

ACE Evaluation Criteria

1. The organization has concrete room for more funding and plans for growth.

Faunalytics has considerable room for more funding. Historically, we have sustained ourselves through fee-for-service income by working with larger organizations. We then pass some of that income on to small organizations through our Grassroots Fund and other pro bono work. This model requires devoting most of our time to client projects as opposed to independent research projects, but the latter arguably have a greater ROI for animals because we choose very strategic topics for our independent studies (e.g., semi-vegetarianism, veg*n recidivism, and increasing donations to animal causes).

With additional funding, we would make marginal improvements to everything we do, including our website and online resources for advocates, our discounted and pro bono projects, and our independent research. More importantly, we would ramp up our primary research projects and conduct more studies similar to what is currently being considered as part of the MaxMind research for farmed animals. We also see a need for such research for wild animals, free-roaming cats, laboratory animals, and others. There is no shortage of good research needed to help farmed (and other) animals, and we are in a strong position to help carry out that research if we had additional capacity, especially more staff members.

We currently have about 2.2 full-time equivalent positions spread across one employee and four regular contractors. We have an annual budget of less than \$150,000. With double that budget, for instance, we would be able to double our staff while having funding left for direct costs to support more independent research (e.g., data collection). At that level, we would be able to maintain our client work while at least doubling our number of pro bono projects and carrying out a major independent studies every year (vs. our current rate of a study every 2-3 years). These studies would be selected and designed with input from advocates and others who use the information to benefit animals.

2. A back-of-the-envelope calculation finds the organization is cost-effective.

This is admittedly a difficult calculation. Because Faunalytics is one or more steps removed from direct animal advocacy, evaluating our impact on the lives of animals is subject to our clients' and users' ability to measure *their* impact. This is nominal in most cases. Among animal advocacy organizations, Faunalytics has a unique understanding of measuring impact. But that also means we understand how difficult and time-consuming it would be to try to estimate the secondary effects that we have by working with our client organizations or through the resources we provide to individual advocates.

With such a small budget and a small staff, even a very modest positive influence on the strategies of animal advocates would suggest cost-effectiveness for Faunalytics as an organization. Over the past 15 years, we have been an important part of changing the culture of animal advocacy to be more focused on effectiveness and

impact. We have also directly helped dozens of animal groups while at the same time educating them on the importance of research and measurement. Although we are unable to measure our impact with a high degree of accuracy, we believe it is large relative to the limited resources we have at our disposal.

3. The organization is working on things that seem to have high mission effectiveness.

Faunalytics' work focuses on ensuring that the resources available for animal advocacy have as much impact as possible. This is similar to ACE's mission, and nothing is more important for animal advocacy. As a movement, we need to have two points of emphasis: 1) growing the pool of resources available; and 2) making sure those resources are used effectively. Faunalytics works in both of these areas through [our client projects](#) and by undertaking studies that increase resources for animal advocacy. Our next independent project is likely to be a "share-of-wallet" study to increase donations to animal causes.

When we have discretion over our own resources (i.e., [our independent projects](#)), Faunalytics tries to ensure that those projects have as much impact as possible by focusing them on farmed animals (or veg*ism), wildlife, or on topics that have the potential to help *all* animal advocates. We use the same approach with our pro bono projects by emphasizing high-impact studies that usually (but not always) focus on farmed animals or veg*ism. They also include projects like our pro bono work with America for Animals to help them determine effective ways to encourage animal-friendly donations.

4. The organization possesses a robust and agile understanding of success and failure.

As noted above, Faunalytics has a uniquely strong understanding of success and failure and impact measurement. We spend quite a bit of our time teaching other advocates these concepts, either directly by working with our clients or indirectly such as our talks at conferences. We employ logic models and theories of change to help advocates articulate outputs versus outcomes and to get closer to measuring their true impact for animals. We are also well-versed in the challenges of measuring success and how to overcome or mitigate many of those challenges with limited resources. While our own impact is especially difficult to measure, we track key metrics for all of our programs and maintain a monthly dashboard.

5. The organization possesses a strong track record of success.

Faunalytics has a 15-year track record that includes a long history of working with animal groups to help them increase their effectiveness. Client satisfaction surveys are typically conducted 6-12 months after our projects and consistently show very positive feedback. We have worked with dozens of such clients, usually with multiple projects per client. Faunalytics has also helped thousands of individual animal advocates and we have spearheaded four major independent studies. Our track record and some of our successes are evident in the [testimonials on our website](#). Some of our studies have had substantial influence, including our study of the perceptions of animal advocates and our recent work on veg*n recidivism.

6. The organization has strong organizational leadership and structure.

As a small organization, our structure is very simple. We have three contractors reporting to the executive director, who in turn reports to the board of directors. While our executive director also currently serves as one of the organization's five board members, it is our intention to separate those roles within the next year or two. We are actively engaged in board development at the moment and plan to grow the board by at least 2-3 positions over the next couple of years. In the meantime, we maintain a strong conflict of interest policy as part of our bylaws (available upon request). [Our directors](#) are all long-time animal advocates and also professionals in their respective fields.

7. The organization is transparent.

Faunalytics strives to be as transparent as possible in our work while also respecting the privacy of our client organizations. We encourage our paid clients to be transparent by providing discounts when they share their results with other animal advocates, and we generally *require* transparency from our pro bono clients. We also provide the full results and original datasets for all of our independent studies (including the Animal Tracker and veg*n recidivism studies). Regarding the organization, we freely share information about our finances and operations upon request and our records are current with Guidestar (we are a Bronze participant now, working toward Silver). We provide information about our goals and plans on our website and directly with our users. We also intend to provide a public annual report/review beginning in early 2016.