United Way of Siouxland Annual Community Impact Funding

Statement of Purpose

United Way fights for the Health, Education, and Financial Stability of every person in every community.

In 2006 United Way of Siouxland (UWS) began working with community partners to take a deeper look at the core issues impacting the health, education, and financial stability in our community and develop goals and strategies for helping individuals and families to reach their greatest potential. We are grateful for the partnership and dedication of community volunteers and agency representatives as we worked to identify the community outcomes that are now a part of our Agenda for Change. These outcomes serve as a compass for our mission to improve lives and funded programs must clearly demonstrate alignment with one or more of these strategic priorities and meet other criteria showing program effectiveness.

Funding Philosophy Statement

The United Way of Siouxland (UWS) developed the community impact process with the philosophy that it is supported by the community, for the community. Therefore, grant awards are determined by volunteer panels made up of donors, content experts, and community volunteers.

The annual grants are used to invest in a wide array of agency programs and services, with a focus on achieving the goals outlined in our Agenda for Change. As custodians of community contributions, strict accountability is expected and required of all funded partner agencies. These partnerships are central to our mission and are based on shared goals and commitments to positively impact the community in which we all live.

Donor Choice Funds

Funds may be designated by donors to United Way affiliated agencies, other United Ways, United Way initiatives or specific impact areas, only. A minimum $50 annual contribution is required for a donor designated pledge. Designated funds will be disbursed separately and will not be included in the unrestricted pool of funds used for community impact funding purposes. Agencies will be notified when designations occur.

Designated funds will not be considered during the community impact funding process; however, designated funds are to be used for a partner program(s) receiving community impact funds. The designated funds are in addition to and separate from the allocation decisions made by Community Impact Volunteers.

Annual Community Impact Funding

Annual community impact funding is awarded to partner programs to support quality, direct services provided. UWS is dedicated to continuing support for programs positively impacting lives on a daily basis.

- All funding decisions for partner programs are made through the community impact process.
- Community impact teams are made up of community volunteers and agency directors who meet as needed to discuss and review programs that fall within three goal areas:
  - Health
  - Education
  - Financial Stability
- Annual community impact funding is awarded to partner programs based on a two-year funding cycle.
- Community impact volunteers will review and evaluate program applications submitted online.

Organizations that qualify for funding: Organizations that qualify as exempt organizations under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (or corresponding section of any future federal tax code), or to organizations defined as charitable under Section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and its Regulations as presently existing or as hereafter amended.

As part of the community impact funding process, volunteers review and evaluate a program's capacity to produce its intended results. While each nonprofit organization has intentions of improving the lives of its clients, it's the results that matter. As part of the community impact process, volunteers will also evaluate the overall impact the program has on the community.

UWS believes that a non-profit agency will increase its ability to positively impact the lives of its clients when it is organizationally strong. An organizationally strong agency has a board of active leaders who set a strategic direction and provide oversight; has programming that is well designed, well implemented, and indicators to measure program success, and a quality improvement process; is financially stable, accountable, and maximizes resources; and has sufficient infrastructure and capacity. Funding will be awarded in two-year funding cycles.

Program applications are evaluated and scored by volunteers only during year one of the two year funding cycle. During year two of funding cycle, program results and financial information will be reviewed only; there will be no scoring.

The volunteers' average score of each program in year one of the funding cycle will determine the achievement level for each program. There are three achievement levels that serve as a guide for volunteers as they make decisions for funding recommendations. Each of the three levels has a minimum and/or maximum percent that can be allocated based on the award given to the program in the previous fiscal year. This tiered system ensures that an agency that scores high in the assessment process is rewarded with a higher level of UWS funding. Community impact grants awarded during year two will match year one allocations. Any funds left in the community impact fund after allocation decisions are made will be moved into the UWS FOCUS Grants Fund to support additional community programs and/or initiatives. One-time grants will be awarded to programs/initiatives that have identified a strategy for impacting current issues happening in our community in a positive and lasting way that will benefit the entire community.

