There was McDonalds and Burger King. There were fewer ways to reach audiences. We all watched the same TV shows, read the same newspaper and magazines and listened to the same radio stations. One ad here, one there and the job was done. In a sense, we were all slaves to advertising. There was no way to avoid the messages the marketers sent us. Today, the relationship has changed. We have more people surfing the Internet than watching TV. Newspaper readership is slipping. What happened? *Choice*.

The Internet and everything it brings delivers one thing more than anything else – a seemingly endless amount of choice. And that has changed the balance of power. Consumers now can go anywhere and do anything. They can find things on their own and form their own opinions on products and services. Technology has liberated them. They no longer must watch ads on TV – they can change channels. They don't have to read ads in the newspaper – they can get a free news service. They now have the power. Where the marketers of the world use to just take it for granted that consumers were listening to them, not they are being forced to woo consumers like never before. And in some competitive markets it's not just courting that marketers have to do. The market-



place has become so competitive that they are almost begging. You can see it every day as marketers race for the bottom with discounts on discounts in order to make a sale. The consumer is now very much the boss, and that is what the revolution is all about.

The competition for the mind

All this leads to one inescapable conclusion. No matter who you are or what you do, you face more competition than ever before. There is the competition of other players in your marketplace. There is competition from new players entering the market every day. But the biggest competition is in the minds of consumers. They now have the power to shut you out and shut you down. The true battle ground is now in the minds of your target audiences. They have only so much attention to give and a free will to do with it as they please. Your marketing message now must compete at the very doorstep of consumer's minds.

Think of it. More choice means that consumers are being bombarded with messages about everything. Each day, the average North American receives 3,000 marketing messages. There is a war going on and it is for the attention of every man, woman and child. Marketers are spending fortunes on trying to get consumers to watch, listen or read something about their products and services. The Internet is partly to blame. It has opened a floodgate of choice which has radically increased the amount of information flowing to and from consumers.

But if choice is a fast flowing river than it has one very large dam – consumers cannot process every message they receive. They cannot read everything, watch everything, listen to everything or do everything. They must make choices, and often they do so poorly. To be a modern consumer is to be bombarded with too much information, and to have only short periods of time to make a decision. So many organizations have failed because in that split second decision that consumers make the organization's message was lacking somehow. It wasn't as compelling as the others. It wasn't what the consumer wanted to hear. It was poorly thought out. In this crucible it does not matter what is right and what is wrong, what is logical and what is emotional. It is a cruel, simplistic and often foolish process. But we all do it a thousand times a day.



To illustrate the problem just take a walk down any major street in a large metropolis. I took a walk in downtown Toronto the other day. It was a just a five minute walk between Union Station and the Metro Toronto Convention Centre. I was attending the Association of Fundraising Professionals Toronto Congress. My walk was all inside through various buildings and walkways which also lead to a large entertainment complex and the world-famous CN Tower. It was full of various signs advertising everything from tourist destinations to colleges.

In five minutes I counted how many ads I saw on the wall, on signs, on displays. There were more than 70. Some were large and some were small. But on average, every three seconds or so I was exposed to another message.

Arguably, the route that I walked had one of the highest concentrations of ad messages in one of the most heavily messaged cities in all of Canada. I was literally at the business end of all Canadian marketing. If I had been a few blocks north or a few kilometers east I would not have had the same concentration of advertising. However, what I saw and heard was in fact the future for most cities – wall-to-wall advertising. It may not exist everywhere, but soon it will.

What was important was how the number of messages impacted me. A message every three seconds is too fast for most people to process. We are not video cameras that record everything and store it in a computer memory hard drive. In other words, I did not process and store the memory of each message as it went by.

When humans are exposed to multiple messages we automatically pick and choose which to take note of and which to ignore. Some we will read, but most we will simply ignore. And even those that get processed to some extent or another may not make it to long-term storage in our brains. We might just as easily process the message and then dump it, retaining no real meaning of it at all.

It shows very clearly that the problem with marketing isn't about where the ads were or what they said. It was my ability to process them. It means that there is a limit to how effective marketing can be. It also means that traditional marketing, especially advertising, is an exercise in controlled wastefulness. It means that marketing in general and advertising in particular is transitory at best. With 3,000 messages bombarding me every day can I really retain anything long-term?



The major hurdle most organizations face is not what to say or how to say it. It is how to break through the defences consumers have built that reject almost all the messages they receive every day.

