

# Help for the Panel Members



Volunteer Position Description  
Site Visit Protocol & Procedure  
Sample Site Visit Questions  
Proposal Packet Explanation  
Agency Self Assessment

# LAKE AREA UNITED WAY ALLOCATIONS

## POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION: Panel Member

### OVERVIEW OF FUNCTIONS:

The primary responsibility of a Panel Member is to observe, report, and evaluate assigned agencies and programs with the goal of making objective assessments and funding recommendations according to the LAUW Allocations Review Process.

### GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES:

Panel members should:

- Serve as the liaison between Lake Area United Way and Assigned agencies and programs.
- Conduct a comprehensive and aggressive examination of assigned agencies and programs.
- Read all written materials on assigned agencies and programs.
- Be fair and unbiased. Report findings and evaluations to full Panel.
- Base all recommendations on LAUW's funding criteria and procedures.
- Participate in all decision making of Panel.
- Attend all meeting and the training session.

### SPECIFIC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Panel members should:

- Identify program/agency issues, concerns, and expectations.
- Monitor and record progress made by agency in addressing issues and concerns raised in the current Allocations letter.
- Attend site visits to assigned agencies and programs.

RESPONSIBLE TO: Panel Chair

TIMETABLE: Volunteer term - 3 months, April - June - renewable

	Estimated Time Commitment (20 Hours)
Training	1 Class - 3 hours
Preparation	At Home - Review agency proposal packet - 1 hour/agency
Site Visits	3 Agency Meetings - 3 to 4 hours each
Panel	1 Panel Wrap-up Meeting - 2 hours

## SITE VISIT PROTOCOL

- I. The purpose of volunteer site visits is as follows:
  - A. To understand the United Way funded programs.
  - B. To become familiar with the facilities and setting of service delivery.
  - C. To observe the service delivery, where possible.
  - D. To meet program and agency staff, clients and volunteers.
  
- I. Prior to site visit, volunteers should review:
  - A. Agency Profile - Form 1
  - B. Annual Request - Form 2
  - C. Functional Budget - Form 3
  - D. Agency/Program self assessment
  
- I. LAUW staff should schedule the site visit in advance of Agency/Allocations Volunteer training.
  - A. The agency site visit must be completed by June 31, so the panels can have their agency rationales and recommendations ready for review by the Allocations Committee by the middle of July.
  - B. Allocations volunteers should notify Sarah if they are unable to attend scheduled visit.
  - C. Allocations volunteers notify Sarah of questions pertaining to Proposal Packet or agency self-assessment.
  
- I. At the site visit, Panel volunteers should focus on the programs LAUW funds. When reviewing overall agency operations, focus your discussions on information pertaining to the agency's overall solvency, whether it is run in a professional manner, and whether it is the type of organization to which you would refer a friend or family member.
  - A. In some cases, everything the agency does is funded in part by LAUW, thus requiring a more thorough review of the agency's overall operational process.
  - B. Be sure that agencies identify their program priority rankings. Knowing which programs are the agency's top priority will help panels and the Allocation Committee determine program (line item) funding recommendations, if there is not enough funding to meet the agency's needs.
  - C. Besides the agency self assessment, a list of sample Program & Budget questions are provided to help assess the agencies - feel free to ask anything you think will be helpful to you in understanding the agency.
  - D. The site visit is not an inquisition and you should not feel as though you are being asked to play an adversarial role. The agencies being reviewed are our partners. Nevertheless, due to LAUW limited resources, tough allocations decisions must be made. Thus, in order for you to objectively formulate program allocation recommendations, you must be free to seek relevant agency information.

## Site Visit Procedure

- I. Introduction/Sign in
- I. Logistics
- I. Citizen Review Process Explanation - Awareness of agency/program service capability for funding recommendation
  - A. Information
    - 1. Proposal Packets
    - 2. Self Assessment Tool
      - a. Not a rigorous tool
      - b. Framework for discussion
    - 3. Supplemental sources of information (see reverse side)
  - B. Process
    - 1. Agency overview - 20 minutes
      - a. Logic diagram/Mission statement
      - b. Funding request - Form 2, Page 1
    - 2. Individual program overview - 15 minutes
      - a. Logic diagram/Program descriptions
      - b. Demographics - Attachment B of Form 1 (narrative)
      - c. Form 3 (Functional Budget)
    - 3. Program Self Assessment(s)
      - a. Paragraphs equal service capacity levels
      - b. Reviewed jointly - page by page consensus
      - c. Section 5 - agency overview
  - C. Wrap-up/Exit Interview (if necessary)
  - D. Site Review Findings
    - 1. Cover memorandum detailing site review date and volunteers present
    - 2. Summary of findings/recommendations
    - 3. Any supplemental documentation requested
- I. New Issues/Past Concerns/Volunteer Questions