In the event that there is a decrease in campaign revenue in either year of the funding cycle, decreased allocations will be calculated based on a formula that incorporates campaign results and program performance based on level of evaluation.

The Three Levels of Evaluation

- **Substantial Achievement**: *score 85 – 100%* (minimum funding level of 95% of previous FY) – An agency in the highest minimum funding level category is a historically superior performer in all categories and there are no concerns about the agency's long term viability. The agency will demonstrate an on-going, consistent culture of quality and continuous improvement that permeates the agency.

- **Material Achievement:** *score 75 – 84%* (funding level of 85% to 95% of previous FY) – An agency in the middle minimum funding level category is an excellent performer in most categories; it may not have demonstrated historically superior performance over time, but exhibits substantial quality, recognizes issues, and demonstrates efforts to improve.

- **Provisional Achievement:** *score 75% or less* (funding level of 75% - 85% of previous FY) – An agency in the lowest minimum funding level category may undergo a dramatic event or decline in performance in such a way as to place doubt on the value of continued UWS investment in the agency.

If a program falls below substantial achievement, they will have the opportunity to contest the assigned achievement level by addressing the specific concerns cited by volunteers through a formal appeals process if the agency's board believes that it was incorrectly assessed. This applies only to the achievement level, allocation decisions cannot be appealed.

The UWS volunteers carefully assess each funding request and use collective judgment to allocate available funds. Funding decisions take into account how well each program aligns with the UWS Agenda for Change and the impact each makes toward community outcomes outlined in that agenda, based on results and information provided in the application.

Overall Score

The scores are based on three main areas, with each area weighted. The areas with the corresponding weights:

- Finance & Governance – 15%
- Program Evaluation – 70%
- Partnership with UWS & Overall Application Completion – 15%

Appeals Procedure

After being informed, in writing, of its achievement level – any agency whose program application falls into the lower two achievement levels may make an appeal for reconsideration to the community impact leadership. An agency wishing to appeal their evaluation score must comprehensively address the cited concerns they received with notification of their achievement level.

The Vice President and Director of Community Impact must receive the agency's written appeal no later than seven (7) days after the date that they receive an announcement of their achievement level.

Any appeal that is received will be directed to the community impact leadership. If the leadership determines that the appeal criteria have been met, the criteria will be evaluated by community impact volunteers associated with that focus area.

Agencies appealing their evaluation will receive decisions regarding final achievement level along with notification of funding level decisions.

Probation/Defunding Policy

UWS strives to set forth clear and realistic expectations between itself and program partner agencies. Occasionally during the evaluation process, certain significant concerns are cited that cause questions about an agency's ability to continue to provide quality programming. The issues may be ongoing or they may be a one-time event in the course of the agency's lifespan. Those issues must be reviewed thoroughly and monitored consistently to ensure continued quality programming.

Probation Guidelines and Procedure

An agency and/or a program will be placed on probation if a program application score falls to the provisional achievement level for the following reasons:

- The results do not show that the program is successfully achieving its intended benefit to clients
- The volunteers evaluating the application do not feel that the indicators used are meaningful in showing the impact to the clients and/or community
- The indicator measurement process causes questions about the fidelity or validity of the data presented in the funding application
- The volunteers cited concerns indicate that programs warrant significant improvement

Community impact volunteers may also recommend programs and/or agencies be placed on probation for the following reasons:

- The finance committee becomes concerned that the financial stability of an organization could impact their ability to provide consistent care and services to its clients
- If the organization's management practices come under scrutiny causing concern about proper management of the programs

Once an organization is placed on probation a letter will go out to the organization's leadership. UWS is committed to working with agencies/programs placed on probation to create a plan of action to resolve the cited concerns. The plan of action will be created by working together to establish realistic goals that include deadlines and benchmark milestones. Agencies will have no more than two funding cycles to adequately address the cited concerns. Organizations will be required to submit progress reports to United Way at intervals that will be determined by the goals and timeline established. Those reports will be shared with community impact volunteers. If the concerns raised are not adequately addressed through this process, as determined by the community impact volunteers, the program(s) will be defunded.

