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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Measurement and evaluation has been mostly linked to the bottom line, and therefore, to the for-profit environment. The public relations literature presents a wealth of information regarding the research and approaches in the field of evaluation, without making any reference to the type of organization. Although evaluation has long been identified as a major issue of the public relations field, by both academia and practitioners (Cutlip, 1994b; Watson, 1994; Macnamara, 2006; Gregory & Watson, 2008), the process has not yet been investigated in nonprofit organizations, specifically. This study examines the measurement of public relations effectiveness in a nonprofit organization (NPO), and seeks to develop a distinct nonprofit public relations evaluation model.

There is currently a considerable body of literature on public relations measurement and evaluation regarding its object of research, methods, and best practice. Most of this refers to proving the effectiveness of public relations programs against financial Return on Investment (ROI). This pattern comes from the predominant focus that the research and practice have on corporate public relations. In contrast, most nonprofits do not pursue remunerative goals. Furthermore, the academic research about public relations for NPOs does not dedicate a special attention to the evaluation process in the nonprofit organizations. It appears that nonprofit public relations borrowed the
corporate framework of public relations management and evaluation, voicing NPOs as if they were themselves for-profit businesses.

Increasingly, measurement and evaluation are studied in order to make them more formal (Macnamara, 2005; 2006). Furthermore, objectives and rigorous methods are required to deliver credible proof of results and Return on Investment (ROI) to management, shareholders and other key stakeholders (Hon, 1998; Macnamara, 2005, 2006, Paine, 2007). On the one hand, the environment in which public relations and corporate communication operate today is increasingly frequented by management practices such as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Key Results Areas (KRAs), Benchmarking, Balanced Score Card, Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE) and other systems of tracking key ‘metrics’ to evaluate activities (Macnamara, 2005, 2006; Likely et al., 2006; Behn, 2003; Jeffries-Fox, 2003). On the other hand, the researchers in the field try to build a generally-accepted standard when it comes to public relations evaluation and to align theory and practice with each other (Gregory, 2001; Watson & Noble, 2005; Gregory & Watson, 2008; Ruler et al., 2008). One of the solutions in this direction was to develop theoretical models. These are theoretical frameworks which aim to better illustrate the public relations evaluation process and which prescribe the essential success indicators for measuring the impact. This study investigates the most comprehensive models in public relations evaluation (Cutlip et al., 1994b; Macnamara, 2006; Lindenmann, 1993; Watson, 1997; Watson & Noble, 2005). Then, it withdraws the most common success indicators prescribed, in four categories, depending on the type of impact they account for: individual, program, organizational or societal impact (Hon, 1997).
A specific model dedicated to measuring and evaluating nonprofit public relations effectiveness is unknown. The final outcome of this study is to pave the path towards a measurement model for nonprofit organizations through the examination of the current public relations program evaluation process in such an organization. Thus, an exploratory study was conducted on this topic using case study methodology. Data was gathered through documentary analysis. Ultimately, this investigation is designed to stimulate a change of vision in nonprofit public relations and to potentially add to the body of knowledge in public relations evaluation.

The importance of this study lies in putting together the conundrum of public relations evaluation with the specifics of a nonprofit organization, an area which has not been explored so far. This paper explores public relations evaluation by considering the specificities of the nonprofit organizational sector. Additionally, the research looks at improving the impact of an NPO through a more rigorous evaluation and measurement process. In addition, it builds the way towards a theoretical evaluation framework, specifically created for public relations in nonprofit organizations.
Public Relations Measurement and Evaluation

Research directions in public relations evaluation.

A considerable amount of attention has been given to public relations evaluation: “dozens of articles, booklets and reports have been published and distributed, giving advice and counsel on how PR practitioners might more effectively build research, measurement and evaluation tools and techniques into their work” (Lindenmann, 2005, 3).

Linda Hon (1998) investigated the areas of research in public relations evaluation. The researcher identified four different directions, relevant for the major topics that have been explored in the field. The “analyses of communication” (p. 106) category of research links the cause (public relations activities) to some effect (generally assumed to be cognitive, attitudinal, or behavioral). It explains how communication effects happen and it discusses its implications for public relations evaluation. The second category identified by Hon refers to “prescriptive research” (p. 107). The scholarship which focused on this direction outlines the evaluation process and points out the importance of evaluation for public relations. The next category of scholarship relevant for public relations evaluation research, “case studies of public relations evaluation” (p. 108), features examples of public relations research in a variety of institutional settings and different ways of assessing the communication effectiveness. The final category of
research about public relations evaluation, according to Hon (pp. 112-116), refers to the interest in investigating “the status and types of public relations evaluation”.

In addition, there is a part of the literature based on the communication effects theories which are being used discussing the potential of PR programs to change attitudes and behaviors (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980; McGuire, 1984; Schick, 1997; Norman 2004). These appeared after World War I, when researchers began to observe and test how politicians and governments had manipulated communication symbols in mass communication messages to bring the world to war (Salwen & Stacks, 1996). The theories of propaganda and the unmitigated media effects – hypodermic needle – marked the 1920s. The mass media studies of Lasswell, 1927, Lazarsfeld, 1948, Berelson, 1952 (as cited in Schramm, 1960) or McCombs and Shaw (1972) started to bring advances both in the mass media research methodologies, as well as in the knowledge of the effects mass media played in public lives and minds.

Currently, one of the most replicated and cited studies in public relations measurement and evaluation remains the relationships research (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Grunig, 2002), through the application and development of relationships measurement (Hall, 2006; Paine, 2007; Wan & Schell, 2007; Ki & Hon, 2007; Yang, 2007; Kiousis et al., 2007). As a result of the Excellence Study (Grunig et al., 1992, 2002), Linda Childers Hon and James E. Grunig (1999) came to the conclusion that the value of public relations stands in building and maintain relationships: “….as important as it can be for an organization to measure PR outputs and outcomes, it is even more important for an organization to measure relationships” (p. 2). The two scholars have found through their research that the outcomes of an organization’s long term relationships with key
constituencies can best be measured by focusing on six precise elements or components of the relationships that exist. These indicators included in the *Relationship Index* were:

1. **Control mutuality:** the degree to which parties agree on who has the rightful power to influence one another;
2. **Trust:** one party’s level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party;
3. **Satisfaction:** the extent to which each party feels favorably toward the other because positive expectations about the relationship are reinforced. A satisfying relationship is one in which the benefits outweigh the costs;
4. **Commitment:** the extent to which each party believes and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote;
5. **Exchange relationship:** in an exchange relationship, one party gives benefits to the other only because the other has provided benefits in the past or is expected to do so in the future;
6. **Communal relationship:** in a communal relationship, both parties provide benefits to the other because they are concerned for the welfare of the other, even when they get nothing in return.

In order to measure the outcomes of an organization’s relationship with key constituencies focusing on these six elements, Hon and Grunig (1999) also developed a questionnaire form that includes a series of agree/disagree statements pertaining to this relationship. Respondents are asked to use a 1-to-9 scale to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree that each item listed describes their relationship with that particular organization (see Appendix 1).

In addition, the Institute for Public Relations (http://www.instituteforpr.org/) is doing consistent efforts in setting up standards for the research in the field of public relations evaluation, as well as for the practice. The most recent standards for practice were reinforced at the latest annual European Summit on Measurement in Barcelona, Spain, organized by the International Association for Measurement and Evaluation of Communication (AMEC) and the Institute for Public Relations, through *The Barcelona Declaration of Measurement Principles* (July 19, 2010).
The Declaration states seven principles which are meant to define the standards in making public relations evaluation successful, and to solve the tensions in the field (http://www.instituteforpr.org/). The seven principles act as “standards which will be business-focused as opposed to academic, highly theoretical, and grounded in real PR practice”:

1. Importance of goal setting and measurement;
2. Measuring the effect on outcomes is preferred to measuring outputs;
3. The effect on business results can and should be measured where possible;
4. Media measurement requires quantity and quality;
5. AVEs are not the value of public relations;
6. Social media can and should be measured; and
7. Transparency and replicability are paramount to sound measurement.

From whichever perspective researchers looked at the field, public relations success measurement was highly linked to and researched within the corporate environment (Miller & Dinan, 2008; Fawkes & Moloney, 2008; Ihlen et al., 2009). The for-profit organizational perspectives work with the principle of PR as a strategic management function (Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Grunig et al., 2002; Cutlip, 1994b; Seitel, 1995; Austin & Pinkleton, 2006; Paine, 2007; Ruler et al., 2008; Wilcox, 2009). They focus on the processes of the public relations programs, in which evaluation is a key element in providing credibility, status and recognition to the PR practitioner or to the PR department within a for-profit organization (Macnamara, 2005, 2006). The same authors’ perspectives connect the PR results as much as possible with marketing and sales objectives, making public relations accountable for the Return on Investment (ROI). Following this connection, some measurement practices have been developed: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Key Results Areas (KRAs), Benchmarking, Balanced
Score Card, Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE) and other systems of tracking key metrics to evaluate public relations activities (Macnamara, 2005, 2006; Likely et al., 2006; Behn, 2003; Jeffries-Fox, 2003). This study will focus on the most common concepts mentioned both in the academic research, and in the professional literature: return on investment (ROI), advertising value equivalency (AVE), as well as the concepts of outputs, outcomes, outtakes and outgrowth.

**Key concepts.**

*Return on investment (ROI).*

The concept of *return on investment* (ROI) is used by the financial sector to determine the value of an investment – it is a measure of the financial benefits of an activity against its associated costs. In other words, when someone asks about ROI, they are really asking: “what did I get back (benefit) from the money I spent (cost)?” ( Likely et al., 2006). Return on investment is the relation between overall expenditure on a certain activity and the benefits to the organization or one of its business units derived from that activity. Benefits can be expressed in many ways, such as revenue generation, cost reduction, and cost-avoidance through risk reduction ( Likely et al., 2006).

ROI is typically calculated by dividing the incremental gain (or return) resulting from an action by the cost of the action (the invested resources) ( Likely et al., 2006). ROI is then expressed as the percent of return for every dollar invested:

$$ROI = \frac{Total\ End\ Value - Costs}{Costs} \times 100\%$$
The ROI ratio can be used a variety of ways: from evaluating the performance of business units or companies over time to evaluating individual investment decisions to determining their feasibility and/or the expected financial benefits. Basically, any positive ROI shows a positive return in excess of what was invested based on the above formula.

Ehling (1992) pointed out that there has been little attention paid to the economic benefit-cost analysis of public relations. This might have happened at that time because top financial managers considered public relations budgets as an “administrative overhead” cost to run an organization or because of the belief that public relations outcomes cannot be quantified. Arguing against these thoughts, Ehling (1992) introduced a mathematical model to quantify public relations end states (cooperation and consensus) and explained how a cost-benefit analysis can evaluate monetary values of public relations programs and optimize public relations decision making.

Hon (1997) left the financial return on investment on a secondary plan and conceptualized public relations effectiveness at four major levels:

1. individual level;
2. program level;
3. organizational level; and
4. societal level.

The Individual level covers the effectiveness of individual practitioners, i.e. how effectively public relations practitioners perform to meet expectations. The Program level indicates whether a public relations program achieves its goals and objective as desired in an efficient manner. The Organizational level is concerned with the contribution that public relations can make to organizational goals and mission, including bottom-line impact. The Societal level of public relations effectiveness is interested in whether public
relations plays “a positive role in democratic society by fostering equilibrium” (Hon, 1997, 6) or whether public relations has negative impact on democracy by contributing to maintaining status quo (unequal power structure in society) (Fawkes & Moloney, 2008). Like Ehling (1992), Hon (1997) turned her attention to public relations effectiveness at the organizational level and asked public relations practitioners and top managers about what values effective public relations can bring to their organizations. Practitioners and top managers reported that benefits (i.e. increase of share price, sales, and market share) generated by excellent public relations far outweighed the costs, although they did not specify a rate of return. Campbell (1993) also found, through interviews with 18 corporate CEOs, that most CEOs confirmed a positive bottom-line impact from public relations.

Kim (2000) criticized the limited value of the program-level accountability measures of public relations such as “counting clippings and subjective content analysis” (p. 274). He emphasized that “showing a direct and measurable relationship between public relations activities and tangible financial benefits to an organization has become key” (p. 274). Lee and Yoon (2010, 16) cite Grunig (2006) who “more recently echoed the importance of return on investment (ROI) at the organizational level for the future of public relations research” (p. 16). Lee and Yoon (2010) looked at how much is public relations worth to an organization and how much economic value can public relations generate for the organization when the organization invests in public relations programs. Although the two scholars focused their research on international public relations, their analysis is relevant for it links together public relations with ROI.
Kim (2000) also highlights the actual bottom-line impact of public relations, by introducing an econometric model to test the relationship between the goals of public relations (i.e. reputation) and the bottom-line impact (i.e. revenue change) to the organization. Analyzing 92 companies in the general service industry from the Fortune 500 list over a 3-year period (1995–1997), he found a positive relationship (beta = 3.47) between reputation and revenue. Kim (2001) also proposed a two-step model of public relations expense on companies’ revenue change mediated by their reputation. He found that an increase in public relations expense (i.e. investment) was related to positive reputation, which also led to an increase in revenue (i.e. economic return).

Furthermore, Kiousis, Popescu and Mitrook (2007) tested the impact of public relations messages on three success indicators: media coverage, corporation reputation, and financial performance. Based on a content analysis and on public opinion survey data collected from 28 corporations ranked by Harris Interactive Reputation Quotient, the researchers found a positive relationship between public relations message tone and media coverage tone. They also found that media coverage attributes (i.e. corporate vision, corporate leadership, and corporate social responsibility) were positively related to a corporation’s bottom line in areas such as revenues, profits, and assets.

*Advertising value equivalency (AVE).*

Advertising Value Equivalents (AVEs) count the column inches of press publicity or seconds of air time gained and multiply the total by the advertising rate of the media in which the coverage appeared. This is the easiest method used by most consultancy firms or practitioners to link the public relations results with ROI: “It is not uncommon, using
this method, to find PR campaigns valued as the equivalent of many hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars of advertising” (Macnamara, 2006, 35).

However, AVE is a key metric only when it comes to media relations. Although criticized by the scholars, arguing about the AVE measurement method validity, practitioners still use it frequently (Macnamara, 2005, 2006; Jeffries-Fox, 2003). A 2001 Public Relations Society of America Internet survey of 4,200 members found press clippings were the leading method of measurement, relied on by 82% of PR practitioners (Macnamara, 2005, 2006). Commonly referred to as “measurement by kilogram” (Macnamara, 2005, 2006), collecting press clippings continues the focus on quantitative measurement, with little attention paid to the quality of media coverage. Moreover, press clippings present quantitative measurement of outputs only, not of outtakes or outcomes. Press clippings, tapes or transcripts indicate only that reporting occurred in the media. They do not indicate whether target audiences read, saw or heard the information and, if they did, whether it influenced their attitudes or behavior.

Because of these characteristics, the AVE concept generated much debate in public relations. The potential shortcomings of this metric come from what is called and how it is used by the practitioners (Jeffries-Fox, 2003). Jeffries-Fox (2003) considers that the name of this metric, highly used by the practitioners to “put a dollar value” (p. 1) on their media relations efforts, suggests that a news story of a certain size has equal importance and impact as an advertisement of the same size in that publication (p.3). Jeffries-Fox (2003) underlines that there has been no research to confirm whether this is true or not. Also, the way AVE is used appears to be faulted, according to the same author:
Another conceptual limitation of AVEs is that they only value what actually appear in the media. Yet it is often the case that public relations professionals counsel clients to behave in a way that purposefully results in an absence of publicity. In these cases no publicity at all is what is desired and what is valued. AVEs have no means of reflecting such value (p. 3).

Moreover, the nature of news communications is considered “fundamentally different” (p. 3) than the nature of advertising communications. An advertising piece generally requires repeated exposure to have an impact on consumers’ awareness, perceptions, attitudes and behaviors, whereas news stories are more diverse in the message they transmit. Because they are written by different journalists and outlets, they are different than the homogenous and somewhat controlled messages transmitted through advertising. Jeffries-Fox (2003, 4) underlines the fact that there is no research comparing the news coverage messages with the messages delivered by advertising.


Likely *et al.* (2006) highlight the differences between the various elements the PR program evaluation should measure, setting up a communication performance measurement framework around *outputs, outtakes, outcomes* and *outgrowths* (see Appendix 2). The scholar differentiates at each of these levels between *efficiency* (whether a given effect is produced with least cost and/or other resources) and *effectiveness* (refers to organizations’ ability to exploit resources in the environment):

1. The *outputs* refer to whatever materials are produced, distributed and covered/picked up. They are the PR “technician” responsibility.
2. The *outtakes* are considered to be at the same technical level, under the attractiveness of and attention to the materials that have been released, as well as the recall/retention/response rate.
3. The next level, bottom-up in Likely’s framework, is the managerial one (project management), where *outcomes* are important. These are considered to be the
communication effects: awareness, knowledge, understanding, perceptions, attitudes/opinions, and behaviors.

4. The first and foremost level are the outgrowths, which are the executives’ responsibility (strategic management), and refer to the positioning of the organization, through its reputation, brand equity, relationships and leadership.

Don Bartholomew (2007) developed a similar model of outputs, outtakes and outcomes, eliminating though the outgrowths (see Appendix 3). His framework is designed to increase the ability to determine ROI. Under outputs he includes everything that has to do with the exposure: number of hits, number of impressions, tonality, prominence, message inclusion, share of voice, share of online discussions etc. The outtakes are considered to be the signs of successful influence: message recall, message retention, and article readership, change in awareness and attitudes, and association with the brand. The outcomes define the success at the action level: visits to the store, event attendance, telling a friend, purchasing product, contacting the organization, vote, etc.

Models in public relations evaluation.

Despite the numerous investigations which underline evaluation, studies have consistently found that, while the importance of research evaluation is widely acknowledged in academia, in everyday practice it is still often neglected (Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Cutlip, 1994b; McCoy, 2005; Gregory & Watson, 2008). The effectiveness of public relations programs was often judged by intuition rather than by intellectual, rigorous procedures (Grunig & Hunt, 1984), and is considered to be relatively “casual and informal” (Hon, 1998, 112) and mainly takes the form of media analysis rather than audience centered research (Austin & Pinkleton, 2006).
In an attempt to solve some of the public evaluation research problems, scholars and several practitioners have designed models which try to explain the effectiveness of public relations function in an organizational environment. These models are idealized theoretical frameworks which aim to set up a standard in evaluation, while trying to align theory and practice to each other:

1. The PII model designed by Cutlip, Center and Broom (1985) (see Appendix 4);
2. Macnamara’s Macro model of PR Evaluation, renamed The Pyramid Model of PR Research (Macnamara, 1992, 2002) (see Appendix 5);
3. PR Effectiveness Yardstick developed by Walter Lindenmann (1993) (see Appendix 6);
4. The Continuing Model of Evaluation designed by Tom Watson (1997) (see Appendix 7); and
5. The Unified Model of Evaluation outlined by Paul Noble and Tom Watson (2005) (see Appendix 8).

These five models are the most comprehensive theoretical models in the literature, and include the concepts and the approaches in public relations evaluation which are the most researched by scholars until now.

**The PII model designed by Cutlip, Center and Broom (1985) (see Appendix 4).**

PII model (see Appendix 4), also known as The Preparation, Implementation and Impact model, treats evaluation like an ongoing process, in which “….each step in program evaluation contributes to increased understanding and adds information for assessing effectiveness” (Cutlip et al., 1994b, 414). According to Cutlip, the first step – preparation – assesses the adequacy of background information, the appropriateness and quality of messages. The second step – implementation – focuses, in the opinion of the same author, on the evaluation of tactics, by examining the number of messages sent to the media and how many people received them. Finally, the impact evaluation looks at
the changes in opinion, attitudes and behaviors, while having at the top of its impact
ladder the social and cultural change generated through the activity of public relations.
The PII Model (see Appendix 4) does not prescribe methodologies, but it “is valuable for
its separation of output and impact and for counselling against the confusion of these
value this model for “it acts as a checklist and as a reminder when planning evaluation”
(p. 79). The PII model emphasizes on the most common error in program evaluation,
which is substituting and shifting measures from one level to another level (Cutlip et al.,
2006). The most common example, as underlined by Cutlip et al., is when the number of
news releases sent, the amount of brochures distributed or the number of meetings held
(i.e. implementation efforts), are used to prove the program effectiveness (i.e. impact
results).

The Pyramid Model of PR Research (Macnamara, 2002) (see Appendix 5).

Macnamara (1992) developed a similar model that he called Macro
Communication Model in reference to marketing writer Philip Kotler’s macro
environment of company operations. Macnamara later renamed this model The Pyramid
Model of PR Research (Macnamara, 2002). The model represents public relations
programs and campaigns in a pyramidal form (see Appendix 5) which rise from a broad
base of inputs, through outputs to outcomes (called results in the initial model from
1992). The pinnacle represents the changes in attitudes and behavior (initially called just
“objectives achieved”). The addition of Macnamara model is that he proposes research
methodologies that can be applied to each step. Moreover, this model distinguishes
outputs and outtakes. For example, a news release can be evaluated as an output in terms of quality, readability and timeliness, but not as to whether a communication effect has been achieved. In other words, the media evaluation report should take into consideration this aspect, while differentiating between the number of messages sent, number of messages received and published in the media (outputs) and the outtakes. The outtakes are defined, in Macnamara’s model, by the type of messages reaching the right target audience, retention and understanding of messages. The complexity with which this assessment is being done will lead in this model to a proper evaluation of the final outcomes of the PR program, which are attitudinal and behavioral changes. The research methods recommended by Macnamara are: academic paper study, interviews, focus groups, observation, media monitoring and media content analysis, surveys and ultimately, sales (or voting results). Macnamara says that this framework “is theoretically sound but also practical in that it suggests the highest level and most rigorous measurement possible” (Macnamara, 2006, 18) for planning and managing evaluation of public relations. In addition, it recognizes communication as a multi-step process.

**The PR Effectiveness Yardstick (Lindenmann, 1993) (see Appendix 6).**

This model also sets a three-level approach (see Appendix 6). Its staging does not progress from planning to objectives. The first basic level measures outputs, such as media placements. The second, intermediate, level judges the number of messages retained and understood by the target audience, and the last advanced level examines outcomes, such as attitudes and behavior changes. Lindenmann is the one who
established the terminology – which has become standard (Watson & Noble, 2005, 82) – of outputs, outgrowth (outtakes) and outcomes. He adopts an approach to research and evaluation based on three levels of sophistication and depth rather than the chronological process of communication from planning through implementation to achievement of objectives. However, Lindenmann omits inputs as a stage in communication. He splits inputs into his intermediate and advanced levels. Therefore, this model has the advantage of separating cognitive and behavioral impact objectives, but it is not as clear that research should begin before outputs are produced. Like the Cutlip PII Model (see Appendix 4), Lindemann’s Effectiveness Yardstick does not specify which research methodologies should be used. However, in the accompanying text he broadly outlines a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques such as media content analysis at level one; focus groups, interviews with opinion leaders and polling of target groups at level two and, at level three (advanced), he suggests, before and after polling, observational methods, psychographic analysis and other social science techniques such as surveys (Macnamara, 2006, 20).

**The Continuing Model of Evaluation (Watson, 1997) (see Appendix 7).**

This model draws on the elements of the other models, but Watson comments that the Continuing model “offers elements that have not been included in the (previous) step-by-step models” (Watson & Noble, 2005, 95). It has an “iterative loop and takes into account the effects that are being created by the program” (p. 95). It is designed to create a dynamic and continuous evaluation process (see Appendix 7).
The PII model (see Appendix 4) and the Pyramid model of public relations research (see Appendix 5) arrange research and evaluation activities in chronological order of activity, from preparation/inputs to impact/outcomes for practical illustration, while in the Continuing model (see Appendix 7) input, output and outcome research are part of a dynamic and continuous process. Thus, the lack of an obvious dynamic quality in the other models led Watson to develop the Continuing model of evaluation. The elements of this model are: an initial stage of Research; the setting of Objectives and choice of Program Effects; from these follow the Strategy Selection and Tactical Choices. Throughout the program there are multiple levels of Formal and Informal Analysis. These lead to judgments on progress in terms of success or “staying alive” (p. 96).

Watson and Noble note that:

The judgments are feedback through iterative loops to each of the program elements. The loops assist the practitioners in validating the initial research and adding new data, adjusting the objectives and strategy, monitoring the progress to create the desired attitudinal or behavioral effects and helping with the adjustments or variation of tactics (p. 96).

The central element of this model is represented by the series of loops which reflect that research and evaluation are continuous. Overall, this process will determine if the organization will succeed or just continue to be at the survival level. As designed, the model can be applied to either a specific program or to the overall public relations activities of an organization.

*The Unified Model of Evaluation (Watson & Noble, 2005)* (see Appendix 8).

Drawing on all previously developed and published models, Tom Watson and Paul Noble went on to develop a more sophisticated model (see Appendix 8). This model
attempts to combine the best of other models and to produce a definitive approach. The Unified Evaluation Model identifies four stages in communication by adding Lindenmann’s concepts of outtakes or outgrowths to the three-stage concept advanced by other models. Noble and Watson prefer to call the four stages or levels Input, Output, Impact and Effect (Watson & Noble, 2005, 89). The input evaluation refers to the planning and preparation stage. The output stage is delivering the messages to the target audience. The effect evaluation looks at attitudes change, while the behaviors are measured though the last stage, called results. This model is a simplified version, which summarizes the other models, while taking into consideration evaluation for all the stages of the PR program. The key elements in this model are, however, the tactical and management feedback, which make the evaluation a continuous process.

**Nonprofit organizations.**

Nonprofit organization (NPO) management literature offers an unpretentious amount of attention to public relations. It acknowledges public relations importance, but does not elaborate much on the specifics. However, the public relations literature reveals, at a high degree, a translation of the standard corporate public relations measurement framework into the organizational public relations success evaluation of NPOs, while the higher interest is on how public relations can be made accountable for the success of fundraising in NOPs, and for successful donors relations.

**Nonprofit sector.**

The nonprofit sector in the United States has witnessed a considerable growth in the past years. In 2007, there were more than 1.64 million nonprofit organizations in the
United States (Butler, 2008: http://www.bls.gov/opub/cwc/cm20081022ar01p1.htm). The nonprofit sector has expanded in terms of number of organizations and number of paid employees. In 1994, there were more than 1.1 million nonprofit organizations in the United States (Internal Revenue Service Data Book 1997, Publication 55B: http://www.irs.gov/taxstats/article/0,,id=97216,00.html), employing about 5.4 million people, or 4.4 percent of all workers. By 2007, nonprofits employed 8.7 million workers, or 5.9 percent of all workers (Butler, 2008: http://www.bls.gov/opub/cwc/cm20081022ar01p1.htm).

Lohmann (1992a, 1992b) conceptualized a theory of meaningful nonprofit sector, describing the essence of why a distinctive sector from business and government exists in the American society: “to create a protected space for the collective expression of what people find most important in their lives.” (Lohmann, 1992b, foreword by Van Til, xi). Lohmann uses the metaphor of commons for nonprofits, which are characterized by four dimensions: (a) uncoerced participation; (b) shared purposes and resources; (c) mutuality (a community of shared values and interests); and (d) fairness.

Generally, the goal of a nonprofit organization is to bring about a change in individuals and in society. According to Drucker (2005), the first thing the NPO management should consider is defining a realistic mission. In other words, the NPO management paradigm is ideally focused on results and success of the actions the NPO is taking towards the change it wants to bring. However, Drucker (2005) notices that nonprofit organizations tend not to give priority to performance and results as businesses do, although performance and results are far more important – and far more difficult to measure and control – in the nonprofit organization than in a business. In a business there
is the financial bottom line. According to Drucker (2005), “profit and loss are not enough by themselves to judge performance, but at least they are something concrete” (p. 107). For a business, profit will be used to measure the business performance, whereas in a NPO executives think through the desired results before the means of measuring performance and results can be determined. While offering this perspective, Drucker considers that the very way an organization defines and measures performance leads to a much different way to run that organization.

However, as nonprofit executives begin to define the performance that makes the mission of their institution operational, Drucker points out that two attitudes need to be avoided. First, the recklessness – to say the cause is everything and if people don’t want to support it, too bad for them – “performance means concentrating available resources where the results are” (p. 109). Second attitude to be avoided would be the opposite of the first one – to go for the easy results rather than for results that further the mission. Essentially, nonprofits fail to perform unless they start out without clearly shaping their mission, “for the mission defines what results matter in a particular nonprofit organization” (p. 109). Drucker concludes by highlighting that the results of a non-profit organization are “always outside the organization, not inside” (p. 110). Good intentions and hopes cannot justify non-results: good intentions, good policies, good decisions must turn into action. “The statement ‘This is what we are here for’ must eventually become ‘This is how we do it’” (p. 110).

