Participatory Capacity Building

A Facilitator’s Toolbox for Assessment and Strategic Planning of NGO Capacity

Jouwert van Geene
Preface

Participatory Capacity Building is a practical toolbox for internal or external facilitators of capacity building of NGOs. The tools can be used to assess an organisation's capacity and plan for strategic and innovative directions for organisational improvement.

Dangers of the Toolbox
As with all facilitation methods the methodology presented in this toolbox should be used with care, as it must be adapted to every situation to use in. As much as we have tried to be specific and detailed on the facilitation steps, this Toolbox should not be taken as a blueprint for facilitation. Facilitating Participatory Capacity Building needs a lot of creativity, courage and involvement both from the facilitator and the participating organisation(s). We hope it provides a meaningful vehicle for sustainable improvement of NGO capacity.

Skilled Facilitators
We want to encourage all practitioners to build their facilitation skills. Especially courses in Group Facilitation Methods and Participatory Strategic Planning, offered by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) all over the world, will provide helpful skills and knowledge to facilitate Participatory Capacity Building processes. See Section 1.4 for more information.
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1. Introduction to the Process
Notes
1.1 Introduction to the Toolbox

In this first Chapter we introduce the process of Participatory Capacity Building starting off with a paper on Capacity Building for NGOs, which puts this Toolbox in a broader perspective. Then two ‘methodologies’ will be introduced: Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET) and Technology of Participation® (ToP)®. This Toolbox builds on both of them. This introduction continues with a section on the role of the facilitator in Participatory Capacity Building. Finally we share experiences with this toolbox as it was developed for and applied with NGOs in Zimbabwe.

After the introduction to the process the Toolbox continues with 6 Chapters containing the actual tools for Participatory Capacity Building:

2. Participatory Capacity Assessment: the process to facilitate self-assessment of NGO Capacity;
3. Analysing and Reporting Participatory Capacity Assessment Scores: the frameworks to reflect on the assessment results;
4. Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop: the process to facilitate reflection on results and strategic capacity planning;
5. Implementation Planning: tools for putting wheels under the capacity building plan;
6. NGO Capacity Building Co-ordination Workshop: the processes for collaborative action of NGOs;
7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building: the frameworks and processes to keep track of progress of capacity building efforts.
1.2 Capacity Building for Non Governmental Organisations

Introduction

It has been widely acknowledged that insufficient capacity of development organisations hinders sustainable development. This problem however cannot simply be defined in terms of gaps in human resources, financial resources or training. The issue is a function of several aspects: limited sense of local ownership of the development processes; excessive dependency on external resources and technical assistance; inadequate considerations of broader environmental or systems factors; and poor integration and co-ordination of multiple development initiatives.

In the past decade there has been much debate and research on the efficacy of technical co-operation and the issue of capacity building. It led to better understanding of development processes and the changes necessary to make development initiatives more successful and sustainable.

This paper will introduce the concept of capacity building for Non Governmental Organisations focusing on an approach that capacitates organisations from within, rather than from the outside. Just as we want to create sustainable change from within the community, capacity building should start from where organisations are, creating change from within.

Introduction to Capacity Building

Capacity is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

To clarify capacity in its context it is necessary to answer the question: capacity for what? Here we narrow down capacity as the ability to solve a problem, to achieve or sustain a mission, to reach a set of objectives. Non governmental organisations need capacity to achieve their planned objectives, to have an impact and to fulfil their organisational purpose.

Capacity building is broader than organisational development, since it includes the overall system, environment or context in which individuals, organisations and societies operate and interact. It is the process by which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions and societies increase their abilities to: (1) perform core functions, solve problems, define and achieve objectives; and (2) understand and deal with their development needs in a broad context and in a sustainable manner.

Capacity building is closely linked to the concept of learning organisations. A learning organisation is one that constantly changes and experiments by using feedback of its results to change its form and processes in ways that make it more successful. Capacity building can be seen as transforming the culture and structural designs of organisations to become real learning organisations.

Capacity building is a continuous and reciprocal process of adjusting people’s attitudes, values and organisational practises while building up appropriate knowledge and skills among various stakeholders in a partnership – to strengthen each partner’s ability to make effective decisions about their own lives and to take full responsibility of the consequences of such decisions.
Dimensions of Capacity in a systems context

Capacity issues can be analysed at three levels (figure 1). Often capacity building is only addressed at the individual and organisational level. However, capacity should be understood at the systems level as well. The system is a regularly interacting or interdependent group of items forming a unified whole. All three levels must be included when assessing and planning capacity to create meaningful change.