Reminder: Allocations Volunteers call (923-2302, ext. 10) or email (smoen@lauw.org) availability for site reviews and any questions to Sarah.

#### Supplemental sources of information

- Annual reports
- Budgets
- Client feedback reports
- Discussion with board members, members of the management team, support staff, direct care providers, and volunteers
- Financial audits and financial reports
- Mission, vision , values statements and logic diagrams
- Memoranda and meeting minutes
- Planning documents and program descriptions
- Quality assurance audits and corrective action reports
- Standard operating procedures
- Training plans and documentation

#### The Assessment Tool designed to:

- facilitate panel members' understanding of agency purpose
- clarify who is served through LAUW-supported programs
- determine the nature of the benefit that the client received

#### Five Criteria

- A focus on children/parents/families vs. adults
- A focus on root causes vs. immediate needs
- A focus on at-risk (vulnerable) populations vs. the general population
- Organizational and service viability
- Commitment to outcome measurement

# AGENCY ANNUAL PROPOSAL PACKET EXPLANATION

## PROPOSAL PACKET FORMS

- Form 1 - Agency Profile
- Form 2 - Annual Report
- Form 3 - Functional Analysis

### **Form 1- Agency Profile**

#### **Background**

This document provides basic agency information which the volunteer and the general public will find beneficial when trying to learn more about the agency in total. Secondly, it provides LAUW Campaign and Marketing Departments valuable information for developing campaign materials. Thirdly, and most importantly for the agency, it provides them the opportunity to make a case concerning why they should continue being funded by LAUW, in specific program areas.

#### **Agency Information - Questions 1-9**

- 1) Self-explanatory.
- 2) List name which it is "also known as" in the community if other than its corporate name.
- 3) List satellite offices, phone numbers and hours of operation.
- 4) Self-explanatory.
- 5) Agency director's name and e-mail address, if available.
- 6) Self-explanatory.
- 7) Self-explanatory.
- 8) Brief statements concerning the mission of the agency and, if available, its vision and values. All agency board of directors should have a clear consensus about the purpose of their organization that can be summarized in a brief three or four sentence statement that explains to the public why the agency exists. In addition, it is becoming increasingly popular for agency boards to establish a concise statement concerning the agency's vision of its future, describing the world as it would be if the organization were successful. Also, agencies find it beneficial to establish a consensus between staff, board members, and volunteers concerning specific values which all agree will be followed when conducting all organizational matters. Finally, the agency is to outline program services provided, highlighting those program(s) funded in part by LAUW.
- 9) Helps volunteer understand agency's planning process.

#### **Staff/Board Information - Questions 10-16**

- 10) Numbers and racial composition of paid staff and if they are considered administrative or programmatic. Since staff may be assigned tasks in both areas, the number of staff listed in each category may be less than a "whole person".

