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Creating new Broadway shows has never been a riskier venture for commercial producers. The costs of producing a show continue to increase, forcing producers to bring in more revenue. Some producers have gotten creative and turned to new methods like crowd funding to reduce the risk of investing and engaging a larger base of backers. While crowd funding as a practice is not necessarily uncharted territory, it is a novel approach to use it in a commercial forum with Broadway shows.

In 2011, a revival of Godspell was produced on Broadway with about 55% of the show’s $5 million initial investment contributed by 700 investors (~20 times more investors than a typical production). This crowd funding structure was effective for a commercial Broadway musical setting, but would this approach work in a smaller setting? Say a nonprofit theater company in Bloomington, Indiana?

In my thesis project, I will research the crowd fundraising process that funded the Broadway revival production of Godspell. I will then research whether this method would be applicable legally, financially, and promotionally for a regional theater company. I plan to interview a number of regional theater companies to establish if crowd funding would be an applicable practice for future productions.

The results of this study can indicate to future producers and managing directors of local and regional theaters whether crowd funding would be effective at raising capital investment and engaging the audience in regional productions.
Crowdfunding has been the buzzword in fundraising for several years. In the 1700’s, Mozart and Beethoven financed their concerts and publications by advance subscriptions. The Statue of Liberty was essentially crowd funded by asking the French and American public for donations as funds. Most recently, President Obama’s campaign mobilized his supporters using small online contributions (Luo 2008). While the idea of funding a project or venture by raising many small amounts of money from a large number of people is not novel itself, how the model is applied and how it is developed makes it an innovative approach to fundraising.

What is novel though about crowdfunding is its ability to exploit social media and the viral marketing of the Internet (Hemer 2011). The Internet has allowed for easy communication and efficiency. The Internet and crowdfunding are distinctly related (Kuile 2011). Crowdfunding platforms can mobilize a large number of people with minimal cost, effort, and risk, three things a theater company is constantly seeking.

In a 2012 Massolution study, there were 452 active crowdfunding sites (Massolution 2012). Companies like Kickstarter, OpenTable, Etsy, and Indiegogo have created a user-friendly marketplace for donation-based funding and capital investment.
crowdfunding. Donation based funding lead to the birth of crowdfunding industry. Funders were encouraged to collaborate in order to achieve a goal to gain perks or rewards in return. However, more recent endeavors have lead to investment crowdfunding where companies pursue funds by selling equity or stake in their business. The backers then become part owners or shareholders and have the potential for financial return on their investment.

Almost $1.5 billion was raised to fund over 1 million successful campaigns by crowdfunding sites in 2011 (Massolution 2012). According to Kickstarter’s website, 44% of campaigns are successful in reaching their fundraising goal. While that its less than half, it is a significant percentage of success. While all sites are different, Kickstarter operates under the “all or nothing” approach where if you don’t reach your goal, you do not receive any of the funds raised. Other sites like Razoo allow you to raise funds like a big piggy bank where you keep the funds raised. The worldwide funding volume grew 91% in 2012 (Massolution 2012). While donation based campaigns still dominate the market, equity campaigns raised a larger amount of funds (Massolution 2012).

In the past, fundraising efforts could only target accredited investors, or investors with high net worth. Since
accredited investors make up approximately 8% of the US population, fundraising was limited (Emmanuel Wasner). By opening up the fundraising opportunities with the remaining 92%, startups and producers could expand their targeted supporters and widen the pool of potential investors.

Having a large group of investors is like having a built-in group of dedicated promoters and long-term donors. It has long been understood that volunteers and current patrons are a nonprofit's best source of donors. Why not take this hypothesis to an investment level? An organization's pool of investors not only engages in a center's programming, but they are also more likely to become long-term subscribers and donors.