Depending on the severity of the situation, an organization on probation may have its grant payments withheld. If an agency fails to submit progress reports, misses a deadline, or benchmark milestone they could also face suspension of their grant payments. If an organization is placed on probation for a second time within three funding cycles they also face suspension of their grant payments and possible defunding.

Immediate Suspension of Funding

UWS reserves the right at any time to reduce or withhold the program's funding, place the entity on probationary status, or terminate funding if any of the following conditions occur:

- Breach of the law (local, state, and/or federal)
- Extenuating changes in community needs, services, and/or resources available
- Failure on the part of the entity to adhere to the standards or policies set forth in the partner agreement
- Failure on the part of the entity to deliver the agreed upon services/program(s)
- Significant changes in conditions that result in the inability of the entity to operate the program

Defunding Procedure

Defunding is a serious matter and is a decision that only UWS board of directors can make. In cases where the community impact leadership team recommends defunding, the following procedures shall be followed:

1. Certified letters explaining the proposed action shall be sent to the funded organization's Board President and Executive Director stating the cause for the action and requesting comments.
2. The funded organization will communicate its comments in writing to the UWS Board of Directors. It is incumbent upon the organization to show cause as to why funding for its programs should not be removed.
3. Funding may be terminated only by a majority vote of the UWS board of directors at a regular or special meeting.

Becoming a New Partner Program

Each year after its annual community campaign, UWS determines the amount of resources it has raised for the Community Impact Fund. Depending on the available resources, UWS may admit new partner programs meeting eligibility criteria during year one of the funding cycle.

Eligibility Criteria

UWS provides resources for programs of non-profit 501(c)(3) or 170(b)(1) organizations that bring services to people residing in Siouxland. United Way-affiliated programs are aligned in their vision for our community through their support of the Agenda for Change. Agencies wishing to have their program considered as partner program must meet the eligibility criteria outlined below.

- Organizations that qualify as exempt organizations under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (or corresponding section of any future federal tax code), or to organizations defined as charitable under Section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and its Regulations as presently existing or as hereafter amended.
- The program must be a previous recipient of the UWS FOCUS grant and services provided by the program must address an identifiable current need or issue in Siouxland.
- Must have identified outcomes and indicators to measure program success and be able to share the process used to collect information and monitor program impact that demonstrates dedication to continuous improvement.
- Organizations must have a volunteer board of directors composed of at least five people, must have established bylaws, meet at least quarterly, and maintain minutes of all board meetings
- Organizations should have an annual operating budget; demonstrate financial controls, including a financial control policy, and should be current on all IRS filings and payment of payroll taxes
- Establish and maintain a counterterrorism policy

The agency must be located in and provide services to the residents of the UWS service area

Process

United Way of Siouxland will contact agencies meeting the outlined criteria to become an annually funded partner program. If resources are available allowing new partner programs, an initial interview will be set with UWS community impact staff and community impact volunteer leadership to determine if the program will be able to deliver results required by partner programs.

Programs that are affirmed by UWS community impact staff and volunteer leadership will be able to apply for multi-year funding during the fall with other UWS partner programs. New partner programs will be considered to be on probation for their first two funding cycles.

Agenda for Change

Purpose

The agenda for change outlines specific outcomes associated with each of the three focus areas. All UWS funded programs are working to impact each of the issues identified. The agenda can be found on our website with the programs that are aligned with each community outcome.

