



## Impact of recommendation

This criterion measures how many people will be impacted, the depth of impact, as well as how it is working to systematically solve the root cause of the problem.



### 1 Maintains status quo

Maintains same level of funding as the prior year;

Reaches the same number of people as the prior year;

Defends against small threats/cuts to a program;

Provides the same standard of services as the prior year;

Solves a discrete problem for a targeted population;

Creates a small regulatory or policy change.



### 2 Program strengthened or partially restored

Slightly increases funding (up to 25%);

Provides services to slightly more participants (up to 25%);

Defends against large threats/ cuts to a program;

Recommends improvements in service delivery;

Solves a broad problem affecting a targeted population;

Creates several regulatory, policy, or legal changes.



### 3 Program Redesign/ new program or complete restoration

Dramatically increases funding to serve the overwhelming majority of people who need the service;

Defends against catastrophic threats/ cuts to a program or defends a life-saving program for a large population;

Program redesign or new program that drastically improves the quality of service;

Solves a broad problem affecting a large population;

Creates an institution level change or changes across several institutions.



### 4 Resolving Issue

Creates a universally beneficial change;

Creates a sustainable way of alleviating/addressing the issue in perpetuity  
Ensures equitable treatment or receipt of services;

Creates a system level change that affects every institution involved.





## Source of recommendation

This criterion measures the extent to which people who are impacted have been involved in crafting this recommendation, advocating for it, and in overseeing and evaluating programs and policies.



**Recommendation was crafted by advocates/organizers with no engagement of impacted community members**

The recommendation was informed by evidence-based approaches or research or routine staff interactions with clients during service delivery;

People impacted by the policy did not have opportunities to provide input on the recommendation;

People impacted by the policy do not have opportunities to advocate with elected officials or decision makers for the policy;

People impacted by the policy will not be involved in the implementation, oversight, or evaluation of the policy

1

**Recommendation was crafted by advocates / organizers with limited engagement opportunities for impacted community members**

The recommendation was primarily driven by evidence-based approaches or research and by one-time engagement events with the directly-impacted population (e.g. surveys, focus groups, 1:1s);

People impacted by the policy have opportunities to submit testimony or speak to the media, or tell their story at a lobby meeting but do not make campaign decisions;

People impacted by the policy may be engaged in surveys, focus groups, or one-time events to evaluate the policy

2

**Recommendation was crafted by advocates/organizers and informed by impacted community members**

The recommendation was crafted with sustained engagement by people impacted by the policy and informed by research and evidence based approaches;

People impacted by the policy play a leadership role in crafting the strategic direction of the campaign;

Organizing efforts are being undertaken to educate, mobilize others;

People impacted by the policy will be engaged to oversee the implementation of the program and evaluate its success.

3

**Recommendation was co-crafted by advocates/organizers and impacted community members**

The recommendation was co-crafted by people impacted by the policy and advocates/organizers;

People impacted by the policy run the strategic direction of the campaign;

People impacted by the policy have an official or legislated role in overseeing the implementation of the program and in evaluating its success

4





## Support behind the initiative

This criterion measures whether the recommendation has broad and deep organizational support and dedicated staff time for advocacy, and whether the recommendation has broad and deep community support with community members organizing around it.



### Limited Organizational Support

The issue was identified by a single non-member based organization and is not widely supported by a broader advocacy community;

Limited staff time and resources are being devoted to move the issue forward;

Community members are not organizing or well aware of the issue.

1

### Broad Organizational Support

The issue was identified and is being worked on by a small group of advocacy organizations (up to 15);

The organizations involved are devoting staff time and resources to moving the issue forward;

Community members have limited engagement with the campaign or knowledge of the issue.

2

### Broad Organizational Support with Limited Community Support

A large coalition of organizations (15 or more) drafted a policy in response to an identified community need;

Significant staff time and resources are devoted to moving the issue forward, including broadening community support and/or a dedicated staff member is running the campaign full time;

A small group of community leaders are organizing District residents in support of the initiative

3

### Broad Organizational Support + Broad Community Support

A grassroots issue is being funded or otherwise supported by organizations;

Directly-impacted communities have monetary, staff, in-kind, policy or legal support from an organization or coalition of organizations to move the issue forward

The issue has deep support across the District and active grassroots organizing.

4





## Building Power



This criterion measures whether the policy recommendation intends to shift power to Black and other marginalized communities, the campaign intends to utilize tactics that broaden support and demonstrate community power, and the leadership affords equal decision making power to impacted community members.

### **Builds power for a single organization or a coalition made up of organizations with paid staff**

The campaign is fought for by paid professional advocates only;

Utilizes "inside game" pressure and tactics that rely on access to and/or relationships with electeds; all advocacy done inside the Wilson Building;

The campaign does not attempt to broaden the coalition or gain support from District residents;

There are no decision making roles for directly impacted community members; Policy maintains the status quo and does not shift power to impacted communities.

1

### **Builds power for an organization made up of individual members or builds power for some community members**

The campaign is fought primarily by professional advocates, with some involvement by impacted community members;

Utilizes "inside game" pressure and tactics that rely on access to and/or relationships with electeds; most advocacy is done inside the Wilson Building;

The campaign holds discrete one-time community events for people to learn more about how to get involved, but mostly in NW;

The organizations involved and select directly impacted community members develop more powerful relationships with elected officials as a result of pushing for the initiative.