Last April, writer Rob Thomas started a Kickstarter campaign to fund the movie adaptation of the cult TV show *Veronica Mars*. The movie, set to star the original actor Kristen Bell, broke two of Kickstarter's records. It was the fastest campaign to reach its goal of two million dollars (reached in 12 hours) and it had the largest number of supporters (Thomas 2013). By the end of 30-day period, the campaign had 91,585 supporters who donated $5,702,153 (Thomas 2013). While the show is still connected legally to NBC, the campaign got the attention of the company's execs. The movie has wrapped shooting and will be hitting theaters in March of 2014. The campaign proved that fans have a say in the future of the entertainment industry. Crowdfunding can harness that support and turn artistic goals into a reality. This campaign spurned some backlash though, since it was a donation-based endeavor. Supporters had no chance of receiving a share in the potential profit of the hit film.
The Rise of Equity Based Crowdfunding

Equity based crowdfunding is a new frontier of the crowdfunding model which would allow backers to hold a share of the potential profits of the project. In January of 2012, Congress created the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act in an attempt to allow businesses to offer equity in their companies instead of traditionally donations or good will. This Act attempted to make it easier to solicit investors and allows producers to raise up to $1 million a year (Outlaw 2013). Producers are now permitted to approach customers, employees, and vendors as potential investors.

The jury is still out on all of the specific regulations from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), so it is still to be determined how effective or user friendly equity based funding can be. However, questions have already arisen regarding the time (and money) consuming all of the preparation of the legal and accounting papers will be. SEC regulations as they stand at the moment have many reporting requirements to the SEC to prevent fraud. Much of this effort could potentially shy start-ups or small arts organizations from using the new method so they are not liable.

According to a 2012 Massolution report, equity based crowdfunding projects raise the most amount of money per project. 21% of the equity-based funds raised
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were for projects that totaled more than $250,000, so the potential for money raised it evident (Massolution 2012).

Legal Issues of the Equity Innovation

In order to raise money from investors in the United States, a company either registers its offer with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to make a public offer or it can rely an exemption to make it a private offer (Emmauel and Wasser). Because of time and money, some (20%) choose to rely on the exemption of Rule 506 of Regulation D (SEC 2010).¹

The JOBS Act still requires investors to be accredited. In order to be compliant, investors cannot simply state they are accredited; they must provide documentation that they are in fact eligible. This documentation could be anything from tax

¹ Rule 506 of Regulation D is an SEC rule that exempts an organization from the registration requirements. This means that companies can offer and sell their securities, assets, without having to register them. Rule 506 allows companies to raise an unlimited amount of money, however certain standards must apply. Producers cannot advertise or solicit funds to the general public. Therefore, it required them to rely on their limited pool of pre-existing relationships with accredited investors.
returns to bank statements and securities statements (Harrison, Forbes).

Companies through the JOBS Act can crowdfund $1 million per year. While this limitation may be a hindrance for some of the larger crowdfunding projects we have seen, like the Veronica Mars movie, it should not be a limiting factor for regional theater companies. Since most Off-Broadway and regional theater productions are financed for under $1 million, the potential to crowdfund is viable in other art forms.

Under the JOBS Act, producers can begin to generally solicit investors, an act that has been prohibited since the Securities Act of 1933. This means that the old ways of investment will “transform from a world of private boardroom deals towards a more open, collaborative, and efficient online process (Barnett 2013).” The freedom granted through general solicitation comes at a price for more disclosure requirements. Companies must file additional paperwork when initiating fundraising campaigns and disclose any materials given to investors with the SEC.

With the added freedom the JOBS Act provides, companies have an added responsibility of disclosure and transparency. The JOBS act is setting out to prevent issues of fraud and abuse. Failure to follow the rules set out by the SEC will result in a probation of one year, a “death sentence” for smaller startups or timely theater productions. This would then require theater companies the additional trepidation and care to follow the guidelines.

In October of 2013, the SEC laid out a proposal for Title III of the JOBS Act that opens the door for crowdfunding for “low budget films and early-stage film startups (Cork 2013).” This proposal aims to make distinctions for the do’s and don’ts of fundraising under the
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2 “General Solicitation” means generally marketing the investment opportunity to the general public.
JOBS act clearer. In order to prevent the potential for fraud, the SEC laid out a few ground rules.

- Companies can only raise a maximum aggregate amount of $1 million through crowdfunding offerings in a 12-month period.
- Investors whose annual income and net worth are less than $100,000 can only invest up to $2,000 or 5 percent of their annual income or net worth, whichever is greater,
- Investors whose annual income or net worth is equal to or more than $100,000 can invest up to 10 percent of their annual income or net worth, whichever is greater. During the 12-month period, these investors would not be able to purchase more than $100,000 of securities through crowdfunding.