Health

- Children are born healthy and develop on track
- Individuals of all ages will increase coping and life skills to achieve mental wellness
- Youth and adults live a healthy lifestyle
- Youth and adults live in and maintain a safe/healthy environment

  Special focus

- Healthy lifestyles
- Reduce bullying and violence
- Healthy developmental growth of children through parenting

Education

- Children enter Kindergarten ready to succeed
- Children are socially and emotionally prepared to succeed in school
- Children are on track academically and prepared to succeed in school

  Special focus

- Kindergarten readiness
- Grade appropriate reading levels
- Graduation rates

Financial Stability

- People have access to resources in crisis to stabilize their situation
- People have resources and skills to build financial stability

  Special focus

- Emergency Services
- Basic Human Needs
- Access to resources that build financial stability
- Increase income potential

Application Evaluation & Scoring

During year one of the two-year of the funding cycle, community impact volunteers will come together to evaluate program applications and make funding recommendations for programs aligned with each of their funding teams. Using a weighted scoring method, the application is broken into three (3) sections: Program Evaluation, Financial & Governance Review, and Partnership & Application Review. Each section is scored and weighted to make up the final community impact score given to the program.

Application Weights and Scores		
Application Section	**Total Possible Points**	**Weight**
Program Evaluation	20	70%
Finance & Governance Review	16	15%
Partnership & Application Review	12	15%

Evaluation Process

- **Read the applications.** Each team member will read applications assigned to their team, making notes to provide feedback for agencies submitting applications concerning the program itself, information provided, information they would like to see, or how to better provide information about a certain criteria. These notes will prove to be essential when evaluating the program, as well as helping our partners with program improvement.
- **Score each application.** Volunteers will score each program based on the five (5) Program Evaluation Criteria, and Financial and Governance Criteria to be scored by the Finance Team. Any criteria receiving a score of 2 or below must have comments to support, or it will not be included when tabulating the average for that criteria.
- **Make final funding recommendations.** Using the average of all volunteer scores for an application, the program will fall into one of the three (3) tiers of minimal funding. This will help to guide the recommendations that are made as a team and forwarded to the Board of Directors for final approval.

*Donor choice dollars are not available to community impact volunteers and are not taken into consideration during the funding decision recommendations.

Program Evaluation Criteria

Using a weighted scoring method, each criterion will be scored using a four (4) point Likert scale. Each criterion correlates to a section of the program application.

Criteria Weights	
Good Investment	20%
Quality of Services	20%
Results & Impact	40%
Financial Utilization	10%
Collaboration	10%

Evaluation Scale	
1	Does not or only minimally addresses what UWS is looking for in this criterion
2	Addresses some, but not all of what UWS is looking for in this criterion
3	Addresses most of what United Way is looking for in this criterion
4	Comprehensively addresses what UWS is looking for in this criterion

This guide is intended to serve as an aid for community impact volunteers as they evaluate and score program applications. Guidelines are given for each criterion that fit with the UWS mission and align with the Agenda for Change. This guide will help volunteers understand the information being sought; as well as the type of information that may be a red flag causing concern about the success the program is having and/or its capacity to deliver intended results.

Good Investment

The application should reflect that the need for the program in our community is well substantiated, and there is clear justification of UWS funds to offer the program.

Requested Information	Red Flags
• Statistical data that can clearly show the extent of the need for the program in the community • Clear and concise information about how the program's services work to alleviate the identified issue • A logical connection between what the program is working to achieve and the overall community outcome • Strategic evidence to identify and reach target populations, and deliver services cost effectively, while ensuring fees are reasonable and do not cause a barrier for clients	• Anecdotal evidence or generalizations of why a program is needed locally (i.e. "many children face challenges today that interfere with their ability to succeed in school," or "Many people have a need for counseling to help them overcome life issues." • Superfluous information and/or "fluff" – providing information that does not answer the question that was asked or information intended to appeal to the emotion of the reader rather than keeping the information factual

Quality of Services

The information provided builds confidence that the program model and/or curricula being used are well-designed to effectively meet the needs of the target demographic and achieve intended results.

