GFCLA Policy Process/Screen/Rubric

Please rate each category on a scale of 1 to 5, based on the strength of conviction in that category. Higher overall score = more likely to take on the issue. (Note that the "risk" category intentionally assigns the higher score to the "no" answer.)

Question to consider when assigning ratings.	No Somewhat Yes
Relationship to Council Priorities 1. Is the issue addressed in the Charter? Directly? 2. Is the issue addressed in council goals or priorities, CFA, policy documents? 3. Is the issue particularly significant to the greater L/A area? 4. Is the issue addressed by like-minded organizations?	**1 2 3 4 5**
Impact potential or ROI 5. Is GFCLA's voice needed for a better chance for a successful outcome? 6. Does GFCLA and its mission stand to make a gain (in influence, awareness, exposure, alliances) regardless of the ultimate outcome on the issue?	**1 2 3 4 5**
Risk 7. Is there risk of alienating needed people/sectors/constituencies? Is it warranted? 8. Would we be sidelining other work previously identified as priority? Is it warranted?	**5 4 3 2 1**
Consensus 9. Does membership easily reach consensus? If not, is the issue worth the contention? And/or can individual members abstain/recuse themselves from the activity? 10. Are GFCLA members/orgs already advocating on this issue while wearing other hats? Does taking a collective stand make a difference?	**1 2 3 4 5**
Expertise on issue 11. Do we have in-house expertise to be effective, or resources available to get what we need? 12. Would we be credible and influential?	**1 2 3 4 5**

Adopted July 13, 2017

Capacity to advocate position
  13. Do we have sufficient funding/staffing to be effective in any course of action?
  14. What level action are we realistically able to take?
	1 2 3 4 5

TOTAL SCORE (6-30)	

Process for vetting policy requests:
- ➢ Requests can come from outside the Council
- ➢ Requests can be made by Council members
- ➢ All requests will go directly to the Policy Committee to apply the criteria/rubric
- ➢ If it is clear that the issue is problematic, or perfect, a recommendation and justification will be brought to the Council to consider
- ➢ If it is not clear on how to proceed a pros and cons overview will be brought to the Council for further discussion
- ➢ The Policy Committee can recommend not taking a position if there is not enough time to go through the vetting process

Council action/decision making:
- ➢ The Policy Committee can recommend and the Council can choose to 'support', 'take no position' or 'come out against' any policy proposal
- ➢ If the Council can *clearly* not reach consensus the issue will not move forward

**Unanswered questions/To Do:
- ● Are members representing themselves or org affiliations? (Lead Team considering)

Adopted July 13, 2017