Rushing’s 1974 study on the differences between profit and nonprofit organizations is among the few which conducted a systematic analysis regarding the differences in organizational efficiency and effectiveness between the two types of
organization. The study, which focused on for-profit and non-for-profit hospitals, revealed that these differences stem from the fact that one type is primarily an economically oriented organization and the other is not. Results are consistent with the postulate that in profit-making organizations, economic outcomes and criteria exert greater influence on decision making and hence on organizational process.

Later, Drucker (2005) identifies few but essential differences between businesses and NPOs. Among these, the most significant is the performance area. Businesses usually define performance too narrowly – as the financial bottom line. This is a very specific and concrete performance definition. It cannot be argued about whether a corporation is doing better because results within terms of profitability or market standing, innovation or cash flow are easily quantifiable and very hard to ignore (Drucker, 2005, 108).

Meanwhile, in a nonprofit organization, there is no such bottom line (Drucker, 2005). At the same time, in a NPO there is the temptation to downplay results by saying: “(…) we are serving a good cause, we are making world a better place.” (p. 111). However, Drucker notes: “That’s not enough. If a business wastes its resources on non-results, by and large it loses its own money. In a nonprofit organization, though, it’s somebody else’s money – the donors’ money” (p. 111). In other words, service organizations are accountable to donors, accountable for putting the money where the results are, and are responsible for performance. Moreover, although NPOs find it very hard to define the results, this can be done, according to Drucker, by setting up ways to achieve immediate results and set up long-term goals building on those initial results.

According to Drucker (2005) another basic difference between businesses and nonprofits is that nonprofits invariably have a multitude of constituencies, and each of
them sees the organization differently. “Building around the long term goals is the only way to integrate these (multitude of) interests – if you focus on short term results, they (the different audiences) will all jump in different directions” (Drucker, 2005, 111).

Furthermore, it is far more difficult to measure and control a NPO than a business (Rushing, 1974; Drucker, 2005). In a business there is the financial bottom line that shows success of that organization, whereas in a NPO success depends on the mission of the organization. For example, Susan G. Komen for Cure (www.komen.org) has as a core mission to encourage research for the cure of breast cancer. As support for this, the goals of the NPO are to bring more early detection, more hope and more survivors. However, the overarching goal of Susan G. Komen refers to an economic cause – raising money in order to finance breast cancer cure research. The second type of goals are moral causes – bringing together survivors and providing moral support to the families and to current patients, as well as encouraging women to get tested regularly.

The long term goal is the fundamental change that the nonprofit institutions aim to make within the society and in human beings; then they project that goal onto the concerns of each of the institution’s constituencies. This requires a different planning from what business people mean by the term. To formulate the plan successfully, nonprofit executives think through the concerns of each of the organization’s constituencies: “the nonprofits are human-change agents” (Drucker, 2005, 112). “Their (NPOs) results are therefore always a change in people: in their behavior, in their circumstances, in their vision, in their health, in their hopes, and above all, in their competence and capacity” (p. 112).
The competitive environment in the nonprofit sector, which began in early 1990s (Brinckerhoff, 2009, 26), brought the two areas – businesses and NPOs – closer together. There is now an intense competition in each sector for clients, for dollars, for visibility, for air time and advertising space, for clicks and eyeballs on websites and for quality staff (Brinckerhoff, 2009). For this reason, Brinckerhoff introduces ten characteristics of successful nonprofits, which, in most part seem to be a standard for organizational success in general, not necessarily for nonprofits only (Brinckerhoff, 2009, 32-33).

Successful nonprofit organizations:

1. Have a viable mission;
2. Are ethical;
3. Are accountable;
4. Are transparent;
5. Have a businesslike board of directors;
6. Have a strong, well-educated staff;
7. Embrace technology for reaching the mission;
8. Engage in social entrepreneurship;
9. Have a bias for marketing;
10. Have a diversified income [are financially empowered].

Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld (1998, 28) distinguish, in their longitudinal study about nonprofit organizational change, between different types of NPOs: charitable nonprofits (public benefit nonprofits) and clubs (mutual benefit nonprofits), NPOs that rely on the sales of services vs. those that rely heavily on donated income, nonprofits that provide ordinary private goods, trust goods, and collective or public goods, and finally, charities that use employees and charities run by volunteers. The two polar areas the researchers group these types of NPOs in are the utilitarian public charities (businesslike in nature and commercial) – they sell private goods and services directly to consumers
and use employees as service providers – and normative public charities – more communitarian in style.

**Public relations in nonprofit organizations.**

Feinglass (2005) considers that public relations is the key activity to survival for “NPOs effective fundraising, for attracting members/ volunteers, energizing supporters and fulfilling organization’s mission” (p. xi).

While public relations evaluation literature is marked by the Excellence Study, in which researchers suggested that in order for an organization to achieve its goals, building long-term, positive relationships with strategic publics is important (Grunig et al., 1992), the nonprofit public relations literature translates this into the nonprofit organizational environment. It was not until the last few years that relationship building and management of relationships with publics emerged as the key research interest in public relations, with emphasis on nonprofit organizations. Most of the studies emphasize on the tactical impact of public relations in NPOs, especially in terms of donors relations and fundraising (Kelly, 1991, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1998; Gordon & Kelly, 1999; Sargeant, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2004; Waters, 2006, 2008, 2009c), advocacy (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Bortree, 2007, 2010) and stewardship (O’Neil, 2007, 2008; Hedrick, 2008; Waters, 2009a, 2009b). Little attention is given, however, to the over strategic contribution of PR in nonprofit organizations, and even less to measuring the overall PR impact on a NPO success.
Donors relations and fundraising

Dyer et al. (2002) give a descriptive general view on the public relations function and activities within a NPO. The research emphasizes on the different activities implied by the public relations practice in the nonprofit sector (Dyer et al., 2002, 16). One of the main findings of this study is that in most NPOs a sole practitioner manages the fundraising, event management, volunteer management, board relations and information campaigns.

Grunig et al. (2002) include, as part of the Excellence Study (Grunig et al., 1984, 1992, 2002), a comparison of means for excellence variables for corporations, government agencies, associations, and nonprofit organizations. This information helps the understanding of how the public relations literature approached nonprofit organizations, when it came to proving their impact and effectiveness. Grunig’s comparison is one of the most specific and thorough researches which define the success of the public relations activity by looking at the type of organization. It looks at corporations, government agencies, associations, and nonprofit organizations, through the lens of the Overall Index of Excellence (and non-excellence) variables. The study shows the areas where non-for-profit organizations are significantly different from corporations and other types of organizations studied. Consequently, the areas where the corporations significantly differ from nonprofits are: the high preference of NPOs for press agentry, as compared to corporate businesses, and for media relations role, both non-excellence variables in Grunig’s study. On the positive side, the NPOs seem to have the communication head as part of the dominant coalition, with a score significantly higher than the one reported by corporations. Being part of the dominant coalition is one of the
core variables in the Excellence Study, also showing the level of acceptance of PR in the strategic plan and a lower level in terms of authoritarian culture than corporations. As described by the scores of the Excellence Study, in corporations the public relations person has a managerial and not a technical role, while in nonprofit organizations, the public relations head occupies both roles – he or she might be the only public relations staff member. Grunig concludes that “the characteristics of excellence are generic for all types of organizations” (p. 86), and that “excellence is not the sole property of large corporate public relations departments” (p. 87).

O’Neil’s (2007) and Waters’ (2006) empirical research on nonprofit organizations both revealed that the public relations relationship indicators of trust, satisfaction, commitment, and shared power differentiate donation giving amounts. Neither study, however, examined the way in which public relations tactics might contribute to the long-term indicators of success. In 2008, O’Neil conducted a study measuring the impact of communications on building trust, commitment and satisfaction (the indicators suggested by the Relationship Index, Hon & Grunig, 1999) among donors. One year before he investigated and demonstrated that increased trust, satisfaction, and commitment are related to increased donor support in NPOs (O’Neil, 2007). In the 2008 study, the researcher focuses on the impact public relations tactics have on the long-term success of a nonprofit organization, finding that public relations and fundraising practitioners should ensure that they include an explanation of how funds are used in multiple venues.

Bortree’s (Bortree 2007, 2010; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009) studies focus mainly on relationship maintenance strategies, dialogic strategies and outcomes for nonprofit organizations with their volunteers, advocates and donors. The researcher puts an
emphasis on adolescents, as potential volunteers and advocates for nonprofits. The value of these studies stand in identifying a new group of nonprofit constituencies, neglected by the literature, and in testing intended behavior beyond the scope of one organization-public relationship:

Prior research on intended behavior that results from organization–public relationships has focused on future intention to remain in the relationship with the organization. This study examined the intention to continue the behavior, volunteering, beyond the scope of one organization-public relationship (Bortree, 2010, 20).

Kelly (1991, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1998; Gordon & Kelly, 1999) has linked nonprofit public relations with measurement and evaluation through the study of effective fundraising management, while examining organization-public relationships within the context of nonprofit organizations. Kelly also draws from the theory provided by the Excellence Study (Grunig, et al., 1984, 1992, 2002) to describe how to use procedures and techniques in order to build and maintain long-term relationships with an important stakeholder of an NPO: the donors. As part of the fundraising process, Kelly recommends a five-step process that consists of research, objectives, programming, evaluation, and stewardship (ROPES). The stewardship step aims to nurture the relationship between an organization and donors. Kelly (1998, 26) considers that stewardship, “a step erroneously missing in public relations” (p. 26), consists of these four elements:

1. reciprocity, appreciating and recognizing donors;
2. responsible gift use, using gifts from donors for which they were intended;
3. reporting, informing donors of how their gifts were used;
4. relationship nurturing, encouraging donors to renew gifts.

The evaluation is considered the “most important issue facing fundraising” (Kelly, 1998, 427), because there is a misunderstanding regarding the success of
fundraising which is too frequently determined by the amount of dollars received in a given year. Kelly defines the effectiveness of fundraising through looking at success evaluation from different perspectives. The success depends on gift utility – the degree to which a gift contributes to organizational goals and priorities; on delay factors – in most of the cases, the costs received in a given year have a weak relationship to the dollars received from major gifts (which sometimes are paid in multiyear installments); and on the degree to which the gifts align to three levels of measuring effectiveness: mission, goals and strategies (Kelly, 1991, 1998). At the first level, effectiveness is measured by fundraising’s impact of the organization. The second level measures effectiveness by the impact of fundraising on donors. The basic level for evaluating fundraising effectiveness, according to Kelly, is to measure the impact of the function on the charitable organization itself – to what degree the gifts support the organization’s mission, goals and strategies.

The method Kelly (1998) suggests as best for nonprofit fundraising evaluation is the evaluation by objectives. Following the ROPES process, public relations practitioners in NPOs set objectives before programming stage starts. Then, the practitioners “build into the objectives the means by which results will be evaluated. If the objectives are met, the departmental goals are fulfilled” (p. 430). Thus, the public relations department (or fundraising department) contributes to the organizational effectiveness. Setting impact objectives is an essential step, according to Kelly, in achieving desired results. In the opinion of the same scholar, the impact objectives should take into account six effects: awareness, accuracy, understanding, agreement, behavior, and repeat behavior, while being careful not to substitute measurement of one effect for another or measurement of output as an indicator of impact. In line with the Excellence perspective, Kelly (1998)
Program Evaluation

Evaluation in public relations has the scientific meaning rooted in social research (Patton, 1982; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Patton (1982) has a broad definition that aligns to the public relations field:

The practice of evaluation involves systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs, personnel, and products for use by specific people to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness, and make decisions with regard to what those programs, personnel or products are doing and affecting (p. 15).

In other words, evaluation seeks accountability and has the aim of improving effectiveness. Watson and Noble (1999, 2005) set out seven principles of evaluation:

1. Evaluation is research;
2. Evaluation looks both ways (formative and summative);
3. Evaluation is user and situation dependent;
4. Evaluation is short term (less than 12 months);
5. Evaluation is long term (operates at a broader, strategic level, and usually concerns issues management, corporate reputation and/or brand positioning);
6. Evaluation is comparative (makes no absolute judgments);
7. Evaluation is multifaceted (because PR is a multi-step process).

Connors (1988) considers that evaluation design is an outgrowth of the objectives and “need not to be sophisticated or complicated” (p. 33.8). Connors refers to evaluation as to a “systematic process designed to reduce uncertainty about the effectiveness of a particular program or program component” (p. 33.8). Furthermore, the evaluation process needs to be a continuous process which can be used in order to make changes and adjustments in a program, as it proceeds.
Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) take a different stand in defining the evaluation. They look at the main two types of defining evaluation (objectives-based definitions and definitions that “equate evaluation with any one methodology”). The authors reject the two main directions and put forward the definition of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981, 1988, 1994, 2003):

“evaluation is the systematic assessment of the worth or merit of an object”. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) discard the idea that evaluation means determining whether objectives have been achieved, “because following it can cause evaluations to fail” (p. 8). Some objectives prove to be unworthy of achievement or “corrupt, dysfunctional, unimportant, not oriented to the needs of the intended beneficiaries, or mainly reflective of the profit motives or other conflicts of interest of those in charge of the program” (p. 8). Furthermore, the objectives-based definition is just looking at the outcomes, whereas evaluation process should also examine the goals, structure and processes, if evaluation is geared toward improvement. Also, evaluation should not equate with any one methodology. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) point out that “instead, it should encompass all methods that are necessary and useful to reach defensible judgments of programs or other entities, and evaluators should selectively apply given methods” (p. 8).

Research Questions

As shown, the considerable body of literature on public relations measurement and evaluation has not yet differentiated between types of organization. The wide range of research directions, models and approaches in public relations measurement and evaluation have mostly focused on developing new concepts and answering questions of
how the evaluation process should be best constructed in order to prove the value of public relations within the organization. This study takes the research one step further, investigating the evaluation process specifically in a nonprofit organization, through the investigation of the following questions:

RQ1: How is the United Way of Delaware County, IN, evaluation process constructed?

RQ2: What are the indicators used by United Way of Delaware County, IN, to define their public relations and organizational success?

RQ3: What would a dedicated nonprofit public relations evaluation model look like for UWDC?

The element that qualified United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) as unit of analysis in this research is its current concern with measuring the impact it has within the community. The organization showed a high interest in improving the evaluation system of its programs in the following years. In this context, the analysis of how UWDC integrates the evaluation of the public relations efforts in the overall organizational performance assessment model will serve as a case study for the paper. The case study was designed to help answering the specific questions regarding the evaluation of public relations in a nonprofit organization, specifically in United Way of Delaware County.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

Case study research is frequently associated with teaching, through its quality of generating frameworks for discussions (van Ruler et al., 2008, 235). However, the case study is a distinctive type of formal research, and the difference between case studies for teaching purposes and case study research lies in the degree of precision and depth of the data presented and analyzed (Yin, 2009).

Yin (2009) believes that case study should be considered in a research primarily if these following three aspects describe the study: the research question requires an extensive and in-depth description of a certain phenomenon; the investigator has little control on the events; and the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context. Case study is meant to contribute to the common knowledge of organizational phenomena. Moreover, it studies complex phenomena: case study helps investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events – organizational and managerial processes, small group behavior, neighborhood change, school performance, international relations, etc. (Yin, 2009). The purpose of doing case studies is to analyze processes and their results, emphasizing the dynamic nature of the phenomena (van Ruler et al., 2008). “The essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or a set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result” (Schramm, 1971, quoted by Yin, 2009, 17).
In the present research, focused on NPO public relations evaluation, the analysis is directed toward the decision of how to do the measurement and evaluation, what the organization is looking at when measuring the PR efficiency and how it decides to implement the evaluation process.

Furthermore, according to Stacks (2002), “there is no more descriptive approach to public relations than the case study” (p. 71), because case study is aimed at illustrating and analyzing the organization and its processes in detail. The case study methodology ultimately “offers a mean of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon” (Merriam, 1988, 32). In addition, Yin (2009) considers case study methodology adequate for how and why type-of-research questions. In other words, it refers to mostly explanatory questions: questions of fact and policy (Stacks, 2002), since it investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.

There is no consensus on the different types of case study. However, there are three most often used categorizations: Yin (2009), Merriam (1988, 1998), and Tellis (1997). Yin (2009) mentions exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive case studies. Exploratory case studies are commonly considered to be the introduction to more ample social research projects, while explanatory case studies may be used for causal investigations. Descriptive case studies, on the other hand, require the development of a theory or basic framework prior to the description itself.

Merriam (1988, 1998) says the end product of a case study can be primarily descriptive, interpretive, or evaluative. A descriptive case study presents a detailed
account of the phenomenon under study and “move in a theoretical vacuum” (Lijphart, 1971, 691). Descriptive case studies are “neither guided by established or hypothesized generalization nor motivated by a desire to formulate general hypotheses” (p. 27). They are mostly used in areas where little research has been conducted. Interpretive case studies too, contain rich, thick description. However, these descriptive data are used to develop conceptual categories or to illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to the data gathering. In other words, a case study researcher gathers as much information about the problem as possible with the intent of interpreting or theorizing about the phenomenon. Evaluative case studies involve description, explanation and judgment – this type of case study weights information to produce judgment, as the final and ultimate act of evaluation.

Tellis (1997) talks about intrinsic, instrumental and collective case studies. Intrinsic case studies are those where the researcher has an interest in the case; instrumental case studies are those in which the case is used to understand more than what is obvious to the observer; and the collective case study is used when a group of several cases is studies. In short, the case study’s importance derives from its ability to provide a better understanding of the phenomenon or to offer the researcher a basis for developing new theoretical frameworks, concepts, or hypotheses (van Ruler et al., 2008, 237).

Because this study seeks to answer questions that arise from and challenge a conceptual review of models and tries to understand the theoretical framework within a specific setting, it can be considered as an interpretive and instrumental case study. Moreover, this research will not attempt to make statistical generalizations to a larger
population. As Yin (2009) explained, it will try to make analytical generalization to expand theory. Walton (1992 describes cases as being “wrapped in theories” (p. 122). According to Walton, cases are “embodiments of causal processes operating in microcosm,” and are being used “to demonstrate a causal argument about how general social forces take shape and produce results in specific settings” (p. 122). Moreover, understanding a specific case by applying available knowledge is an important intellectual task for social scientists, as well as “understanding a particular empirical instance in its own right and contrasting it with other cases” (p. 122). These are the advantages of the case study, which generally builds the “practical steps toward constructing theoretical interpretations” (p. 128). Walton (1992) concludes saying that case studies are likely to produce the best theory. Thus, the present study seeks to develop a theoretical framework for public relations evaluation, specifically for nonprofit organizations.

**Research Design**

I. **Research questions.**

RQ1: How is the United Way of Delaware County, IN, evaluation process constructed?

RQ2: What are the indicators used by United Way of Delaware County, IN, to define their public relations and organizational success?

RQ3: What would a dedicated nonprofit public relations evaluation model look like for UWDC?
The research questions focus on the evaluation processes in United Way of Delaware County, IN (UWDC). Specifically, they direct the investigation to the way the evaluation and assessment of impact is currently conducted in the organization. Also, the study looks at the way public relations evaluation is being integrated in the overall organizational evaluation process within UWDC. In addition, the study investigates the current success indicators used by UWDC regarding organizational and public relations impact. Ultimately, the research seeks to design a theoretical model which would be specific for evaluating the programs and activities of UWDC, as well as the overall organizational success, through the public relations component.

II. Case study protocol.

Overview of the case study research.

The main focus of this study is the evaluation and measurement process within UWDC, especially in the context of the operational changes in the past few years: from funds allocations to community solutions model. The goal of the study is to define the way UWDC integrates public relations evaluation into the overall organizational success metrics and to build a nonprofit public relations evaluation model for United Way of Delaware County.

The UWDC community solutions model is based on engaging as many community actors and partners as possible in the organization’s campaigns, as long as these partners have the resources or the interest to contribute. The resources UWDC handles are not only financial resources, but also expertise, time, network, technical capabilities etc.
Field procedures.

Case study protocol questions (i.e. the specific questions that the case study investigator must keep in mind while collecting the data, and the potential sources of information for answering each question):

1. What is the organizational history and background?
2. What is the organizational structure for UWDC?
3. Does the organization have a strategic plan for the current year?
4. What is UWDC’s philosophy on evaluation?
5. How is UWDC’s success measurement system organized?
6. What are the success indicators that UWDC has in place?
7. How is the public relations and communications component integrated in the overall organizational strategic plan?
8. What are the main public relations and communication activities of UWDC?

Sources of data.

This case study is based on documentary analysis. The nonprofit sector has not been previously explored in order to develop a dedicated theoretical framework for public relations evaluation. Thus, at this stage, the research should focus on data collected with as little subjective interference as possible. The main sources of data for the present study will be the organizational documents of United Way of Delaware County. Additionally, several informal meetings with the President/CEO and the Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment will be set up for acquiring internal and external relevant documents. The research main interest will be on the following sources of data:

- United Way and UWDC web sites.
- Public nonprofit directories.
- Organizational strategic plan.
- Communications and public relations plan.
- Organizational chart.
- Internal evaluation reports.
Strategies.

The guidelines for obtaining and organizing the data are defined as following:

- Obtain and list, in the same table the organizational goals and the success indicators.
- Obtain media materials and see how the media relations activity is monitored and evaluated.
- List the benchmarks the organization is using in setting up the objectives.
- Expand the list of case study protocol questions, if necessary, and make sure that each of those questions has an answer in the collected documents.
- While acquiring documents, briefly describe their content and the reasons they are important for the study.

Format for the collected data.

- Hard-copy and electronic format for all internal documents.
- Links to the web sites which are a source of public data, with the date when they were retrieved.
- All documents are named and dated.
- Documents will be numbered while received, in chronological order.

Guide for the case study report outline.

The case study will be written and reported by pursuing the following sections:

- Research questions
- Description of the research design
- Description of the unit of analysis
- Data collection procedures
- Findings
- Discussion and conclusions
- Bibliographical information

III. Data collection.

This case study uses two main sources for data collection. One source of data is consisted of the (online) public records of United Way and United Way of Delaware County, IN. The second source of data is based on documentation consisting mainly of internal documents: strategic plans, organizational objectives, programs and initiative
goals, previous evaluation reports, media materials and newspaper clippings, and other organizational records.

The most relevant documents used for this study are included in the Appendices section, as illustration. The list of the organizational documents used for this case study consists of:

1. United Way of Delaware County Mission, Community Goals and Strategies Matrix (see Appendix 9)
2. United Way of Delaware County Philosophy: “Live United” (see Appendix 10)
3. United Way of Delaware County 2010 – 2011 Programs and Initiatives (see Appendix 11)
4. Organizational Chart (see Appendix 12)
5. United Way of Delaware County 2010 – 2013 (Outcome-Focused) Strategic Plan (Excerpts and extended version) (see Appendix 13)
6. 2010 – 2013 – Strategic Goals (see Appendix 14)
7. The Road to Community Impact. Changing Direction (see Appendix 15)
8. Strategic Dashboard – Internal Performance Indicators (see Appendix 16)
9. 2009 Communications Plan Outline – put together by Joseph David Advertising
11. Guiding Principles for the Transformation to the Community Solutions Business Model (see Appendix 18)
12. News clippings about the switch from community funds allocation to community solutions model (see Appendix 19)
13. Community Solutions Investment Process – Q&As for the media (see Appendix 20)
14. Investment Process Summary – press material (see Appendix 21)
15. 2010 Program outcomes: Education, Income, Health (see Appendix 22)
CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDY

Unit of Analysis

This study is based on a single-case design of United Way of Delaware County, Indiana, Inc. The case relies on documentary and secondary analysis, and investigates the public relations evaluation practice of this nonprofit organization (NPO). It is a holistic design, looking at the global nature of the PR evaluation process in the nonprofit organization.

Organizational background.

United Way.

United Way of America (http://liveunited.org/), based in Alexandria, Virginia, is a non-profit organization that works with nearly 1,300 local United Way offices throughout the United States. The organization was founded in Denver, Colorado in 1887, under the name of Charity Organization Society. The founders were the church leaders of the community, and the main purpose of the organization at that time was to plan and coordinate local services and to conduct a single fund-raising campaign for 22 agencies (http://liveunited.org/pages/history). Currently United Way expanded beyond the American borders, United Way Worldwide (http://worldwide.unitedway.org/) being able to provide leadership and support for a network of nearly 1,800 community-based United
Way offices in 45 countries and territories

The story of United Way started in 1887 (http://liveunited.org/pages/history), when a Denver priest, two ministers and a rabbi recognized the need for cooperative action to address their city’s welfare problems. The Rev. Myron W. Reed, Msgr. William J.O’Ryan, Dean H. Martyn Hart and Rabbi William S. Friedman put their heads together to plan the first united campaign for ten health and welfare agencies. They created an organization to serve as an agent to collect funds for local charities, as well as to coordinate relief services, counsel and refer clients to cooperating agencies, and make emergency assistance grants in cases which could not be referred. That year, Denver raised $21,700 and created a movement that would spread throughout the country to become the United Way.

In 1918 executives of 12 fund-raising federations met in Chicago and formed the American Association for Community Organizations (AACO), the predecessor to United Way of America, while a year later, in 1919, Rochester, New York, used the name Community Chest, a name widely adopted by United Way organizations and used until the early 1950s. This year marked the beginning of a 10-year growth period in the number of Community Chests: 39 in 1919, reaching 353 in 1929. In 1948 more than 1,000 communities had already established United Way organizations (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 1971 United Way of America moved from New York City to Alexandria, Virginia, and two years later, in 1973, United Way and NFL partnership is established, with the scope of increasing public awareness of social service issues facing the country.
In addition to public service announcements in which volunteer NFL players, coaches and owners appear, NFL players support their local United Ways through personal appearances, special programs, and sitting on United Way governing boards (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 1974 the organization established a record: United Ways raised $1,038,995,000 in America and Canada, the first time in history that an annual campaign of a single organization raised more than $1 billion. United Ways undertook with the National Football League (NFL) the largest public-service campaign in the nation's history; a major part of that campaign was Great Moments, the televised United Way/NFL public-service announcements. In the same year United Way International was formed, in order to help nations around the world form United Way-type organizations. In 1982 United Way of America's new National Service and Training Center opened in August, increasing the organization's ability to assist the nation's 2,200 United Ways, while in 1987 United Way recognized its centennial by saluting the America volunteer through many programs, including a dedication of a United Way postage stamp by the U.S. Postal Service (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, a fully staffed Operations Center at United Way of America worked closely with other organizations to ensure that those in need received help. In 1993 the corporate community identified a demand for easier, more cost-efficient ways to process workplace campaigns. The United Way Board saw these resolutions as the first steps in ensuring that United Way continued to be the premier workplace fund-raiser because of its ability to better meet customers' needs through the use of new technology (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).
In 1994 United Way of America was selected by Financial World magazine as the charity of choice and for its leadership in not-for-profit ethics and accountability. In the same year the first edition of United Way of America's Quality Awards took place. These awards recognized United Way organizations that demonstrated measurable progress in customer satisfaction, accountability and productivity. In 1995 United Way of America's Board of Governors unanimously approved the adoption of Strategic Direction for United Way: Charting the Path for Building Better Communities.

In October of 1996, United Way of America identified healthy children, healthy families and healthy communities as focus areas under the strategic plan. In the following years’ campaigns (1997 - 1998), United Ways collectively raised $3.4 billion, boosting revenues by more than $150 million for a 4.7 percent increase over 1996-1997 levels. In 1999 Bank of America Foundation donates $50 million over 5 years to local United Ways in 22 states where they conduct business to support United Way's Birth to Work Agenda, previously called Success by 6®. In the same year Bill and Melinda Gates donate $10.5 million to support vital United Way programs and services to strengthen the United Way system (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

2000 was a year of changes and new initiatives. United Way started developing a national brand management strategy designed to differentiate United Way brand and system. The strategy helped to reposition United Way as more than a "fundraiser", but rather as the leading community impact organization. Also in the year 2000 United Way and its partners, the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems, successfully petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to designate "211" for health and human services information and referral. Originally created by United Way of Atlanta,
211 is an easy-to-remember and universally recognizable telephone number that makes a critical connection between individuals and families in need and the appropriate community-based organizations and government agencies. Further on the same year United Way of America launched the United Way State of Caring Index®. The index measures the needs of American and the caring and compassion of the nation, as well as each state in America (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In the 2000-2001 campaigns, United Way generated a record-breaking $3.91 billion in resources. For the fifth year in a row, campaign growth outpaced inflation. In December 2001, the preliminary report of the Task Force on Strengthening the United Way System – Rising to the Challenges – was presented to UWA's Board of Governors and the United Way system's National Professional Council (NPC). The proposed mission statement "to improve lives by mobilizing the caring power of communities" and vision statement are adopted by UWA's Board of Governors and strongly endorsed by the NPC (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).