- 11-12) Quantifies agency volunteer activity.
- 13) Self-explanatory.
- 14) Seeks total numbers and percentages pertaining to board member composition.
- 15-16) Attempts to clarify board involvement and "committee structure".
- 17) Concerns "Current Board Members and Officers". The question does not request board member addresses or phone numbers, but does seek the city of residence, and length of continuous service on the Board.
- 18) Agency board members are responsible for representing the public's interest, thus justifying an agency's non-profit tax status. Consequently, LAUW reviews agency governance and oversight capabilities to ascertain if it is reasonable to assume that boards are knowledgeable about audit and tax-related information.
- 19-21) Clarifies board member independence from agency or staff influence due to possible financial consideration. The issue is not whether agency staff serve on the board or if a few board members receive some kind of compensation but whether the board can reasonably be expected to put community, agency and client interest ahead of their own.
- 22-23) Identifies whether anyone affiliated with the agency benefits from its purchase or grant-marking procedures and if so clarifies how and why.
- 24) Since it is the agency's Executive Director's responsibility to carry out board policy, the board must have some mechanism for evaluating the Executive Director's performance.
- 25) Requires the agency to self declare any legal matters related to fundraising practices, which donors/contributors might reasonably be interested in having knowledge of. It also provides the agency the opportunity to frame an explanation for the cause of action.
- 26-29) These questions provide agencies the opportunity to clarify specific fundraising strategies and how they protect the interests of both donors and prospective donors. It is not expected that agencies will provide copies of material mentioned in questions 27 and 28 at a site review. If it is determined that the agency needs to make available such information, LAUW volunteers with appropriate expertise shall at a later time be convened to review the documents in question and report their findings to the Allocations Committee.
- 30) Auditors are reporting on financial statements the value of donated goods and services that an agency receives and sometimes assigning such values across income and expense categories. If this is the case, an agency is expected to provide the information available when completing question 30 (not on the financial forms 2 or 3.) The purpose of this question is to give an agency the opportunity to demonstrate the benefit it provides the community through such donations.
- 31) As agency use of the web for fundraising expands, so too does the responsibility of LAUW member agencies to use the avenue responsibly and ethically. As with other fundraising, governance and service provision efforts, any wrongdoing, perceived or otherwise, by a United Way agency possibly spills over to LAUW or its member organizations. Thus, this question, like others elsewhere throughout the Form 1, is designed to promote transparency. Agencies are to provide their web address and how to access the specific information requested in questions 30 and 31.

### **Program Description - Question 32**

32) Describes only programs the agency provides for which LAUW funding is sought. When describing each program where LAUW funding is sought, agencies are to explain:

- How the need was determined.
- The specific problems the program seeks to address.
- The desired client outcomes.
- The indicators/measurements used to determine achievement of outcomes.
- How LAUW funding will be used.
- What the programs eligibility criteria are and its service delivery time frame.
- What specific program services are provided.

### **Attachment A**

All agencies must provide a logic diagram for:

- Overall agencies operations - (identified as Attachment A)
- Each specific UWASIS program category for which LAUW funding is being sought (identified as Attachment A1, A2, A3, etc.)

Question 32 should be used as a separate form and attached as a cover sheet to each program logic diagram. Consequently, agencies must make an appropriate number of copies before beginning to complete it for each program for which LAUW funding is sought. All program logic diagrams should tie back to the overall agency logic diagram. It is suggested that the agency-wide logic diagram proceed/serve as the cover sheet for agency program descriptions (question 32) and accompanying program logic diagrams.

### **Attachment B**

This attachment documents both agency-wide and program output data concerning unduplicated count of persons served, regardless of whether or not LAUW funding is received. This assists LAUW volunteers, LAUW marketing, and donors better understand the numbers of persons an agency assists by race and sex agency-wide and programmatically by income and age categories.

Agencies should prioritize the listing of their programs by listing the most important first. Agencies should also indicate which programs are new.

**Lake Area United Way**

**Agency/Program  
Citizen Review  
Process**

# INDEX

Description of Lake Area United Way’s Allocations Process.....	Page 1
Site Visitation Instructions.....	Page 2
Instructions for Member Agencies .....	Page 4
Assessment Tool	
▪ Focus on Children/Parents/Families.....	Page 6
▪ Focus on Root Causes .....	Page 8
▪ Focus on Vulnerable At-risk Populations .....	Page 10
▪ Organizational and Service Viability .....	Page 12
▪ Outcomes and Results .....	Page 14

**Lake Area United Way  
The Colby Building  
221 W. Ridge Road  
Griffith, IN 46319  
219/923-2302**

David Sikes, Director Allocations.... Ext. 303.....dsikes@lauw.org  
Sarah Moen, Assistant.....Ext. 301.....smoen@lauw.org

## **Description of LAUW's Allocations Process**

Lake Area United Way (LAUW) relies on volunteers in making its annual allocations decisions. Member agencies are asked to complete two steps in advance of a site visit by LAUW volunteers.