Source: SEC 2013

In order to prevent fraud and keep the business transparent, companies will be required to file certain information about crowdfunding activities with the SEC. Companies will be obligated to disclose:

- Information about officers and directors as well as owners of 20 percent or more of the company.
- A description of the company’s business and the use of proceeds from the offering.
- The price to the public of the securities being offered, the target offering amount, the deadline to reach the target offering amount, and whether the company will accept investments in excess of the target offering amount.
- Certain related-party transactions.
- A description of the financial condition of the company.
- Financial statements of the company that, depending on the amount offered and sold during a 12-month period, would have to be accompanied by a copy of the company’s tax returns or reviewed or audited by an independent public accountant or auditor.

Source: SEC 2013
The SEC is currently open for public comments about the proposal until February 3, 2014 (a full 90 day period). At that time, the commission will review the feedback and decide whether to adopt the rules. These regulations will be crucial to the future of equity-based crowdfunding. If the SEC overregulates the Act, the new strategy will be squashed before its explored. There needs to be a degree of flexibility allowing the crowd to regulate itself to allow small businesses to explore the possibilities of the capital-raising vehicle (Fink 2013).

One major piece of the equity puzzle that must be ironed out is the management of such a large group of investors. Holding shareholder meetings for hundreds or thousands of investors may present a new set of problems (Emmanuel 2013). CEOs must determine how to maintain communication with $100 investors and $10,000 investors. Coordinating the traditional communication between shareholders and executives
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**Producing Musicals**

In 2012, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) released its report on how American adults engage with the arts. This survey has been conducted six times since 1982 and is an immense resource to studying patterns and understanding arts audiences and demand for arts experiences (NEA 2012). According to the report, 49% of US Adults (or 115 million) attended a visual or performing arts event with in a 12-month period (2012).
Musical theater is the most popular art form according to the NEA data with just over 15% of adults attending a musical event (NEA 2012). Musicals lead the categories of Performing arts activities by over 6% (NEA 2012). For a fundraising technique that requires a large following of support and awareness, musicals are best candidates for crowd funding model. This is because musicals have a larger audience and attendance.

The downside is that the NEA data shows that the audiences for live musical theater have declined 9% since 2008 (2012). Therefore, something is happening to overall revenue. Either ticket sales are diminishing or theaters are not grossing as much money. Therefore, arts organizations are trying to identify new funding sources to keep musicals
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**Figure A**
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The Theatre Communications Group did a study in 2012 on the fiscal state of 178 professional non-profit theater companies in America. Between October 2011 and September 2012, the theaters attracted 11.3 million patrons, sold 761,000 subscriptions and held over 36,000 main series performances of 1,222 productions (TCG 28 2012).

The report showed the trends to the Change in Unrestricted Net Assets (CUNA) over the past 4 years. CUNA is the difference between total unrestricted income and total unrestricted expenses (TCG 2012). Figure A shows how total income was slightly less than expenses in 2008 and 2012 and significantly less in 2009 (notice the negative CUNA).

Of the theaters that were surveyed, there has also been a shift in the number of theaters making a profit. Figure B shows how over the past three years, the percentage of theaters with a negative CUNA has increased.

*Figure B*
*Source: NEA 2012*
Anyone can take a check from a wealthy donor. Big time producers do not have to be working producers, meaning they do not have to have a working knowledge about theater. In fact, for many, “the only thing they had done in the theatre was sit in a seat” (Adler 2004). Investors enjoy the “perks of associating...they can enjoy the parties, the excitement of watching a show churn its way through rehearsals, [and] the frisson of opening night jitters” (Adler 2004).

According to the Theatre Communications Group 2012 report, expenses are at a 5-year high. Technical and production costs has increased 26.4% over past 4 years, artistic expenses 7.7%, and building and maintenance 10.2%. These expenses are outgrowing the inflation rate, and theaters have to keep up with the trend. Theaters across the country are trying various methods of compensating.