In 2003 New Membership Standards for United Ways were designed and adopted, in order to enhance the level of accountability and transparency in United Way operations. In the same year United Way of America launched what matters® advertising campaign. what matters® is an articulation of the commitment United Way has toward
creating meaningful and tangible impact in communities across America
(http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 2004 United Way showed strong relief activity. In response to the devastating
hurricanes that ravaged the state of Florida, United Ways throughout Florida led response
and recovery efforts by identifying the most serious needs in devastated communities.
The Florida 2-1-1 Network responded to thousands of telephone calls directing victims to
services such as shelters, food, medical assistance, disaster preparedness and response
activities, post-disaster assistance, and recovery information. Local 2-1-1 operators also
matched volunteers with opportunities to give help in affected communities
(http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

The tsunami that struck South Asia focused attention on that area of the world.
The United Way Coordinated Crisis Response Team worked collaboratively with staff
from United Way International, United Way of America, and United Way affiliates in
India, Indonesia, Kenya, Malaysia, and Thailand to collectively respond to the Indian
Ocean communities impacted by the disasters (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 2005 United Way of America updated its Standards of Excellence. First
adopted in 1973 and last updated in 1988, the Standards – which provide a
comprehensive description of benchmark standards and best practices – reflect the
organization's strategic shift from its traditional role as a fundraiser to a new mission
focused on identifying and addressing the long-term needs of communities. Furthermore,
United Way launched an effort in 2005 to identify and track troubling social issues that
are common across communities in the U.S. The research showed America has fared in
improving education, income and health status (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).
In 2006 United Way of America and MTV create Storm Corps, an Alternative Spring Break program that invites young people to help United Way rebuild the Gulf Coast after the devastating hurricanes of 2005. Nearly 100 young adults traveled to Biloxi, MS, and Foley, AL, to assist with rebuilding and recovery efforts (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 2007 the United Way Financial Stability Partnership™ was introduced. The national initiative will empower low- to moderate-income people to achieve long-term financial stability that leads to independence. United Way annual revenue topped $4 billion for the first time, continuing its status as the nation’s largest charity (http://liveunited.org/pages/history).

In 2008 United Way launched the 10-year goals in Education, Income and Health through the report "Goals for the Common Good, the United Way Challenge to America" (http://liveunited.org/pages/mission-and-goals/), reinforcing the new role United Way takes within communities: putting resources together in order to achieve the community goals in three core areas: education, income, and health (http://liveunited.org/pages/mission-and-goals/).

“Our nation can’t accept these conditions¹. We need to challenge our systems – to create opportunities for a better life for everyone. To move more aggressively in this direction, United Way drew on research and sought input from a broad range of partners to gauge where progress has – and has not – been made over the last 10 years. This information is the foundation for these Goals for the Common

¹ “Almost one in four working parents don’t earn enough to provide for their families. An alarming 25 percent of teenagers will not graduate on time, imperiling their chances to make a successful transition to adulthood. Only one in three adults can be considered healthy, based on risk factor data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and more than 49 million Americans lack even basic health insurance.” Brian A. Gallagher, President & CEO, United Way, in Goals for the Common Good, the United Way Challenge to America (2008, 3).
Good. By 2018, we as a nation must: cut by half the number of young people who
drop out of high school, cut by half the number of lower-income families that lack
financial stability, increase by a third the number of youths and adults who are
healthy and avoid risky behaviors” (p. 3)

The main focus of United Way is identifying and solving pressing community
issues, as well as making measurable changes in the communities through partnerships
with schools, government agencies, businesses, financial institutions, voluntary and
neighborhood associations, faith-based organizations, and other charitable organizations.
The issues that United Way organizations focus on are most of the times determined
locally because of the diversity of the communities served. However, the actions of all
United Ways are derived from the following three sectors: education, income and health.
The education emphasis refers to helping children and youth achieve their potential, the
income sector promotes financial stability and independence, and the health component
emphasizes on the importance of improving people’s health. The organization conducts
its activities by mobilizing people in the communities to give, advocate, and volunteer to
improve the conditions in which they live (http://liveunited.org/pages/organizational-
background/).

In May 2009 United Way of America and United Way International formally
joined forces to become United Way Worldwide
Through this integrated and interdependent United Way plans to increase its
organizational performance and results through the United Way members and affiliates
around the world. United Way Worldwide is currently the leadership and support
organization for the network of nearly 1,800 community-based United Ways in 46
countries and territories. The organization envisions a world where all individuals and families achieve their human potential through education, income stability and healthy lives.

*United Way mission.*

“United Way improves lives by mobilizing the caring power of communities around the world to advance the common good.”

*United Way goals.*

These refer to the 10-year program designed to achieve the following goals by 2018:

- Improve education, and cut the number of high school dropouts – 1.2 million students, every year – in half.
- Help people achieve financial stability, and get 1.9 million working families — half the number of lower-income families who are financially unstable — on the road to economic independence.
- Promote healthy lives, and increase by one-third the number of youth and adults who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors (http://liveunited.org/pages/mission-and-goals/).

According to the website of the organization, these objectives will be achieved through mobilizing the caring power of communities around the world, through:

- A worldwide social movement – LIVE UNITED (According to the 2009 Annual Report (p. 15), the LIVE UNITED brand was created in partnership with McCann Erickson New York, United Way Worldwide’s pro-bono advertising agency) – and thereby mobilization of millions to action – give, advocate and volunteer to improve the conditions in which people live.
- Connecting all sectors of society – individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations and governments – to create long-term social change that produces healthy, well-educated and financially-stable individuals and families.
- Raising, investing and leveraging billions of dollars annually in philanthropic contributions to create and support innovative programs and approaches to generate sustained impact in local communities.
• Holding the organization accountable to this cause through its steadfast commitment to continually measure – in real terms – improvements in education, income and health (http://liveunited.org/pages/about-united-way-worldwide/).

United Way conducts its activity as a nonprofit organization which works with 13.8% administrative costs in the United States, while United Way Worldwide currently works with 10% administrative funds (see Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2) (https://give.liveunited.org/page/contribute/support_us?default_amt=100):

![Figure 4.1: United Way America Distribution of Funds](image-url)

**United Way of Delaware County, IN (UWDC).**

The movement that started in Denver came to Muncie when concerned citizens established the Muncie Community Fund on February 12, 1925, the foundation of United Way of Delaware County, IN.

United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) Indiana works, as part of United Way Worldwide, to build a strong, healthy community. UWDC works as a not-for-profit organization, 501(c)(3), and is strategically investing in quality programs, building
partnerships, advocating for better policies, and engaging people in the community (http://www.invitedtoliveunited.org/index/about/). Their mission is to engage the society to improve lives by focusing resources on the same three main sectors: education, income and health. It does that by charging a 10% administrative fee for all donations. Overall, only 12.3% of funds raised by UWDC are used for fundraising and administration, United Way aiming for efficiency through community support (which keeps costs to a minimum) including extensive volunteer leadership, executives “loaned” by companies, public service, advertising donations and more (http://www.invitedtoliveunited.org/index/about/faq.asp).

The organizational philosophy is caught under the vision, mission and values statements:

*Vision:* To unite the caring power of our community to improve lives.

*Mission:* We engage the community to improve lives by focusing resources on education, income and health.

*Values:*

- We develop trust with our partners in our community.
- We work together on our solutions.
- We measure results and learn from their impact.
- We invite all to join us (http://www.invitedtoliveunited.org/index/about/mission-vision-and-values.asp).

Like each of the 1,400 United Ways in the country, United Way of Delaware County is also autonomous and managed by local volunteers. United Way (UW) is a national training and service center providing services to United Ways across the country. United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) pays membership dues to UW in return for
services which include the use of the United Way name and logo, market research, promotional items, national/NFL advertising, and training for staff. UW does not govern UWDC. Led by a board of local volunteers, all funding and leadership decisions for UWDC are locally made.

In 2006 United Way of Delaware County’s Board of Directors approved the adoption of the Community Solutions Business Model as means to be more responsive to needs and challenges detected in the community. This approach builds upon United Way’s traditional approach as a funder of service programming by expanding its role in the community to advance the common good in the areas of education, income and health (see Appendix 1). In doing so, UWDC puts emphasis on shared vision within the community, as well as collaborations and innovation. The organization is explicitly stating its focus on measuring and reporting to the community the results of its strategies and resource investments.

2008 was the year when United Way of Delaware County, Indiana, started to be concerned with their way of measuring the organizational impact: the Community Solution Teams revised Community Investment Policies and Procedures, towards determining the Community-Level Goals, Objectives and Measurements for the organization (http://www.invitedtoliveunited.org/index/about/united-way-delaware-county-history.asp). Currently the organization is concerned with polishing its system of measuring the impact it has within the community.

The way UWDC operates changed in 2009, when the organization started communicating the Community Solutions Investment Model, in alignment with United Way Worldwide (UWW) Common Good Goals, in which evaluation and measurement
play an important role. The transformation refers to the way the organization looks at the problems in the community, and to the way the funds are being distributed. One of the UWDC organizational goals is to engage the entire community around a shared vision that includes not only meeting the needs of individuals and families, but also finds solutions to the root causes of problems that have challenged the local communities for the past years. And this work is being done with the aim of better measuring and better reporting to the community the results of their investments in United Way (see Appendix 14).

In this model, the measurement and evaluation is considered by UWDC as a tool for improvement. Second, UWDC’s current funding process is aimed to be intentional and transparent. One of the key actions to achieve this was the convening of a Community Solutions Task Force in 2008, composed of representatives of stakeholder groups in the community. The Task Force’s primary role is to provide guidance to UWDC and its Board of Directors regarding our transformation. To this purpose, they have developed an extensive list of Guiding Principles for United Way (see Appendix 18) as the organization is moving forward in the design and implementation of this new approach.

*Organizational Structure of UWDC* (see Appendix 12).

- President/CEO
- Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment
- Database/Relationship Manager
- Marketing and Communications Manager
- Student United Way President Ball State University
- Director Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network (INRN) – Eastern Region
- Director Livable Communities (contract)
- Executive Assistant
- AFL-CIO Community Service Liaison

UWDC has nine employees: two contract employees and seven long-term staff. The structure of the organization is circular, and the interactions show a horizontal type of culture, as proved by my two visits in their office located in downtown Muncie, IN. Each employee knows what duties the others have, can always cover up for them, and take charge. The employees work with the volunteers, who are organized in Committees or Task Forces (i.e.: Community Solutions Task Force, Marketing and Communication Committee etc.). Currently, UWDC has approximately 7000 donors, more than 300 companies and partner organizations, and a high number of local volunteers (see Appendix 20).

In addition, the Board of Directors is formed by 12 volunteers and a chair, who are representatives of prominent community institutions and organizations in the community, like: Yorktown Town Court, Ball State University, Delaware Sheriff’s Department, Star Press, First Merchants Insurance, etc.

The public relations activity within the organization is managed by the Marketing and Communications Manager and by the Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment.

Given this organizational change and the higher focus of UWDC to measure the community impact, the analysis of how United Way integrates the PR efforts evaluation in the overall organizational performance assessment will serve as a case study for this paper.
Analysis of the Documents

1. UWDC Mission, Community Goals and Strategies Matrix (Appendix 9).

As presented by the UWDC President & CEO, this is a marketing document. It summarizes the UWDC organizational processes and shows the three main mission pillars of UWDC, as well as the goals under each pillar and the strategies and tactics of reaching these goals. The key mission of UWDC is “to engage the community to improve lives by focusing resources on” the three pillars: Education (for children and youth), Income (financial stability), Health (improving and generating health independence). Successful activities on these pillars are leading to meet the overall organizational goal, which is “ensuring the basic needs of individuals and families”, or “advancing the common good.” The document is important because it represents a brief introduction in the core of the UWDC activity, as well as a marketing piece, briefly translating the strategic plan of UWDC. Document 1 (see Appendix 1) is the frame of UWDC plan, while the Outcome-Focused Strategic Plan (see Appendix 5b) shows a lot of the organization philosophy in achieving the common good.

The last level in the matrix, under goals, is formed by the community solutions and agenda strategies, which include: community engagement, 2-1-1, initiatives, donor relationships, advocacy, resource generation, volunteer engagement, inclusion, labor, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network, progress and results measurement, community investment, partnerships and collaborations. This list is a mix of UWDC projects and initiatives (2-1-1, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network), activities employed by and for the organizations (initiatives, advocacy, donor relationships, resource generation,
partnerships and collaborations) and organizational directions (progress & results measurement, community engagement, community investment, inclusion, labor).

Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network is one of the strategies mentioned in the matrix. This strategy consists of a way to “provide leadership in creating dynamic learning experience for Indiana nonprofit organizations.” With one of the largest nonprofit lending libraries in the State of Indiana, the Eastern Region of Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network is housed at United Way of Delaware County. There are five regional locations serving nonprofit organization in Indiana (http://www.invitedtoliveunited.org/index/nonprofit-resources/). Essentially, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network acts as a consultant referral by: serving as the central referral source in linking nonprofit groups to professionals; identifying and coordinating a cadre of skilled volunteers; serving as consultant for local nonprofit organizations; assisting in board development and management activities.

Another strategy employed by UWDC is the 2-1-1 initiative (http://www.in211.org/index.htm) in Indiana. 2-1-1 is a three-digit phone number anyone can call to get information about health and human services (housing, employment, legal aid, counseling and much more). It was launched in 1997 by United Way of Atlanta as a phone line “to give or get help.” In Indiana the info-line 2-1-1 starts being used in 1999, and one year later The Indiana 211 Partnership incorporated as a nonprofit organization and formally requested reservation of 2-1-1 dialing code for developing Indiana’s 2-1-1 system. The goal is to create a seamless network of information and referral services that enables anyone in Indiana in need of human services to have quick referrals to those who provide them by dialing 2-1-1. Additionally, aggregate data will be collected to assist
communities in assessing needs and allocating resources. The Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) recognized the Partnership as the proper administrator for the 2-1-1 dialing code on February 20, 2002, and issued a final order on June 17, 2004. The Indiana General Assembly passed legislation supporting 2-1-1 that became effective July 1, 2004 (I.C. 8-1-19.5). IN211 is actively working to implement 2-1-1 service in order to serve all Hoosiers through linked IN211 Centers.


This document is relevant as it defines the key concepts of “living united”, “advancing the common good”, and “community partnerships”, while explaining the three areas on which UDWC focuses: education, income and health. The document also defines the change that UDWC aims at within the community: “We don’t just address the symptoms of a problem. We go deeper to get at the underlying causes. Success is measured by the lives and community conditions we improve.” (p. 1)

This is also an informational/promotional piece which briefly reveals that the organization focuses on community partnerships as a key avenue for achieving its goals. Furthermore, the document shows how UWDC works with a variety of organizations and partners: nonprofits, business community, government, faith groups and individuals. The contributions UWDC receives are invested in supporting 21 programs administered by Community Partners in the focus of the three pillars – education, income and health. For example, this document shows how UWDC is partnering with over 50 community organizations in order to provide low and moderate-income individuals and families with free tax preparation services and information about the Earned Income Tax Credit. This
document also mentions results of the programs and initiatives it mentions: “as a result of this outreach (the Earned Income Tax Credit preparation), those who used these services in the last two years have obtained over $3,000,000 from their federal tax returns, including $725,000 in Earned Income Tax Credits.


UWDC supports 21 programs administered by the community partners in three focus areas: education, income and health, and several initiatives, focused in the same three directions.

The complete 2010 – 2011 programs list can be found in Appendix 11, along with the partners for every program. The main initiatives of UWDC for the current year are:

- Education-related initiatives:
  - **Student Success Coalition** (encourages success in children by focusing on the child as a whole: academically, socially, physically and emotionally; it works to develop trusting relationships and partnerships between schools, out of school time programs, parents, teachers and students).
  - **Delaware County Early Childhood Coalition** (aims to ensure that all children are nurtured by informed families/caregivers and have access to quality health, developmental and educational services which prepare them for success in school and life; under UWDC leadership this coalition will raise the awareness of early childhood learning in the community, advocate on behalf of young children and implement proven strategies to prepare all children for Kindergarten).

- Income-related initiatives:
  - **Delaware County Financial Literacy Initiative** (develops comprehensive financial literacy course that is consistent among all organizations that work with low-income individuals).
  - **Free Tax Preparation Services promoting the Earned Income Tax Credit** (UWDC partners with the IRS, AARP, VITA, and more than 50 other organizations and volunteers to provide free tax preparation services to low-income families in Delaware County).

- Initiatives with health focus:
- *United Way of Delaware County Caregiver Coalition* (ensures that family or informal caregivers\(^2\) have the support necessary to remain healthy and productive in the workplace while providing quality care to their loved ones).

- *The FamilyWize Discount Prescription Card* (UWDC works with community health providers, and has made this Discount Card available since 2007, in order for low-income members of the community to save in prescription costs).

- Furthermore, there is one initiative that falls under the scope of all three directions (education, income and health): *United Way-LifeStream 2-1-1* (a toll-free resource referral hotline which connects individuals to a variety of services from basic needs such as shelter and food to life’s more difficult challenges: finding childcare and resources for caregivers).

This document is also a brief presentation document but it is relevant and important for it pictures the focus of the organization for the year, regarding its activities, as well as regarding the presentation and communication form of these projects and initiatives.

4. **Organizational Chart (Appendix 12).**

This document depicts not only the structure of UWDC, but also the organizational culture, which is based on collaboration and is very low-hierarchical. The chart creates a circular dynamic of the organizational roles, in which the President/CEO is in the center. Around it there are the other eight employees who respond and “gravitate” around the organization’s President: Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment, Database/Relationship Manager, Marketing and Communications Manager, Student United Way President Ball State University, Director Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network (INRN) – Eastern Region, Director Livable

\(^2\) Caregiver is defined as anyone providing care through involvement in activities of daily living for an adult family member or friend 18 years of age or older.
Communities (contract), Executive Assistant, and AFL-CIO Community Service Liaison. The circular relationship theoretically cancels any type of organizational hierarchy, as showed by the document, and supports the idea that each of the eight employees can shift roles as the circle moves. According to the Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment each employee knows the job of and can temporarily substitute other employees.

However, the overall key roles in the organization are held by the President/CEO, Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment, Marketing and Communications Manager and Database/Relationship Manager. The other positions are rather specific, depending on a certain program or initiative, or on a certain group of constituencies.

The Marketing and Communications Manager’s main roles are of information and outreach both for the organization, as well as for the projects and initiatives. The job also includes speech writing for the President and media relations and monitoring. Currently the job is vacant since December 2010 and the tasks have been temporarily taken over by the Director of Agency Relations and Community Investment, until a new marketing and communication manager will be hired.

5. United Way of Delaware County 2010 – 2013 (Outcome-Focused) Strategic Plan (Excerpts and extended version) (Appendix13a, 13b).

This is the most eloquent document for the present study, for it shows that UWDC is an outcome-driven organization. The 2010 - 2013 outcome-focused strategic plan has been developed to guide UWDC as it continues to implement the Community Solutions approach (see Appendix 13b, 1). According to this document this approach built upon
United Way’s traditional approach as a funder of service programming by expanding its role in the community to advance the common good in the areas of education, income and health (p. 1).

There is a dual focus to this strategic plan. The first is the achievement of meaningful change in the lives of individuals and families in our community. That will be accomplished through the proactive Community Solutions Agenda that includes multiple change strategies and encompasses UWDC’s work from resource development to community initiatives. The second is the expanded capacity of United Way to effectively fulfill its role as a community solutions leader and champion (p. 1). Moreover, the strategic plan shows the interest UWDC has in evaluating the impact it makes within the community:

United Way and its partners evaluate the effectiveness of strategies in order to continuously improve. They identify appropriate measures, collect and analyze results, and assess progress toward desired outcomes. Outcomes may be measured at multiple levels (e.g., programs, system and community). What is learned may cause United Way and partners to re-think, change or adjust strategies, actions and investments. Results are communicated to the community (p. 8).

In the overall framework of the outcome-focused plan (see Appendix 13b, 3) the Vision and Mission establish the purpose of the organization, and the overall intent of this plan. That purpose is further translated into the specific desired results to be achieved in the community. Those Community-Level Goals serve to guide the work of United Way, both internally and externally. To achieve those goals, United Way is committed to producing specific outcomes at the program and initiative level (p. 4). The strategic plan includes goals and key success indicators on each of the three dimensions – education, income and health. The performance indicators are separated in two categories: A.
program/initiative and community-level indicators and B. performance indicators for the organizational strategic plan. The Overall framework of the UWDC strategic plan shows the exact flow and hierarchy of these indicators.

The strategic plan document also includes the Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda, which includes “the individual strategies to be implemented in order to produce the desired outcomes for individuals and families in the three main areas: education, income and health. (...) Ultimately, the focus of all these strategies will be the achievement of the Community Goals” (p. 6).

The core strategies for of the Community Solutions Agenda, as considered by UWDC, are: Community Engagement, Volunteer Engagement, Advocacy, Community Investment, Initiatives, Partnerships & Collaborations, Resource Generation, Donor Relations, Progress and Results Measurement, Inclusion, 2-1-1, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network, and Labor. The strategic plan also illustrates the benchmarking approach of UWDC: “Each Core Strategy will have benchmark measurements in order track progress and success. These benchmarks will be derived from the specific activities associated with each core strategy” (p. 7).

Another element that this document illustrates is the ongoing performance measurement approach: “Its purpose (of the ongoing performance measurement) is to provide an ongoing source of data and information to volunteers and staff so that they can continuously improve upon the strategies in the Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda. All programs and initiatives will be measured based on their specific outcomes results. The results will be analyzed in terms of their effectiveness in improving lives and
in improving community conditions” (p. 7). This is assessed by UWDC using the key indicators in Figure 4.3.

Interestingly enough, the organization first offered the excerpts from the strategic version to be included in the research (see Appendix 13a). The excerpts document is included in the overall strategic plan. However, it is relevant for the research, despite the repeating content, due to the fact that it shows what goals the organizational representatives think are essential for evaluation: the excerpts document does not offer the context of the strategic plan and stops at the internal strategic goals.

The extended version of the strategic plan shows, in addition, the “high priority action steps” identified to achieve “organizational excellence” (p.11). Among those projected priorities, the outreach to different constituencies and creating relationships are recurrent organizational tasks. Furthermore, the need for assessment tools is also identified as very important.

Figure 4.4 shows the performance indicators UWDC established for the overall organizational objectives. These objectives refer to what the organization should do in order to be able to achieve the community goals, which are a higher priority in the overall framework than the organizational objectives. According to the strategic plan, the community goals are the central element in any action UWDC takes:

The Program and Initiative Outcomes, the Community Solutions Agenda, the Internal Strategic Goals and corresponding Strategic Organizational Objectives, and all the indicators that follow are intended to work toward making these Community Goals a reality. While the Community Goals serve to guide and align all elements of the plan and work of the organization, we realize that substantial progress in each of those focus areas will be limited during the three-year duration of the plan (p. 1).
### A. Program/initiative and community-level indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Children enter school ready to succeed.</td>
<td>1. Increase income.</td>
<td>1. Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children achieve academic goals.</td>
<td>2. Build savings.</td>
<td>2. Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth are productive and engaged citizens.</td>
<td>3. Gain and sustain assets.</td>
<td>3. Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program &amp; Initiative Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Children meet age appropriate benchmarks at Kindergarten entrance.</td>
<td>Lower income families and individuals:</td>
<td>4. Caregivers are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elementary school children are prepared to succeed in later grades.</td>
<td>1. Have their basic needs met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Young people graduate from high school.</td>
<td>2. Have increased job skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Young adults make a successful transition from high school to work life.</td>
<td>3. Receive all public benefits for which they are eligible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All children have at least 31 of 40 developmental assets.</td>
<td>4. Have savings or checking accounts and money saved for an emergency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Indicators for program/initiative and community-level performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of children who begin Kindergarten successfully.</td>
<td>• Number of families receiving assistance through food pantries, shelters, and other emergency assistance outlets.</td>
<td>• Number and percentage of individuals who have access to health care, and are receiving that care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of students entering fourth grade who are proficient readers.</td>
<td>• Percentage of eligible households accessing public benefits.</td>
<td>• Percentage of people who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of public high school students who graduate on time.</td>
<td>• Percentage of families and individuals with a checking or savings account.</td>
<td>• Number of caregivers accessing support services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: UWDC community goals and key success indicators
### B. Performance indicators for the UWDC organizational strategic plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Organizational Objectives</th>
<th>Internal Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engage the diverse stakeholders in the community around the issues of health, education and income.</td>
<td>- Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been started/initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invest diverse array of resources into programs and initiatives that contribute toward achievement of community-level objectives.</td>
<td>- Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have quality, well-defined relationships with diverse array of community partners.</td>
<td>- Total amount of resources under management annually, and the corresponding percentage of change year–to-year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have donors, advocates and volunteers who are highly engaged, aware of United Way’s work, and feel recognized and appreciated for their contributions.</td>
<td>o Financial resources (individual and corporate contributions, government and foundation grants, endowment, in-kind, and special events);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop and implement organizational policies, procedures, structures and systems that facilitate the achievement of Community Outcomes.</td>
<td>o Human resources (volunteers, including advocates);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conduct and participate in community events.</td>
<td>- Within each goal area, total amount of resources invested, number of programs and initiatives supported, and number of clients served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Promote giving, advocating, and volunteering.</td>
<td>- Number and percentage of program partners that increased their effectiveness in producing meaningful results for their clients (used outcome data and information to make improvements in service delivery and/or outcome achievement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide the community with information about relevant issues, current and potential solutions, and the work of United Way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document reiterates the UWDC goals, aligned with the organizational vision and mission. The document shows the same separation between community goals and organizational goals. The community goals are put face-to-face with the key success indicators (see Figure 4.3). The organizational goals (p. 2) are weighted by the following performance targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Goals/Internal Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>- The total resources under management from all sources will reach $3 million annually by June 30, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Partner Engagement</td>
<td>- The annual workplace campaign will comprise 60% of all resources under management by June 30, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource Development and Mobilization</td>
<td>- All programs and initiatives that are partnering with UWDC will be producing meaningful and measurable results that positively contribute to the achievement of United Way’s intended community-level outcomes within Education, Income and Health by June 30, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Measure, Evaluate and Communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: UWDC organizational goals and performance targets

The same organizational goals in this document are called internal strategic goals in the strategic plan (Appendix 13b), showing that UWDC makes the distinction between internal and external goals and objectives. The Measure, Evaluate and Communicate goal refers to the way United Way and its partners should evaluate the effectiveness of strategies “in order to continuously improve.” They “identify appropriate measures, collect and analyze results, and assess progress toward desired outcomes. Outcomes may be measured at multiple levels (e.g. programs, system and community). What is learned
may cause United Way and partners to re-think, change or adjust strategies, actions and investments” (p. 2).


This document shows the change in the operations and in the philosophy of UWDC, process which started in 2006, continued with the changes in 2008, and started to be communicated at the beginning of 2009. Basically, the organization switched from the strategy to fund direct services to “measurably changing community conditions” (p. 1). Through this new approach United Way also expanded the relations with their partners, which until 2008 were primarily agencies – in the new model all the community members who can play a role can be partners, and the whole community will own the effort as opposed to before, when United Way was the sole owner of the projects. Furthermore, the approach to resources has changed, from “resources equals money” (before 2008) to including people, relationships, expertise, etc. in the resources pool, along with the financial resource. This new model makes United Way play more roles than just funder/fundraiser and creates long-term relationships within the community for the common good.

This document is essential for the present thesis research because it shows the event that generated the need for UWDC to do consistent and rigorous measurement: switching from funding to community solutions, the UWDC operations became more complex, more demanding for the community, and more exposed. By deciding to involve as many actors as it can in the process of change and in obtaining common good, United Way noticed the requirement that comes with that: they needed to become accountable.

