



United Way
Guelph Wellington
Dufferin
Change starts here.

Assessment Rubric

**for United Way Guelph Wellington Dufferin
Applications for Funding**

Last updated:
August, 2015

Give. Volunteer. Act.

Assessment Rubric

for United Way Guelph Wellington Dufferin Applications for Funding

This rubric is a guideline for Fund Distribution Committee volunteers to assess applications for funding. The rubric may be helpful to agencies to help them assess what information to provide in their application.

The following categories, based on some of United Way's funding principles, should be used as a general guideline for assessing applications. Final decisions on funding are made by the United Way Guelph Wellington Dufferin Board of Directors.

Note that the questions presented in this rubric relate to questions in the application form, which in turn are based on the funding principles of:

- Measurable Impact
- Collaboration
- Accountability and Resource Management
- Inclusivity and Accessibility

****Note: Programs that rank poorly on the rubric may be denied funding. Those that rank well will be considered for 1- or 3-year funding, as deemed appropriate.***

UW Staff Application Evaluation Tasks

Eligibility Checklist

- a. Is the eligibility checklist complete and is all necessary documentation attached to the application?
 - Eligibility checklist incomplete. Documentation missing.
 - Eligibility checklist mostly complete, with a few gaps. Documentation attached.
 - Eligibility checklist complete. Documentation attached.

Agency Information

- a. Do current board of directors' practices (e.g. number of members, frequency of meetings, recruitment) seem appropriate and adequate to meet the needs of the agency?
 - Board of directors' practices seem inappropriate and do not provide sufficient oversight or community representation.
 - Board of directors' practices provide some oversight and community representation.
 - Board of directors' practices provide exemplary oversight and community representation.
- b. Is the information about human resources and financial management clear? Does it seem to meet the needs of the agency?
 - Human resources and financial management info vague; unclear if agency provides accountability and transparency to staff, clients, funders, community.
 - Human resources and financial management info provided; agency provides accountability and transparency to staff, clients, funders, community.
 - Human resources and financial management info very clear and provides exemplary accountability and transparency to staff, clients, funders, community.

Agency Financial Management

- a. If applicable, do agency reserves seem adequate and appropriate?
 - Lack of agency reserves
 - Presence of agency reserves that would last up to one month
 - Presence of agency reserves that last up to 3 months or more

Agency Consolidated Financial Information (Q. 2)

- a. Does the Agency Consolidated Financial Information align with the Audited Financial Statements?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
a. Agency Consolidated Financial information and Audited Financial Statements have large differences.	a. Agency Consolidated Financial information and Audited Financial Statements have some differences.	b. Agency Consolidated Financial information and Audited Financial Statements have no differences.

Agency Consolidated Financial Information – Details (Qs. 3-4)

- b. Are all significant budget variances explained?
c. Are agency surplus/deficit positions clearly explained?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
a. Explanations for significant budget variances vague and inadequate. b. Explanation for agency surplus/deficit inadequate.	a. Explanations for significant budget variances adequate but with some gaps. b. Explanation for agency surplus/deficit adequate but with some gaps.	a. Explanations for significant budget variances satisfactory. b. Explanation for agency surplus/deficit satisfactory.

Letters of Support (Q. 5)

- b. Are two (2) letters of support attached? Do they clearly identify the local need for this program?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
a. Letters of Support are missing or do not identify local need for program.	a. Letters of Support mention local need for program but require further explanation.	a. Letters of Support clearly outline local need for program.

Program Information (Qs. 6-7)

- a. Does the program clearly align with the mission of the agency?
- b. Are barriers to accessing services clearly identified and addressed?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The program does not align with the mission of the agency. b. The barriers to accessing services are not identified and/or addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The program aligns somewhat with the mission of the agency. b. The barriers to accessing services are somewhat identified and/or addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The program aligns well with the mission of the agency. b. The barriers to accessing services are clearly identified and/or addressed.

Service Delivery Information (Qs. 8-9)

- a. Is the target population clearly described and appropriate for the program’s intended focus area?
- b. Is the program rational clear based on the description of the local need? Is there adequate supporting data and an explanation of how the need was identified in the community?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Description of the target population is vague or inappropriate for program focus area. b. Program Rationale/Local need is not clear. Inadequate or inappropriate data to support need for program. No explanation of how the need was identified. c. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Description of target population adequate but needs further clarification. b. Program Rationale/Local need adequately demonstrated. Some data to support need for program. Some explanation of how the need was identified. c. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Description of the target population is clear and highly appropriate for program focus area. b. Program Rationale/Local need clearly demonstrated. Sufficient data to support need for program. Clear explanation of how need was identified. c.