Requested Information	Red Flags
• A clear and thorough description of the services being offered, how they are offered, and to whom they are offered • A logical explanation of why the program model or curricula is used that will create confidence that the program is effective. Clear and concise justification/evidence, from reliable sources, that the activities and services make the intended program results likely to happen (i.e. a good business plan is outlined to achieve the program's intended results) • Demonstrates that staff is adequately trained to provided quality services and receives updated training as needed	• A vague description of services offered (i.e. "we provide outreach services to youth and help them deal with the many issues they face in today's world") • An absence of evidence that the program services/activities offered are effective in achieving the program's intended results. A lack of substantial information to show program services are offered in a purposeful way that will produce the intended outcome. (i.e. "We believe that by giving coats to people who cannot afford them, they will miss less work")

Results & Impact

There is a clear link between indicator results and the community outcome the program is aligned with. The indicators provided are meaningful and connect to the information provided in the Quality of Services portion of the application. Data fidelity is evident and no concerns about the data presented showing the results of the program.

Requested Information	Red Flags
• A clear picture of the program's effectiveness and success rate based on indicator results, as well as the supporting narrative • A logical connection between the indicators, what the program has stated as its intended outcome, and the overall benefit to the community • Provides a reasonable data collection process for indicator information that builds confidence in the fidelity of the data • A satisfactory explanation of how data is used to determine program success and/or how it is used as a tool	• A vague explanations of the link between the indicators and how they help to evaluate a program's success • Survey or interview questions that are leading, confusing or poorly worded – getting quality information from poorly designed questions is difficult • The process for collecting data associated with the indicator results is vague or does not include specific details such as method, frequency and timing, or who is responsible for overseeing the process. If this information is lacking, it may indicate that the

- for continuous improvement - If results were not at the expected level, an action plan for meeting the goal in the future has been provided - A template of the data collection method(s) has been provided; the questions asked and/or observations used build confidence in the quality of the data - Indicators are well-defined, if necessary	information in not being used in any purposeful or meaningful way; rather the information is being collected simply to satisfy an action item

Financial Utilization

The program budget clearly explains how funds are being used and demonstrates a budget proportionate to the services. Assurance that the organization is financially stable and consistent, quality services will be provided to its clients.

Requested Information	Red Flags
- The program's viability is reflected through leveraging their UWS funds in order to gain additional funding streams; this includes using UW funds as matching dollars to access grants - If UWS funds are not being leveraged and/or additional funding sources are not being sought, a reasonable explanation has been provided - A comprehensive explanation is given if requesting an increase in funding	- A program budget that is unclear or seems disproportionate to the services and activities offered. - Vague descriptions of how their UWS partnership has helped to increase revenue, funding streams, etc. with no clear link between the funds and their UWS partnership

Collaboration

The program shows concrete evidence of meaningful partnership and/or collaboration with another organization(s) to reduce duplication of services, achieve a shared and specific goal, sharing costs and/or resources, or to utilize a standard data collection process to better identify the impact and/or gaps in services in the community.

Requested Information	Red Flags
- Specific examples of how the program works directly with another organization(s) by sharing resources or combining efforts to achieve a common outcome or objective - The benefit(s) of the collaboration, such as reduction of duplicated services, enhanced effectiveness in achieving program goal or data collection should be included	- Statements that the program collaborates through client referral to other programs/organizations. Traditionally this is not collaboration, rather it is cooperation; unless it is demonstrated that each program/organization is assisting the client with a specific issue associated needed to achieve a shared outcome. - Statements that the program collaborates by arranging donations from area businesses, working with other organizations for an event, providing space in a facility for another group, setting up field trips to area centers, etc.

Financial & Governance Review

This portion of the application will be scored by the finance team. This team is comprised of community impact volunteers who have financial expertise. Each member of this special team will evaluate how an agency governs their organization, as well as the financial stability of the organization as a whole.