This document changes the focus from program performance indicators to internal/organizational performance indicators. The organization sets some “performance targets” (see Figure 4.4), and classifies the indicators of success into: “on track to meet established benchmarks”, “some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks” and “serious concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks” (p. 1). However, the document doesn’t reveal any established benchmarks. Furthermore, the quantitative indicators are mostly organizational output (i.e.: number of programs and initiatives supported, amount of resources invested, number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been completed), whereas the outcome is not as much regarded: there is only one entry that shows outcome, but that refers to the partners effectiveness: “number and percentage of program partners that increased their effectiveness in producing meaningful results for their clients (used outcome data and information to make improvements in service delivery and/or outcome achievement)” (p. 1).

The “dashboard” document is UWDC “day-to-day measurement tool”, as mentioned by the President & CEO of the organization. The internal performance indicators, as showed in this document created in November 2010 with deadlines in 2011, lead to high priority actions for the organization. This illustrates that the idea behind measurement in the case of UWDC is to continuously improve its operations.

The strategic plan (Appendix13b) contains the template of the same document, on a larger time-frame, and with the high priority steps aligned to the organizational goals (p. 11). Moreover, the high priority action steps in the strategic plan also include a key
constituency for each priority action. The use of this list and the completion of the action steps are, according to the information in the strategic plan (Appendix 13b), necessary to achieving the highest standards of organizational excellence for UWDC. “The products of these steps will position the organization to be even more effective in fulfilling its leadership role in the community” (see Appendix 13b, 11).


The need of a communication plan for UWDC came in 2008, when the organization acknowledged the need to explain to its constituencies the organizational changes and the new community solutions model. Essentially, this document shows how an advertising agency outlined the communication of the new Community Solutions to the UWDC publics. The version from April 2009 does not incorporate any evaluation/outcomes section, neither in the plan, nor in the next steps section.

This document is valuable, though, for it shows that UWDC measures the success in a financial year cycle. Moreover, this communication plan illustrates the main stakeholder groups of UWDC: Staff, Board, Media and the General Public. The “general public”, based on UWDC public documents, consists of: individual donors – 3500; partners – 165 companies & organizations, (potential) advocates, (potential) volunteers, residents of Delaware County.

The document also reveals that the success in case of UWDC is defined considering the time factor, and its audiences. On the one hand, the organization focuses on short-term results, through assessing the impact of its programs and initiative. Among donors this means to achieve their understanding that they were part of the organizational
success. For the rest of the community and partners short-term results mean that these constituencies are able to understand UWDC’ mission and that they can be part of this, by continuing to donate, volunteer, and advocate. On the other hand, United Way of Delaware County also takes into consideration the long term results, which are assessed through the impact the organization has in the community, and through the level of acceptance regarding the recent changes in the United Way philosophy and procedures.


The Goals for Common Good is the official document of United Way, through which the national organization explains the transformation that took place in 2008, to which local American United Ways aligned in the same year. This document is the only one that shows explicit benchmarks for the “common good”, as an overarching goal for United Way until 2018. The benchmark is the year 1998, and the goals require that not only all the United Ways should align, but the overall American community. The document is symbolically called the United Way Challenge for America.

The main goals of this 2018 strategic plan are focused on the three main pillars – education, income and health – and are state in the document by the Brian A. Gallagher President & CEO of United Way.

By 2018, we as a nation must:

- Cut by half the number of young people who drop out of high school;
- Cut by half the number of lower-income families that lack financial stability;
- Increase by a third the number of youths and adults who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors (p. 1).
Furthermore, the “issues and indicators at-a-glance” (p. 3) shows 12 specific quantitative indicators for each problem the organization wants to solve within the community. The 1998 benchmark refers to the “common good index” (p. 16), which shows decline. The “common good index” indicates how conditions in education, income and health have declined during recent years in America. The index is based on the 12 indicators used by United Way for understanding the conditions in education, income and health. The organization set conditions that existed in 1998 at an index number of 100 – the United Way Common Good Index fell to 93.1 by 2006. This indicated to the organization that significant efforts must be made to lift the index back to its 1998 level and higher.


The principles document is a guide to how the transformation process should take place and it is devoted to the UWDC Community Solutions Task Force. It emphasizes on the importance of effectiveness, as an essential quality of United Way work within the new model, the Community Solutions Business Model. The core values of the new model are:

- We develop trust with our partners in our community.
- We work together on our own solutions
- We measure results and learn from their impact.
- We invited all to join us (p. 1).

The document talks about benchmarks and accountability, but it does not explicitly state figures or quantifiable objectives. The guidelines are rather procedural and values-oriented.
At the core of these Guiding Principles is the belief that relationships are critical to success. UWDC specifically states in this document that it will continue to strive to build and add positive relationships in the community, including with the volunteers and donors, the business community, government, educational institutions, the faith community, foundations, neighborhoods, agencies, associations and individuals. The organization emphasizes that the central and most valued relationships remains the one with the Partner Agencies. However, the transformation, which changed UWDC, will also change the nature of this relationship UWDC has with the Partner Agencies: moving from a funder-fundee relationship to partners working toward common goals in the community.

In communicating the change to the Partner Agencies, one of the core elements was for UWDC representatives to meet, in December, 2008, with Executive Directors and Board members of the Partner Agencies to update them on the UWDC community investment process and to answer any questions they might have, while sharing the Guiding Principles with them.

12. News clippings about the switch from community funds allocation to community solutions model (Appendix 19).

The organization has no extensive and consistent media monitoring system. However, it has archived the clippings in the local media starting with February 2009, when the organization started to communicate the change to the community solutions model. The four clippings appeared in The Star Press (Muncie, IN) and all refer explicitly in the title about the new United Way focus, except one, which focuses on the negative side of the process, specifically to the fact that some agencies, former exclusive UWDC
partners in the past, will not receive funding (see Appendix 19, 2). One of the articles is an editorial, one is a front-page article, one is an opinion article, and the last one is an article in the local news section. The monitoring report binder UWDC has is a file with the photocopied articles, and no additional qualitative media analysis.

13. Community Solutions Investment Process – Q&As for the media (Appendix 20).

The media coverage materials regarding the organizational transformation (towards the community solutions model) (see Appendix 19) came after some media briefings organized by UWDC with the local media. The meetings with the media took place at the beginning of 2009, with the scope of explaining to the local press how the new organizational model will affect the funding United Way used the local nonprofits with. Thus, the document about the UWDC Community Solutions Investment Process focuses on how UWDC developed its new funding process and how this process will work: the responsible person who will make the decision about the funding, the selection of funded projects, and the technical aspects of application and selection for funding.

This document reiterates the process the organization has been through in the last years in order to build upon its traditional role as solely a funder of agencies. The public for this document is the media who is interested to know on what extent this change will affect the activity of UWDC within the community, specifically, how the UWDC funding process of the local agencies (smaller NPOs) will be affected. The communication of this change is depicted by UWDC, through this press material, as “the culmination of years of research, deliberation, and engagement between our volunteers and with the community.
at large” (p. 1). The organization also communicates that this change will be governed by transparency and maintaining the tradition to serve the interests of the community.


This document also refers to the moment UWDC announced the transformation to the media. As the title of the document shows, this is a summary of the way UWDC will handle the funding process. The summary briefs the media representatives on the changes the organization made and the impact these changes will have on the community, as well as the teams responsible for handling the process.

The content of the press materials show what were the main points released by the organization, as compared to how it was depicted in the media. The documents are valuable in order to prove the importance of media relations for UWDC and to reveal the way the organization is managing these media relationships. Moreover, these documents, as documents that were made public, reinforce the information from the internal ones.

Also, the documents show the new requirements UWDC has for the agencies that apply for funding. Among these criteria, the partners’ ability to track their progress and to collect data that will help the overall evaluation of the program plays an important role.


This document, structured in three parts – education, income and health – is extremely relevant for this research. It came in a spreadsheet format and it provides a thorough example of a program outcomes report, built on the Delaware County benchmarks. The impact is calculated per each program, related to the program goals and to the current figures in Delaware County.
The program goals are not, however, formulated in terms of expected figures, so it is difficult to judge if the goal was actually met. For example, under the goal “Children meet age appropriate benchmarks at Kindergarten entrance”, 345 children were reached directly through the program and a total of 2802, impacted indirectly. These results were calculated out of a total number of 6216 children of 0-5 years old in Delaware County. Since there was not any initial percentage to aim to, the total of 3147 children impacted by the United Way program is as successful as it would have been if only 100 children would have been impacted, since there was no percentage or figure in the goal. The program brings change within the community, so United Way meets its overarching goal, according to this document. Yet, it does not give the organization a tool to know at what level is that change, as compared to the resources invested in the program. Also, it gives a lot of freedom to the partners and agencies to decide on these figures, and it takes out of the efficiency principle UWDC talks about in the other documents. Nevertheless, it is a relevant instrument for illustrating the extent to which the organization is measuring the impact and what benchmarks it uses.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Research Question 1
How is the United Way of Delaware County, IN, evaluation process constructed?

The research showed that assessment is an important value for UWDC, especially in the context of the recent changes that the organization has been communicating. UWDC changed its focus from simply funding non-profits from the community, to putting the community itself in the center of UWDC activity. Thus, the new community solution organizational model makes UWDC more responsible and accountable in the eyes of the donors and beneficiaries (see Appendix 15, Appendix 20). Therefore, the research goal of developing an evaluation model for UWDC is well-timed, since evaluating impact is one of the core goals of the new organizational model.

The UWDC internal indicators dashboard showed what is on the priority list of UWDC for 2011. This document is an essential tool that is constantly updated by the organization, depending on the results of the evaluation. In other words, it is an improvement tool. Among these priority action steps, outreach and assessment are core priorities:

- “Develop a multi-faceted marketing and communications plan that represents a comprehensive approach to educating and informing key audiences on the Community Impact Agenda and organizational strengths of United Way of Delaware County” (Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks).
- “Develop an outreach effort to the identified leaders for the purpose of expanding their individual awareness, knowledge, and support of the Community Solutions
“strategies” (Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks).

• “Develop an assessment tool for special events to ensure that their purpose and benefits align with the organization’s intended outcomes” (Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks).

• “Develop a communication plan to report results on an on-going basis from Community Solutions investments” (Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks).

UWDC is aware that after each program ends, the program should be taken, through measurement, at a different level. Measurement is, by itself, a way for UWDC to improve, to increase the efficiency and impact, and to create ownership among the community members of the UWDC programs.

The key element that generated UWDC’s interest in measurement and evaluation was the transition to the community solutions activity model. Hence, the UWDC framework of evaluation revolves around communicating this change to the community. The study of UWDC documents revealed that the community goals are in the center of all the organizational actions (see Figure 5.6). These goals determine the programs and initiatives of the organization in the areas of education, income and health. According to this study, the community goals are considered achieved if the evaluation of the programs and initiatives shows impact. The evaluation process that is currently in place for UWDC initiatives and programs involves the Delaware county benchmarks and the results offered by the partners of these programs and initiatives. In addition, the internal organizational goals and objectives align to the community goals, in order for UWDC to become more efficient. These goals and objectives are also evaluated in the UWDC framework, with the scope of reaching success – achieving the community goals – and
continuously improve – constantly setting up high priority action steps (see Appendix 13b and Appendix 16).

An interesting aspect of the organizational framework are the strategies that UWDC designed as tools to achieve the goals on the three pillars – education, income and health. These strategies are practically a mix of strategies with tactics. First, there are listed programs and initiatives conducted by the organization (2-1-1, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network, initiatives), and second, activities employed by and for the organizations (advocacy, donor relationships, resource generation, partnerships and collaborations) as well as philosophical approaches (progress & results measurement, community engagement, community investment, inclusion, labor). These strategies fit in the UWDC evaluation framework either in the upper level (programs and initiatives evaluation: 2-1-1, Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network, initiatives) (see Appendix 9), or in the organizational level (advocacy, donor relationships, resource generation, partnerships and collaborations, progress & results measurement, community engagement, community investment, inclusion, labor).
Community Goals

- Education Goals
- Income Goals
- Health Goals

Programs & Initiatives

Internal / Organizational Goals

Strategic Organizational Objectives

Evaluation

Improvement

Performance

Figure 5.6: UWDC evaluation framework
Research Question 2  
What are the indicators used by United Way of Delaware County, IN, to define their public relations and organizational success?

The research revealed that UWDC does not have a public relations responsible person, nor a public relations strategic plan. The function of marketing and communications manager substitutes for some of the technical public relations activities the organization needs (i.e. writing speeches and press releases, organizing press briefings, and maintaining relationships with the media representatives). Furthermore, the research shows that revisiting the marketing and communications attributions is a high priority action step for UWDC in 2011 (see Appendix 16). According to Appendix 16, the revisited marketing and communications plan will also include, in the attributions of the responsible, the following activities: education and information of the key audiences, outreach efforts, awareness, community and volunteers relations and communications and ensuring a shared vision between the organization and its constituencies. Yet, all these activities define a public relations direction for the organization.

Even if UWDC does not specifically have a public relations department/responsible, the approach of UWDC to public relations activities potentially makes public relations a management function in the organization. UWDC is not concerned specifically with public relations evaluation, but the research shows public relations as an integral part of the organization, through the marketing and communication roles and objectives (see Appendix 16, Appendix 13b). It can be argued that UWDC does not see the public relations activity as a tool, but as a strategic function within the organization. Judging after what the research showed regarding the
communication needs that UWDC has, public relations function within UWDC has the potential of fulfilling a strategic role if it will be included as part of the dominant coalition, as Grunig (1994) argues.

The study did not identify any explicit public relations and evaluation system. The nonprofit organization is fully focused on the social change results, but not accounting for measuring the intermediate elements that bring these results: volunteers, engagement, and advocacy, through communication and public relations. The overall organizational success of UWDC refers to the way the three pillars balance a better life within the community. Neither one of them has a higher weigh than the other two in deciding if the organization was or not successful at the end of a financial cycle. All three of them are equally important, but the community members have a say in deciding which one of the three pillars will receive more attention in the following campaign. The interesting thing about UWDC is that the community will vote for a pillar or the other with their dollars, which is also considered a sensor for the problems within the community. 15% of the UWDC programs and initiatives budget will be designated by the community/donors. The rest of the funds are managed by the organization, and the direction of the funds is decided by the UWDC board of directors.

In this context, the success indicators (i.e. performance indicators, in UWDC vocabulary) listed in Figure 5.7 answer the RQ2, illustrating UWDC’s approach towards performance. Figure 5.7 is designed considering the performance indicators revealed by the research in Figure 4.3 and Figure 4.4. United Way of Delaware County assesses success/performance by looking at the key indicators for community performance (through programs and initiatives in the three directions: education, income and health)
and at the organizational performance which, according to the UWDC evaluation
framework (see Figure 5.6), are designed to lead towards achieving the community goals.
Key indicators for internal performance (strategic organizational objectives)

- Percentage of children
- Percentage of students

- Number of families
- Percentage of households
- Percentage of families

- Number and percentage of individuals
- Percentage of people
- Number of caregivers

- Number and percentage of action steps
- Total amount of resources available % / year.
- Total amount of resources invested / each goal
- Number of programs and initiatives supported
- Number of clients served
- Number and percentage of partners that increased their effectiveness

Figure 5.7: UWDC list of success / performance indicators
Research Question 3
What would a dedicated nonprofit public relations evaluation model look like for UWDC?

RQ3 is an extrapolation of the case study. It will be answered through the comparison of the findings from research questions 1 and 2 with the information gathered from the review of literature. Hence, it will be approached and answered in the Discussion chapter.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This study puts the general public relations evaluation literature face-to-face with the evaluation procedures within a real NPO – in this case, UWDC. The final aim of this research endeavor is to build an evaluation framework that would better fit the nonprofit organization that the study looks at, and provide a starting point for a dedicated nonprofit public relations evaluation model. The approach of this study involves the following steps: withdrawing the most common success indicators mentioned by the public relations evaluation literature; building the current model of evaluation in the case of UWDC (RQ3); and comparing the two frameworks, with the scope of improving UWDC evaluation model and paving the way to a public relations evaluation model specifically for NPOs.

Extensive Model in Public Relations Evaluation

One of the problems identified by the scholars in the field of public relations evaluation is that, so far, the research has not provided a standard model, which would be generally accepted by the academia, as well as by the practitioners. Nevertheless, while looking at the studies that have been written regarding public relations measurement and evaluation, some patterns were observed in most of the theoretical frameworks provided. This present paper lists most of the recurrent success indicators in the literature, and will refer to this list as to the Extensive Theoretical Model in Public Relations Evaluation (see
These success indicators were organized in four categories, adapting Hon’s (1997) classification: success at the individual level, success at the program level, organizational level and societal level. However, by looking at the public relations evaluation literature, this study observed that at times, the theoretical framework refers to, directly or indirectly, and stems from public relations evaluation in for-profit organizations. In most of the times, however, the literature does not make the connection between the success indicators and the specific type of organization (profit or nonprofit). Little attention has been given to connecting the evaluation of public relations function and the specific nature of an organization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Level</th>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
<th>Societal Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Background information (situational analysis, audience, media)</td>
<td>- # of messages send to the media</td>
<td>- # of people who learned the message content – awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>- Messages consistency (appropriateness) and activity content</td>
<td>- # of messages published in the media</td>
<td>- # of people who changed their opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Studies <em>(Hon, 1997)</em></td>
<td>- Quality of messages <em>(Cutlip et al., 1985)</em></td>
<td>- # of activities</td>
<td>(Lindenmann, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication tools and presentation <em>(Macnamara, 1992, 2002)</em></td>
<td>- # of attendants <em>(Cutlip et al., 1985)</em></td>
<td>- # of people who changed their attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # of message receivers</td>
<td><em>(Macnamara, 1992, 2002)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # of people who retained the message</td>
<td>- # of people who changed their behavior, as desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- # of people who understand the message <em>(Macnamara, 1992, 2002)</em></td>
<td>- # of people who repeat the behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Message retention, comprehension, awareness and reception <em>(Lindenmann, 1993)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public relations goals stemming from the organizational mission, goals, and objective <em>(Hon, 1997)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effectiveness goes beyond program effects <em>(Grunig et al., 1992)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Organizational long-term relationships with publics <em>(Grunig et al., 1992)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ROI/ bottom-line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social and cultural change <em>(Cutlip et al., 1985)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.8: Extensive Theoretical Model in Public Relations Evaluation: Success Indicators
The first category in Figure 6.8 refers to is the *individual level* at which public relations activity is assessed. This category refers to the expertise of the public relations practitioners. The assumption is that the experience, the academic studies, and the expertise of the public relations practitioners, translated into their ability to think strategically, to counsel management, and to work efficiently with the media, are essential indicators for public relations success, particularly in NPOs. The literature (Fawkes & Moloney, 2008) shows that the greater the communication and public relations budget, the greater the voice an organization has in the public sphere. Thus, the corporations, focused on the financial results as an end, and on public relations as a means to that end, have the potential to receive more specialized public relations help than the NPOs. This is accomplished either with an in-house specialist or through consultancy firms. Moreover, that specialized public relations help needs to justify its existence by showing results and showing its contribution to the financial ROI.

Meanwhile, NPOs relate to the financial results as a means to an end, which in most cases, is the social change. Therefore, it would not be an exaggeration to say that what NPOs actually do is public relations at a higher level, which ironically enough, is being done with fewer public relations resources and expertise. This lack of specialization of public relations in most NPOs is bringing with itself a less intense focus on measurement and evaluation. This happens not because specialization would not be needed – actually, the public relations activity in an NPO ideally requires most of the attention on how to measure the impact, since we are talking about social change – but because of the limited resources of people, money and expertise.
The second category, the evaluation of public relations at the program level, received most of the literature’s attention. The evaluation is looked at as a continuous process, from the planning stage of the public relations program, to the implementation, and to ultimately assessing the impact. The strategic planning of public relations in the standard theoretical model starts with research, for setting up benchmarks, and ends with research, which is meant to assess the extent of the impact the public relations program has made. This approach to evaluation can be applied to both businesses and nonprofit organizations, because it deals with the more technical part of the activity of public relations. However, the preliminary research, which is aimed to help setting the objectives of the program, is more likely to be overlooked in some NPOs’ cases, since NPOs already have their benchmarks. Rather, they already know what problems they need to solve and unfortunately they do not conduct the preliminary research stage.

The third level that the public relations evaluation standard model refers to is the organizational level. At this level, the evaluation focuses on aligning the public relations goals with the organizational goals and objectives. The assumption of the evaluation at this level is that the public relations function is a strategic management function, and the PR practitioner is part of the dominant coalition. Moreover, the effectiveness in this case goes beyond program’s effect and focuses on the organizational relationships with the constituencies. However, this approach includes explicitly the financial return on investment as an overall success indicator in the public relations evaluation standard model. The organizational level is the stage at which evaluation is conducted to measure the contribution of the public relations to the overall organizational success. This is where
the public relations in for-profit organizations appears to be an overachiever and non-profit public relations evaluation appears inadequate.

The fourth level is the *societal level*, which refers to the impact an organization has within the community it operates. In other words, this category has as a main indicator of evaluating the public relations, the social and cultural change. Both businesses and NPOs have a say in changing the community and bringing social change. It is only that the NPOs are having this as an overall goal, while the businesses regard the social change as collateral consequence, if social change does not serve their financial purposes.

**UWDC Organizational and Public Relations Evaluation Model**

**RQ3. What would a dedicated nonprofit public relations evaluation model look like for UWDC?**

The RQ3 inquires about an ideal public relations evaluation model that would serve United Way of Delaware County goals and objectives. This ideal model will be aligned to the overall UWDC evaluation framework that the case study revealed (see Figure 5.6 and Figure 5.7), looking critically at the success indicators identified in the extensive standard model in public relations evaluation (see Figure 6.8).

The result of this analysis of UWDC face to face with the extensive standard model in public relations evaluation is illustrated by Figure 6.9.
Figure 6.9: The UWDC Evaluation Tree

- Community Goals
- Organizational Goals and Objectives ↔ Public Relations Goals
- Organizational Publics ↔ Public Relations Objectives
- Organizational Timeline ↔ Public Relations Strategies

Tactics

- Success Indicators (see Figure 6.10)
- Measurement (Instruments)
- Responsible

Societal Level indicators

Organizational Level indicators

Program Level indicators

Individual Level indicators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Level</th>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
<th>Societal Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning/ Inputs</td>
<td>2. Implementation / Outputs</td>
<td>3. Impact / Outcomes</td>
<td>- Social and cultural change (see Figure 5.7, indicators for program/initiative and community-level performance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Expertise in public relations, community relations, fundraising.
- Experience in the nonprofit sector.
- Academic studies in nonprofit management and public relations.

- Research: background information (situational analysis, publics analysis, media analysis)
- Messages consistency (appropriateness) and activity content
- Quality of messages
- Communication tools and presentation
- # of partners and volunteers that attended to the communication workshop.

- # of messages send to the media
- # of messages published in the media
- # of activities
- # of attendants
- # of message receivers
- # of people who retained the message
- # of people who understand the message
- Message retention, comprehension, awareness and reception

- # of people who learned the message content – awareness
- # of people who changed their opinions
- # of people who changed their attitudes
- # of people who changed their behavior, as desired
- # of people who repeat the behavior

- Public relations goals stemming from the organizational mission, goals, and objective
- Organizational long-term relationships with publics
- Amount of money invested in the community
- Indicators currently used by UWDC (see Figure 5.7, indicators for internal performance - strategic organizational objectives)
- ROI/ bottom-line

---

**Figure 6.10: Updated UWDC Performance Indicators Model**
## UWDC Public Relations Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Goal:</th>
<th>Shared Community Vision</th>
<th>PR Goal:</th>
<th>Promote public awareness about UWDC Community Investment approach</th>
<th>PR Objective 1:</th>
<th>Establish relationships with core media representatives in Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td>Encourage journalists to become UWDC Community Investment Solutions ambassadors</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
<td>Measurement (instruments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactic 1</strong></td>
<td>Create a comprehensive media list.</td>
<td>Number of outlets; Number of journalists included in the media list; Number of journalists considered &quot;core&quot; media representatives.</td>
<td>The final media database.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactic 2</strong></td>
<td>Develop and pretest key messages for delivering to journalists.</td>
<td>Number of journalists who expressed their interest in the concept of community investment; Number of journalists who expressed their intention to write.</td>
<td>Keep record of the emails (sent and received); Keep record of the phone conversations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactic 3</strong></td>
<td>Organize monthly press briefings &amp; develop Community Investments media kits (fact sheets, county figures, programs outcomes, photos, audiovisuals)</td>
<td>Number of each materials category that was produced; Number of distributed materials; Number of journalists present at the briefings; Number of the press materials published.</td>
<td>Keep records of the produced materials; Keep records of the materials that were distributed, and of the circumstances in which they were distributed; monitor the press outlets and keep records of the coverage with date, author, publication and the generating tactic of the coverage (i.e. press briefing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactic 4</strong></td>
<td>Develop and deliver human interest stories.</td>
<td>The number of stories pitched to the journalists. The number of covered stories.</td>
<td>Keep record of the emails (sent and received); Keep record of the phone conversations; Assign a volunteer or a media team member to monitor the media for the covered stories. Compile a media coverage report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.11: UWDC Public Relations Strategic Plan (Example)**
Implications and Applications

There are two levels this study approaches the UWDC evaluation model. First, it looks at the indicators the organization uses to measure success. Second, the study analyses the way the overall organizational model integrates the public relations model. Nonetheless, the latter level implicitly influences the first one.

The way the organization looks at public relations evaluation (RQ2) determines the success/performance indicators it designs. Currently, United Way of Delaware County differentiates between community-level performance indicators (for programs and initiatives) and strategic organizational performance indicators, which ultimately lead towards community-performance (see Figure 5.7). The organization does not approach, in its general framework, the public relations component. The public relations activities are encountered at the improvement stage (which is what UWDC calls high priority actions steps – see Appendix 13b and Appendix 16).

The UWDC Evaluation Tree (see Figure 6.9) adds the public relations component into UWDC evaluation framework, by introducing the four levels of indicators in the extensive theoretical model in public relations evaluation (see Figure 6.8): individual, program, organizational and societal level. Thus, this model of evaluation, specifically created for a nonprofit organization, will take into account the list of indicators included in Figure 6.10, and is an example of how the public relations goals and objectives can be included and evaluated in the overall UWDC plan.

The Evaluation Tree model for UWDC is based on the assumption that social change – community impact, in the case of UWDC – is achieved through using public relations as a bridge between the community needs and the organizational goals and
resources. The Tree doesn’t change the UWDC approach to evaluation, considering evaluation at all levels, as a continuous process (as in Figure 5.6). In addition, the UWDC Evaluation Tree model deepens this approach, by setting up indicators of success at each of the four levels (see Figure 6.10). The individual level, in the case of UWDC, refers to all the three indicators mentioned in the literature, but makes these indicators more specific. The individual responsible with marketing and communications within UWDC and public relations activities should not only have academic studies in the field of public relations and communication, but also strong experience in the nonprofit sector. This study argues that for the overall success of the organization toward achieving the community goals the personnel should not only be experts in public relations, but also have a good knowledge of the nonprofit sector, and vice-versa. One without the other would make the overall process of evaluation imperfect and incomplete.

At the program level, the UWDC Updated UWDC Performance Indicators Model prescribes that the evaluation should consider the inputs, the outputs and the outcomes measurement. At the input level, the model adds to the theoretical framework, in the case of UWDC, the indicator referring to the number of volunteers and partners receiving communication workshop. If the organization wants to have the role it assumes – the leader in putting resources together in the service of the community – then the organization needs to make sure it engages the whole community in the same public discussion. This means that all the actors involved in the Community Solutions Investment process should have the same voice. For this, UWDC can put together communication workshops and measure this activity as an input indicator. This indicator is specific to the nonprofit sector, since the community and the organization have the
same ultimate goals: social change and community impact. At the output and outcome communicational level, the model does not bring any new elements. However, it advises on the instruments to measure these indicators. A sample of these instruments can be seen in Figure 6.11, and an extended version, in Appendix 23.

At the organizational level, the UWDC model includes and aligns the public relations goals and objectives with the organizational mission, goals and objectives. In addition to that, it will include the relationship measurement, while the ROI indicator in the business sector will be, in the case of UWDC, the amount of money invested in the programs and initiatives conducted in the community. In addition, the leader role of UWDC in implementing the programs and initiatives within the community will bring another important indicator in the model. That is the effectiveness of the programs and initiatives partners. At this level, the study recommends that the objectives for these partners shall be measurable, and at the beginning of each year, and specific benchmarks should be set.