This is the immovable dam in the fast-flowing river that is choice.

The death of advertising and PR

Through this lens we can begin to see the truth about advertising and public relations – the two war-horses of marketing. They just don't work anymore.

A long time ago, they did. That's when advertising was a lot simpler. You bought a newspaper or radio ad, people saw or heard it and they responded by supporting your cause. I still remember placing one or two big ads in the newspaper back in the 90s and having almost everyone I know tell me they saw them. Advertising was that effective.

Those days are now gone. The media, and consequently, the advertising world, has fractured. Fewer people read newspapers, watch TV or listen to radio. More of them are going online to get their news and information. At the same time there's been an explosion in available media. In the city of 150,000 where I live there are almost a dozen radio stations, two major newspapers, three magazines and two online news services. But a great many people here actually listen to national radio from outside the area and read national newspapers. It all means that individual advertising vehicles reach fewer people than ever before. It means that to get the same reach as you did a decade ago you have to do a great deal more advertising on more channels. And that costs money. Lots of it. In today's world of advertising you need to go big or go home. The days of doing an ad here or there are over. The days of effective advertising being cheap are over.

The way most major advertisers overcome the problem is volume. They spend a lot of money buying as many ads as possible. Others try for a breakthrough message – one that is funny, clever or horrific. Both can work. However, these tactics are obviously something that only the largest of organizations can afford. For the small or medium-sized non-profit these methods are out of reach.

Online ads have been called the saviour advertising because they deliver a more tar-



geted approach. The advertiser who put up those signs along the downtown corridor in Toronto where I walked could not be sure who would walk along and see them. The advertiser on Facebook, in contrast, knows more. They can select gender, age, interest, location, education and more. Certainly, online advertising is more effective. However, the same fundamental problems remain. There are too many online mediums and too many online ads. Consumers “tune out” online ads just as efficiently as they do print or TV ads. Reaching people online also requires high volumes or expensive, break-through ads. And that costs too much money.

PR, on the other hand, is often seen as “free”. We all know the story. The small business or non-profit sends out a media release, the local newspaper writes a story about it and everybody becomes famous. I used to do this for a living. I was a newspaper editor who received pitches from local businesses and non-profits. I’ve worked for businesses, non-profits and PR agencies pushing media releases on news organizations. And I can tell you that with a few exceptions free publicity is seldom free and seldom effective.

The same challenges exist in PR as in advertising. There are now too many media outlets in most communities. Each has only a piece of the fractured media landscape. Reaching all of them with a media release is easy. Getting them all to use it is difficult. Here, the regional, national and international nature of most media outlets is making a major impact. There are so many news organizations outside your community that it is now quite common for many people to read only regional or national news, and ignore local sources all together. This makes PR that much harder for a local non-profit organization. The barriers to getting a media release used by a media organization increase astronomically as you go up the food chain – the local media are difficult to influence, the regional ones very hard and the national ones almost impossible.

An added problem is that most news organizations have very tough defences against using your media release. They are constantly being bombarded by such requests. They have neither the time, the people or the space to run everything. In fact, depending on the media outlet, most of what they receive will be thrown out. Even if your media release makes the cut, it will often be relegated to the “back pages” where no one will ever read it.

I know one non-profit that used to agonize over writing their “free” column that their



local newspaper gave them. It was so far back in the publication that only the most hearty of pager-turners would ever go there. It was no surprise to me that in fact the only people who seemed to know about the column were the newspaper editor, the PR person who wrote it and the PR person's mother. The newspaper offered the space for the column for nothing because it had a value of practically nothing.

There are some notable examples where PR works. Just look at most marketing and communications books for samples. However, the vast majority fail or do poorly. At best, PR yields very uneven results.

Advertising and PR are not what they used to be, but they are not dead. They still have a role to play. However, it is clear that in and of themselves they can no longer deliver the marketing punch that they used to.

The commoditization of non-profits

Another important trend in the revolution is commoditization.

Have you ever looked at a fundraising direct mail letter that comes to your house and say "I've seen this before"? You know that that can't be true. The letter is from an organization you haven't heard of, but you could swear you've seen that exact same letter before. What gives?

The letter looks familiar because depending on the issue, you have seen the same pitch, the same design, the same appeal and the same beneficiary many times over. There are too many charities communicating to too many donors with same techniques about the same causes. It all looks the same.