In 2011, Ken Davenport set out to crowdfund the first Broadway Musical, a revival of Godspell. He began a campaign called “the People of Godspell” which allowed shareholders to invest as little as $1,000. Typically, Broadway musicals engage experienced investors who invest over $50,000. According to the Broadway League, only one out of five Broadway productions recoup their initial investment (Sopelsa 2010). That is quite staggering statistic that has been consistent over the past 60 years.
Over 700 people joined the shows investment group and made up 55% of the $5 million initial investment. The production ended up running for nine months, which was much longer than many expected for the revival. The show also is planning a tour in the 2013-2014 season. Davenport depended on his large group of investors to bring a new energy to the industry. However, this strategy was able to conjure up new ideas for raising capital. This equity based crowdfunding campaign tapped into the reasons why people invest in a start up, or in this case a new theatrical production.

People invest in theatre for more reasons than to make money. While they don’t want to throw their money around, there is an emotional aspect behind investing in the arts. They want to be a part of the artistic process and ride the rollercoaster of creating new work. By allowing participation with lower barriers to enter, the number of investors can increase. The exclusivity and perks of participating also intrigue investors. For the People of Godspell, names on a poster outside the theater, house seats, People of Godspell T-shirts, party invitations, backstage tours and exclusive ticket discounts were tempting enough to garner interest (Healy).

The Non Profit Conundrum

While equity based crowdfunding is great for commercial venues, this new development may not be applicable to nonprofit. Non-profit companies do not have shareholders. Equity crowdfunding would not be feasible for a 501(c)3 organization because they cannot distribute surplus revenues. A company could create a Low Profit Limited Liability Company (L3C) that would be eligible to receive funding from the nonprofit, for-profit, and governmental spheres allowing them to crowdfund.
Since Godspell was a purely commercial venture, they were able to crowdfund by creating a limited liability company (LLC). The LLC provides liability protection from third-party claims for the “People of Godspell” as well as the management team (San Diego Corporate Law). This means that members are protected from personal liability and that the LLC would incur the debt or be sued.

**L3Cs**

Low profit limited liability companies, or L3Cs, are one solution to the equity problem. L3Cs are a type of LLC, which by law provide socially beneficial work at its core (Phen 2010). The potential profit is not as important as furthering a social agenda. An L3C has the spirit of a nonprofit with the business capabilities of a for-profit.

In order for a company to qualify as an L3C, it must satisfy certain criteria. First, the company must significantly further the accomplishment of one or more charitable or educational purposes (Reinhart 2011). Second, no significant purpose of the company is creation of income or the appreciation of property (Reinhart 2011). Third, the company cannot have a political or legislative purpose (Reinhart 2011).

All of this legal red tape is not worth the trouble. Nonprofit arts organizations do not have the manpower to maintain such a complicated legal structure. A small regional theater company who holds a staff of about 20 people would not have the manpower to support an L3C and a 501(C) 3 under the same roof. Maintaining a nonprofit’s 501(C)3 standing is extremely valuable in soliciting donations for the tax deductible status. Trying to adapt equity based crowdfunding projects for a nonprofit organization is like fitting a square peg into a round hole. With some serious manipulation it could theoretically work, but it would never truly adapt for regional theatre company.
How This Translates

The possibilities for crowdfunding campaigns are as endless as your imagination. Krista Detor, a Bloomington, Indiana based musician, used crowdfunding to support a new album. Detor had much critical success from Rolling Stone to the Boston Herald and an extensive touring career. However, she hadn’t made an album in over four years due to the overwhelming costs to produce and distribute the work. With the help of Crowdhoster and 265 supporters, Detor raised $27,730 of her $25,000 goal (a 111% funding). Detor states that she will spread the funds “out over promotions, distribution, graphic design, [and] web design” (Crowdhoster 2013).

While Detor used crowdfunding for the music industry, another Bloomington company utilized the method for their theatrical endeavors. Operating for 32 years, the Bloomington Playwrights Project (BPP) prides itself on being the only professional theater in Indiana that produces new plays. In the 2011-2012 season, their gross revenue totaled $263,674 (US 2012). The BPP used crowdfunding technique to raise over $36,000 for their annual fundraiser, The Playoffs. This fundraiser involves “9 playwrights, 9 directors, and 27 actors [who] have 24 hours to write, direct, and produce a full production based on a surprise theme, prop, and line of dialogue” (BPP 2013). Implementing the “walkathon model,” they used the crowdfunding site Razoo
to allow participants to compete to raise the most money. The BPP has tripled the amount of money the Playoffs have made in the past three years by utilizing crowdfunding sites and opening the fundraising up to a larger base instead of counting on angel donors.\(^3\) Of the $36,000 raised, the BPP has kept costs to a minimum and has only spent $1,500 on prizes and benefits for participants and donors.