- Basic programmatic and administrative data are documented in LAUW's annual Allocations Proposal Packet that is provided to member agencies.
- Member agencies are asked to complete a self-assessment using the tool that follows on page 6. A member agency is expected to share the results of the completed self-assessment with panel members before the date of their site review. The results should assist the agency in preparing for its site visit. The agency is expected to explain its self-assessment findings and any agency/program enhancement plans it has enacted since the agency's last self assessment with this year's Allocations Panel volunteers.

Site visits are conducted by panels of volunteers formed for this purpose. Training is provided for Allocations volunteers and agencies in advance of all site visits. To the extent that it is possible to do so, panels will evaluate all agencies that are in a single field of service during the same year.

Site visits are scheduled by LAUW. LAUW staff may serve as facilitators during site visits.

The attached assessment tool is divided into the five criteria that are used in evaluating an agency. They include:

- A focus on children/parents/families vs. adults;
- A focus on root causes vs. immediate needs;
- A focus on at-risk (vulnerable) populations vs. the general population;
- Organizational and service viability; and
- Commitment to outcome measures.

The assessment tool is not intended to be a rigorous tool. Its primary purpose is to provide a framework for discussion that is organized around Lake Area United Way's established priorities.

The funds available for any given year are divided among Lake Area United Way's fields of service using the first three of the above five criteria. The specific priorities assigned to these criteria are established by the Vision Council and may change from year to year.

The Allocations Committee then determines agency allocations within the various fields of service based on a discussion that includes panel findings of site visits.

In October, a Preliminary Allocation Letter is issued to each agency so that they can plan for the coming year.

A Final Allocations Letter is sent by February after any required adjustments have been made pending the results of the fall's United Way fund-raising campaign.

## Site Visitation Instructions

A preview should be provided by the site review facilitator for both the agency's management team and the Allocations Panel volunteers at the beginning of a visit. This should include introductions, explanations concerning the activities that will be undertaken during the visit, and any logistical concerns that may need to be addressed. All site review participants will be advised that each assessment criteria addressed in the program assessment tool will be jointly evaluated by both the agency's management team and the Allocations Panel volunteers during the visit. Finally, the agency will be provided with dates by which it can expect to receive a copy of the site review meeting minutes for review and comment.

The next step in the site visit process will generally be an agency presentation addressing each LAUW-funded program. This presentation should be based on the agency's logic diagrams and individual programmatic logic diagrams. Approximately 15 minutes per LAUW-funded program should be allocated to this initial phase of the site review. After a general understanding of the agency's mission and program goals has been established, the Allocations volunteers should begin a page-by-page review of the agency's self-assessment. LAUW volunteers should encourage the agency representatives to expand on their agency's rationale for each rating. Before moving from one self-assessment item to the next, the Allocations volunteers should attempt to establish a consensus between themselves and the agency with respect to their rating of each item. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached, the item should be deferred to the end of the site visit.

Although volunteers conducting the site visit should use the Allocations Proposal Packet prepared by the member agency as their primary reference source, an agency may provide additional information to support its self-assessment. Supplemental sources of information could include any of the following to the extent that these items are available and additional information is required:

- Annual reports;
- Budgets;
- Client feedback reports;
- Discussions with board members, members of the management team, support staff, direct care providers, and volunteers;
- Financial audits and financial reports;
- Mission, vision, values statements, and additional logic diagrams;
- Memoranda and meeting minutes;
- Planning documents and program descriptions;
- Quality assurance audits and corrective action reports;
- Standard operating procedures; and
- Training plans and documentation.

An Allocations panel may choose to participate as a committee of the whole in any interviews that are conducted. Alternately, they may break up into two or more groups to evaluate various components of the agency's self-assessment. To the extent that it is possible to do so, however, at

least two members of the panel should collaborate in the interviews and the review of supplemental materials pertaining to each element of the assessment tool.

Again, it is expected that a consensus will be reached among the panel members concerning each element of the assessment tool. If the site visit has not been conducted by the Allocations volunteers acting as a body of the whole, each cadre of volunteers should share their results and reasoning with all other members of the review panel at the end of the site visit. An exit interview should then be conducted so that agency representatives can be apprised of each rating. In the event that a consensus score cannot be obtained among the panel members, the panel chair will assign a score.

The basis or rationale for any difference of opinion between the member agency's self-rating and the Allocations panel's rating should be discussed with agency representatives and noted in the space that follows each element of the assessment tool. Any input that the agency management team makes during the discussion or debriefing should be considered by the panel chair in making his or her final report to the Allocations Committee.