The result is the commoditization.

Commoditization is when a good or service loses differentiation. Most often, this happens because of a fundamental change in production. Usually, it involves intellectual capital. Smarter thinking or a wider use of superior techniques results in the ability to make things faster and/or cheaper, and that leads to a flood of the good or service in the marketplace. An example would be generic pharmaceuticals and silicon chips. Both moved from premium margin products to a commodity status.



There's plenty of them and they're cheap.

That's what we're seeing in the non-profit world, especially charities. There are so many charities doing mostly the same thing that the differences between them have begun to blur. A good example in Canada, and likely in the US, too, is cancer. There are literally dozens of cancer charities in most large centres. There are the big charities that address overall cancer needs. There are also specialty charities that handle pieces of the pie, such as breast cancer. There are research-based charities who fund academic research at universities. And there are local cancer charities that help fund local care centres.

They all have the same issue. They all have the same goal, more or less. Many of them use the same techniques – direct mail, major gifts, planned gifts, events, etc. The case can be made that in categories like cancer, fundraising is sold in bulk.

The issue of price is important to commoditization. Usually, prices fall when the market is flooded with products available in bulk. One could argue that there has been an impact on price if you look at what the increased competition has done to donation appeals.

We have seen a movement in fundraising to more gifts at lower dollar values. An example would be the explosion in web, mobile and social media giving. More asks are being made this way, and for significantly less than major giving or even some direct mail campaigns.

The big thing about commoditization is its effect on marketing.

When one charity begins to look like another it reduces the effectiveness of their marketing. Being as good as the other charity now means being just as invisible as they are. Like in advertising, there are ways to overcome this, such as spending money on volume or on breakthrough messages.

Here again, most small and medium-sized non-profits can't afford to play the game.



The myth that you are different

The commoditization of non-profits is not just about marketing. There is in fact a grain of truth in it. Every charity wants to think it is unique, but most are not. They ask the same donors to help them do the same kinds of things to help the same kinds of beneficiaries. They differ in their location, their scope, perhaps even in their historical roots, especially so of religious-based charities. But by and large they are the same. One cancer charity in one town is very much the same as the one in the next town.

The place where this can best be seen is in branding. There's a school of thought in non-profit branding that says looking inward is all there is.

The approach is simple. Get all of your stakeholders to fall in love again with your values and mission, whip up a cool logo and a tag line and call it a day.

The advantage is that by going back to your roots you re-discover what makes you, you. And it has obvious fringe benefit of rallying your stakeholders back to the colours – the focus on re-living the mission takes their minds off the many troubles the organization faces here and now. The final benefit is that the process is simple. And that's likely why it is so popular among branding agencies – they can use the same cookie cutter approach time and time again.

This approach might work if these charities were unique to begin with. They aren't. And so, the result is that most of these brands are the same because the organizations are so similar. They were built the same way, by the same people with the same result in mind. They may have different logos and use different colours, but the message is identical. Their mission and vision statements read the same. Their brand taglines sound similar. And when this brand goes out into the real world and is judged by customers and stakeholders against others it cannot be heard or seen in the chorus of similar brands. An inward looking brand actually contributes to the commoditization effect which robs marketing of most of its effectiveness. A new inward looking brand will often achieve nothing except that it may be nicer to look at than the last one. Considering how expensive they are, that is a waste of money.

In the revolution, it is not who you are that counts. It is who you are in relation to others.



The answer is to build an external-facing brand. Branding cannot exist in a vacuum. It must take notice of the revolution in marketing and make those forces work for the brand rather than against it. If your town has a dozen charities, your local charity needs to have a brand that is different from the rest. If your cancer charity looks and sounds like a dozen other cancer charities, then you need a brand that is unique.

This process of being more external than internal is what for-profits, especially retailers, do. They realize the obvious. Competition is fierce and the only way to succeed is to stand out in the crowd. Why doesn't the not-for-profit sector do the same? There are many reasons. One is that they and the branders they hire don't understand the marketing revolution. Too many non-profit leaders think branding is just a logo and marketing and communications is just about tactics rather than strategy.

Too many marketers sell tactics, not strategy, and giving clients what they want rather than what they need is the easiest thing to do.

A good example was a branding exercise I was a part of as an observer.

The big not-for-profit hired a big branding company who went the "internal" route. They promised that the brand would change the way employees and volunteers work and would make clients sit up and take notice.