The biggest opportunity in measurement for the nonprofit sector, in the case of UWDC, lies at the societal level, where the standard public relations evaluation model does not offer explicit indicators. However, UWDC has a solid list of performance indicators that can be used (see Figure 5.7). The observation this study brings at this level is that those indicators should be linked to recommended annual outcomes related to the percentage of children, families, and caregivers etc., affected by the organization’s action within the community. Setting up rigorous and generally-accepted benchmarks, as well as measurable objectives can help the organization focus better its resources. Moreover, the
organization should be able, through this model, to make a better distinction between goals, measurable objectives, strategies and measurable tactics.

**Limitations**

The chosen study design presents some limitations. When deciding on a case study research, the major limitation recognized by the literature is the inability to generalize its findings (Stacks, 2002; Walton, 1992). Yin (2009) argued that case studies are only “generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes.” He explained that the purpose of case studies is in “analytical generalization” to expand theory and not in statistical generalization. This study does not attempt to make statistical generalizations to a larger population – the model it proposes is specific for UWDC. In other words, this research only makes an analytical generalization to expand theory.

The second limitation refers to the documentary analysis limits, which prevented the researcher to expand the knowledge further than the documents the organization offered for the analysis and the public documents. While this method was chosen to prevent any form of subjective bias that would appear, for example, through interviews, it has the shortcoming of determining the researcher’s own subjectivity and background bias in analyzing the documents.

Furthermore, this study focuses thoroughly on only one unit of analysis. This leads also to non-generalizable results. Hence, the theoretical model proposed by the study becomes hard to be standardized and it offers little opportunity for this framework to be directly applied to another organization other than United Way of Delaware County.
However, the case study provided insights regarding the evaluation process, as seen in a prominent nonprofit organization in the United States. Although not generalizable, the findings of this study offer opportunities for further research.

**Opportunities for Further Research**

Although it has limitations, this study paves the way to future research in the field of public relations evaluation in nonprofit organizations. A few research opportunities are drawn in this direction.

Research can be done to modify or test the proposed model for other specific NPOs towards building a standardized model. The benefits of this research would be continuing to build on a dedicated public relations evaluation literature and scholarship. Furthermore, although this thesis did not provide any analytical correlations between several organizations, a study can be conducted to further research in a quantitative direction. The developed NPO model – the list of success indicators – can be put face to face with the business model, by looking at the common shared indicators and establishing the quantitative priorities for each indicator, in each type of organization. This research direction has the opportunity to show how much each indicator is valued in an NPO, as compared to in a for-profit organization. One assumption can be that an indicator as, for example, media coverage would score higher in a for-profit business than in a NPO, due to a higher necessity to show immediate results in a for-profit than in an NPO.
**Suggested Best Practices in Measuring NPOs**

The value of this thesis is both scholarly – due to the new theoretical model it proposes – and practical. Although the model is not generalizable, it may assist UWDC to develop a public relations strategic plan, in which evaluation is an important element for the overall organizational success (see Figure 6.11). Furthermore, the UWDC evaluation tree (see Figure 6.9) and the recommended public relations strategic plan (see Figure 6.11, Appendix 23) built in this study contribute to a series of several best practices in the field of nonprofit organization evaluation.

1. If there is one thing corporate public relations evaluation literature is teaching NPOs, that thing is linked to the dominant coalition aspect: public relations practitioner within the NPO should be part of the dominant coalition and should have a say in the organizational strategic decisions. This management function of public relations within NPOs will help aligning the public relations, communications and marketing goals to the organizational goals and will help the evaluation process to become comprehensive. Aligning the organizational goals with the public relations goals will help aligning the tactics of the organization with the public relations tactics, and measuring these results altogether, for a greater impact.

2. Every NPO wants to have the unanimous voice UWDC aims at, illustrated by two of UWDC’s organizational goals: “shared community vision” and “alignment” (of all actors towards the mission). In order to achieve these organizational goals, an NPO should have consistent communication with all the volunteers, partners and community members involved in the organizational activities. But above that, these actors need to
become message vehicles and mission ambassadors themselves. In order to do that, this study recommends communication workshops as an evaluation tool for the organization (see Appendix 23). The workshops would be addressed to all the organizational constituencies, or to identify opinion leaders and will consist of a session where the organization shares its mission, values and vision, and a part where the floor is opened for discussion with the participants (which are key audiences for the organization). This tactic will not only benefit the organizational impact (by helping the organization sharing its messages), but also the way this impact is assessed and measured. These communication workshops will rather be a form of public conversation between the nonprofit organization and the community members. They will open the floor for a face-to-face discussion, and for a type of communication that businesses fail to achieve or are afraid of: a two-way symmetrical communication. Nonprofit organizations have in their nature this type of communication, which is actually a perfect way to evaluate if the organization is doing good or not, by receiving direct feedback from the co-interested groups. For businesses this type of communication is like an open-heart surgery – even if they do it, it hurts a lot, because businesses have a higher tendency toward controlled and structured communication. Meanwhile, for nonprofits, opening up to their public for a critical discussion about their activity would be the ideal way of evaluating their impact and going beyond building genuine relationships with their audiences. Collecting the feedback from each workshop and centralizing it would make a good evaluation piece for the NPO and would establish a valuable measurement tool.
3. Most nonprofit organizations have an array of departments and specialized volunteers: for fundraising, for events planning, for community relations, for marketing and communication, etc. This study suggests to NPOs, as a best practice, to assign a responsible with measuring the organizational impact. This position can be held by an employee or by a volunteer, or it can generate an evaluation team. This team would be the center of collecting information from each department about what the organization does, how it does it (with what resources) and with what results.

Having this evaluation team in place would help each department of the organization become more responsible about their outcome-oriented activities, but it will also help the organization overall: first, because this team would facilitate the guidelines for each department to become accountable and to assess its activities (so it will create an organizational evaluation plan template for everybody to follow); second, because by establishing this team the organization makes a statement in front of its constituencies about the importance it genuinely gives to the impact it makes and to the results of its social investment.

4. The organizational evaluation plan established by the evaluation team should be designed around three main pillars: outputs, outcomes and outtakes. The evaluation team will work side-by-side with the public relations and communication team, in order to establish the benchmarks and the success indicators specific for the organization. The choice of the public relations team to be support for the evaluation team is not aleatory. This study’s assumption is that there are many organizations which do well in their communities, but they do not have the tools or the necessary expertise to voice their
benefits to the community. Thus, public relations is seen as a support for the NPOs to do good and to measure that good. There is no need for an organization to have a public relations department, if the organization does not contribute to the peoples’ lives, in a positive way. In other words, public relations should be preceded by a strong organizational mission and vision. Otherwise, there is no need of public relations (unless the organization is willing to build the mission and vision and improve its activities).

In this context, the outputs, outtakes and outcomes evaluation pillars will have two dimensions: an organizational dimension (based on the organizational goals) and a communicational dimension (based on the public relations goals). First, under outputs the organization will put the number of action steps in the strategic plans that have been completed (organizational dimension). Then, under the communicational dimension the outputs will measure the number of activities that have been communicated to the members of the community (the outputs will measure the media coverage, number of hits, number of impressions, tonality, prominence, message inclusion, share of voice, share of online discussions etc.). Second, under outtakes, the organizational dimension will measure, for example, the number of people who attended an event, the number of people who asked for support from the organization, the number of people who recommended the organization or a project of the organization to a friend, etc. Under the outtakes, the communicational dimension will measure the awareness level regarding an event or project of the organization, the understanding and the perceptions of the audiences, as well as the attitudes/opinions generated by the communicational and organizational efforts, together. Third, under outcomes, the organizational dimension will measure the end impact within the community (depending on the organizational goals),
whereas the *communication*al component will measure the behaviors of and the relationships with the audiences that lead the organization to reach its goals (organizational audiences start with the employees of the organization, volunteers, and continue with the partners, members of the community etc.).

All these pillars are interconnected and not self-sufficient. This means that if the evaluation reaches only the first one or two pillars, then the evaluation cannot be able to prove the overall impact of the organization. Moreover, if only the measurement at the end pillar (outcomes) is conducted, and if some goals are proven not to have been met, then the organization would not know what it did wrong through the process. Hence, the other two pillars (outputs and outtakes) also have a regulatory role – the organization can improve on its way to achieving the grand organizational goals.

Moreover, each of the three pillars – under the communication dimension – is meant to build the way toward the ultimate desired behavior among the constituencies and toward the desired relationships. The outputs and outtakes build this way at the cognitive and attitudinal levels, through building awareness and acceptance. The outcomes build the behavioral level, through the actions taken by the co-interested groups.

The research tools for measuring the outputs, outcomes and outtakes may vary depending on the human and financial resources the organization has. But the closer the organization gets to its constituencies, the better and the easier the evaluation becomes. Moreover, there are a number of research businesses that can offer pro-bono services in order to assist NPOs with their evaluation. This study recommends to both NPOs and
businesses to encourage such practices in order to maximize the NPOs impact within the community and the social change.

**Conclusion**

One of the purposes of this study was to explore the public relations evaluation field by looking at it from the nonprofit perspective. The academic research has not gone in-depth in the direction of public relations evaluation in nonprofit organizations. Moreover, the public relations practice was conveyed from the business sector to the nonprofit sector without too many questions and without differentiating the practice by types of organization. This situation brought inequalities in the public communication area, where the budgets of public relations dictate the strength of the organizational voices in the public sphere. In this context, evaluation becomes essential for nonprofits, as a way to improve their effectiveness, independent from the communication and public relations budget. This study ultimately advocates that not only the public relations component should be integrated to the nonprofit management component, but the public relations evaluation process can be improved and adapted to NPOs in order to maximize their global impact.
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Appendix 1: Relationship Survey

Control Mutuality
1. This organization and people like me are attentive to what each other say.
2. This organization believes the opinions of people like me are legitimate.
3. In dealing with people like me, this organization has a tendency to throw its weight around. *(Reversed)*
4. This organization really listens to what people like me have to say.
5. The management of this organization gives people like me enough say in the decision-making process.

Trust
1. This organization treats people like me fairly and justly.
2. Whenever this organization makes an important decision, I know it will be concerned about people like me.
3. This organization can be relied on to keep its promises.
4. I believe that this organization takes the opinions of people like me into account when making decisions.
5. I feel very confident about this organization’s skills.
6. This organization has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do.

Commitment
1. I feel that this organization is trying to maintain a long-term commitment to people like me.
2. I can see that this organization wants to maintain a relationship with people like me.
3. There is a long-lasting bond between this organization and people like me.
4. Compared to other organizations, I value my relationship with this organization more.
5. I would rather work together with this organization than not.

Satisfaction
1. I am happy with this organization.
2. Both the organization and people like me benefit from the relationship.
3. Most people like me are happy in their interactions with this organization.
4. Generally speaking, I am pleased with the relationship this organization has established with people like me.
5. Most people enjoy dealing with this organization.

Exchange Relationships
1. Whenever this organization gives or offers something to people like me, it generally expects something in return.
2. Even though people like me have had a relationship with this organization for a long time, it still expects something in return whenever it offers us a favor.
3. This organization will compromise with people like me when it knows that it will gain something.
4. This organization takes care of people who are likely to reward the organization.

Communal Relationships
1. This organization does not especially enjoy giving others aid. *(Reversed)*
2. This organization is very concerned about the welfare of people like me.
3. I feel that this organization takes advantage of people who are vulnerable. *(Reversed)*
4. I think that this organization succeeds by stepping on other people. *(Reversed)*
5. This organization helps people like me without expecting anything in return.

Once the questionnaire has been filled out, the negative indicators of each concept should be reversed, and the answers to all of the items measuring each relationship outcome should be averaged, so that overall “mean” scores can be calculated. Testing of the scales shows them to be good measures of perceptions of relationships, strong enough to be used in evaluating relationships.

---

Appendix 2: The Likely performance measurement framework².

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost-effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive</strong></td>
<td>Strategic management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- financial/resource utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- planning/strategy formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- continuous improvement/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- client relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- brand equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; effectiveness measures combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- supplier management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- client service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- attitudes/opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; effectiveness measures combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technician</strong></td>
<td>Inputs/Throughputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- process quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- task time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- cycle time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reach/coverage/pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outtakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- attention to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- recall/retention/response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; effectiveness measures combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3: Bartholomew Evaluation Framework

Appendix 4: Cutlip, Center and Bloom PII model (1985)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Social and Cultural Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who repeat behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who behave as desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who change attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who change opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who learn message content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Number who attend to messages and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who receive messages and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of messages placed and activities...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of messages sent to media and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>Quality of messages and activity <em>presentation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of message and activity <em>content</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy of background <em>information</em> base for designing program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5: Pyramid Model of PR research (Macnamara, 1992; revised in 1999 and 2002)\(^5\)

---

Appendix 6: PR Effectiveness Yardstick (Lindenmann, 1993)⁶
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Appendix 7: Continuing Model of Evaluation (Watson, 1997)\(^7\)
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Appendix 8: Unified Evaluation Model (Noble and Watson, 1999/2005)\textsuperscript{a}

United Way of Delaware County
Advancing the Common Good

We engage the community to improve lives by focusing resources on:

**Education**
Helping Children & Youth Succeed

**Income**
Promoting Financial Stability

**Health**
Improving Health & Independence

**Basic Needs**
Ensuring the Basic Needs of Individuals and Families are Met

- Children enter school ready to succeed.
- Children achieve academic goals.
- Youth are productive and engaged citizens

Lower income families & individuals:
- Increase Income
- Build Savings
- Gain and Sustain Assets

- Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.
- Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
- Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.
- Caregivers are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.

**Community Goals**

**Community Solutions**

**Strategies**

- Advocacy
- Resource Generation
- Volunteer Engagement
- Progress & Results Measurement
- Community Investment
- Partnerships & Collaborations

- 2-1-1
- Initiative
- Inclusion
- Labor

**Donor Relationships**

**Community Engagement**

**Agenda**

- Labor
- Partnerships
- Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network
- Progress & Results Measurement
LIVE UNITED

• To Live United means being part of the change.
• It takes everyone in the community working together to create a brighter future.
• Together, we can accomplish more than a single group can on its own.
• Give. Advocate. Volunteer. LIVE UNITED.

ADVANCING THE COMMON GOOD
Advancing the common good means creating opportunities for a better life for all. When we reach out a hand to one, we influence the condition of all. We all win when a child succeeds in school, when families are financially stable and when people have good health. These results have benefits that ripple out to the community as a whole.

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS
Contributions to UWDC support 21 programs administered by Community Partners in the focus areas of Education, Income and Health. UWDC also works with a variety of organizations including nonprofits, the business community, government, faith groups and citizens in order to address critical issues facing the residents of Delaware County.

Partnering with over 50 community organizations led by AARP, IRS, and VITA, United Way is working to provide low and moderate-income individuals and families with free tax preparation services and information about the Earned Income Tax Credit. As a result of this outreach, those who used these services in the last two years have obtained over $3,000,000 from their federal tax returns, including $725,000 in Earned Income Tax Credits.

Working with community health providers, UWDC has made the FamilyWise Prescription Discount Card available since November 2007. Through May 2010, individuals in Delaware County have saved $232,902 in prescription costs.

UWDC, BSU’s Fisher Institute for Wellness and Gerontology, Lifestream, and the Ball Brothers Foundation have partnered together to develop with broad community involvement a white paper outlining the needs and services for our older adults so they can continue to live full lives.

UWDC continues to partner with Lifestream in providing Delaware County with 2-1-1. A person calling 2-1-1 has the call answered by a trained Information & Referral Specialist, who assesses the caller’s needs and gives information that will enable the caller to connect with available human services to meet those needs.

Working with representatives from MITS, Delaware County, local agencies and advocates for those with disabilities, UWDC was able to help bring to our community two minivan taxi cabs that will provide round-the-clock service to people with disabilities throughout Delaware County.

EDUCATION INCOME & HEALTH
There are basic things that we all need for a good life: a quality education that leads to a stable job, income that can support a family through retirement, and good health. United Way is focused on the building blocks for a better life, investing in our community through our 3 Focus Areas:

- **Education**: Children and youth are nurtured by informed parents/caregivers and have access to quality health, developmental, and educational services that prepare them for success in school and life.

- **Income**: Individuals and families can meet life’s basic needs—shelter, food, clothing, and transportation—and gain economic stability through education, job training, permanent housing, and basic supportive services. United Way supports programs for people living in poverty, the “working poor,” and survivors of violence or disaster.

- **Health**: Individuals and families have access to quality, affordable healthcare and the opportunity to maximize their physical, mental and emotional health and well-being in order to lead independent, productive lives.

LASTING CHANGES
Our goal is to create long-lasting changes by addressing the underlying causes of problems, while still providing basic needs to those in crisis. We don’t just address the symptoms of a problem. We go deeper to get at the underlying causes. Success is measured by the lives and community conditions we improve.
AOK: A Better Way provides an after school program to strengthen families and provide students a place to achieve their academic goals while building their character in a peaceful environment.

Adult Day Services: Alpha Center provides adult day service for persons 60 and older who may be physically and cognitively impaired and those who are socially isolated.

After School Programs: Muncie Boys and Girls Club provides after school and summer programs for children during the time of day when they are most likely to engage in risky behaviors.

Center Based Childcare: United Daycare Center provides developmentally appropriate and inclusive early childhood education/care which contributes to the positive development of all children.

Childcare Resource and Referral: Huffer Memorial Children’s Center provides child care referrals for parents, training for providers, and promotes quality child care environments for 10 counties in Eastern Indiana.

Client Services: Cancer Services Little Red Door provides equipment, food and services in order to reduce the physical and financial burdens of a cancer diagnosis.

Disaster Services: American Red Cross provides emergency services to all residents in an affected area during a natural or man made disaster, as well as during a personal disaster, such as a house fire.

Domestic Violence Services: A Better Way Services provides an ongoing emergency domestic violence shelter and provides a host of related services.

Early Intervention Therapies: Hillcroft Services provides developmental therapies to children birth to three who are developmentally delayed or who have been diagnosed with a medical condition that has a high probability of developmental delay.

Educare: Huffer Memorial Children’s center provides developmentally appropriate and inclusive early childhood education/care which contributes to the positive development of all children.

Education Enrichment: Motivate Our Minds provides tutoring and educational assistance to children after school.

Emergency Food and Financial Assistance Program: Salvation Army provides emergency financial and food assistance to those in crisis in Delaware County whose total household income is within 200% of the federally established poverty level.

Financial Assistance: YMCA provides financial assistance to individuals and families who otherwise may not be able to afford it, so they may participate in the membership program in order to build a healthy spirit, mind and body.

Food Distribution: Second Harvest Food Bank provides food to all food pantries and other nonprofit organizations that serve low income individuals and families in the county in an effort to eliminate hunger. They also run the Tailgate Food Distribution Program, where families may periodically receive food directly from the organization at a community distribution location, generally a community center.

Healthcare Coverage: Through Gateway Health Clinic, persons with low incomes who are uninsured are able to access sliding fee or free health services, including preventative health care.

Isanogel: Hillcroft Services provides a camping experience to youth and adults with disabilities at Isanogel Center.

Meal Delivery: This program provided by Meals on Wheels is designed to deliver meals every Monday through Friday to homebound persons living within the Muncie city limits who are unable to manage their own meal preparation. This service allows elderly and disabled people to live independently in their own home.

Medical and Dental Services: Through Open Door BMH, persons with low incomes who are uninsured are able to access sliding fee or free health and dental services, including preventative health care.

Men’s Shelter and Rehabilitation Program: Muncie Mission deals strongly with addictions counseling and uses the 12 Step program for recovery. There are 5 levels to the program, the final being the move to an independent living apartment building.

Mentoring: Big Brothers/Big Sisters provides a matching program between an adult (a big) and a child (a little) in order to contribute to the development of the child into a confident, competent and caring adult.

Transitional Housing: Bridges Community Services provides transitional (supportive) housing opportunities for forgotten populations: single dads with children and single women, as well as housing for single moms with children. The goal for each of these programs is that the family will leave Bridges better educated, more gainfully employed and able to sustain permanent housing.
EDUCATION:
Student Success Coalition
The Student Success Coalition is designed to encourage success in children by focusing on the child as a whole: academically, socially, physically and emotionally. This coalition works to develop trusting relationships (partnerships) between schools, out of school time programs, parents, teachers and students.

Delaware County Early Childhood Coalition
The Early Childhood Coalition is being formed in order to ensure that all children are nurtured by informed families/caregivers and have access to quality health, developmental and educational services which prepare them for success in school and life. United Way of Delaware County is uniquely positioned to reach out to children and their parents because of it relationships with the nonprofit, education and business communities. Through United Way's leadership, this coalition will raise the awareness of early childhood learning in the community, advocate on behalf of young children and implement proven strategies to prepare all children for Kindergarten.

INCOME:
Delaware County Financial Literacy Initiative
The community solutions team volunteers realized, through the funding process, that there is a need for a comprehensive financial literacy course that is consistent among all organizations that work with low-income individuals. The response has been overwhelming from organizations in Delaware County who provide financial literacy courses. From this response, subcommittees of non-profits, organizations and businesses began working to design particular areas for this comprehensive course. When this launches, there will be a financial literacy template that can be used by numerous agencies and offered to the public on a regular basis here in Delaware County.

Free Tax Preparation Services promoting the Earned Income Tax Credit
United Way of Delaware County partners with the IRS, AARP, VITA, and more than 50 other organizations and volunteers to provide free tax preparation services to low-income families in Delaware County. To date, more than $3 million have been brought to back into the community.

HEALTH:
United Way of Delaware County Caregiver Coalition
There are estimated more than 12,000 caregivers in Delaware County working part or full time in addition to providing assistance in daily living activities to their loved ones. These individuals, on average, spend 20 hours a week on care giving responsibilities. So, it’s not surprising that many care givers become overwhelmed by the stress, and their health begins to suffer. In fact three quarters of all care givers report that the demands have affected their health. Many report their productivity and performance at work suffer as well. Because of the impact on their work, it is estimated that the average loss of lifetime wealth for a person who is a care giver is more $650,000.

United Way’s health community solutions team is working to develop a Delaware County Caregiver Coalition, which will focus on ensuring that family or informal caregivers have the support necessary to remain healthy and productive in the workplace while providing quality care to their loved ones.

The FamilyWize Discount Prescription Card
Working with community health providers, United Way of Delaware County has made the FamilyWize Prescription Discount Card available since November 2007. Through May 2010, individuals in Delaware County have saved nearly $250,000 in prescription costs.

EDUCATION, INCOME & HEALTH:
United Way-LifeStream 2-1-1
United Way-LifeStream 2-1-1 is a toll-free resource referral hotline to connect individuals to a variety of services from basic needs such as shelter and food to life’s more difficult challenges: finding childcare and resources for caregivers.
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**OVERALL FRAMEWORK**

The outcome-focused planning process begins with the end in mind, and then puts the elements in place that will make those desired results a reality. For the United Way of Delaware County, the framework encompassing those desired results and supporting elements is as follows:

- **Vision:** To unite the caring power of our community to improve lives.

- **Mission:** We engage the community in improving lives by focusing resources on education, income, and health

- **Community Goals for Education**
- **Program and Initiative Outcomes in Education**

- **Community Goals for Income**
- **Program and Initiative Outcomes in Income**

- **Community Goals for Health**
- **Program and Initiative Outcomes in Health**

**Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda**

**Program/Initiative and Community-Level Performance Indicators**

**Internal Strategic Goals**

**Strategic Organizational Objectives**

**Performance Indicators for the Strategic Plan**

**High Priority Action Steps**
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COMMUNITY GOALS
United Way of Delaware County is focused on ultimately achieving meaningful and measurable goals at the community level in the defined focus areas of education, income and health. The Community Goals drive all of United Way’s work—strategy development, resource development, marketing, accountability, and services—-and its efforts to partner with others to advance the common good. The entire United Way organization will align with these goals in terms of both resources and activities.

Education: All children are nurtured by informed parents/caregivers and have access to quality health, developmental, and educational services which prepare them for success in school and life. Specifically:

1. Children enter school ready to succeed.
2. Children achieve academic goals.
3. Youth are productive and engaged citizens.

Income: Individuals and families can meet life’s basic needs (shelter, food, clothing, and transportation) and gain economic stability through education, job training, permanent housing, and basic supportive services. United Way supports programs for people living in poverty, the working poor, and survivors of violence or disaster. Specifically, lower income families and individuals:

1. Increase income
2. Build savings
3. Gain and sustain assets

Health: All people have access to quality, affordable healthcare and have the opportunity to maximize their physical, mental, and emotional health and well-being to lead independent, productive lives. Specifically:

1. Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.
2. Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
3. Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.
4. Caregivers are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.

PROGRAM AND INITIATIVE OUTCOMES
While the community goals represent a longer-term purpose, progress toward those intended results can be produced at the program and initiative level. The following intended outcomes directly contribute to the corresponding goals.

Education
1. Children meet age appropriate benchmarks at Kindergarten entrance.
2. Elementary school children are prepared to succeed in later grades.
3. Young people graduate from high school.
4. Young adults make a successful transition from high school to work life.
5. All children have at least 31 of 40 developmental assets.

Income
Lower income families and individuals:
1. Have their basic needs met.
2. Have increased job skills.
3. Receive all public benefits for which they are eligible.
4. Have savings or checking accounts and money saved for an emergency.
5. Purchase and/or maintain their home.
6. Invest in their child’s education.
7. Start a business.

Health
1. Adults and children receive timely, regular preventive healthcare.
2. Youth and adults acquire and maintain healthy lifestyles.
3. Caregivers receive the support necessary to provide quality care to their loved one and stay productive in the workplace.

**COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS AGENDA**

The agenda is one of several dynamic elements of this plan. In this case, the agenda includes the individual strategies to be implemented in order to produce the desired outcomes for individuals and families in the areas of education, income, and health. As such, it includes the strategies to encourage the community to Live United, and in so doing, give, volunteer, and advocate. Ultimately, the focus of all the strategies will be the achievement of the Community Goals.

All of these identified strategies will evolve over time as conditions in the community change. The constant is that the strategies will be developed and implemented to produce meaningful and measurable change in individuals and in the community.

The Core Strategies of the Community Solutions Agenda are as follows:

- Community Engagement
- Volunteer Engagement
- Advocacy
- Community Investment
- Initiatives
- Partnerships & Collaborations
- Resource Generation
- Donor Relations
- Progress and Results Measurement
- Inclusion
- 2-1-1
- Indiana Nonprofit Resource Network
- Labor

Each Core Strategy will have benchmark measurements in order track progress and success. These benchmarks will be derived from the specific activities associated with each core strategy.

**KEY INDICATORS: PROGRAM/INITIATIVE AND COMMUNITY-LEVEL PERFORMANCE**

Ongoing performance measurement is a key element of this plan. Its purpose is to provide an ongoing source of data and information to volunteers and staff so that they can continuously improve upon the strategies in the Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda.

All programs and initiatives will be measured based on their specific outcomes results. The results will be analyzed in terms of effectiveness in improving lives and improving community conditions.

The following Key Indicators will be used to measure the overall impact of UWDC activities and investments in programs and initiatives:

Education
United Way of Delaware County
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- Percentage of children who begin Kindergarten successfully.
- Percentage of students entering fourth grade who are proficient readers.
- Percentage of public high school students who graduate on time.

Income
- Number of families receiving assistance through food pantries, shelters, and other emergency assistance outlets.
- Percentage of eligible households accessing public benefits.
- Percentage of families and individuals with a checking or savings account.

Health
- Number and percentage of individuals who have access to health care, and are receiving that care.
- Percentage of people who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
- Number of caregivers accessing support services.

INTERNAL STRATEGIC GOALS
The achievement of the intended results at all levels will be directly influenced by the internal capacity of United Way. The following internal goals will serve to guide the internal organizational development, as well guide the external strategies of the Community Solutions Agenda.

1. Shared Community Vision: United Way and the community establish a shared vision for the future by creating a collective understanding of key community interests, aspirations, assets and concerns which represent the perspectives of diverse groups, individuals and sectors.

2. Partner Engagement: United Way deliberately and actively builds quality relationships with traditional and non-traditional partners and involves them at every step of the way. United Way engages partners around priority community issues, shared strategies and corresponding resource development and mobilization.

3. Resource Development and Mobilization: United Way mobilizes the many community assets – money, people, knowledge, relationships and technology – needed to implement community solutions strategies and achieve meaningful results. Operating from a flexible multi-year resource development plan – that supports community solution strategies, includes keys market segments (both traditional and non-traditional) and ensures a balanced and diverse revenue base from multiple sources – United Way builds personal relationships with donors/investors, segments markets based on interests, and recognizes all contributions.

4. Alignment: Leaders align all organizational elements and resources (functional areas, systems, skills, staff, board, volunteers, structure, culture, mindset and investments) to support United Way’s Mission, Vision and Community Outcomes.