**Levels of Capacity – within a systems context**

1. **The System**
   The highest level of capacity is the broader system or enabling environment level. For some national NGOs this level covers the entire country or region they work in and all the sub-components that are involved. For other NGOs that work more sectoral (e.g. health) the system would only include those relevant components.

   The systems level includes both formal and informal organisations. Only the key organisations or stakeholder within the context of the NGO are relevant, looking at the nature of the relationships between the entities. (See figure 2)

   1. **The System**
      The highest level of capacity is the broader system or enabling environment level. For some national NGOs this level covers the entire country or region they work in and all the sub-components that are involved. For other NGOs that work more sectoral (e.g. health) the system would only include those relevant components.

   The systems level includes both formal and informal organisations. Only the key organisations or stakeholder within the context of the NGO are relevant, looking at the nature of the relationships between the entities. (See figure 2)

   **Level 1: the Broader System**
   **System Factors:**
   - Socio-political
   - Government / public sector
   - Economic / Technological
   - Physical environment

   Dimensions of capacity at the Systems Level:
   - Policy Dimension: systems have a purpose to meet certain needs in society, including value systems.
   - Legal/Regulatory Dimension: includes rules, laws, norms, standards which govern the system, and which sets boundaries for an NGO.
   - Management or Accountability Dimension: defines who ‘manages’ the system, or who is responsible for potential design, management and implementation, co-ordination, monitoring and evaluation etc. of development initiatives in the system of the NGO.
   - Resource Dimension: (human, financial, information) that may be available within the system to develop and implement the NGO initiatives.
   - Process Dimension: the inter-relationships, interdependencies and interactions amongst the entities, including flow of resources and information, formal and informal networks of people and supporting communications infrastructures.

2. **The Entity or Organisation**
   There are typical dimensions that need to be assessed and developed at the organisational level. (see figure 3)
Unlike traditional capacity development and organisational strengthening which focuses on human resources, processes and organisational structures, a more comprehensive approach examines all dimensions of capacity at entity level, including its interactions within the system.

This also applies to organisational sub-units within the entity, such as project teams, work-groups etc.

Dimensions of Capacity at the Entity Level:
- Human Resource Management: the most valuable of the entity’s resources and upon which change, capacity and development primarily depend.
- Financial Resource Management: both operating and capital, required for the efficient and effective functioning of the NGO, including fund-raising.
- Equitable Participation: involvement of local knowledge and stakeholders related to project access and project benefit.
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: impact of the NGOs work looking at different aspects like environmental, economic, political, institutional and cultural factors.
- Partnering: collaboration with other NGOs, donors, policy makers, and private sector entities.
- Organisational Learning: teamwork, information-sharing and capacity for generating information that leads to improvement of current practice.
- Strategic Management / Governance: board practices, planning, commitment to goals, mission and philosophy or culture.

3. The Individual
The individual level is a major dimension of capacity – people, including small interpersonal networks of individuals. The individual level includes the involved management, professionals, support staff but also those who are beneficiaries or are otherwise impacted by the NGOs work (specific client groups, segments of society, etc.).

This level addresses the individual’s capacity to function efficiently and effectively within the entity and within the broader system.

Often, capacity building focuses on individual skills and knowledge needed to perform job descriptions or positions. Increasingly, the dimensions of accountability, performance, values and ethics, incentives and security are becoming more important at this level.

Capacity Building Processes
Capacity building must be regarded as an organisation-wide process, involving many dimensions of the organisation and its environment. Human Resource development is critical within this process, but it is not just limited to skills and knowledge development (e.g. through training). The process of ‘skilling-up’ involves expressing thoughts and voicing opinions – the essence of meaningful contributions to capacity building from within.

There are some stages to define in capacity building:
1. Setting the stage and formulating the ‘entry point’ of the process
2. Capacity assessment
3. Strategic capacity planning and benchmarking
4. Implementing capacity building strategies
5. Sustaining capacity by ongoing monitoring and benchmarking

It should be noted that on beforehand nothing has been decided about the choice of capacity building strategies. In principle, everything is possible, from Appreciative Inquiry to Total Quality Management, from Organisational Learning to Advanced Information Technology. Choice of the capacity building approach will depend on the capacity assessment and the strategic capacity planning exercises.

**Capacity Building Entry Point**

Start of any capacity building exercise should be assessing the need for capacity building in the first place. This can be done by introducing the topic of capacity building to the senior management of an NGO and by assessing the actual level of knowledge and experience of capacity building within the organisation.