Their process was simple. They mostly consulted board of directors and senior staff to create the brand. The idea of testing it against the competition wasn't part of the process. The result was a brand that consisted of a nice logo and a tag line. It didn't change the organization or the people in it. It didn't solve the serious marketing challenges they faced, which, in their case, was that no one knew who they were. Their brand still can't be heard above the chorus.

What they bought was a \$50,000 logo and a lot of hype.



Tactics disguised as strategy

The challenge of branding is part of a larger issue that the revolution has laid bare – the reliance on tactics rather than strategy.

Many non-profits say they have a marketing and communications strategy. They have yearly budget plans. They have communication plans. They have communications staff. They have a marketing advisory committee. In short, they push a lot of paper and most of all it is called “plans”.

But take a closer look. The plans are shallow. Many talk about spending. They will buy these ads or upgrade their website for this amount of money. Others have things about messaging, but mostly about their boilerplate communications and elevator speeches. A few carry details about advertising campaigns, but these are usually transitory, flash-in-the pan plans for one-time use only. Most concentrate on tactics, on “things”. This usually includes something about updating their website and social media, a bit about sending out newsletters and something about media releases and annual events. Nowhere do they go deeper.

Nowhere do they define who they are in comparison to the rest of the world. They exist oblivious to the revolution, as if it has never happened and never will. So, what most non-profit communications strategies really amount to are a bunch of tactics strung together.

I’ve seen this first hand. The local government that has no communications plan and just lurches from one thing to another. The hospital that has a communication plan based on media releases. The social service agency who’s plan amounts to having their communications coordinator doing the same activities she did last year and the year before.

Until the revolution, having a coherent strategy wasn’t always necessary. Doing everything like you used to do – ads, media releases, print newsletters – was a successful strategy. You didn’t need to do much planning or thinking. Non-profit marketing and communications was relatively easy.

All of that has changed. The things that used to be so simple and effective no longer do the job. The revolution demands a real strategy, especially one that positions you in the



competitive marketplace.

There's one big problem with strategy – it's not easy. Creating a strategy takes time. You need to step back from the day-to-day things and look at the big picture. For most communications folks I know that's hard to do. The here and now always seems to need more attention than what is happening tomorrow and the next day. It also requires skills. That is a challenge.

Too many people in communications have the wrong set of skills for the task. There are the former journalists and public relations graduates. Their great skill is writing. And there are the technicians who know how to use the latest graphics software or are experts in social media. Their experience and training has never asked them to think about the “big picture” and consequently they have never developed these skills. Some think buying the services of ad agency can solve this problem, and they are wrong. Agencies specialize in selling things, and most agencies tend to sell tactics, not strategies. If they do create strategies it is usually campaign-related, like an advertising plan. Most do not actually know how to do a complete end-to-end, long-term strategy for a non-profit organization. And even if you can find an agency that does fit the bill, it still doesn't take away the need for your organization to do most of the heavy lifting. No outsider can create an entire communications strategy all by themselves.

The leadership of the non-profit will have carry some of the load because a strategy is something that needs a great deal of attention from senior figures in the organization. For all these reasons, a real strategy isn't easy to do. And that's why most non-profits ignore it.

Partly, this is do the mindset of non-profit leaders. Too many of them believe marketing and communications is more “window-dressing” than an actual strategic function. The idea that a communications plan needs to consider the world outside the non-profit is a disconnect to them. Communications is simple to their pre-revolution minds – we need to communicate, we say it and people receive it, end of story.

It is no wonder then that most non-profit communications shops, especially in small-to-medium-sized organizations, are badly resourced. For many, marketing and communications is not seen as an investment. It is seen as an expense.



The queen of the tactics

The absence of strategy explains the hype surrounding social media. In a world where tactics are everything than social media is the queen of the tactics.

New, cool and ground-breaking, social media is a major part of the revolution. It has changed the way we communicate and the way we behave. Who would have thought a decade ago that we would be linked online to our friends, colleagues and people we don't even know through Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and more?

The power, the reach and the effectiveness of social media is unquestionable. However, social media is often blown out of all proportion by those within and without the non-profit world. It is powerful, but it is not the only power. It can reach, but it is not the only way to reach. It is effective, but it is not the only effective tool. And that is the key. Social media is, at the end of the day, only another communications tool.