Using a weighted scoring method, each criterion will be scored using a four (4) point Likert scale. Each criterion correlates to a section of the program application.

Criteria	Weight
Appropriate Use of Funds	30%
Acceptable Level of Reserves	30%
Sound Financial Management	30%
Governance & Oversight	10%

Appropriate Use of Funds

The organization's financial records should demonstrate financial responsibility by showing that it spends its funds honestly, and prudently.

Standards	Scoring Scale
At least 65% of its total expenses were spent on program activities	1 – Does not demonstrate appropriate use of funds based on what United Way is looking for in this criterion
Administrative and fundraising overhead does not exceed 25%	2 – Minimally demonstrates appropriate use of funds based on what United Way is looking for in this criterion
The percent of revenue and support from United Way is reasonable for the size and nature of the organization	3 – Minor concerns about appropriate use of funds based on what United Way is looking for in this criterion
The agency's most current interim financial statement shows they are on budget for the year	4 – No concerns about appropriate use of funds based on what United Way is looking for in this criterion

Acceptable Level of Reserves

Nonprofit organizations will be better managed and more financially stable if they have an operating reserve ratio level appropriate for the specific conditions in which that particular organization operates.

Standards	Scoring Scale
1. Minimum ratio should be 3 months or 25% unless there are factors that suggest the organization need not maintain reserves at this level such as: • Revenue sources are not subject to large, unexpected negative fluctuations • The governing board believes it is of overriding importance that every possible resource is used in the provision of current program services • The nature of activities is such it is not very likely that situations requiring additional and/or available resources are necessary. 2. To avoid accumulating funds that could be used for current program activities, the unrestricted net assets available for use should not be more than three times the size of the past year's expenses or three times the size of the current year's budget, whichever is higher	1 – The operating reserve ratio level is more than three times the size of the past year's expenses or current year budget 2 – The operating reserve ratio level is well below the minimum ratio without justification 3 – The operating reserve ratio level is close to being within acceptable range 4 – The operating reserve ratio is appropriate for the organization

Governance & Oversight

The governing board has the ultimate oversight authority for any nonprofit organization. To ensure oversight authority, the volunteer board should be active, independent, and free of self-dealing.

Standards	Scoring Scale
A board of directors that provides adequate oversight of the organization's operations and its staff indicated by: • Regularly scheduled appraisals of the CEO	1 – Does not meet any these standards 2 – Only minimally meets these standards 3 – Meets most of these standards 4 – Meets all of these standards

• Has a conflict of interest policy • Has a whistleblower policy • Receives the organization's IRS Form 990 annually, the audited financial statement, or if there is no audited statement, then the unaudited financial statement • Governance decisions of the organization are reserved for (or subject to approval by) board members • Documentation of meetings held or written actions undertaken during the year by the governing body	
A board of directors with a minimum of five voting members	

United Way Staff will evaluate each agency's IRS Form 990 for this criterion and then give the score to the finance committee so that they can have this information as they complete the rest of their evaluation.

Partnership & Application Review

This portion of the application will be scored by UWS staff and then presented to the community impact volunteer leadership for approval.

Using a weighted scoring method, each criterion will be scored using a four (4) point Likert scale.

Criteria	Weight
Demographics	20%
Application Completeness & Accuracy	40%
Community Impact Commitment & Advocacy	40%

Demographics

Agencies must provide demographic information about their unduplicated clients in all categories; if this is not provided or there is a large number of unknown, agencies should be prepared to provide justification.

Standard	Related Score
Percent of unknown in Household Income area is disproportionate to other categories with no justification	1
Percent of unknown is over 30% in 3 or more categories with no justification	2
Percent of unknown is between 10 – 30% in 3 or more categories with no justification	3
Less than 10% are listed as unknown in all category or justification provided	4

Application Completeness & Accuracy

Agencies have made sure that all information asked has been provided, and that it is accurate.