Program Budget (Qs. 10-12)

- a. Is a comprehensive and logical budget breakdown of proposed funding periods provided?
- b. If applicable, is the need for additional funding clearly explained?
- c. Has the agency sought other sources of funding? Is a clear explanation provided, one way or the other?

<p>Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)</p>	<p>Adequate (Clear and complete)</p>	<p>Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Budget is vague. b. Explanation of need for additional funding insufficient. c. Few or no alternative sources of funding sought/ lack of clear description of these sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Budget provides sufficient detail and logic. b. Explanation of need for additional funding sufficient, but with some gaps. c. Some alternative sources of funding outlined with adequate description of these sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Budget is highly detailed and logical. b. Explanation of need for additional funding detailed and logical. c. Alternative sources of funding available with detailed description of these sources.

Logic Model (Qs. 13-18)

(Inputs>Activities>Outputs> Indicators> Program Outcome>Shared Community Outcome)

- a. Are the identified outcomes concrete, measurable and feasible, given the scope of the program’s activities and outputs?
- b. Are the selected United Way shared Community Outcome(s) appropriate given the program Outcome(s)?
- c. Are indicators clear? Do they measure progress towards the program outcomes?
- d. Are the activities of the program client-focused, and do they link clearly with the program goal/focus area and local need?
- e. Do the program outputs follow logically from the program activities? Do estimates seem realistic?
- f. Has the agency provided sufficient details about inputs?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outcomes are abstract and overly-ambitious. Not a feasible result. b. Shared outcome is inappropriate. Does not correspond to the rest of the logic model- no logical connection to outputs, etc. c. Indicators are not clear and do not clearly measure outcomes. d. Only internal activities are described. Do not link well to focus area and local need. e. Program outputs are intangible, unclear and unrealistic. No logical connection between activities and outputs. f. Limited input information provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outcomes are adequate, but somewhat vague. b. Shared outcome could correspond to rest of logic model. Requires explanation. c. Indicators are clear and measure outcomes adequately. d. Activities mostly client-focused, with some internal activities. Link somewhat to focus area and local need. e. Program outputs somewhat clear. Estimates need adjustment. Some connection between activities and outputs. f. Input information provided and somewhat clear. Requires further explanation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outcomes are concrete and measurable. Feasible result. b. Shared outcome is appropriate. Corresponds to rest of logic model. c. Indicators are clear and measure outcomes appropriately. d. Activities are all client-focused. Link clearly and appropriately to focus area and local need. e. Program outputs are clear and realistic. Follow logically from the indicated activities. f. Inputs are specific and clear.

Program Evaluation Tool (Q. 19)

- a. Is there an evaluation tool attached? Is it appropriate given the size/scope of the program and agency?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
a. No evaluation tool available. Plan for evaluation inappropriate for size/scope of agency and program.	a. Evaluation tool is attached. Tool is somewhat appropriate for agency and program size/scope, but with some gaps.	a. Evaluation tool is attached. Tool is highly appropriate for agency and program size/scope.

Collaboration (Q. 20-22)

- a. Are the other community agencies/programs that serve similar populations or needs identified?
- b. Is it clear that this program meets a need in the community that is not being met by any other local program or service (i.e. this program is not unnecessarily duplicating an existing service)?
- c. Does the program work with other agencies to enhance program delivery?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No community agencies/programs serving similar populations or needs that are known by the United Way are identified. b. Program appears to be a direct duplicate of an existing program. c. Agency works in a very limited capacity with other community programs. Does not appear to enhance program delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Some community agencies/programs serving similar populations or needs that are known by the United Way are identified but key agencies/programs missed. b. Program overlaps with an existing program(s) but explanations regarding unique aspects are provided. c. Agency works with other community programs but collaborations could be improved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All and/or key community agencies/programs serving similar populations or needs that are known by the United Way are identified. b. Program appears unique in meeting a community need. c. Work with other community programs clearly enhances program delivery.

Impact Story (Q. 23)

- a. Does the brief story demonstrate the impact of the program? Does it reflect the program's outcome(s)?

Marginal (Lacking sufficient information; requires clarification or additional information)	Adequate (Clear and complete)	Exemplary (Well-conceived and thoroughly developed)
a. Story does not at all demonstrate program impact and outcomes. Vague and irrelevant.	a. Story somewhat demonstrates program impact and outcomes, but is rather vague.	a. Story clearly demonstrates program impact and reflects the aforementioned program outcomes.