5. Measure, Evaluate and Communicate: United Way and its partners evaluate the effectiveness of strategies in order to continuously improve. They identify appropriate measures, collect and analyze results, and assess progress toward desired outcomes. Outcomes may be measured at multiple levels (e.g., programs, system and community). What is learned may cause United Way and partners to re-think, change or adjust strategies, actions and investments. Results are communicated to the community.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 2006, United Way of Delaware County’s Board of Directors approved the adoption of the Community Solutions Business Model as means to be more responsive to needs and challenges of our community. This approach builds upon United Way’s traditional approach as a funder of service programming by expanding its role in the community to advance the common good in the areas of education, income and health.

United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) now works to engage the entire community around a shared vision that includes not only meeting the needs of individuals and families, but also finding solutions to the root causes of problems that challenges our community. With an emphasis on collaborations and innovation, UWDC seeks to work with an ever wider range of community partners and their resources in order to address these challenges. And UWDC is focused on measuring and reporting to the community the results of our strategies and resource investments.

The 2010-2013 Outcome-Focused Strategic Plan has been developed to guide UWDC as it continues to implement the Community Solutions approach. It represents UWDC’s commitment to establishing long-term community goals, determining how we’ll measure success, developing and implementing the right multi-dimensional strategies, measuring results of our strategies and resource investments over time. The Plan seeks to provide the framework as UWDC works to have maximum impact on improving our community and people’s lives.

The Plan will help ensure that UWDC is focused, strategic, and able to make hard choices that are necessary to achieve maximum impact in the areas of education, income and health.

There is a dual focus to this strategic plan. The first is the achievement of meaningful change in the lives of individuals and families in our community. That will be accomplished through the proactive Community Solutions Agenda that includes multiple change strategies and encompasses UWDC’s work from resource development to community initiatives. The second is the expanded capacity of United Way to effectively fulfill its role as a community solutions leader and champion.

UWDC’s Vision is to unite the caring power of our community to improve lives; and our Mission is to engage the community in improving lives by focusing resources on education, income, and health. In order to successfully achieve our Mission and Vision, UWDC has established Community Goals that detail the meaningful community change towards which we are striving in everything we do in the areas of education, income and health.

The Program and Initiative Outcomes, the Community Solutions Agenda, the Internal Strategic Goals and corresponding Strategic Organizational Objectives, and all the indicators that follow are intended to work toward making these Community Goals a reality. While the Community Goals serve to guide and align all elements of the plan and work of the organization, we realize that substantial progress in each of those focus areas will be limited during the three-year duration of the plan.
Significant results, however, can be expected for each of the program and initiative level outcomes that align with the Community Goals, as well as the Strategic Organizational Objectives that align with the Internal Strategic Goals.

The Plan also details High Priority Action Steps that align with the Internal Strategic Goals. These action steps are not intended to detail the entire scope of UWDC’s work, but rather to detail the facets of the work that will expand and strengthen the Strategic Organizational Objectives and the transformation to becoming a Community Solutions United Way.

The entire strategic framework reflects the logic of this approach: from the Vision and Mission to the plan performance indicators, each element of the plan is logically linked to the preceding element. As a result, it is reasonable and plausible to think that the Community Goals and Program/Initiative Outcomes can be achieved over time through the implementation of the plan.

The process of developing the Plan was data and information driven, and that will also be the case with the implementation of the plan. Just as we ask of our partners that we support, UWDC’s decision-making and continuous improvement efforts will be guided and informed by data and information. Consequently, ongoing measurement, analysis, and reporting of performance indicators will be an essential element in the implementation of the plan.

Rather than a static document that will remain unchanged during the three-year period, this plan accurately reflects the dynamic and responsive nature of the community solutions work. This Plan will be open to ongoing assessment and revision, while remaining aligned and focused on the Community Goals. Ultimately, the question of achieving maximum impact on the areas of education, income and health must be constantly posed, and answered with the best strategies and the most scalable solutions known at the time.

Moreover, just as the development of the Plan was a team effort by volunteer leadership and staff, so too will be the implementation of the Plan. Neither group can do it alone. Collectively, volunteers and staff can ensure that all the High Priority Action Steps are fully implemented and completed on time.

And this will help ensure that work of UWDC in the community, the Community Solutions Agenda, will be as successful as possible. The Community Solutions Agenda is the specific strategies and actions that UWDC volunteers and staff work with our community partners to improve lives and change community conditions in the areas of health, education and income. The Agenda makes possible for UWDC to deliver upon the invitation to the community to give, advocate and volunteer. When we LIVE UNITED, we will do so through the Agenda.
OVERALL FRAMEWORK

The outcome-focused planning process begins with the end in mind, and then puts the elements in place that will make those desired results a reality. For the United Way of Delaware County, the framework encompassing those desired results and supporting elements is as follows:

**Vision:** To unite the caring power of our community to improve lives.

**Mission:** We engage the community in improving lives by focusing resources on education, income, and health

- Community Goals for Education
- Community Goals for Income
- Community Goals for Health

- Program and Initiative Outcomes in Education
- Program and Initiative Outcomes in Income
- Program and Initiative Outcomes in Health

Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda

Program/Initiative and Community-Level Performance Indicators

Internal Strategic Goals

Strategic Organizational Objectives

Performance Indicators for the Strategic Plan

High Priority Action Steps
In this framework, the Vision and Mission establish the purpose of the organization, and overall intent of this plan. That purpose is further translated into the specific desired results to be achieved in the community. Those Community-Level Goals serve to guide the work of United Way, both internally and externally. To achieve those goals, United Way is committed to producing specific outcomes at the program and initiative level.

These specific outcomes will be made possible through the implementation of a Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda that will include a range of individual change strategies. These strategies will include those related to resource development, community solutions, marketing, operations, and administration.

The outcome-focused planning process recognizes the need to continually measure progress to ensure the highest levels of performance. And so at this point in the framework a measurement component is included. In this case that component includes specific indicators of performance for Community Goals, and program and initiative outcomes.

In order for the Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda to produce the desired results, the United Way of Delaware County must be a high performing organization in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. The elements of Internal Strategic Goals, Strategic Organizational Objectives, and High Priority Action Steps address the area of organizational capacity. Those elements provide guidance and recommendations on strengthening the organization and putting it in a position to excel in achieving the desired results for individuals, families, and the community.

An outcome-focused plan is as dynamic as the process that developed it. Therefore it is necessary to measure the performance of the plan on an ongoing basis. Measuring the indicators of performance will yield data and information that can be used for continuous improvement.

This strategic framework reflects the desire that the implementation of this plan produces meaningful results in the community, and increase the capacity of the organization to have an even greater impact in the priority areas of education, income, and health.

The various elements reflected in the framework, will now be outlined in greater detail.
PURPOSE OF UNITED WAY OF DELAWARE COUNTY

The vision and mission of United Way of Delaware County describes the role of the organization in the community, and the difference it wants to make in the lives of individuals and families. It also serves to focus the work of the organization on the success factors of education, income, and health.

Vision: To unite the caring power of our community to improve lives.

Mission: We engage the community in improving lives by focusing resources on education, income and health

COMMUNITY GOALS

While our Vision and Mission details our purpose, UWDC needs to be more focused in order to achieve meaningful results. To this end, United Way of Delaware County is focused on ultimately achieving meaningful and measurable goals at the community level in the defined focus areas of education, income and health.

The Community Goals drive all of United Way’s work—strategy development, resource development, marketing, accountability, and services---and its efforts to partner with others to advance the common good. The entire United Way organization will align with these goals in terms of both resources and activities.

Education: All children are nurtured by informed parents/caregivers and have access to quality health, developmental, and educational services which prepare them for success in school and life. Specifically:

1. Children enter school ready to succeed.
2. Children achieve academic goals.
3. Youth are productive and engaged citizens.

Income: Individuals and families can meet life’s basic needs (shelter, food, clothing, and transportation) and gain economic stability through education, job training, permanent housing, and basic supportive services. United Way supports programs for people living in poverty, the working poor, and survivors of violence or disaster. Specifically, lower income families and individuals:

1. Increase income
2. Build savings
3. Gain and sustain assets

Health: All people have access to quality, affordable healthcare and have the opportunity to maximize their physical, mental, and emotional health and well-being to lead independent, productive lives. Specifically:

1. Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.
2. Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
3. Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.
4. Caregivers are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.

PROGRAM AND INITIATIVE OUTCOMES

While the community goals represent a longer-term purpose, progress toward those intended results can be produced at the program and initiative level. The following intended outcomes directly contribute to the corresponding goals.

Education
1. Children meet age appropriate benchmarks at Kindergarten entrance.
2. Elementary school children are prepared to succeed in later grades.
3. Young people graduate from high school.
4. Young adults make a successful transition from high school to work life.
5. All children have at least 31 of 40 developmental assets.

Income
Lower income families and individuals:
1. Have their basic needs met.
2. Have increased job skills.
3. Receive all public benefits for which they are eligible.
4. Have savings or checking accounts and money saved for an emergency.
5. Purchase and/or maintain their home.
6. Invest in their child’s education.
7. Start a business.

Health
1. Adults and children receive timely, regular preventive healthcare.
2. Youth and adults acquire and maintain healthy lifestyles.
3. Caregivers receive the support necessary to provide quality care to their loved one and stay productive in the workplace.

COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS AGENDA

The agenda is one of several dynamic elements of this plan. In this case, the agenda includes the individual strategies to be implemented in order to produce the desired outcomes for individuals and families in the areas of education, income, and health. As such, it includes the strategies to encourage the community to Live United, and in so doing, give, volunteer, and advocate. Ultimately, the focus of all the strategies will be the achievement of the Community Goals.

All of these identified strategies will evolve over time as conditions in the community change. The constant is that the strategies will be developed and implemented to produce meaningful and measurable change in individuals and in the community.

The Core Strategies of the Community Solutions Agenda are as follows:
Each Core Strategy will have benchmark measurements in order to track progress and success. These benchmarks will be derived from the specific activities associated with each core strategy.

**KEY INDICATORS: PROGRAM/INITIATIVE AND COMMUNITY-LEVEL PERFORMANCE**

Ongoing performance measurement is a key element of this plan. Its purpose is to provide an ongoing source of data and information to volunteers and staff so that they can continuously improve upon the strategies in the Comprehensive Community Solutions Agenda.

All programs and initiatives will be measured based on their specific outcomes results. The results will be analyzed in terms of effectiveness in improving lives and improving community conditions.

The following Key Indicators will be used to measure the overall impact of UWDC activities and investments in programs and initiatives:

**Education**
- Percentage of children who begin Kindergarten successfully.
- Percentage of students entering fourth grade who are proficient readers.
- Percentage of public high school students who graduate on time.

**Income**
- Number of families receiving assistance through food pantries, shelters, and other emergency assistance outlets.
- Percentage of eligible households accessing public benefits.
- Percentage of families and individuals with a checking or savings account.

**Health**
- Number and percentage of individuals who have access to health care, and are receiving that care.
- Percentage of people who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
- Number of caregivers accessing support services.
INTERNAL STRATEGIC GOALS

The achievement of the intended results at all levels will be directly influenced by the internal capacity of United Way. The following internal goals will serve to guide the internal organizational development, as well guide the external strategies of the Community Solutions Agenda.

1. Shared Community Vision: United Way and the community establish a shared vision for the future by creating a collective understanding of key community interests, aspirations, assets and concerns which represent the perspectives of diverse groups, individuals and sectors.

2. Partner Engagement: United Way deliberately and actively builds quality relationships with traditional and non-traditional partners and involves them at every step of the way. United Way engages partners around priority community issues, shared strategies and corresponding resource development and mobilization.

3. Resource Development and Mobilization: United Way mobilizes the many community assets – money, people, knowledge, relationships and technology – needed to implement community solutions strategies and achieve meaningful results. Operating from a flexible multi-year resource development plan – that supports community solution strategies, includes keys market segments (both traditional and non-traditional) and ensures a balanced and diverse revenue base from multiple sources – United Way builds personal relationships with donors/investors, segments markets based on interests, and recognizes all contributions.

4. Alignment: Leaders align all organizational elements and resources (functional areas, systems, skills, staff, board, volunteers, structure, culture, mindset and investments) to support United Way’s Mission, Vision and Community Outcomes.

5. Measure, Evaluate and Communicate: United Way and its partners evaluate the effectiveness of strategies in order to continuously improve. They identify appropriate measures, collect and analyze results, and assess progress toward desired outcomes. Outcomes may be measured at multiple levels (e.g., programs, system and community). What is learned may cause United Way and partners to re-think, change or adjust strategies, actions and investments. Results are communicated to the community.

STRATEGIC ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES

In order to ensure the achievement of the Internal Strategic Goals, United Way of Delaware County will achieve the following Strategic Organizational Objectives:
1. Engage the diverse stakeholders in the community around the issues of health, education and income.
2. Invest diverse array of resources into programs and initiatives that contribute toward achievement of community-level objectives.
3. Have quality, well-defined relationships with diverse array of community partners.
4. Have donors, advocates and volunteers who are highly engaged, aware of United Way's work, and feel recognized and appreciated for their contributions.
5. Develop and implement organizational policies, procedures, structures and systems that facilitate the achievement of Community Outcomes.
6. Conduct and participate in community events.
7. Promote giving, advocating, and volunteering.
8. Provide the community with information about relevant issues, current and potential solutions, and the work of United Way.
9. Gather and manage information regarding the community and the work of United Way.

**KEY INDICATORS FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN**

The measurement system also includes plan-specific indicators that measure the success of achieving organizational strategic goals. This will be essential if the plan is to be a dynamic and responsive document that provides ongoing direction and guidance to the organization.

**Internal Performance Indicators:**

- Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been started/initiated
- Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been completed
- Total amount of resources under management annually, and the corresponding percentage of change year-to-year
  - Financial resources (individual and corporate contributions, government and foundation grants, endowment, in-kind, and special events)
  - Human resources (volunteers, including advocates)
- Within each goal area, total amount of resources invested, number of programs and initiatives supported, and number of clients served
- Number and percentage of program partners that increased their effectiveness in producing meaningful results for their clients (used outcome data and information to make improvements in service delivery and/or outcome achievement)

As a means of measuring the overall performance of the plan, UWDC will utilize the following performance targets for the fiscal year 2012-2013:

**Performance Targets:**

- The total resources under management from all sources will reach $3 million annually by June 30, 2013.
- The annual workplace campaign will comprise 60% of all resources under management by June 30, 2013. (This reflects the intent to produce a balanced
portfolio of revenue sources, while still recognizing the important role of the annual workplace campaign.)

- All programs and initiatives that are partnering with United Way of Delaware County will be producing meaningful and measurable results that positively contribute to the achievement of United Way’s intended community-level outcomes within *Education, Income, and Health* by June 30, 2013.

**IN SUMMARY**

This outcome-focused strategic plan is designed to produce the desired results for the community and the organization. It is a document that is both structured and flexible. As a result it allows the organization to be responsive and proactive within an overall framework focused on action and results.

As UWDC volunteers and staff implement this Plan and carry out the strategies of the Community Solutions Agenda, we will always do so in a manner that is aligned with our *Values*:

- We develop trust with our partners in our community
- We work together on our solutions
- We measure results and learn from their impact
- We invite all to join us
## HIGH PRIORITY ACTION STEPS

The completion of the following action steps have been identified as necessary to achieving the highest standards of organizational excellence. The products of these steps will position the organization to be even more effective in fulfilling its leadership role in the community.

The responsibility for each action step will be determined on a case by case basis. Potential team members may include staff, volunteers, or Board Committees. The various roles on each team will also be determined on a case by case basis.

The High Priority Action Steps are designed to put the organizational practices and processes in place to support the mission and vision of the organization. They are not intended to be inclusive of all the critical work done by UWDC’s volunteers, partners and staff. The High Priority Action Steps focus on work related to implementing the Community Solutions Business Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal # 1: Shared Community Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Way and the community establish a shared vision for the future by creating a collective understanding of key community interests, aspirations, assets and concerns which represent the perspectives of diverse groups, individuals and sectors.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>High Priority Improvement / Enhancement</th>
<th>Key Group/Constituency</th>
<th>Projected Completion Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Update the mission and vision so that it reflects the community impact direction and work</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Update the website, and put in place a process to continually update it so that it reflects the dynamic nature of the organization at this time</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Reconstitute the Marketing and Communications Committee of the Board, with a focus on its expanded role and responsibilities</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Develop a multi-faceted marketing and communications plan that represents a comprehensive approach to educating and informing key audiences on the Community Impact Agenda and organizational strengths of United Way of Delaware County</td>
<td>Organization and Community-Wide</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Identify community leaders from all sectors that can play key roles in the Community Solutions strategies</td>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Community Vision</td>
<td>Develop an outreach effort to the identified leaders for the purpose of expanding their individual awareness, knowledge, and support of the Community Solutions strategies</td>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal # 2: Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Way deliberately and actively builds quality relationships with traditional and non-traditional partners and involves them at every step of the way. United Way engages partners around priority community issues, shared strategies and corresponding resource development and mobilization.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>High Priority Improvement / Enhancement</th>
<th>Key Group/Constituency</th>
<th>Projected Completion Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner Engagement</td>
<td>Develop initial Community Solutions Mobilization Plans for Focus Area initiatives</td>
<td>Community Solutions Partners</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal # 3: Resource Development and Mobilization</th>
<th>High Priority Improvement / Enhancement</th>
<th>Key Group/Constituency</th>
<th>Completion Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop a multi-faceted resource development plan that represents a comprehensive approach to securing the resources necessary to meet organizational needs (including planning giving, endowment, major gifts, and multi-year gifts)</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop and implement a relationship management system, including policies and procedures</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop a program to identify and secure grant funding in support of United Ways community-level outcomes</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop personalized philanthropic proposals to be presented to donors</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Assess and update the donor/volunteer/advocate recognition policies and procedures</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Initiate an ongoing outreach effort to inform and engage tax, legal, financial management, and estate planning professionals in an understanding of United Way as a leading choice for charitable giving</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop an approach to address the need for a community plan to match organizations who seek volunteers and individuals who want to volunteer</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Develop a process to collect data and information on the number of volunteers involved in the Community Solutions work, and the number of volunteer hours</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal # 4: Alignment</th>
<th>High Priority Improvement / Enhancement</th>
<th>Key Group/Constituency</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Update the Fund Distribution Policies, aligning them with the community impact direction and focus</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>December, 2008 (completed 11/2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Update the Board structure and policies for the purpose of alignment with the community impact direction and outcomes, including member roles and responsibilities, orientation and training, and recruitment objectives</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Form a Resource Development Committee on the Board, with defined structure, policies, and responsibilities, and relationship to the current Cabinet</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Implement a training schedule to ensure that all staff are proficient in all the capabilities of ANDAR, and additional software available within the organization</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Develop an assessment tool for special events to ensure that their purpose and benefits align with the organization’s intended outcomes</td>
<td>Organization-Wide</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Develop and implement a volunteer orientation and training template that will provide efficiency and consistency</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Develop and implement a process to continually monitor and update all volunteer communication tools, so that the most current information is being provided to all volunteers</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Develop volunteer orientation template, assessment tools, and policies and procedures for the purpose of continuous improvement of the volunteer role, responsibilities, and experience</td>
<td>United Way Volunteers</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Assess and update the volunteer recognition policies and procedures</td>
<td>Resource Donors</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal # 5: Measure, Evaluate, and Communicate</th>
<th>High Priority Improvement / Enhancement</th>
<th>Key Group/Constituency</th>
<th>Completion Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure, Evaluate &amp; Communicate</td>
<td>Work with Community Partners who have received Community Solutions funding in order for them to provide outcome results in alignment with new reporting requirements</td>
<td>Community Solutions Partners</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure, Evaluate &amp; Communicate</td>
<td>Develop the reporting and information sharing requirements for the Community Solutions Partners for the funding cycles based on feedback from the 2009-2010 funding cycle</td>
<td>Community Solutions Partners</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure, Evaluate &amp; Communicate</td>
<td>Develop a communication plan to report results on a on-going basis from Community Solutions investments</td>
<td>Community-Wide</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010-2013 STRATEGIC GOALS

Vision: To unite the caring power of our community to improve lives.

Mission: We engage the community in improving lives by focusing resources on education, income, and health

COMMUNITY GOALS

Education
- Children enter school ready to succeed.
- Children achieve academic goals.
- Youth are productive and engaged citizens.

Income
Lower income families and individuals:
- Increase Income
- Build Savings
- Gain and Sustain Assets

Health
- Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.
- Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
- Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.
- Caregivers* are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.

KEY INDICATORS

United Way of Delaware County will measure success by the tracking the following key indicators:

Education
- Percentage of children who begin Kindergarten successfully.
- Percentage of students entering fourth grade who are proficient readers.
- Percentage of public high school students who graduate on time.

Income
- Number of families receiving assistance through food pantries, shelters, and other emergency assistance outlets.
- Percentage of eligible households accessing public benefits.
- Percentage of families and individuals with a checking or savings account.

Health
- Percentage of people who are covered by health care insurance.
- Percentage of people who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
- Number of caregivers* accessing support services.

*Caregiver is defined as anyone providing care through involvement in activities of daily living for an adult family member or friend 18 years of age or older.
ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS

Shared Community Vision
United Way and the community establish a shared vision for the future by creating a collective understanding of key community interests, aspirations, assets and concerns which represent the perspectives of diverse groups, individuals and sectors.

Partner Engagement
United Way deliberately and actively builds quality relationships with traditional and non-traditional partners and involves them at every step of the way. United Way engages partners around priority community issues, shared strategies and corresponding resource development and mobilization.

Resource Development and Mobilization
United Way mobilizes the many community assets – money, people, knowledge, relationships and technology – needed to implement community solutions strategies and achieve meaningful results. Operating from a flexible multi-year resource development plan – that supports community solution strategies, includes keys market segments (both traditional and non-traditional) and ensures a balanced and diverse revenue base from multiple sources – United Way builds personal relationships with donors/investors, segments markets based on interests, and recognizes all contributions.

Alignment
Leaders align all organizational elements and resources (functional areas, systems, skills, staff, board, volunteers, structure, culture, mindset and investments) to support United Way’s Mission, Vision and Community Outcomes.

Measure, Evaluate and Communicate
United Way and its partners evaluate the effectiveness of strategies in order to continuously improve. They identify appropriate measures, collect and analyze results, and assess progress toward desired outcomes. Outcomes may be measured at multiple levels (e.g., programs, system and community). What is learned may cause United Way and partners to re-think, change or adjust strategies, actions and investments. Results are communicated to the community.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS

- The total resources under management from all sources will reach $3 million annually by June 30, 2013.

- The annual workplace campaign will comprise 60% of all resources under management by June 30, 2013. (This reflects the intent to produce a balanced portfolio of revenue sources, while still recognizing the important role of the annual workplace campaign.)

- All programs and initiatives that are partnering with United Way of Delaware County will be producing meaningful and measurable results that positively contribute to the achievement of United Way’s intended community-level outcomes within Education, Income, and Health by June 30, 2013.
The Road to Community Impact: Changing Direction

**From**

- Strategy is to fund direct services
- Partners are primarily agencies
- United Way owns the effort
- Resources = money
- United Way’s role is funder/fundraiser
- Ask donors for money for United Way once a year
- United Way operates as two separate businesses

**To**

- Strategy is to change community conditions
- Partners are whoever can play a role
- A community owns the effort
- Resources include people, relationships, expertise, etc.
- United Way plays various roles
- Create long-term relationships with diverse community investors
- All organizational resources align
## Internal Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been started/initiated</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and percentage of action steps in the strategic plan that have been completed</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of resources under management annually, and the corresponding percentage of change year-to-year</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (individual and corporate contributions, government and foundation grants, endowment, in-kind, and special events)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources (volunteers, including advocates)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within each goal area, total amount of resources invested, number of programs and initiatives supported, and number of clients served</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and percentage of program partners that increased their effectiveness in producing meaningful results for their clients (used outcome data and information to make improvements in service delivery and/or outcome achievement)</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color Coding Key:**

- **Performance results is on track to meet established benchmarks**
- **Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks**
- **Serious concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks**

**Performance Targets:**

- The total resources under management from all sources will reach $3 million annually by June 30, 2013.

- The annual workplace campaign will comprise 60% of all resources under management by June 30, 2013. (This reflects the intent to produce a balanced portfolio of revenue sources, while still recognizing the important role of the annual workplace campaign.)

- All programs and initiatives that are partnering with United Way of Delaware County will be producing meaningful and measurable results that positively contribute to the achievement of United Way’s intended community-level outcomes within *Education, Income, and Health* by June 30, 2013.
## 2010 High Priority Action Steps to be completed by March 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Completion Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reconstitute the Marketing and Communications Committee of the Board, with a focus on its expanded role and responsibilities (Marketing &amp; Communications Committee – MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop a multi-faceted marketing and communications plan that represents a comprehensive approach to educating and informing key audiences on the Community Impact Agenda and organizational strengths of United Way of Delaware County (MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify community leaders from all sectors that can play key roles in the Community Solutions strategies (All Committees)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop an outreach effort to the identified leaders for the purpose of expanding their individual awareness, knowledge, and support of the Community Solutions strategies (MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Define the responsibilities and expectations of a Community Solutions Partner – both funded and non-funded, as they work collaboratively with United Way to achieve the Focus Area outcomes (Community Solutions Committee – CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive Community Solutions Mobilization Plans that includes the strategies to sufficiently produce the intended outcomes. (Based on organizational capacity) (CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establish a program to encourage and promote shared learning among the partners so that current research, lessons learned, and promising practices can be transferred community-wide (CSC/MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Establish and utilize a discretionary fund that allows United Way to be responsive to breakthrough opportunities in the achievement of Focus Area outcomes, with an expedited process with standard expectations, consistent with CST decisions and process, and with proper steps and approval. (CSC/Finance Committee)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop a multi-faceted resource development plan that represents a comprehensive approach to securing the resources necessary to meet organizational needs (including planning giving, endowment, major gifts, and multi-year gifts) (Resource Development Committee – RD / Campaign Cabinet)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop a program to identify and secure grant funding in support of United Ways community-level outcomes (RD/CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop personalized philanthropic proposals to be presented to donors (RD)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assess and update the donor/volunteer/advocate recognition policies and procedures (MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Develop an approach to address the need for a community plan to match organizations who seek volunteers and individuals who want to volunteer (RD/MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Develop a process to collect data and information on the number of volunteers involved in the Community Solutions work, and the number of volunteer hours (RD / CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Update the Board structure and policies for the purpose of alignment with the community impact direction and outcomes, including member roles and responsibilities, orientation and training, and recruitment objectives (Governance Committee/MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Form a Resource Development Committee on the Board, with defined structure, policies, and responsibilities, and relationship to the current Cabinet (RD)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Implement a training schedule to ensure that all staff are proficient in all the capabilities of ANDAR, and additional software available within the organization (Staff)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Develop an assessment tool for special events to ensure that their purpose and benefits align with the organization’s intended outcomes (MC/Finance)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Develop and implement a volunteer orientation and training template that will provide efficiency and consistency (RD/MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Develop and implement a process to continually monitor and update all volunteer communication tools, so that the most current information is being provided to all volunteers (MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Develop volunteer orientation template, assessment tools, and policies and procedures for the purpose of continuous improvement of the volunteer role, responsibilities, and experience (RD/MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Work with Community Partners who have received Community Solutions funding in order for them to provide outcome results in alignment with new reporting requirements (CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Develop the reporting and information sharing requirements for the Community Solutions Partners for the funding cycles based on feedback from the 2009-2010 funding cycle (CSC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Develop a communication plan to report results on a on-going basis from Community Solutions investments (MC)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Establish an Advocacy Committee and determine advocacy vision, guiding principles, and platform (Advocacy Committee)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Color Coding Key:

- Performance results is on track to meet established benchmarks
- Some concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks
- Serious concern that performance results will not meet established benchmarks
GOALS FOR THE COMMON GOOD
THE UNITED WAY CHALLENGE TO AMERICA
WHAT GETS MEASURED GETS DONE
FOR MANY MILLIONS OF HARD-WORKING FAMILIES, the basic ingredients for a good life are increasingly beyond reach. Almost one in four working parents don’t earn enough to provide for their families. An alarming 25 percent of teenagers will not graduate on time, imperiling their chances to make a successful transition to adulthood. Only one in three adults can be considered healthy, based on risk factor data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and more than 49 million Americans lack even basic health insurance.