Information Requested – 2 points for each
• Amount being requested in the application must match the line item "UW Support" in the program budget. If these amounts do not match the lower amount will be used for allocation considerations • Provided a signed Transmittal Form and Counterterrorism Compliance Form (US Patriot Act)

Community Impact Commitment & Advocacy

Standards – 1 point for each
• Demonstrates commitment to UWS partnership through meeting attendance
• Financial support of the UWS campaign through employee campaign, organizational donation, and/or special fundraising events; campaigns must be completed no later than the announced early bird deadline
• Demonstrates advocacy by attending Speakers Bureau training, willingness to speak at rallies when asked, and/or having a backup speaker if applicable
• Identify itself as a UWS community partner in every practical way through the display of the current UWS logo and name on properties, offices, advertisement, stationery, and publications and indicate that programs are funded by UWS in communications such as mailings, press releases, annual meetings, special events, etc. Examples will be submitted to UWS staff via email by the application deadline.

Glossary of Common United Way Terms

Activities – The types of services the program provides – what the program does with the inputs to fulfill its mission. Examples of activities include: providing counseling to clients, providing training for clients, mentoring clients, providing meals, on-site support for clients, advocacy on client's behalf, etc.

Collaboration - a structured, mutually beneficial relationship between two or more organizations that work towards a common goal by sharing resources, responsibility, authority and accountability for achieving results. (Referrals are not considered by United Way to be collaborations).

Community Impact - An organized set of activities offered by United Way to increase the community's ability to solve important problems through the efforts of multiple organizations using a variety of methods all aimed at achieving important community outcomes.

Community Impact Team – A group of volunteers comprised of issue experts, United Way board members, practitioners, donors and community volunteers who assist in the development of and ensure progress towards United Way's overall Impact priorities by guiding the strategic investment of United Way resources (funding, relationships, staff time, partnerships and collaborations, etc.) to advance the common good in Siouxland.

Community Impact Process – The annual process driven by the Community Impact Team and supported by a number of community volunteers to review program applications and collectively make critical decisions on how to strategically invest Impact Fund dollars in programs and initiatives to best achieve impact in the community in the areas of Education, Income and Health.

Data Collection Method – The specific method(s) that will be utilized to gather data on progress towards achieving program goals. Data collection is HOW the specific information identified as indicators will be gathered – the method(s), tool(s) and processes. Data Collection may include review of participant or program records, self-administered questionnaire, personal interview and/or rating by a trained observer. For best results, data collection instruments and procedures should be pre-tested with a sample prior to full implementation of the data collection process.

Impact Areas - A focus area for investment of United Way resources, there are three (3) Impact Areas, each of which contains community outcomes with programs working collectively to make a positive impact toward those outcomes.

Indicators - The specific items of information that track a program's success on outcomes. They describe observable, measurable characteristics or changes that represent achievement of an outcome. An indicator is WHAT is being measured.

Initiative – A strategy developed to address a specific community issue that is funded by United Way in an effort to promote collaboration & maximize the results achieved as we focus on advancing education, income & health

Program Outcomes/Goals - Benefits to program participants or changes in knowledge, skill, behavior or circumstances. Participant outcomes should logically link back to the activities of the program and flow from there to community outcomes. For example, an outcome for an individual participating in a job-training program would be improved job skills and ultimately finding and maintaining substantive employment.

Program - A set of organized activities offered by an agency to an individual, group or neighborhood intended to result in certain outcomes related to an important community need. For example, a job training program might include a set of activities such as conducting intake and assessment of job skills, enrollment in a job training class, provision of child care while in class, assistance finding a job, help with interviewing skills, etc. all targeted toward achieving outcomes like increasing job skills and finding and maintaining gainful employment.

Services - A particular set of activities offered within a program. For example, a job-training program might include offering outreach services to identify potential program participants or a childcare service to participants so they can participate in job training classes.