At the end of each agency site review, panel members should be given the opportunity to meet privately to finalize the panel's report. An exit interview with the agency should be held if the panel chooses to wrap up its agency site review in private rather than in front of the agency. The exit interview should inform the agency of any major problems the panel identified concerning program service capability, substantial funding modifications the panel proposes to recommend to the Allocations Committee, or additional information the panel may require to complete its final report.

The site review minutes should consist of the following four items:

- Information detailing the dates of the visit and the members of the visitation team;
- A summary of all findings and recommendations;
- Any panel notes that were created as part of the site visit; and
- A copy of any supplemental documentation provided by the agency.

## **Instructions for Member Agencies**

It is mandatory that the member agency conduct a self-assessment and share the results with its Allocations volunteers in advance of any site visit. It is particularly important that this self assessment be conducted in a forthright manner. Greater evaluation credit will be given to an agency/program whose management team has recognized a need for action than to programs that are rated more highly than the agency can document. The first finding indicates an understanding of the criteria in question and a commitment to improved performance; the latter option indicates that the management team may not have understood the criteria or possesses inadequate program knowledge to accurately assess service capability. You cannot improve what you do not measure.

The assessment tool has been designed:

- To facilitate panel members' understanding of an agency's purpose;
- To clarify who is served through LAUW-supported programs; and
- To determine the nature of the benefit that the client received.

The agency should plan for Allocations Panel volunteers to be on-site for three to four hours. In order to demonstrate how effective its LAUW-funded programs are, agency presentations, including the discussion of the self-assessment, should incorporate pertinent information that is documented in the agency's Proposal Packet (e.g., funding data, client demographics, program specifics, etc.). Agency personnel should structure their presentations to address specific program operations and client benefits. It is further recommended that these formal presentations focus on a program's outcomes. Agency representatives should be prepared to identify all of their programmatic outcomes. Further, they should be able to fully describe all indicators and measuring tools that have been developed to date, all measurements that are in development, findings to date, and any actions taken in response to these findings.

To the extent that it is possible to do so, agency management teams should ensure that staff and agency volunteers are available to members of the Allocations panel. Additionally, any supplemental information that is requested by the panel should be provided as long as it is germane to a criteria being analyzed and not subject to confidentiality restrictions. Further, the agency should have ready access to documents that verify how program service quality is maintained, evaluated, and improved. Given the optimal nature of the highest ratings included in each scale, the burden of proof escalates as ratings increase.

# **LAUW Agency/Program Assessment Tool**

**Name of Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of LAUW-Funded Program:** \_\_\_\_\_

**LAUW Field of Service:** \_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0 Focus on Children/Parents/Families

Lake Area United Way has decided to prioritize programs that directly target the needs of children and the functioning of the family unit. This is not to say that other needs are not great or compelling. Resources are limited, however. Lake Area United Way has determined that the subsequent need for many different kinds of intensive services can be avoided if the needs of children and the families that support them can be met.

Choose the paragraph below that best describes the current status of each LAUW-funded program with respect to the issue in question. **Please use a separate assessment form for each LAUW-funded program.**

### Agency Volunteers

- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 4. The program in question targets the needs of children, parents, or families. The services provided specifically address the functioning of the family unit (i.e., the level of material and/or psychological support that is provided to children in the context of a family unit that includes one or more children living with one or more parents or related caregivers), contribute to improvements in this regard, or supplement for the absence of family support.  
An agency claiming this type of focus should be prepared to document its eligibility criteria and the precise relationship that exists between the service or intervention that it provides and the amelioration of or supplementation for one or more specific needs of children.
- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 3. The program in question serves a general population that includes children, parents, or families. Although the services provided do not address the functioning of the family unit, contribute to improvements in this regard, or supplement for the absence of family support in a direct way, indirect effects (e.g., improved health, learning, reduction of dysfunctional behaviors, amelioration of poverty, enhancement of family functioning, etc.) are assumed.
- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 2. The program in question serves adults who generally do not have intact families. The services provided address needs that would otherwise be met in the context of a viable family unit.
- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 1. The program in question serves a general population that includes children, parents, or families. The services provided do not specifically address the functioning of the family unit or contribute to improvements in this regard.



