

Report: All Responses

Filters

Source: **All**

Responses: **All**

Time in Survey: **None set**

Date Range: **None set**

Conditions: **No Condition Set**

Questions: **All**

Source	Started Survey	Currently in Survey	Completed Survey	Were Terminated	Did not Finish	Average Survey Length
Survey Link	41	0	23	0	18	00:07:28
Totals	41	0	23	0	18	00:07:28

Q1 :

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Make CFC the Gold Standard of Workplace Giving Accountability	0	0
	Total	0	100%

Q2 : Determine the transparency needs of donors and charities

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	96
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	24	100%

Q3 : What, if any, federal (or other) regulatory restrictions are there on CFC's ability to share information publicly?

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	20	83
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	3	13
	Total	24	100%

Q4 : Determine what criteria are used to inform decisions on whether or not to include a charity in the CFC (eligibility)

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	96
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	24	100%

Q5 : Evaluate audit requirement for smaller local charities

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	20	83
2	Nay	2	8
3	Abstain	2	8
	Total	24	100%

Q6 : Improve the governance structures of federations

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	22	92
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	1	4
	Total	24	100%

Q7 : Change the annual application requirement to one that is less frequent but with required supplemental submissions

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	21	88
2	Nay	2	8
3	Abstain	1	4
	Total	24	100%

Q8 : Feel free to comment on any of the recommendations related to making CFC the gold standard of workplace giving accountability.

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1		5	100
	<p>Many Transparency issues should be inherent with public accountability standards as a 501(c)(3) and given previous OPM Memorandum and Guidance. Many of these issues may be easily addressed by the notion to better educate LFCC so they know too expect that certain information is made available to the local federal population and as well as to the LFCC.</p> <p>In regards to the audits of smaller charities, even though it may be a hardship all parties need to feel confident that auditing is happening and that these entities are reliable.</p> <p>Use caution when evaluating the smaller charities, if costs will be incurred for the evaluation.</p> <p>Ensure that when the fee structure is determined to cover costs of teh campaign, a fair and equitable assessment is made. Do not tax the charities to carry the burden of costs for functions performed by PCFOs, etc. Telling the donor htat 100% of their contributions are going to the cahrity is not totally true. The charities provide the assistance to those in need Let's not alienate the charities and burden them with fees and assessments unnecessarily. No discounts for federations, if charities are not receiving a discount also. Perception is reality.</p> <p>Improving the governance structure of federations requires more information about current models and their effectiveness.</p>		
	Total	5	100%

Q9 :

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Improve Local Campaign Structure	0	0
	Total	0	100%

Q10 : Improve the governance structure of LFCCs; Develop required training for LFCC members

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	22	96
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	1	4
	Total	23	100%

Q11 : Improve the process for releasing donor information to participating charities

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	100
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q12 : Establish a pre-emptive voluntary fundraising disaster relief program

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	18	78
2	Nay	3	13
3	Abstain	2	9
	Total	23	100%

Q13 : Extend solicitation period to January 15

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	20	87
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	2	9
	Total	23	100%

Q14 : Reduce costs by "Going Green"

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	19	83
2	Nay	2	9
3	Abstain	2	9
	Total	23	100%

Q15 : Feel free to comment on any of the recommendations related to improving the CFC's local campaign structure.

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	<p>Release Information to Charities: I am in favor, but also note that this would mean charities would be getting partial lists until all data is processed and reconciled. Extending the campaign makes it more difficult to process and reconcile data in a more timely manner.</p> <p>I am in favor of letting LFCC's determine if their own special circumstances requires a campaign extension.</p> <p>I would be in Favor of allowing for an extension of the campaign if it did not affect the payroll deduction dates - i.e., if we switch to 10 Military Monthly Deductions (3/1-12/1) and 20 Bi-Weekly Civilian Deductions (i.e., PP4-23).</p> <p>CFC's are not set up for disaster relief, and independent charities that do respond seem to do a much better job of immediately opening their doors for response and collection of donations. It would be nearly impossible for us to maintain our standards of having a fair and even playing field, yet respond within the 24 hour window other charities independently do.</p> <p>Assume LFCC Training will be on-line, however would hope it can also be delivered in person by PCFO/CFC Director with Train-the-Trainer held for designated individual</p> <p>LFCC training needs to be universal and standards based, probably best served by creating an online module that ensures everyone is getting access to the same material. Eppley Institue, University of Indiana creates great training modules.</p> <p>Going green really needs to also be know as reduction of paper. Savings bonds are no longer paper; a goal for no or very limited paper should be set.</p> <p>Automating the process will improve the release time for donor informatoin to charities</p> <p>Whne looking to reduce costs by going green, I would encourage people to take into account who is affected by this. For instance, if you require only on-line submissions of applications but the people reviewing applications are now having to print everything out, you are putting the expense burden on those reviewing applications instead of the person submitting the application. Nothing has been saved, you are just switching the cost to someone else.</p> <p>Extend solicitation period to January 15: Make this flexible in the same way 1 Sep thru 15 Dec give flexibility now</p> <p>Training for LFCC's should include developing standardized best practices.</p>	7	100
	Total	7	100%