Crowdfunding for a regional theater company is a smart and effective way of engaging your audience and educating potential patrons about a theater’s programs. When mounting a campaign on any crowdfunding site, an organization creates a video to help promote the project but also inform backers of how the money will be used and why they should contribute. While this may seem like a time consuming step, it is an important aspect to any successful project and should not be avoided. Over 80% of projects on Kickstarter have a video explaining and speaking directly to backers (Kickstarter 2013). These videos and the placement on the crowdfunding site are advertising opportunities not only about the designated project but also for the organization at large. Razoo even made the Playoffs a “featured project” on their homepage. This engaged potential donors who visited Razoo’s site and had never even stepped foot in Bloomington.

Mounting a crowdfunding campaign mobilizes a theater company’s audience base. Part of the reason the BPP’s campaign was successful was because half of the supporters were already engaged with the theater and the other half donated because a friend was involved and asked for donations. The Playoffs engages donors and audience members annually to give to the theater, and it spreads the word about the BPP and its programming via participants. Word of mouth and exposure is huge for crowdfunding campaigns. For

\(^3\) An angel donor is someone who donates a significant portion of the goal or annual fund.
longer campaigns, organizations tend to experience a 22% bump in demand after a campaign ends (Ghose, qtd. in Strohmeyer 2013). The next crucial step is taking the half of donors that are not engaged with the theater and turning them into subscribers and eventually consistent donors.

Crowdfunding is an entry point for new donors. Patrons have the opportunity to help support the organization without breaking the bank. The theater has a chance to reach out to their patrons and start the habits of contributing to the arts and the organization. From a crowdfunding campaign organizations can develop relationships with one-time backers creating the potential to be long time donors and subscribers. People give money to successful organizations and projects that show potential. Launching a crowdfunding campaign is giving donors security that the money is not wasted and they can donate to thriving and dynamic organization.

Michael Kaiser, the “turnaround king”, is most notable for his work with reviving the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theater. Kaiser argues that a lack of fundraising income is not at the fault of “charming and professional fund-raisers” but because of the lack of a “dynamic marketing program that conveys the excitement of a thriving artistic program” (Kaiser 50). Non-profit arts organizations should not cut programming in order to cut expenses. They need to convey the message of the exciting life and developments in the theater. This tactic gives donors a reason to donate and something to support. Supporters do not want to throw money at a sinking ship, so don’t give them a reason to believe the organization is dying out.

This practice secures the donor base and creates less risk for the theater company. In the past, if an angel donor stopped giving, a company had to scramble to patch that
missing hole in the annual fund. With crowdfunding, each donation matters, but the theater doesn’t rely on the bank account of one individual. Prior to the BPPs creation of their crowdfunding campaign, the success of the Playoffs relied on a $3,000-$4,000 donation from a single donor. This structure prevented the growth of the fundraiser itself and created risk to the continuation of the theater.

Theater companies like BPP have the opportunity to expand this crowdfunding model throughout their organization. They can mount a project to fundraise for anything from new auditorium chairs, to new lobby decorations, costly ticketing software, or even the company’s next big musical. Regional theater companies can fundraise the costs needed to mount each musical. Mounting a campaign acts not only as the marketing for the production but it also provides the funds required for the production. The supporters of the campaign become a built in audience and advance the word of mouth marketing. Mounting a musical becomes less risky because the funds are diversified from more sources and the audience for the production has already been found.

Since mounting multiple campaigns in one season may seem like a daunting task, theater companies have the opportunity to revamp their annual campaigns. BPP and other regional theater companies conduct their annual campaigns with mailings and rely on physical checks, because that’s the way it has always been done. If theater companies were to employ the crowdfunding fundraising model for annual drives, they could engage not only their existing supporters but also a new pocket of investors. Theaters, like the BPP, have proven that CFPs have been accommodating to a mix of offline and online donations. Therefore, traditional donations can still be utilized. However, the CFPs reach for the fringe online user and supporters only capable of modest donations.
Conclusion

Crowdfunding has already established itself as a profitable way to fundraise. However, we are just breaking the surface of what the model has to offer. The continuous growth of the use of both the Internet and crowdfunding platforms indicates that crowdfunding will not just be a fad.