## 2.0 Focus on Root Causes

Lake Area United Way prioritizes funding to programs that address the root causes of human suffering. This is not to say that programs that address human service needs after they have arisen are not important to the community. Nevertheless, the limited resources that are available to Lake Area United Way must be directed to programs that can promise the most significant contribution to the community's well being over the long term. Consequently, programs that prevent or minimize the need for subsequent services that are more intensive and less promising in nature will be treated as priorities.

Choose the paragraph below that best describes the current status of each LAUW-funded program with respect to the issue in question. **Please use a separate assessment form for each LAUW-funded program.**

### Agency Volunteers

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 4. The program in question targets the root causes of human suffering (e.g., physical or psychological pain, social deprivation, etc.) or adverse developmental outcomes (e.g., delinquency, poor educational outcomes, etc.) The relationship between the service methodology employed and the behaviors and outcomes that are targeted for prevention are well established.

It is incumbent on the agency to establish the precise relationship that exists between the root cause that a program purports to address and the kind(s) of human suffering or adverse developmental outcomes that are prevented or minimized.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 3. The program in question does not address the root causes of human suffering or adverse developmental outcomes that develop or occur later in life. However, it provides assessments (e.g., case management, information and referral) or diversions (e.g., recreational and leadership development programs) that are generally believed to preclude participation in activities that could lead to ongoing dysfunctional behaviors or adverse developmental outcomes.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 2. The program in question does not address the root causes of human suffering or adverse developmental outcomes that develop or occur later in life. However, it does meet one or more material needs (e.g., food, clothing, shelter, immediate medical services) that are of a critical nature.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 1. The program in question does not address the root causes of human suffering or adverse developmental outcomes that develop or occur later in life. Although it meets the immediate needs of clients, they are not of a critical nature.



### 3.0 Focus on Vulnerable At-risk Populations

Lake Area United Way has decided to prioritize programs that address the needs of at-risk or vulnerable populations. This is not to say that programs that address the needs of a broader population are not important to the community, nor does it suggest that certain children, families, and adults are free of risk. For our purposes, however, the term “at-risk” is defined as significantly reduced access to the full range of familial and societal resources that are needed to avoid human suffering or adverse developmental outcomes. Lake Area United Way has determined that it can best serve the community by targeting its scarce resources toward programs that focus on populations that are profoundly disadvantaged with respect to the full range of these essential resources.

Examples of vulnerable populations who tend to be more “at-risk” than others include, but are not limited to: single head of households, linguistically-isolated families, individuals with disabilities, medically fragile individuals, homeless families, low-income families, geographically-segregated children and families, illiterate individuals, and abused children.

Choose the paragraph below that best describes the current status of each LAUW-funded program with respect to the issue in question. **Please use a separate assessment form for each LAUW-funded program.**

#### Agency Volunteers

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 4. The program in question targets clients who have been identified as being at-risk.

An agency claiming a focus on one (or more) at-risk populations should be prepared to document its eligibility criteria on a case-by-case basis, the evaluation instrument that is used in establishing the at-risk designation, and the precise nature of the profound risk that is involved. If this at-risk designation is not determined on a case-by-case basis, the client demographic served should be clearly established as being at-risk in the relevant literature or in a client-based or geographic study that has been conducted (e.g., a neighborhood or city-wide survey or census).

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 3. The program in question focuses specifically on underserved clients who have been identified as possibly being at-risk. However, this at-risk designation is not well established in fact or in relevant literature.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 2. At-risk populations are not targeted by the program. The immediate needs of at-risk populations are addressed, however, to the extent that individuals who are at-risk participate in the program.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ 1. A general population is served by the program. Although at-risk populations may be served as well, the program either does not specifically address their immediate needs or the extent to which those needs are addressed is unclear.



## 4.0 Organizational and Service Viability

Although Lake Area United Way supports programs rather than agencies, it recognizes that there is a correlation between agency viability and program performance. Programs must be housed or embedded in viable agencies. The following items address agency viability. This question is designed to afford agency representatives an opportunity to assess critical organizational strengths and weaknesses. The agency viability discussion that takes place during the site visit should also assist Lake Area United Way to identify ways in which it can help develop organizational capacity among its member agencies.