Our nation can’t accept these conditions. We need to challenge our systems—to create opportunities for a better life for everyone. To move more aggressively in this direction, United Way drew on research and sought input from a broad range of partners to gauge where progress has—and has not—been made over the last 10 years. This information is the foundation for these Goals for the Common Good.

By 2018, we as a nation must:

- Cut by half the number of young people who drop out of high school
- Cut by half the number of lower-income families that lack financial stability
- Increase by a third the number of youths and adults who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors

These targets—one in the area of education, another focused on income and a third focused on health—are building blocks for a good life.

You need a quality education that leads to a stable job, enough income to support a family and good health.

United Way has a theory about how to create changes of this magnitude. It begins with declaring bold goals. When the stakes are high, Americans will rise to the occasion. That leads to partnership, the second critical element. We have to think differently about partnerships and set aside our special interests if we want to make real progress. This work requires collaboration across all sectors—big businesses, small businesses, elected officials, nonprofits, academia, the faith community, the labor movement, the media, parents and neighbors. Working together, we can accomplish things that no organization, no individual and no government can accomplish on its own.

With this challenge to America, United Way hopes to reignite a movement that is committed to creating opportunities for everyone—and we invite you to be a part of it. Visit WWW.LIVEUNITED.ORG to find out how you or your organization can make a difference. Together, united, we can inspire hope and create opportunities for a better tomorrow.

Brian A. Gallagher
President & CEO
United Way
Education, income and health are the building blocks for a good life. Education is essential to getting and keeping a job with a livable wage and health benefits. An income adequate to pay for today’s necessities and save for the future provides families some sense of financial stability. Access to quality health care keeps children on track in school and adults productive at work. Remove any one of these building blocks and the other two topple.

Working with many partners, United Way continually looks for the most effective ways to help people gain access to educational, economic and health-related opportunities. To achieve further progress, it is now necessary to measure where we stand in these areas and look ahead to where we need to be as a country. For this reason, United Way launched an effort in 2005 to identify and track troubling social issues that are common across communities. The 12 indicators presented here show how America has fared in improving education, income and health status. They are based on the most reliable and relevant data available.

Taken together, these indicators show isolated signs of progress, but, overall, underscore the enormity of the task ahead.

The three 10-year goals pull together the individual indicators, so that the sum is indeed greater than the parts:

- **Cutting the number of students who drop out by half** requires improved readiness for kindergarten and closer attention to students as they move through the school system.
- **Cutting the number of financially unstable working families by half** requires strategies to help people increase income, save, and grow long-term assets.
- **Increasing by one-third the percentage of healthy youth and adults** requires that more Americans have access to health coverage and to good primary care from (and even before) birth, as well as the resources to avoid or stop substance abuse and other risky behaviors.

The need to act is great. But America’s energy and creativity in finding long-lasting solutions are great as well. A few examples of how communities are advancing the common good are presented here. Their strategies have reduced the dropout rate, increased income and promoted health in cities and counties of all sizes. Now it’s time to take these strategies to scale.
## ISSUES AND INDICATORS AT-A-GLANCE

### EDUCATION

**Helping Children and Youth Achieve Their Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Readiness to achieve in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Children enter school developmentally on track in terms of literacy and social, emotional and intellectual skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of 3- to 5-year-olds with 3 or 4 (of 4) school readiness skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Academic achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Elementary students are prepared to succeed in later grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of fourth graders who are proficient readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Young people graduate from high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of public high school students who graduate on time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Productive and engaged youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Young adults make a successful transition from high school to work life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who are not working or in school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

**Promoting Financial Stability and Independence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Achieving greater financial stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Lower-income working families move toward financial independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of lower-income working families that spend more than 40% of their income on housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Increasing income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Working families increase their income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of working families that are lower-income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Building savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Lower-income working families have savings or checking accounts and money saved for emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of lower-income working families that have a checking or savings account with a minimum of $300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Gaining and sustaining assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Lower-income working families build appreciating assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Rate of homeownership for lower-income working families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. family income less than 250% of the federal poverty level

### HEALTH

**Improving People’s Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Maternal health and infant well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Babies are born at low risk for preventable health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of babies who are born low birthweight (5 pounds, 8 ounces or less)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Basic health care coverage and prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Children and youth receive timely, regular preventive health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: Percentage of children under the age of 18 who are not covered by health care insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issue: Healthy youth and adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended result: Youth and adults are healthy and avoid risky behaviors (for a definition of “healthy,” refer to the table on page 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators: Percentage of students grades 9–12 who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors; percentage of adults 18 and over who are healthy and avoid risky behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HELPING CHILDREN AND YOUTH ACHIEVE THEIR POTENTIAL

“Weapon the education of the people the fate of this country depends.” Disraeli was speaking of his country, Great Britain, some 150 years ago, but these words capture the American belief in the critical importance of universal education. Education is the foundation for a good life, setting the individual on a path of personal fulfillment, economic security and societal contribution.

We are highlighting three points in students’ lives that help predict success in school and later as adults: readiness to enter kindergarten, reading proficiency in fourth grade and on-time graduation from high school.

Readiness to succeed in school means that children enter kindergarten developmentally on track in the areas of literacy and in social, emotional and cognitive skills. One way to track pre-literacy and cognitive skills is by looking at the percentage of children ages 3 to 5 who have all or most of four commonly recognized school-readiness skills (recognizing their letters, counting to 20 or higher, writing their names and reading or pretending to read). Data from the National Household Education Survey show progress, but less than 40 percent of kids enter school with the skills needed to succeed in kindergarten and beyond. Those without these skills—the majority of young children—are starting school already at a disadvantage.

United Way is leading an effort that would measure more comprehensively all dimensions of school readiness at the beginning of kindergarten.

Academic achievement means elementary-age students are prepared to succeed in later grades and to graduate from high school. If children are reading at grade level in fourth grade, they have a much better chance of handling more complex assignments in later grades. And if they are doing well, the chances are better, too, that they feel confident they can handle middle and high school classes. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, reading proficiency has improved over the last 10 years, but less than one-third of the nation’s fourth graders are rated “proficient” in reading.

Academic achievement is also reflected in on-time high school graduation rates. The percentage of freshmen who enter high school and graduate four years later increased by a few points since 1997 to about 74 percent. But that

“The Ad Council directs 80% of its efforts to improving our children’s future. The early childhood education campaign, Born Learning, is strengthened by local United Ways and their partners, who deliver quality experiences to millions of parents and caregivers across the country.”

—Peggy Conlon, President and CEO, The Ad Council
Cut America’s High School Dropout Rate in Half

- By 2018, 87 percent of high school seniors will graduate on time, up from 73.9 percent today.
- An ill-prepared 12th grader does not one day magically appear in a cap and gown ready to pick up a diploma. This 10-year goal means we must engage with children and families from birth.
- That increase translates to 560,000 more youth who will receive diplomas in 2018.

**EDUCATION 10-YEAR GOAL: Raise the Graduation Rate**

![Graph showing the trend of high school graduation rates from 1998 to 2018.](source.png)

Source: Common Core of Data, National Center for Education Statistics.
still means more than 1 million students each year fail to get their diploma on time, as reported by the National Center on Education Statistics.

That number is unacceptably high. Dropping out means these young people will more than likely never earn enough to make ends meet. It means their children will be similarly disadvantaged and perhaps start kindergarten unprepared, thus perpetuating the cycle.

Finally, the last piece in understanding how education contributes to achieving the potential of children and youth:

Young adults, age 18 to 24, are making a successful transition from high school to the working world. They may be in college, in a training program or working, acquiring the experience they need to succeed as adults. The measure for this is the percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who are neither working (full or part time) nor in school. This indicator should trend downward: that is, a decrease in the indicator means an increase in the percentage of young adults productively engaged after high school. And while the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey shows a slight improvement over the past decade, too many young adults—more than one in seven—are neither working nor attending school, even part time. When they fall between the cracks, our country suffers the consequences.

In today’s economy, a high school diploma is an absolute necessity, although good jobs that require no more than a high school education are getting much harder to find. Through Destination: Graduation, United Way of Metropolitan Dallas aims to help youth on the path toward a productive future by preparing them for college. Started in 2005, the program combines an emphasis on completing high school with encouraging students to pursue further education. It prepares students for academic success by teaching them how to take notes, how to study and test-taking strategies—as well as offering mentoring and counseling. Another component helps parents interact with teachers and administrators, learn about college entrance requirements and communicate with their teens about school issues.

The program began in one high school in 2005. During its first year, participating students increased their Preliminary SAT scores by an average of 120 points, which brought many over the critical 1000 scoring mark. They advanced to the next grade level at a rate that was 19 percent higher than their peers. Parents swelled the membership of the PTA and initiated a monthly breakfast with the principal. By 2007, Destination: Graduation had expanded to five high schools.

PARTNERS
• Dallas Independent School District
• Plano Independent School District
• Capital One
• Ernst & Young
• Texas Instruments
• The Muse Family Education Foundation
• Citigroup
• Wachovia
• Wells Fargo
• Hall Financial Group
“Failure to graduate hurts our children, damages our economy and weakens our national security position in the world.”

—General Colin L. Powell (Ret.), Founding Chair of America’s Promise

Closing the Achievement Gap

In the mid-1990s, Madison, Wisconsin, set an ambitious 10-year goal: to close the gap between the average reading scores of white third graders and those of other racial groups. Through Schools of Hope, more than 20 government, business, nonprofit and other organizations met this goal. Schools of Hope began as a civic journalism project of the Wisconsin State Journal and WISC-TV, which brought public attention to the school district’s achievement gap and the many causes behind it. United Way of Dane County accepted the challenge to mobilize a community-wide effort to tackle the problems highlighted in the media.

The Schools of Hope leadership team deliberately set a specific, bold target. With that focus, 18 Vista workers coordinated the efforts of hundreds of volunteer tutors. A summer program targeted bilingual children in kindergarten and first grade. Parents read with their children more frequently. Continuing to work with the media was critical to success, as was the decision to go to scale and involve all 24 elementary schools in the district.

In October 2004, the superintendent was able to announce the district no longer had evidence of a racial achievement gap at the third grade reading level.

For Blacks and Latinos, the Likelihood of Completing a Diploma Is Considerably Lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Category</th>
<th>Share of 18- to 24-year-olds completing high school or obtaining GED or other certificate in 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than One Race</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of 18- to 24-year-olds who complete high school, or obtain GED, or other certificate — 2005

PROMOTING FINANCIAL STABILITY

Helen Keller, Abe Lincoln, Irving Berlin, Frederick Douglass—these inspirational Americans have exemplified the uniquely American ideal that hard work will lead to success, and that no matter how humble one’s origins, the sky is the limit in the land of plenty and opportunity.

That ideal is in peril. Even with more than one family member bringing in wages—or with one person holding down two or three jobs—many families are barely getting by, with no ability to save for college, a home or retirement. Wages have not kept up with the rising cost of housing, health care, child care, gas and other needs. Just one unanticipated expense—a car break-down, an uninsured illness, a week without a paycheck—can lead to crisis.

Achieving greater stability allows lower-income working families to move toward financial independence. A revealing indicator of this level of stability is the percentage of lower-income working families who spend more than 40 percent of their income on housing. This tenuous balance between income and housing costs gives a sense of the hardship faced by many as they attempt to pay for the single biggest expense for a typical family.

The situation has worsened significantly since 2000, according to data from the American Community Survey. More than one-third of lower-income working families spend more than 40 percent of their income on housing. On average, a family needs to earn at least $15 per hour so that housing does not overwhelm their monthly budget. With the minimum wage less than $7 an hour in most states, many millions of families earn far less than $15 per hour—even when two members are pooling their wages.

Given the cost of living today, a family needs to earn at least 2.5 times the federal poverty level to be considered financially stable in most communities. But the percentage of working families that earn less than this has stagnated over the past decade. Currently, about 23 percent of working families fall below that level; with the percentage of financially unstable African American and Latino families significantly higher.

Most Lower-Income Working Families Do Not Have Resources Saved to Weather an Emergency That Might Require Even $300 in Unanticipated Expenses.

**10-YEAR GOAL**

**Cut in Half the Number of Lower-Income Families Who Are Financially Unstable**

- By 2018, 1.9 million more working families will become financially stable and able to take the next steps to long-term independence.

- This 10-year goal means helping these families increase income, build savings and grow assets so they have reduced debt and are working toward a goal that might be stable housing, business, retirement or postsecondary education.

**INCOME 10-YEAR GOAL: Reduce the Number of Lower-Income Working Families Who Are Financially Unstable**

Source: American Community Survey.
Note the emphasis on lower-income working families: those in which one or two adults together work the equivalent of a full-time (or even more than full-time) job and simply cannot earn enough to make ends meet. Our 10-year goal is to cut in half the number of these families who lack financial stability. This goal aims for financial independence, not a street of gold. Many families lack the opportunity to earn a decent income and the skills to manage their money, save even a small portion or build assets for the future.

Building savings is vital to deal with unexpected, unbudgeted expenses. Only 37 percent of lower-income working families have a checking or savings account with at least $300 saved, according to an analysis of the Survey of Income and Program Participation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That amount—$300—is what is needed to weather a single typical emergency, as evidenced by the average loan obtained through payday loan services. Just as important as the dollar amount, an account means building a relationship with a bank, credit union or other mainstream financial institution and not having to rely on a high-fee check-cashing or payday loan service. It also allows a family to set goals to build savings and ultimately assets, whether for higher education, a business, retirement funds or a home.

This leads to the third step in a continuum: building assets. The largest asset for many Americans is their home. Even with the current downturn in the real estate market, a home’s value increases over the long term so the owner’s assets grow. About 50 percent of lower-income working families own a home, according to the American Community Survey. However, this figure hides a great disparity in homeownership, with Latinos and African Americans only one-third to one-half as likely to own a home as white working families.

“Helping working individuals and families achieve financial stability is a key priority for Bank of America. We applaud United Way’s ambitious 10-year goals, and we are honored to work with them on initiatives such as the United Way Financial Stability Partnership.”

—Ken Lewis, Chairman and CEO, Bank of America
United Way Financial Stability Partnership

Step 1: Increase Income
The first step in the financial stability continuum offers tools and strategies that help individuals and families increase their income—by fully accessing available public and employer benefits, reducing debt and increasing credit ratings, claiming the Earned Income Tax Credit, learning to budget, and seeking workforce development opportunities to enhance job skills.

Step 2: Build Savings
Low- to moderate-income families struggle to build and increase their personal savings, often because immediate needs take priority over longer-term financial needs, yet savings give individuals the flexibility to make financial decisions that benefit themselves and their families and are critical to helping families manage crises.

Step 3: Gain and Sustain Assets
Before the 1990s, few believed that acquiring assets—retirement accounts, homes, postsecondary education or life insurance—could help move families out of poverty. However, research conducted over the past decade demonstrates that assets increase household stability, decrease economic strain, and decrease the likelihood of poverty transmittal from one generation to the next.

Technology as a Financial Tool
United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta and its partners saw the need for a more efficient system to connect individuals and families with health, safety net and asset-building benefits. They piloted an electronic benefits calculator, a tool that streamlines the eligibility screening and enrollment process for federal, state and community benefits.

Initially targeted to families with young children, the success of the program led United Way to offer the tool to workforce development agencies, free tax preparation sites and 2-1-1 call specialists.

From 2006 to 2008, the total value of benefits received through this screening partnership has increased from $665,000 to $1,118,000.

By the end of 2009, United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta and other United Ways around the country will be using Web-based software that calculates benefits but also has far more extensive capabilities. Nets to Ladders, as the name signifies, helps people climb the ladder of independence.

PARTNERS
- Department of Human Resources
- Social Security Administration
- Department of Community Affairs
- IBM
- AT&T
- Annie E. Casey Foundation
- Arthur M. Blank Family Foundation
- The Atlanta Community Food Bank
- Internal Revenue Service
IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS

According to an Arabian proverb, “he who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything.”

Health is strongly linked to education and income: Good health allows children to learn better and adults to increase their income through productive work. Conversely, health problems often lead to increased school absences (a predictor of dropping out of high school) among children, as well as increased on-the-job absences by adults. To further connect the dots, entry level and lower paying jobs are often without health benefits. A lack of health care coverage often means that primary care—so important to preventing or treating illness before it becomes more serious—is an unattainable luxury. A serious illness with no or insufficient health insurance has driven thousands of Americans into financial crisis. Fifty percent of bankruptcies in 2005 and 2006 were caused by medical debt.

Key markers contribute to a healthy progression through life: a normal birthweight, preventive health care beginning in earliest childhood, and avoiding risky behaviors and staying healthy as a youth and adult.

Maternal health and infant well-being start children off in the right direction. It is ironic that underweight babies are a concern when America is simultaneously worried about obesity among children and adults, but low birthweight (5 pounds, 8 ounces or less) can lead to developmental problems later in life.

The number of babies born at a low birthweight increased over the last 10 years, to 8.2 percent, according to the National Center for Health Statistics. That’s 1 in 12 babies. Among the many causes of low birthweight—pregnant women’s poor nutrition, teen pregnancies, smoking and substance use, and lack of prenatal care—are preventable factors that can be addressed at the community level.

Health care coverage for children means they are more likely to receive preventive health care (such as immunizations, physicals and non-emergency treatment).

How We’re Measuring Health

Healthy Youth
• Are not involved in violence
• Do not use tobacco
• Do not use drugs
• Do not abuse alcohol or drive drunk
• Practice abstinence or safe sex
• Are not overweight

Healthy Adults
• Have good overall health
• Do not use tobacco
• Do not abuse alcohol
• Do not have high blood pressure
• Are not obese
Increase by One-Third the Number of Youth and Adults Who Are Healthy and Avoid Risky Behaviors

By 2018, the percentage of youth who are healthy and avoiding risky behaviors will increase from 34 percent in 2005 to 45 percent in 2018—that means 1.9 million more healthy young people.

The percentage of adults (age 18 and older) who are healthy and avoiding risky behaviors will increase from 35 percent in 2005 to 47 percent by 2018—that means 29.2 million more healthy adults.

Achieving this goal requires us all to become more aware of health risks and the potential effects they have on ourselves and others, starting from before birth. Working to change policies and practices, such as by extending health care coverage, will also enable more people to live healthier lives.

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Survey and Behavior Risk Factor Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Those with health insurance are more likely to receive regular care. The percentage of children with health coverage has increased slightly, but data from the Current Population Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau show that almost 12 percent (one in eight) of America’s children remain without such insurance coverage.

The health of America’s youth and adults is also a serious concern. In looking at data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, just over one-third of youth in grades 9 to 12 and one-third of adults can be considered healthy, with the percentage stagnating for youth and worsening for adults when compared to a decade ago. For this reason, boosting the number of healthy youth and adults is our third goal for advancing the common good.

“As we approach our goals for Healthy People 2020, United Way will be an important partner in creating strong local relationships to address the prevention of risky behaviors and the root causes of poor health outcomes and disparities among groups.”

—Dr. Janet Collins, National Center for Chronic Diseases and Health Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

![Almost Half of Adult Americans Face Obesity or Hypertension](image)

“This year marks the 35th anniversary of the NFL partnership with United Way, and we’re very proud to be working on our joint commitment to improving youth health and fitness. Together, we hope to make a positive impact on the health and well-being of our nation’s children. We’re inviting the public to join us in this work.”

—Joe Browne, NFL Executive Vice President

A Healthier Start to Life

Many of the more than 350 United Way Success By 6® coalitions around the country recognize that success for six-year-olds begins literally before they are born.

Here’s how a few United Ways have targeted infant health:

- In Baltimore, participants in the Success By 6 partnership coordinated by the United Way of Central Maryland received center- and home-based services when they were pregnant. Infant mortality was half of that for other mothers in their neighborhoods, preterm births occurred 50 percent less often and low birthweights were 24 percent less frequent compared to those not in the program.

- Lubbock (Texas) Area United Way set up a pilot program to improve infant health. Only 2 percent of the women who participated gave birth to low birthweight babies, compared to 11 percent in the prior three years.

Reducing Teen Drug and Alcohol Use

In 1995, teen alcohol and drug use in Santa Cruz County, California, exceeded national averages. Community leaders, parents and teens formed Together for Youth/Unidos para Nuestros Jovenes (TFY/UPNJ) to change that.

TFY/UPNJ envisions a community where youth are healthy, successful, valued and respected and are community leaders. Strategies known as the Seven Essential Components underlie projects to reduce harmful behaviors.

Outcomes measured have included alcohol and drug use among youth, as well as related indicators such as the high school dropout rate and community tolerance of youth alcohol and drug use. More than 10 years later, TFY/UPNJ is seeing results, targeting binge drinking, adult provision of alcohol to teens, methamphetamine usage and other problems identified through community input.

This effort has turned the curve on binge drinking, reducing the percentage of underage binge drinkers from 66 percent of teens age 16 to 20 in 2006 to 59 percent in 2007.
The Common Good Index indicates how conditions in education, income and health have declined during recent years in America. Using 1998 as a base year—and setting conditions that existed in 1998 at an index number of 100—the Common Good Index fell to 93.1 by 2006 (see Notes About the Indicators for methodology).

This indicates that significant efforts must be made to lift the index back to its 1998 level and higher.
WHAT’S UP, WHAT’S DOWN

Through the indicator research summarized in this publication, we’ve gained a clear picture of the state of education, income and health in America.

Three indicators are worsening:

- Working families that spend 40 percent or more of their income on housing
- Low birthweight babies
- Healthy and risk-avoiding adults over age 18

Four indicators show little or no improvement:

- Working families that remain lower-income
- Lower-income families with checking or savings accounts and a balance of at least $300
- Homeownership among lower-income working families
- Healthy and risk-avoiding youth

Five indicators show some improvement, but progress has been too slow and there’s still a long way to go:

- Kindergarten readiness
- Fourth grade reading proficiency
- On-time high school graduation
- Productivity among young adults
- Children’s health insurance

This information gives us a baseline against which we can set—and meet—bold but achievable long-term goals. And this national picture gives us a way to effect change by affecting individuals. Already, in communities large and small, people are working together to challenge the status quo and create opportunities for everyone to gain the education, income and health needed to succeed and plan for the future.

Where the Data Come From

- Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the National Household Education Surveys
- National Assessment of Educational Progress
- National Center for Education Statistics
- Population Reference Bureau calculation of the American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
- National Center for Health Statistics
- Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
- Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Behavior Risk Factor Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Percentage of lower-income working families that spend more than 40% of their income on housing

- Worsening

Working families have one or two parents who worked 50 or more weeks (combined) during the previous year. Lower-income means that family income was 250% of the federal poverty level. Housing expenses include rent, mortgage and home maintenance costs.

Source: Population Reference Bureau calculation of data from the American Community Survey.

Percentage of low birthweight babies born annually

- Worsening

Low birthweight is defined as below 2.5 kilograms (5 pounds, 8 ounces).

Source: National Center for Health Statistics.

Percentage of healthy and risk-avoiding adults over age 18

- Worsening

A composite indicator of the percentage of adults 18 and older who reported being healthy and avoiding risky behaviors: good overall health, no smoking, no alcohol abuse, not being obese and not having high blood pressure. (See page 22 for detail.)

Source: Center for Advancement of Public Health calculation of data from the Behavior Risk Factor Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Percentage of working families that are lower income

- Little or No Improvement

Lower income means that family income was less than 250% of the federal poverty level. Poverty level varies by household size and location (Alaska and Hawaii levels are higher).

Source: Population Reference Bureau calculation of data from the American Community Survey.
**Percentage of lower-income working families with at least $300 in a checking or savings account**

- Little or No Improvement

**Homeownership rate among lower-income working families**

- Little or No Improvement

**Percentage of healthy and risk-avoiding youth**

- Little or No Improvement

**Percentage of children age 3 to 5 who have at least three of four school-readiness skills**

- Improvement But Gains Still to Be Made

---

Working families are families where one or some combination of adults in the family worked at least as many weeks in the previous month as there were weeks in that month.


Working families have one or two parents who worked 50 or more weeks (combined) during the previous year. Lower-income means that family income was less than 250% of the federal poverty level. Housing expenses include rent, mortgage and home maintenance costs.

*Source: Population Reference Bureau calculation of data from the American Community Survey.*

A composite indicator of the percentage that reported being healthy and avoiding risky behaviors: not involved in violence, no smoking or drug abuse, no alcohol binge drinking (including drunk driving), practicing abstinence or safe sex, and not being overweight. (See page 22 for detail.)

*Source: Center for Advancement of Public Health calculation of data from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

The specific cognitive skills assessed are the ability to 1) recognize letters, 2) count to 20 or higher, 3) write their names, and 4) read or pretend to read.

*Source: National Household Education Survey, National Center for Education Statistics.*
The scoring levels on the reading tests are: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. For more detail, see Notes About the Indicators.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics.

The averaged freshman graduation rate is an estimate of the percentage of high school students who graduate on-time derived by dividing the number of graduates with regular diplomas by an averaged estimate of the size of the incoming freshman class 4 years earlier.

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

This indicator is defined as 1) not working full or part time, 2) not having a degree beyond high school (associate, bachelor’s, etc.) or not having completed at least 1 year of college.

Source: Population Reference Bureau calculation of data from the American Community Survey.

“How wonderful it is that nobody needs to wait a single moment before starting to improve the world.”

—Anne Frank
NOTES ABOUT THE INDICATORS

Numerous public, academic and private organizations collect data; choosing from among the range of choices took great care and deliberation. As much as possible, the 12 indicators meet three criteria:

- **Contribution to improvement of a community issue.** Research had to show that making progress in the broader area (education, financial stability, health) would truly improve a critical community issue. Otherwise, it could be an interesting statistic, but not worth allocating time and resources.

- **Availability of data.** Data had to be available, timely and trustworthy. Many issues that are critical to solve do not have reliable, periodic data at this point.

- **Relevance to United Ways’ current work and relationships.** The indicator had to relate to community objectives already defined by a substantial number of United Ways or to relationships that they could build on.

According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the levels on the reading tests are defined as follows:

2) Proficient – Solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.
3) Basic – Partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.
4) Below Basic.

**Public on-time graduation rate**

For our purposes, dropouts are those students who do not graduate on time. Thus dropouts include those who might not graduate in the expected length of time but eventually get a high school diploma or its equivalent. In 2005, for example, when looking at all students age 18 to 24 (whether having attended public or private school or having attended overseas), 87.6% gained a GED or equivalency certificate, while only 74% graduated on time in 2005–06 (which excludes those attending overseas). Research has suggested that those who earn these alternative certificates often do not fare as well as their peers who graduate “on-time.” Also note that the averaged freshman graduation rates for 1998 through 2004 were calculated and published by the National Center for Education Statistics. The rates for 2005 and 2006 were calculated by United Way of America using the Common Core of Data and the averaged freshman graduation rate formula from the National Center for Education Statistics. Also, all school years were referred to by the later year, so that the 2005–06 school year was labeled 2006.

**Financial stability**

Financial stability is defined as earning 250% of the federal poverty level or more. This amount roughly corresponds to similar thresholds defined by the Self-Sufficiency Standard (source: Wider Opportunities for Women) and family budgets (source: Economic Policy Institute). These two well-respected initiatives more accurately capture the real costs of different domains of daily life: housing, health care, child care, transportation, food, etc. The federal poverty level was used in this report. Though not incorporating cost of living differences in most cases, the poverty level is used within so many other indicators and is readily available at various levels of analysis and time periods.

**Healthy youth**

The following were used to create the “healthy and risk-avoiding” youth composite indicator: Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who 1) did not carry a weapon in the past 30 days; 2) did not smoke cigarettes in the past 30 days; 3) did not chew tobacco, or use snuff or dip in the last 30 days; 4) did not use cigars, cigarillos, or little cigars in the last 30 days; 5) did not binge drink in the last 30 days; 6) did not smoke marijuana in the last 30 days; 7) did not use cocaine, including powder, crack or freebase in the last 30 days; 8) did not drive after drinking alcohol; 9) did not have sex or used birth control the last time they had sex; and 10) are not overweight (as defined by body mass index (BMI) at or above the sex- and age-specific 95th percentile of the 2000 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention BMI cutoff points http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/bmi/childrens_BMI/about_childrens_BMI.htm).

**Healthy adults**

The following were used to create the “healthy and risk-avoiding” adult composite indicator: Percentage of adults age 18 and over who: 1) reported good, very good or excellent health (choices were: excellent, very good, good, fair and poor); 2) did not smoke more than 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and who currently do not smoke every day or some days; 3) did not drink five or more drinks on one occasion in the past 30 days; 4) are obese (that is, body mass index greater than 30); and 5) have been told blood pressure was high.