Arts organizations have no basis as to why they should not be employing crowdfunding techniques in their organizations. While nonprofit arts organizations at the moment must shy away from developments in equity-based crowdfunding, the traditional donation based crowdfunding has been proven to be an effective and legal way of supporting programming and engaging their audience.


Appendix

Interview with Bloomington Playwrights Project
Managing Director Jessica Reed

1. What was the campaign for?
   We used the crowdfunding site Razoo to raise money for the Playoffs. The Playoffs is our annual fundraiser where 9 playwrights, 9 directors, and 27 actors have 24 hours to write, direct, and produce a short 10 minute play based on a surprise theme, prop, and line of dialogue. We used Razoo not as a traditional kickstarter campaign, but more as an online donation collector. We used the walkathon model where participants raised money to enter and competed for who could raise the most money. Individuals would ask friends and family to contribute to the specific team,

2. What was your first step in starting your campaign? What Crowdfunding platform did you use and why?
   Well, the Playoffs is an annual event, so we had much of the event was already in motion. This year we decided to find a new website that we could use that didn’t have high flat or transaction fees. We had been using Just Give but two years ago they instituted a $500 flat fee for the service. We needed a website to direct people to that would make it easy to give, and it didn’t have to be fancy at all. Razoo charges a 4.9% transaction fee on donations, which was much lower than Just Give. They also allowed us to enter offline donations free of charge.

3. Was the campaign successful?
   Yes, we were able to raise about $36,000 and the money is continuing to be raised. Unlike other websites, Razoo doesn’t stop allowing people to donate. Walkathon model: individuals ask their friends and family. The Playoffs started 12 years ago and typically raised $3,000-4,000 from one angel donor. 3 years ago when Chad joined the BPP, we started utilizing all of the participants and ended up making $12,000. Last year we raised $21,000, and this year we were aiming for $20,000. We were quickly approaching that goal, so we decided to bump up the goal to $25,000, then $30,000, and finally $35,000.

4. How did you market your Crowdfunding campaign? Did you concentrate on friends and “family” (donors, subscribers)?
   We have hardly had to market it because the participants have reached out to friends and family. Razoo also made us the featured non-profit for a few weeks, so some people donated without being solicited. About half of the donations came from donors or people who are regularly involved at the BPP and the other half came from friends of participants. Since The Playoffs is an annual event, our donors expect to be asked and want to help it the goal.

5. How did you decide the different levels/benefits given to your supporters?
For donating, supporters saw that $25 printed scripts for the actors and crew, and $50 bought a costume for an actor. We tried to make the prizes fun but also cost effective for us. Donors who raised $25 received a autographed photo of “George Clooney” (assisted by the Chad), and those who donated $75 became members of Chad’s sticker of the month club. The 70 people who participated and actually raised money also received prizes like season tickets, foam fingers, and trophies.

6. **What was the post campaign experience like for you? Was it difficult to follow through with the benefits promised?**
   Razoo has been really easy to work with and have been in communication with us. Razoo will automatically send donors a letter to be used as a tax write off, and they send supporters weekly updates on how the fundraising goal is going. The Playoffs happened Halloween weekend and we have already received a check for $18,000.
   Enter offline donations- and razoo does nothing but subtract from the goal

7. **Why do you think your campaign was so successful? / Unsuccessful?**
   The Playoffs are successful for us because they are branching beyond normal base of donors. We were also able to keep our costs down and only spent about $1,500 dollars on prizes and such. Although out final net profit hasn't been calculated, we were able to make an estimated $33,000.

8. **What would you change about your experience with future crowdfunding?**
   We know that we are not really-not fully utilizing Razoo to its capacity, so we would like to explore more of what it has to offer.

9. **Did it require much effort? Was it worth the effort?**
   Not at all. We had an intern this semester that was able to manage the project for us. We have been able to enter in offline donations, like when someone mails in a check, and Razoo will subtract it from the goal. We were also able to specify which person/team that the donations were designated for.

10. **Do you think it is possible to crowdfund for BPP’s future capital campaigns or productions?**
    I don’t think we are against it but we just don’t get many online donations. Our annual campaigns usually done with mailings- typically by check (or paypal on the website).