Strengths and weaknesses in the following areas as well as others that are deemed to be important should be considered in assessing the agency's overall viability.

- a. Leadership (Board and Staff):
- b. Planning Processes:
- c. Equipment/Facility:
- d. Client/Stakeholder Relationships:
- e. Service/Utilization Capacity:
- f. Sustainability:

**Although separate sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, and 5.0 must be completed for each LAUW funded program, section 4.0 needs to be completed only once since it covers the entire agency and all its programs.** Choose the paragraph below that best describes the current status of the LAUW partner agency.

### Agency Volunteers

—      —      4. The agency in question has in place all of the key capacities (e.g., leadership, funding, facilities and equipment, technology, stakeholder relationships, etc.) that are needed to house viable “state of the art” human service programs.

In order to claim this rating, the agency is expected to provide recent objective proof to this effect (e.g., a comprehensive accreditation certification or an organizational assessment using a credible instrument or tool).



## 5.0 Outcomes and Results

Lake Area United Way is committed to the use of outcomes measures. All member agencies must demonstrate their ability to identify, measure, and use outcome indicators to improve programmatic services to enhance clients' lives.

As such, LAUW expects an agency seeking program funding to demonstrate throughout its Allocations Proposal Packet and during the agency site review process, that programmatic inputs, activities, outputs, immediate outcomes, intermediate outcomes, and long-term outcomes, together with specific program indicators pertaining to key outcomes, have been identified and measured. Program logic diagrams should incorporate indicator measurement results associated with specific key outcomes.

The agency must demonstrate how outcome measures have been integrated into the agency's other critical activities (e.g., planning, marketing, fund-raising, etc.). Specific outcome indicators and measurement tools should be discussed in the agency proposal packet and during the site review process.

Following the agency review process, Allocations Panel volunteers are to assess the agency's own ranking of its program outcome measurement capability (as identified by the lines the agency checked below). Allocations Panel volunteers are to check **all** appropriate boxes that they are in agreement with as well. The observation section of this criteria (page 16) is for LAUW Allocations volunteer use only. The agency's selection of all appropriate boxes below will be assessed by Allocations volunteers based on how the agency incorporated outcome measurement into its proposal packet and site review presentation.

Choose the paragraph below that best describes the current status of each LAUW-funded program with respect to the issue in question. **Please use a separate assessment form for each LAUW-funded program.**

### Outcome Identification

#### Agency Volunteers

- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ A. The agency identified program outcomes that enhance client quality of life.
- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ B. Program outcomes have been identified, but they are not well defined in so far as how they will enhance client quality of life.
- \_\_\_ \_\_\_ C. The agency has yet to identify outcomes that if measured would demonstrate client benefit or program enhancement.
- It does not know how to do so.
  - It lacks the administrative capacity to do so.
  - It is not interested in doing so.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

## Outcomes Measurement

### Agency Volunteers

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ A. The agency demonstrated a variety of methodologies and measures being used to determine the extent to which outcomes pertaining to LAUW-funded programs are achieved. Program outcome indicators have been selected and are being measured.

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ B. Some measures of outcomes have been developed. However,  
 they are not systematically deployed or consistently used.  
 few or no program outcome indicators are being measured on a consistent basis.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ C. The agency has yet to adequately demonstrate an ability to measure outcomes.

- It does not know how to do so.
- It lacks the administrative capacity to do so.
- It is not interested in doing so.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

## Use of Outcomes Data

### Agency Volunteers

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ A. The agency demonstrated that outcomes data is routinely analyzed and translated into specific action pertaining to LAUW-funded programs. The agency:

- documented the process of analysis that was employed.
- produced the data that was analyzed.
- identified the specific conclusions that were reached.
- explained why these conclusions made sense.
- documented the specific steps that were taken as a result.
- showed the results accruing from these various changes.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ B. The agency demonstrated that limited outcome data is gathered and:  
 routinely analyzed and translated into action to improve the quality of LAUW-funded programs and services.  
 occasionally analyzed and translated into action to improve the quality of LAUW-funded programs and services.  
 systematic processes have not been established to formalize its use.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ C. The management team has yet to demonstrate an ability to use outcomes measurement.

- It does not know how to do so.
- It lacks the administrative capacity.
- It is not interested in doing so.

**Boxes are for LAUW volunteer use only.**