Many treat it more like salvation than a tool. I've seen this before where a non-profit rushes to put up a Facebook page or add a Twitter account without much thought, if any, of what they will do with it. There are books, seminars, consultants and agencies who do nothing but advocate for social media. Collectively, they tell stories of non-profits that have undergone transformative change through social media. Their Facebook page has raised thousands in donations. Their Twitter feed is followed by thousands. Their YouTube channel has a dozen videos.

In this hype we need to remember that social media is a new tool and success with it alone is still very much uncommon. The success stories are the exception to the rule. The success of most social media campaigns depends on the non-profit more than it does the medium itself.

The problem is that social media in itself does not solve the issues that the revolution has created. It cannot suddenly make you heard when before you were barely audible. It is not an effective weapon to wield against competition. It is not a positioning strategy.

If no one knows who your non-profit is before you use social media chances are that that will still be the case after you begin using it. Worse, social media reinforces the competitive marketplace that non-profits face. In the revolution, the temple of choice is in social



media. A non-profit starting a Facebook page is entering a medium dominated by an avalanche of competing messages and organizations with more and more entering the fray all the time.

Some would argue that the real strength of social media is in creating a community of stakeholders. This is partly true. There has never been an easier time to reach out to people and get them involved in what you are doing. However, there are limits to the communities that social media creates. These networks are often transitory. People enter and leave the community more than physical communities. The connection they have to you often runs shallow.

They connect for one reason or another at a particular time and then they lose interest. At this stage, many are as good as gone, but because of a number of factors they do not break the link with you. Perhaps it's too difficult to drop you. Perhaps they are just too busy. Whatever the reason they appear to be part of your community but they are in fact gone.

The ease of joining an online community has also lowered the value of participation. Offline, there is a limit to how many physical communities of flesh and blood one can join. Online, there are practically no limits. And so, people “accumulate” online communities in large numbers. Managing all those connections means ignoring some and concentrating on others. Again, it means that some people are in your online community in name only. In reality, they seldom go online with you.

Without strategy, social media is just another tool. With strategy, social media becomes what all the hype says it is – a transformative communications platform that delivers impressive results. Social media is queen of the tactics, but strategy is still king.



The never-ending revolution

One final thing needs to be said about the revolution. It is just getting started. We are all creatures of the present. We live in the here and now and often our society forgets to think what came before or what lies ahead. And so it is easy for non-profit leaders to think that the revolution has already happened and that the change it has brought is done. They are very, very wrong.

The revolution is not a single change. It is not even a series of changes. It is a wave of change that has no end. What we have seen is just the beginning. More, perhaps even greater, changes lie ahead.

The next one will be the mobile platform. The beginning stages of the mobile revolution can already be seen. We marvel at our smart phone and their apps, but they are primitive to what lies in store five or ten years down the road.

The near future will also bring things that we can't even imagine. Most of us couldn't see the power of the web before it came. Most of us couldn't understand Facebook when it arrived. There are likely things in development right now that one day will make everything we take for granted in marketing and communications redundant.

This knowledge that the revolution is just getting started changes everything. It gives us a new perspective on marketing and communications. The revolution isn't about responding to this change or that one. It is about dealing with continual change.

How can one deal with change upon change? Certainly, the tactics we use now will not continue as they are. Social media, the web and more – they will all change. In many ways the angst some non-profits have over things like social media is academic since it will all be radically different as time marches on. The key to managing the revolution will be strategy. No matter what changes happen at the tactical level, how a non-profit defines itself and how it compares to others will never change. The one constant in the never-ending revolution is strategy.



The Answer

At **JohnSuart.Com**, we've developed a system that takes advantage of the changes that the revolution has brought. Called Sustainable Communications, the system uses a different way of thinking about communications. It moves communications from a shot-in-the-dark process to an engine designed to convert strangers into long-term friends and stakeholders. Sustainable Communications can fit any budget and any type organization, large or small. And likely, it will save you money.

More information and a free consultation is available.

go@johnsuart.com

www.johnsuart.com

Join the discussion Online

Ask questions, provide input and more online.



The best non-profit marketing blog in Canada.
<http://johnsuart.blogspot.com>



The Canadian Non-Profit Marketing Group at LinkedIn
<http://www.linkedin.com/groups?mostPopular=&gid=3266202>



www.johnsuart.com

Copyright 2012 John C. Suart
All rights reserved.