Q16 :

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Enhance the Donor Experience	0	0
	Total	0	100%

Q17 : Allow new hires to make CFC pledges immediately

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	21	91
2	Nay	2	9
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q18 : Clarify and explain the costs and benefits of the CFC to donors

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	22	96
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q19 : Increase access to federal retirees, contractors, National Guardsmen and Reservists by removing solicitation prohibition and offer credit/debit and/or allotment contributions (retirees only)

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	100
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q20 : Design recurring pledge process

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	100
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q21 : Feel free to comment on any of the recommendations related to enhancing the donor experience.

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1		4	100
	<p>I would like to allow new hires to start a deduction immediately, but the implications and complications of doing that would greatly reduce our accountability and transparency (in my opinion).</p> <p>Regulations need to be changed asap in order to institute a pilot</p> <p>Need some way to ENSURE that brochures are in fact being given out (accountability to the fed agency or military unit) including all military academies</p> <p>Would open up the credit/debit card proces to all federalempleyees, not just retirees.</p> <p>Clarify and explain the costs and benefits of the CFC to donors: I note Nay only because the way in which this issue was presented indicated taht we may erroneously indicate to potential donors that 100% of CFC funds pass to agencies at no cost. It does not matter whether overhead is deducted up front or if agencies pay at the back end, we cannot portray that there are zero CFC costs. Donor dollars pay the cost. The saavy donor knows that the CFC is not cost-free, and we should not portray it that way.</p>		
	Total	4	100%

Q22 :

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Streamline the Campaign Infrastructure	0	0
	Total	0	100%

Q23 : Increase effectiveness of payroll office reporting

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	23	100
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q24 : Create one national CFC website that include one online giving system for payroll allotments and credit/debit cards, lists all national and local charities, with one search function

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	21	91
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	1	4
	Total	23	100%

Q25 : Create a 'universal giving' structure to permit donors to contribute to organizations participating in other campaign regions

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	22	96
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	0	0
	Total	23	100%

Q26 : Increase the value proposition of the campaign for donors

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	19	83
2	Nay	1	4
3	Abstain	3	13
	Total	23	100%

Q27 : Create a national CFC Receipts and Distribution Center to process contributions

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	Yea	20	87
2	Nay	0	0
3	Abstain	3	13
	Total	23	100%

Q28 : Feel free to comment on any of the recommendations related to streamlining campaign infrastructure.

Order	Answer	Responses	Percent
1	<p>I support the value proposition but NOT if it leads to a flat fee for charity participation</p> <p>Increasing the value proposition for Donors seems to coincide with the concept of fees for application and/or charity listing. I do not believe there is the perfect solution on the table to allow this, but not also limit the choice of charity that may be important to many donors. Likewise, it makes it tougher on smaller charities to compete/remain effective. I love the concept, but step cautiously with the law of unintentional consequences.</p> <p>Regarding Receipt and Distribution - I believe the model I outlined at the San Antonio 50 CFC meeting demonstrates a successful means of implementation and would encourage that it be used. At PCFO discretion (or perhaps OCFCO discretion if the PCFO does not have a good track record), Phase 2 could be implemented a lot sooner for many, but it would be a mistake to implement it immediately for all.</p> <p>Universal Giving should have highest priority</p> <p>If I had to list one recommendation that will be a leveler and a game changer, it is a universal website. So many of the other recommendations are best served by this piece it is imperative that this become a priority in my mind.</p> <p>Use caution when increasing the value proposition for donors. Taxing the charities to ensure that 100% of the donor's contribution goes to the charities is a perception, not reality. Taxing or assessing fees to the charities (who are the entities that help those in need") may cause concern. Do not minimize the charities ability to do what they do best-help those in need.</p> <p>When talking about increasing the value proposition to donors I would look carefully at how that is done. If you begin "charging" non-profits to apply to the campaign and the charges are more than they are raising, I beleive that is a problem. I know that the current % system puts the burden on larger, national organizations, but I would look closely about how you are going to change this process.</p> <p>Increase the value proposition of the campaign for donors: Abstained. Do not know what "increase the value proposition of the campaign" means.</p> <p>Improving the value proposition for donors is a good thing. But we do that by actually making the CFC more efficient, not by shifting costs to the charities and then misleading donors by telling them that 100% of their donation goes to the cause. My Yea vote for improving the value proposition is not a vote in favor of Kal's suggestion as articulated at the last meeting. We cannot lie to donors -- it's bad policy, and they will see right through it. We need to focus on actually reducing the costs of the campaign.</p>	8	100
	Total	8	100%