2

### **The collective power of impacted community members is increased with or without the support of organizations**

The campaign is fought by both professional advocates and impacted community members;

Utilizes both "inside game" and "outside game" pressure and tactics;

Advocacy and organizing occurs both inside the Wilson Building and engagement opportunities in community spaces throughout the District particularly SE and NE;

Directly impacted community members have decision making roles, but are not primary decision makers on campaign strategy;

The organizations involved and the representatives/ leaders from directly impacted communities of color develop more powerful relationships with elected officials and build infrastructure for future campaigns.

3

### **Shifts the balance of power to impacted community members**

The campaign is fought primarily by impacted communities, members of which are the leaders and decision makers and make strategic decisions for the campaign;

Utilize primarily "outside game" tactics and pressure;

Advocacy and organizing happens regularly in SE and NE and in primarily Black and other neighborhoods with large communities of color and also occurs throughout the District;

District residents leverage collective power to push for policy initiatives with support from nonprofit advocates;

Black and communities of color have greater self determination and say in policy decisions that affect them

4





## Racial Justice

This criterion measures the extent to which advocates' understanding of the problem and solution considers systemic racism, whether the policy recommendation advances racial justice and remedies historic inequality, and the recommendation attempts to transform policies and programs that are rooted in racist stereotypes and myths



### Colorblind

1

This recommendation does not mention race, uses language that ignores systemic oppression or reinforces harmful stereotypes about Black people and people of color, or is ahistorical in its analysis;

The recommendation predominantly impacts low-income people of color, but the recommendation does not result in a material change in the circumstances of Black and other communities of color;

The recommendation is informed by myths and stereotypes about Black and other people of color and doesn't respond to the systemic problem;

White, middle-high income people were predominantly the ones crafting the recommendation with limited opportunities for input or decision making by directly-impacted people of color

### Working toward Racial Equity

2

This recommendation does not have a clear racial analysis, uses euphemistic or coded language rather than directly naming systems of oppression against Black people and people of color;

The program predominantly impacts Black people and people of color, but does not seek to remedy historic inequities, is not framed as a justice issue, reinforces a narrative of 'deserving' vs 'undeserving.'

A racially diverse coalition of paid advocates were predominantly the ones crafting the recommendation with intentional opportunities for input, but limited decision making by directly-impacted Black and other people of color.

### Embraces a Racial Equity Framework

3

This recommendation has an explicit racial analysis, is clear and direct about the legacy of historic racism and systems of oppression against Black people and people of color;

This recommendation combats racist myths and stereotypes about people living in poverty;

The program reframes the narrative around how low-income people of color are seen as service recipients by integrating an analysis around systemic white supremacy, the legacy of racial discrimination, and racial inequity;

The recommendation was equally crafted by a racially diverse coalition of paid advocates and directly-impacted Black and other people of color

### Racial Justice

4

This recommendation centers Black people and people of color, their voices and experiences, it contextualizes the issue within the intersecting systems of oppression, white supremacist policies and a legacy of economic violence;

The program/policy was crafted in order to directly address historic racial discrimination, systemic white supremacy, and racial inequity;

The recommendation was crafted by directly-impacted Black and other people of color with support from a racially diverse coalition of paid advocates.





## Fair Budget Coalition Recommendation Selection Rubric



### Goals:

1. Create an objective and transparent way to guide FBC's decision making around what policies we work on and support;
2. Encourage member organizations to consider and incorporate FBC's values into their decision making;
3. Create a way to evaluate whether the policies that are being proposed are creating systemic changes, advancing racial justice, are broadly supported, build power, and are guided by impacted constituencies.



### How to use this rubric:

The rubric is a tool to help FBC members examine the ways in which policy recommendations are developed. During the development of a policy recommendation, FBC members (within their issue groups) should ask themselves questions about the policy's intended impact, the roles of community members impacted by policy decisions, the level of support behind an initiative, whether the campaign builds power for marginalized communities, and if it advances racial justice. Each proposal will include a self-assessment; for each category, members will assign themselves a score from 1-4 and add up the total score they received.

### For members while developing recommendations:

- Use the rubric to ensure that each proposed recommendation aligns with Fair Budget Coalition's mission and values and moves towards actualizing the Fair Budget Coalition vision;
- Set goals for issue groups to ensure that their recommendations are grounded in the experiences of community members impacted by the policies for whom we advocate;
- Use it as an internal assessment tool to gauge the strength of a policy and campaign and identify areas of growth and improvement;
- Guide decision making processes within issue groups.
- The FBC recommendation form will directly reflect the rubric, so please be prepared to explain the process behind developing specific policies and assign yourself a rubric score.

### For Steering Committee while making budget and policy decisions:

- To create score for each recommendation, the SC will examine the self-assessment rubric scores each issue group assigned each recommendation, conduct its own assessment and scores to each submitted recommendation based off of the form responses, and look at the results of the membership voting process;
- They will use it as a guide when FBC endorses policy proposals;
- It will help explain how FBC makes endorsement decisions.