

Guiding principles of the proposed funding process:

1. With or without the use of any worksheet or other numerical rating process, any agency whose application meets the committee's expectations in every way should receive as close to full funding as BAUW is able to provide.
2. All agencies whose applications meet all expectations should receive the same percentage of their funding request, i.e., no attempt will be made to establish that one such agency is more worthy than another.
3. If an agency's application fails to meet expectations in some way but there is a reasonable and well-defined way to judge it as being as worthy as one that does meet all expectations, that agency should receive the same level of funding as those that meet expectations.
4. If an agency fails to meet expectations in an area of most importance, it should receive no funding unless specifically determined otherwise by discussion of the board.
5. If an agency's application does not rise to the level of meeting expectations in the most important areas and rise above failure to meet expectations in at least one other area, that agency should receive no funding.
6. Agencies whose applications lie between the two extremes described above should be considered individually by the full committee. They are eligible to receive up to the same percentage of their funding request as those that meet all expectations, but not more.

The proposed agency funding determination process in brief:

There are six steps in the funding determination process. More detail is provided in the narrative below.

1. **Application review** (Group scoring submitted, Date TBD)
2. **Application data entry** (Executive Director, Date TBD)
3. **Full Board discussion** (BAUW Board ALLOCATION meeting – Date TBD)

The proposed agency funding determination process in detail:

Non-profit status determination

- This is the final year that an organization can use another organizations 501C3 status.

Application review (Agency Liaison, Date TBD)

- Gather as a group to read/discuss the groups applications. The liaison should reach out to the agency contacts to clarify any questions in order to fully understand and assess the application.

Rating	Meaning	Rating	Meaning
1	Fails to meet expectations	6	Meets expectations
3	Lacking in expectations	9	Exceeds expectations

The six assessment areas are weighted differently to reflect their relative importance. Community Impact, Community Need, and Fits BAUW Priorities are considered to be twice as important as Fiscal Management and Track Record. Ability & Evaluation is slightly more important than the latter two areas.

Weighting	Assessment area	Weighting	Assessment area
10	Community Impact	6	Ability & Evaluation
10	Community Need	5	Fiscal Management
10	Fits BAUW Priorities	5	Track Record

Definitions of Assessment Areas in Scoring Worksheet:

Community Need

The program addresses a recognized health and human services need in our community
The need is consistent with BAUW mission and funding priorities for the current year
The problem/situation addressed by the agency is serious
The agency provides strong data to validate the need for this program

Impact

The program clearly demonstrates a meaningful linkage between community needs, program activities and outcomes
The program provides a meaningful volume of services and/or people served
United Way funding will make a difference and bring about positive change in people's lives

Ability & Evaluation

The Agency has a history of reliability
There is adequate staffing and resources to conduct this program
The program plan is sound
Clear goals and objectives are written
Measurable outcomes are evident
The agency/program demonstrates the ability to deliver and measure proposed outcomes

Financial Management

Financial information is presented clearly & accurately
The agency has a balanced budget
The agency has adequate reserves BAUW policy recommends 3-6 months
There is diversified funding/other funding is available to support program(s)
The funds that are requested from BAUW support client services
Overhead expenses are a reasonable % of total budget

Track Record

There is year-round commitment to work with the United Way
The agency appeared to have accomplished their goals and objectives from last year
The agency makes a difference with previous years' UW funding

If a board member (liaison) feels the dollar amount the agency is requesting needs to be lowered, please indicate that adjusted dollar amount in the "Liaison adjusted request" column on the Scoring Worksheet. All agencies with liaison adjusted requests will be flagged for full-board review during the allocation decision making meeting.

Application data entry (Executive Director, Date TBD)

- Ratings for all applications are entered in the application funding worksheet, which computes an application score.
- Applications are initially categorized as:

Score	Category	Significance
276 to 414	Green	Automatically receives as close to full funding as possible. No committee discussion.
200 to 275	Yellow	Flagged for discussion by committee. May receive up to Green category funding level.
0 to 199	Red	Automatically receives no funding. No committee discussion.

Examples and rationale for the categorization scores:

Weighting	10	10	10	6	5	5		
Agency Name	Community Impact	Community Need	Fits BAUW Priorities	Ability & Evaluation	Fiscal Management	Track Record	Application Score	Score Range
Agency 1	9	9	9	9	9	9	414	Green
Agency 2	6	6	6	6	6	6	276	Green
Agency 3	6	3	9	6	6	6	276	Green
Agency 4	6	6	6	1	3	1	206	Yellow
Agency 5	6	6	6	1	1	1	196	Red
Agency 6	1	9	9	9	9	1	294	Yellow

Agency 1 receives Exceeds Expectations ratings, resulting in a $9 \times 10 + 9 \times 10 + 9 \times 10 + 9 \times 6 + 9 \times 5 + 9 \times 5 = 414$ score.

Agency 2 Meets Expectations in each area, resulting in a score of 276

Agency 3 is Lacking in Expectations in Community Need, but Exceeds Expectations in Fits BAUW Priorities and Meets Expectations in all other areas, resulting in a score of 276 equivalent to Agency 2

Agency 4 Meets Expectations in the three most important areas and rises above Failure to Meet Expectations in one other area, resulting in a score greater than 206, above the 200 cutoff

Agency 5 Meets Expectations in the three most important areas but Fails to Meet Expectations in all other areas, resulting in a score of 196, below the 200 cutoff

Agency 6 Fails to Meet Expectations in one of the three most important areas, and thus is flagged Yellow for discussion in spite of having a strong score of 294

- Initial funding level
 - The worksheet determines how much is available to award to agencies submitting long-form applications.
 - It also determines the total of funding requests of applications in the Green and Yellow categories.
 - The ratio (Funds Available) / (Funds Requested) is computed as a percent.
 - Initially, all Green/Yellow category agencies receive this percent of their request up to a maximum of 100%.
 - Agencies with Red category applications are initially awarded \$0.00. This is also their final award.

Full Board Discussion (Date TBD)

- Any board member can request further discussion of an application. Contact UW staff to add to the agenda.
- Applications will be discussed when
 - the current “liaison adjusted request” compared to the previous year’s ‘agency request’ has increased by 25% or more
 - any agency request that is 10% or more of our total allocation budget
- Applications that are submitted after the due date will be reduced by a minimum of 10% of the agency request for that year
- All Yellow Category applications: After discussion, the board may choose to lower the awards of agencies in this category.
- Funds are freed up by the lowering of these awards. The worksheet automatically redistributes these funds across all agencies whose awards have not been lowered by the committee. Awards that have been manually adjusted by the committee remain fixed at the committee-determined level.
- If there are remaining funds after allocation process, these funds could go into the reserve, or otherwise be used as the committee decides.