Also, on adult data from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 1) alcohol use in 2003 was worded slightly differently than during other years and 2) the trend line was made comparable for high blood pressure; 3) did not drink five or more drinks on one occasion in the past 30 days; 4) are obese (that is, body mass index greater than 30); and 5) have been told blood pressure was high.

**Common Good Index**

The Common Good Index is calculated by dividing 100 by the total number of indicators (12). This number (8.33) became the baseline for 1998, on top of which percentage points marking improvements in each indicator were added or from which percentage points marking worsening conditions were subtracted. For each year, the points were summed to arrive at a total.
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United Way of Delaware County Community Solutions Task Force
Guiding Principles for the Transformation to the Community Solutions Business Model

Adherence to the Core Values is central to the transformation:

The core values of United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) must be the driving force behind every decision and action taken to advance the common good; therefore, the Community Solutions Task Force (CITF) have aligned our findings with those core values:

- We develop trust with our partners in our community.
- We work together on our solutions
- We measure results and learn from their impact.
- We invite all to join us.

The CITF believes that by implementing the Community Solutions Business Model (Community Solutions) in Delaware County, we will be able to develop and manage resources and improve lives in a more effective manner. [and change community conditions]

Although the transformation to Community Solutions is a large undertaking, requiring substantial changes not only internally with United Way, but also in the community, we believe the payoff in improved community conditions will be well worth the effort.

This belief was one of many that resulted from the three sessions in which the CITF participated on August 23, September 20, and October 18. During these intensive sessions, the CITF members were informed about the Community Solutions business model and its implementation by UWDC; and the dialogue and conclusions drawn from these sessions have been summarized in this report.

Implementing Community Solutions will lead to greater success for UWDC and the community. The necessary commitment, however, will require courage and confidence in order make the tough decisions and to manage the risks and uncertainty inherent in the process of transformation. Along with deepening our relationships with our traditional community partners, new partnerships will be established with organizations in the community in order to achieve the successes we know are possible. As initiatives and strategies are developed to address the pressing needs in our community, the partners will continuously align with our three areas of focus: Education, Income and Health. Because this process of transformative change to a Community Solutions United Way will take years, rather than months, United Way will celebrate short-term successes as they are achieved.

To create transformational change, public engagement and messaging are critical:

- The Board of Directors is crucial to the success of engaging the public during the transformation to Community Solutions. All members of the Board of Directors must be able to respond to inquiries and concerns of those in the public in a compelling and accurate manner.

- Community Solutions Teams will choose a priority on which to focus that is data driven and supported by the most recent research available. The priority must also be one that resonates with the community at large.

- Success will be contingent upon the extent to which UWDC can rally the community to action around its targeted issues and solutions. How these issues and solutions are defined will determine in large part who feels connected to the work of United Way.
• UWDC will devote considerable effort to increase the knowledge and understanding about its work to more people, as well as shifting individuals' and organizations' focus to a long-term and community-wide perspective, while still acknowledging that we must always provide for people's basic needs.

• UWDC will be the lead organization for the community in its development of the necessary cross-coordination amongst the various stakeholders in developing viable solutions and resources.

• In order to ensure broad support, UWDC will to reach out to the whole community and provide opportunities for everyone to buy into the new approach. UWDC will attempt to involve individuals and organizations that have not traditionally been involved in the work of the United Way.

• Engagement with those in the community must become more strategic and meaningful in order to develop more effective and lasting partnerships.

• UWDC will aim to develop consensus, but given the issues and solutions required to address them, consensus might not always be possible. In order to move forward with transformation, UWDC may at times need to base its decisions on majority rule.

• Not all groups will agree with the transformation of UWDC, but the transformation needs to occur if we hope to advance the common good.

The engagement of those having the greatest opportunity to change lives is essential:

• Relationship building is at the heart of this new work. Agency relationships will change from that of funder-fundee to partners working toward a common goal.

• Both parties will rely on the other's ability to carry out the mission of our work.

• Partner agencies will have representation on committees and working groups when their expertise would add value.

• Program outcomes are critical to our success and we must have confidence that the ones that have been established by our partner agencies are, in fact, realistic, accurate and measurable.
  o Candid, open discussions will be held with agencies to determine the status of their outcomes in a non-threatening way.
  o Agencies shall have the ability to make course corrections in terms of outcomes if they find they are not being achieved or if they find they are measuring the wrong thing.

• Agencies provide many services in the community that we may not be aware of. United Way will learn about all programs being provided by agencies in order to know who can be called upon to assist with all goals and strategies that are established by Community Solutions Teams (CST).

• Duplication of services is a complex issue. While we want to be sure that there is no unnecessary redundancy in program or service delivery, we recognize that some duplication of services may be beneficial to the community. Therefore, when this issue is being addressed, there will be a thorough review of all aspects of the program on a case by case basis.

• In order to build the relationships with agencies that are necessary to move forward, an interim allocation of funds procedure will be established for the 2008-2009 cycle. Funding will be continued at current levels for this transition year, unless there are serious
concerns among Community Solutions volunteers regarding a particular program. The following items must take place:

- CSTs will begin reviewing program outcomes submitted by agencies in December.
- CSTs will meet with agencies to begin discussions around programs and the outcomes they may realistically expect to achieve in the short, intermediate and long term. These discussions will take place in a non-threatening way, so as to get accurate information. This will include:
  - Conversations with agencies with whom the Community Solutions Committee has had concerns in the past will occur first.
  - Both parties will understand that the purpose of these discussions is not to be punitive, but fact finding in nature.
  - If the CST’s determine, after discussions that there are serious concerns regarding the operations of a program, funding adjustments can be made.
- CSTs and agencies enter into discussions regarding the goals established by each CST and how the agency sees it’s programs and the organization as a whole fitting into each of the goals, or the focus area as a whole.

**Benchmarks are required to affect this transformational change:**

- Although it is important to have aspirational goals, UWDC will establish benchmarks for its work both in resource development and community strategies.
- Metrics and benchmarks will be set up in order to measure short-term success, and possibly redirecting strategies and investments for both community solutions and resource development. Appropriate individuals will be involved in setting realistic benchmarks.
- Organizational benchmarks specifically focused on the transformation to Community Solutions will be established in order to ensure that UWDC is heading in the right direction or, if necessary, to make a course correction.
- Course corrections are inevitable outcomes from complex endeavors such as transformation to Community Solutions. UWDC will be committed to dealing with the reality of current conditions and take the necessary actions to take a different direction if necessary.
- UWDC will celebrate the successes that are based on the benchmarks.

To gain support and ensure integrity of the value proposition to the donor, research and data are required by the Community Solutions Teams (CST) when determining on which issues to focus.

- CSTs will establish broad goals within each focus area that are based on the most current data and research available from all credible sources.
- As CSTs begin to focus deeper and deeper within each area, data and research will drive the process. When establishing strategies to reach the targeted outcomes, best practices and research will be utilized when applicable for our community.
- CSTs will bring people they feel are needed into the process when necessary. People will be chosen based on their content expertise at each level of the decision-making process.
- Current United Way agencies will not be excluded from providing input, and in fact will be solicited for their expertise of the subject matter.
• If the CST establishes a goal or outcome that they find the data will not support or that there is not a way to measure the progress, they will make adjustments or course corrections.

In order to measurably improve lives and community conditions, resource development must be fully integrated into the transformation.

• Donor interests and concerns will be taken into consideration when UWDC develops goals and strategies. Although community investment will rest on a foundation of research and area expertise, UWDC will seek synergy between the supported programs and initiatives and the donors’ passions.

• UWDC will gain more information about the donors through stronger relationships with them, enabling UWDC to build an effective case for support of programs and initiatives that are of particular concern to the donor.

• Resource Development is not separate from the work UWDC is doing to improve lives in the community. The two are inter-related.

Some progress has been made, but there is more work ahead as UWDC transforms itself into a Community Solutions United Way.

The current work of the CITF has been one crucial step in this larger process. The members of the CITF believe that although this work of the CITF is of value to UWDC and the community, the continuance of the Task Force beyond its original end date would be highly beneficial to UWDC’s transformation. Therefore, the members of the CITF recommend to the Board of Directors that the CITF continue to provide guidance through periodic meetings as long as all those involved believe such guidance is beneficial. Currently the projected end date would be July 1, 2009, based on the following timeline:

July 31, 2008    Focus area initiatives have been identified and strategies determined.
October 31, 2008 Fund distribution process and policies finalized.
January 31, 2009 2009 – 2012 Application for funding is available to agencies
July 1, 2009    2009 – 2012 Program funding begins.

Approved by Board of Directors on December 17, 2007
United Way changing funding process, focus

The local United Way funds 24 partner agencies.

By IVY FARGUHESON
farguheson@muncie.gannett.com

MUNCIE — No longer is the United Way of Delaware County focused solely on raising funds for its partner agencies.

The organization wants to encourage community members as a whole to change the lives of their neighbors for the better.

The board of directors and staff have adopted a “community solutions business model,” basing program funding on the performance of each partner agency and its ability to benefit community conditions.

In other words, agencies must now prove that their programs have improved the community as a whole.

“Everything that we’ve been doing up to (this) point has been focused on ensuring that we’re responding better to meeting community needs,” said Gary Chenault, president and CEO of the local United Way. “Thus, changing community conditions is at the foundation of everything we’re doing.”

The local United Way now funds 24 partner agencies such as Meals on Wheels and Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

All agencies were invited to submit a “letter of intent” indicating that agency’s interest in requesting funding under the new guidelines for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 2009.

A Community Solutions Team — comprised of community specialists, community volunteers and agency representatives — has determined which programs can submit further proposals for funding based on criteria proving the programs’ community impact.

This has not been an easy process for the CST members.

There is no guarantee that all programs that have traditionally received United Way support will be funded in the next fiscal year. There is also no promise that those are funded will receive the amount requested.

“This has been the most exhaustive program review ever conducted in the history of our organization,” said Chris Fancher, chairman of the United Way of Delaware County’s board of directors. “There will be a number of very good programs that will not get funded. ...”

“We believe, however, that we made this transition to the Community Solutions model because it has the best chance of helping all of us achieve the established community-level goals in the areas of education, income and health.”

Contact news reporter Ivy Farguheson at 219-5833.
FUNDING

The agencies on June 30

**6 Agencies not eligible**
The Spirit of the Lord is there is Liberty.
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United Way invests in community solutions

Since 1926.
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The first page of a document discussing the role of community solutions in addressing community problems. It emphasizes the importance of investing in community solutions to support local organizations and communities, highlighting the contributions of individuals and groups working together to make a positive impact. The text mentions United Way's commitment to investing in community solutions, underscoring the organization's dedication to improving the quality of life in communities across the nation.

Since 1926, the United Way has focused on investing in community solutions to address pressing issues and support local organizations. The text encourages readers to engage with United Way and its initiatives to contribute to positive change in their communities. The document also highlights the importance of collaboration and partnership in achieving community goals.
United Way will focus on changing community conditions

The United Way of Delaware County is taking a bold and brave step this year by narrowing its focus internally and demanding results from its agency partners. It will no longer be your parents' United Way. It's going to be better.

But, it will be controversial, and it will be emotional for those agencies that will have to go elsewhere for funding they've grown so accustomed to getting from the United Way. This United Way has served Muncie and Delaware County since 1925. Until now, it has used a 20th-century model even as we've moved into a 21st-century world. That changes going forward.

The community outcome focus has been discussed now for more than two years. It started with expanded involvement across agencies, government and business, and after a long gestation period, now is the time for implementation.

This is where the rubber meets the road. It's one thing to say that you will narrow your focus and concentrate on agency partners that address your priority areas — education, income and health. It's another to put that strategy into practice. But this needs to be done for our community to make progress. There are simply too many priorities, and in some cases, we've been running in place.

Muncie and Delaware County must begin to do things differently on many levels in this time when fewer dollars are available. All organizations — but especially one like the United Way, which impacts so many — must be strategic in the way they operate.

But the change does not stop with United Way's agency partners. There also will be a greater emphasis on engaging the entire community through volunteer opportunities, advocacy, and partnerships and collaborations with other groups and government agencies.

The United Way is moving away from being a static organization that just doles out money toward being fully invested an active partner, facilitator and resource with a focus on areas where improvement could make a significant difference in the quality of life of all Delaware County residents.

The United Way's leadership on this front is necessary. And it is the right agency to give this direction. It can identify the duplication of services, identify possible gaps and suggest ways to fill them, even if it means using a resource outside of United Way.

The old employee-campaign-based model has been waning for years, and employers have been seeking more accountability from agencies.

This new model provides that. This will not be a pain-free process, and there will be successes and failures along the way. But it will have a measurable impact, and that's the best reason to do it.
For over 4 years, United Way of Delaware County (UWDC) has been in the process of building upon its traditional role as solely a funder of agencies. This change has been a response to our desire to have greater impact than funding of direct service programming, alone, can accomplish. With approximately 7,000 donors, 300+ business partners, and extensive non-profit and community relationships, we believe that we have not been using all the resources available to us. United Way funding has been providing great support to wonderful programs, but we want to do even more.

We are working to engage the entire community around a shared vision that includes not only meeting the needs of individuals and families, but also finds solutions to the root causes of problems that have challenged our communities for years. We are working to foster collaborations, innovation and greater focus with a wide range of community partners and their resources in order to address the issues surrounding education, income and health. And are working to better measure and report to the community the results of their investments in United Way.

We can do all of this while still funding the excellent programs that meet people's basic needs and provide preventative and developmental services. Yet as we build upon our tradition of serving the community since 1925, this transformation has generated questions about the process UWDC is using to determine which programs to fund. Below are answers to these questions.

**How did UWDC develop its current funding process?**

UWDC’s current funding process is the culmination of years of research, deliberation, and engagement between our volunteers and with the community at large. Throughout our transformation, our goal has been to evolve in a way that fits with Delaware County and meets the unique needs of our community.

We always have strove to be intentional and transparent. One of the key actions to achieve this was the convening of a Community Solutions Task Force, composed of representatives of stakeholder groups in the community. The Task Force primary role is to provide guidance to UWDC and its Board of Directors regarding our transformation. To this purpose, they have developed an extensive list of Guiding Principles for United Way as we move forward in the design and implementation of our new approach.

At the core of these Guiding Principles is the belief that relationships are critical to success. UWDC will continue to strive to build and add positive relationships in our community, including with our volunteers and donors, the business community, government, educational institutions, the faith community, foundations, neighborhoods, agencies, associations and individuals. One of our central and valued relationships is the one we have with our Partner Agencies. As we have changed in this transformation, so has our relationship with our Partner Agencies. It has moved from a funder-fundee relationship to partners working toward common goals in the community.

During the development of our current funding process, we have met extensively over the years with representatives of our Partner Agencies to engage, inform and discuss with them the nature of the changes taking place. Most recently, in early December, 2008, UWDC met with Executive Directors and Board members of our Partner Agencies to update them on our community investment process and to answer any questions they might have.

**Who is making the decisions about the funding?**

One of the Goals of this transformation has been the evolution of our Allocation Panels into the Community Solution Teams (CST). There is a CST assigned to each of the three focus areas of education, income and health. The CSTs are composed of content experts, including representatives
from our Partner Agencies, and now work year-round as they explore the research, resources, and relationships to be leveraged and applied to the challenges facing our community through strategies that will deliver the desired results. At the same time, they also determine how to best strategically invest in the programs that serve the community.

A total of 30 volunteers are participating in our most extensive review process ever. They will be developing the program funding recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Directors by June, 2009, for final approval.

**How will they determine in which programs to invest?**

In order to be more strategic in how we invest resources in the community, United Way moved in 2007 to three areas of focus: education, income and health. The determination of these focus areas were a result of research, public forums and surveys. Every program submitted for consideration is reviewed by one of the focus area CSTs.

Continuing the focusing process, The CST volunteers last year developed Community Goals in each of the three focus areas. These goals are the positive results in people’s lives brought about by changes in community conditions. Guided by an extensive review of research and community assessment, the volunteers determined the Community Goals based not only on where they believe there are considerable needs, but also where United Way will have the most impact.

Going forward, every program that is funded, every initiative United Way participates in, every resource that is mobilized will be aligned with the Community Goals. It will be these goals that United Way will invite to community rally around in collective, focused action.

The Community Goals are as follows:

**Education:**
1. Children enter school ready to succeed.
2. Children achieve academic goals.
3. Youth are productive and engaged citizens.

**Income:**
1. Lower income families and individuals:
   1. Increase Income
   2. Build Savings
   3. Gain and Sustain Assets

**Health**
1. Individuals and families receive basic health care coverage and prevention.
2. Individuals and families are healthy and avoid risky behaviors.
3. Seniors and persons with disabilities are able to remain independent.
4. Caregivers are healthy and able to maintain their jobs.

In order to move toward realizing the Community Goals, the CSTs developed 15 corresponding Community Objectives. This year in order to be considered for funding, each program has submitted a letter of intent detailing how it contributes to one or more of these Community Objectives. The CSTs reviewed each program’s eligibility for funding based on its alignment with the Community Goals and the corresponding Objectives.

**What other criteria besides the Community Objective did the volunteers use to determine which programs will or will not be funded this year?**

As always, there was also a financial and legal review that included an examination of each agency’s bylaws, audit and IRS Form 990, as well as the program budget. As needed, site visits and other follow-up actions were and will be used whenever there were questions or concerns.

Yet In addition to the volunteers determining how well each program matched the appropriate community objectives, a careful review was conducted to look at how the organization met four other criterions:
2009 Community Solutions Investment Process Questions & Answers

- Program effectiveness to determine if the program followed best practices and had success in working with their target population or otherwise demonstrated they could deliver the results with the population they are serving.
- Their ability to track the progress of their clients, to collect the data necessary to do so, and to report to the United Way on the Goals of the program.
- Collaborations and the ability of the programs to work with other organizations in the community to produce results.
- Overall organizational capacity to provide the program they described in the letter of intent.

Who will receive recommendations for funding this year?

After much review and deliberation, the Community Solution Teams will invite a group of programs to submit full funding proposals. These proposals will go through another extensive review process from which the CSTs will develop their funding recommendations. The proposals will be evaluated based on the same criteria as the letters of intent. These recommendations will be the result of the CSTs' decisions about how to best strategically invest our limited resources in order to achieve the Community Goals.

Will United Way still fund basic needs services?

Yes. In order for an individual or family to achieve financial stability, their basic needs must be met. While our three Community Goals in the Income Focus Area are all targeting financial stability, one of the seven corresponding Community Objectives is that low income individuals and families have their basic needs met. As we mentioned earlier, programs are required to be aligned with priority objectives, so those programs which are able to effectively meet basic needs will be eligible for United Way funding.

Will all of the Programs that submitted letters of intent be invited to submit a formal funding proposal?

The Community Solution Teams had to balance the needs of the community with the limited resources available. With 24 Partner Agencies providing Letters of Intent for 39 programs, the amount requested exceeded funds available. The competition for United Way funds has never been stiffer. Consequently, there will be very good programs that will not be invited to apply for funding, including some programs United Way has funded for many years.

These are, without a doubt, the most agonizing decisions for our Board of Directors and Community Solutions Team volunteers, and they are not being made lightly. We believe, however, that we owe it to our donors and the community-at-large to fund only those programs we firmly believe will have the greatest possible impact upon the Community Goals we have described. If we compromise on that commitment and make funding decisions based solely upon historic relationships, we will not maximize the impact of our dollars through the Community Solutions model.

The loss of United Way funding does not mean, however, the end of our relationship. Each of the organizations that applied does wonderful work. Those organizations we have previously funded can receive donor-designated gifts and take advantage of UW's other resources such as technical assistance, if they wish. And they will be able to apply for funding in the future. We will also look for opportunities to include them in the collaborative efforts and coalitions in which are participating around the issues of education, income and health.
What’s next?

On February 25, 2009, United Way of Delaware County sent out invitations to submit program funding proposals. The CST volunteers will then review the proposals and determine their 2009-2010 program funding recommendations. These recommendations will be provided by June, 2009, to UWDC’s Board of Directors, who will make the final program funding decisions.
2009 Community Solutions Investment Process Summary

For over 4 years, United Way of Delaware County has been in the process of building upon its traditional role as solely a funder of agencies. This change has been a response to our desire to be more responsive to the needs in our community, and truly advance the common good. Going forward, we will not only fund direct service programming (including basic needs), but we will also work to engage the community to improve lives by focusing resources on education, income and health— the building blocks of a better life.

This is the first year we have aligned our program funding process with this Community Solutions approach. During the development of this process, we have consulted with a diverse group of community representatives, including our Partner Agencies. The volunteers of our Community Solution Teams—who include content experts in the fields of education, income and health—are currently in the midst of a thorough and extensive process of determining which programs will receive United Way’s limited resources.

Programs invited to submit full funding proposals were those that the volunteers determined were best aligned with the established Community Goals. The programs were evaluated on their effectiveness in delivering results and their ability to track, measure and report on the progress of their clients. The organizations’ collaborations in the community and their capacities to deliver the promised results were evaluated as well.

As in past years, requests for funds exceeded funds available. Consequently, there are very good programs that have not been invited to apply for funding, including some programs United Way has funded for many years.

These are, without a doubt, the most agonizing decisions and they are not being made lightly. The invitations to apply were given to those programs that we believe will have the greatest possibility of improving lives through a focus on education, income and health. If we compromise on this commitment and make funding decisions based solely upon historic relationships, we will not maximize the impact of those funds and our Community Solutions approach.

The loss of United Way funding does not mean, however, the end of a relationship. Each of the organizations that applied does wonderful work. Those organizations we have previously funded can receive donor-designated gifts and take advantage of UW’s other resources such as technical assistance, if they wish. United Way will also look for opportunities to include them in collaborative efforts around the issues of education, income and health as we all move forward to create lasting change and truly advance the common good.
### COMMUNITY GOALS - EDUCATION

Children meet age appropriate benchmarks at Kindergarten entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Direct Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th># children 0-5 in Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>United Day Care Center</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>Hillcroft Services</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educare</td>
<td>Huffer Memorial Children’s</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>6216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th># children 0-5 in Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Resource and</td>
<td>Huffer Memorial Children’s</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Dental Care</td>
<td>Open Door Health services</td>
<td>837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2802</strong></td>
<td><strong>6216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary school children are prepared to succeed in later grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Direct Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th># children 5-9 in Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOK</td>
<td>A Better Way</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Enrichment</td>
<td>Motivate Our Minds</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School and</td>
<td>Boys and Girls Club</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer programs</td>
<td>Bridges Community Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>6561</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All children have at least 31 of 40 developmental assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Direct Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th># children 0-18 in Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOK</td>
<td>A Better Way</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>Hillcroft Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educare</td>
<td>Huffer Memorial Children’s</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>559</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,618</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNITY GOALS - INCOME

Lower income individuals and families have their basic needs met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Services</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Shelter and Rehab</td>
<td>Muncie Mission</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>United Daycare</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Dental Services</td>
<td>Open Door Health Services</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Delivery</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>A Better Way</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Assistance</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>5765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Bridges Community Services</td>
<td>556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Hunger</td>
<td>Second Harvest</td>
<td>???</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                       | 10537                               | 115,192 Delaware Co. |

Lower income individuals and families receive all public benefits for which they are eligible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Services</td>
<td>Cancer Services</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18,404 Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower income individuals and families have increased job skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Direct Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Bridges Community Services</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>115,192 Delaware Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Shelter and Rehab</td>
<td>Muncie Mission</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total                    | 142                                 | 115,192 Delaware Co. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program--Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educare</td>
<td>Huffer Memorial Children's Center</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115,192 Delaware Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>United Daycare</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                       | 236                                 | 115,192 Delaware Co. |

Lower income individuals and families have savings or checking accounts and money saved for an emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Bridges Community Services</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115,192 Delaware Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Shelter and Rehab</td>
<td>Muncie Mission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                       | 89                                  | 115,192 Delaware Co. |
Lower income individuals and families purchase and/or maintain their home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Bridges Community Services</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18,404 Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower income individuals and families invest in their child's education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educare</td>
<td>Huffer Memorial Children’s Center</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18,404 Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Italicized numbers indicate number of families, not individuals. Average family size in Delaware County according to US Census data is 2.86.

Second Harvest provides information in terms of pounds of food and cost savings to nonprofit service providers. They provided 700,000 pounds of food to providers.
## COMMUNITY GOALS - HEALTH

Adults and children receive timely, regular preventative healthcare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Coverage</td>
<td>Gateway Health Clinic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>United Daycare Center</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Services</td>
<td>Cancer Services</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Dental Coverage</td>
<td>Open Door Health Services</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2291</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth and adults acquire and maintain a healthy lifestyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Shelter and Rehab</td>
<td>Muncie Mission</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>United Daycare Center</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanogel</td>
<td>Hillcroft Services</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Delivery</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>8671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School and Summer Programs</td>
<td>Boys and Girls Club</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9607</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caregivers receive the support necessary to provide quality care to their loved one and remain productive in the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># Achieved</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Services</td>
<td>Cancer Services</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanogel</td>
<td>Hillcroft Services</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UWDC Strategic Public Relations Plan (Sample)

### Organizational Goal

#### Shared Community Vision

**Promote public awareness about UWDC Community Investment approach**

**Establish relationships with core media representatives in Delaware County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measurement (instruments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 1</td>
<td>Create a comprehensive media list.</td>
<td>Number of outlets; Number of journalists included in the media list; Number of journalists considered &quot;core&quot; media representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 2</td>
<td>Develop and test key messages for delivering to journalists.</td>
<td>Number of journalists who expressed their interest in the concept of community investment; Number of journalists who expressed their intention to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 3</td>
<td>Organize monthly press briefings &amp; develop Community Investments media kits (fact sheets, county figures, programs outcomes, photos, audiovisuals etc.)</td>
<td>Number of each materials category that was produced; Number of distributed materials; Number of journalists present at the briefings; Number of the press materials published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 4</td>
<td>Develop and deliver human interest stories.</td>
<td>The number of stories pitched to the journalists. The number of covered stories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PR Objective 2:

**Organize communication workshops with key groups and individuals within Delaware county community**

**Design the workshop as an open public conversation between the organization and its audiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy:</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measurement (instruments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 1</td>
<td>Create a list/database of key opinion leaders and key groups for UWDC in Delaware county.</td>
<td>The number of people and groups included in the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 2</td>
<td>Schedule several communication workshops throughout the year, with invitations sent to different groups.</td>
<td>Number of invitations sent; Number of workshops scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 3</td>
<td>Create the presentation for the workshops and create a list for the open discussion topics at the end.</td>
<td>Number of people attending the presentation section in one workshop; number of people asking questions/making comments; number of suggestions received from the participants; number of new volunteers registered as a result of the workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Goal:</td>
<td>Partner Engagement</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Goal:</td>
<td>Establish long-term relationships with the current and potential UWDC partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Objective 1:</td>
<td>Promote awareness among the current and potential partners about UWDC Community Investment approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td>Ensure outreach to current and potential partners through several alliances with Delaware County specialists in the fields of education, income and health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 1</td>
<td>Write bylined articles on the topics of education, income and health with local specialists and pitch them in the local outlets and to radio stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contac the experts</td>
<td>Agree on the topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of specialists invited for the bylined articles; number of written articles; number of pitched articles; number of published articles; readership and rating for the outlets in which the materials were published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 2</td>
<td>Establish a LinkedIn page and a LinkedIn discussion board for UWDC, moderated by some Delaware county economic development, health and education specialist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create social media page</td>
<td>Communicate the organizational updates on the page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of social media members; number of comments on the discussion board initiated by the members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep record of the Delaware county experts in the fields of education, economic development and health. Keep record of the written, pitched and published articles. Assign a media monitor volunteer who will keep track of the published articles, of the messages they conveyed and of the readership/rating of the outlet. Compile a media coverage report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Objective 2:</td>
<td>Promote acceptance among the current and potential partners about UWDC Community Investment approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td>Involve the current and potential partners in the decisions of UWDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>Invite current and potential partners and local specialists to attend the UWDC communication workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of the specialists and partners invited; number of the specialists and partners attending the workshops; number of current and potential partners getting involved in the conversations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep record of the number of attendees and identify the partners and the specialists in a separate list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Objective 3:</td>
<td>Promote action among the current and potential partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td>Create direct, face-to-face contact with both current and potential partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>Arrange independent meetings, throughout the year, with current and potential partners in order to discuss about the UWDC Community Investment approach. Include in those discussions some human interest stories referring to UWDC impact and the way the organization measured the results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of meetings with current and potential partners; number of potential partners expressing their intention to become UWDC partner; number of current UWDC partners expressing their intention to continue to work with UWDC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep record of the number and content of the discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>