Capacity building may also be a tool brought in by an external partner (donor, government, client, consultant) assuming it is needed for by a particular NGO. In a way an outsider has hijacked the capacity issue from the NGO, which might cause lack of ownership at a later stage.

Before launching the assessment process, the organisation’s senior management needs to determine its specific objectives in relation to the self-assessment. Options range from benchmarking capacity and monitoring change over time to using the tool to initiate a comprehensive organisational development program.

The following steps must be taken before entering a capacity assessment:

- Gain a commitment to the entire process (including follow-up) from senior management.
- Determine a reasonable and adequate amount of time that the assessment team can devote to the exercise.
- Advocate the benefits of completing such an assessment.
- Discuss ways in which the organisation can create a "safe environment" for those participating in the self-assessment. This could include; off-site assessment, discussion ground rules that emphasise mutual respect, and the use of an external facilitator.

Most common entry point for the capacity assessment of NGOs is the entity level, or the individual level. Capacity assessment of the organisation may for example be combined with a training needs assessment at individual level to ensure motivation to embark the process.

**Participatory Capacity Assessment**

The most appropriate method for Capacity Assessment of NGOs is self-assessment or participatory assessment. This is a process whereby an assessment team with representatives of the organisations goes through an assessment exercise that provides information about the capacity of their organisation. Self-assessment has the advantage of organisational learning and building of ownership of the capacity building process.

The Participatory Capacity Assessment (PCA) presented in this toolbox uses the Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET), developed by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). POET is a method that uses the “critical incident” technique to focus group discussions about organisational capacity. An assessment team is lead through a number of questions referring to incidents that have happened to their organisation in relation to capacity dimensions. Each member of the assessment team then “scores” the level of capacity, based on discussions and their own views and experiences.

Typical Capacity Dimensions used by PCA are Human Resource Management, Financial Resource Management, Equitable Participation, Partnering, Organisational Learning, Strategic Management / Governance. Other dimensions might be added when appropriate.
PCA outcomes include an objective measurement of the organisation’s capacities and the degree of consensus about this level of capacity (graphically illustrated in figure 4).

PCA outcomes also provide a method for benchmarking of NGO capacities. When assessing the capacity of a number of similar NGOs (a cohort), for instance from one NGO sector or region, an overview of the capacity levels of these NGOs will be created in order for NGOs to compare their capacities.

Within the whole process anonymity and confidentiality is guaranteed by using coded participants names and organisations pseudonyms.

PCA can be used as a tool for monitoring capacity, when applying it on a regular (yearly) basis, but also encourages organisational reflection and learning.

Steps of PCA:
- Introducing the methodology and building the assessment team;
- Conducting a PCA session (5-6 hours), preferably by an outside facilitator (see Chapter 2.);
- Analysing and reporting PCA Scores (see Chapter 3.);

Strategic Capacity Planning and benchmarking
Next step in the capacity building process is to plan strategies based on the assessment. First the NGO must prioritise the capacity dimensions using the results of the PCA. The NGO might choose capacities that are relatively low, focusing on ‘weaknesses’. On the other hand the NGO might also want to build on existing strengths in its capacity.

After prioritisation specific objectives must be set with regards to the capacities that have the highest priority. These objectives should be designed in a consensus workshop with internal staff, and must be as realistic as possible.

Examples of capacity objectives include:
- Improvement of the PCA results in absolute terms; e.g. increased score for financial resource management from 58 to 70, within 3 years.
- Improvement of PCA results in relation to other NGO’s scores (benchmarking); e.g. scoring higher than the cohort mean score in at least 5 of the 7 capacity dimensions.
- Improvement of consensus on organisations capacity; e.g. increased average score on consensus from 56 to 70, within 1 year.
- Decrease of dependency on external funding; e.g. decreased percentage of external funding from 99% to 80% in 2 years. Minimum of 2 new local income sources generated.
- Decreased staff turnover, etc.

After establishing the capacity objectives strategies can be drawn up. These may include examples like:
- Organisational Change methodologies, like Appreciative Inquiry, Total Quality Management, Coaching for Breakthroughs, Organisational Learning, Systems Transformation, Advanced Information Technology, the Problem Solving Method etc. These methods can be applied by training management in new management tools, or by consultations of external experts;
- Staff improvement: On-the-job training of staff, staff exchange with other NGOs, regular training programmes;
- Enhancing staff recruitment, staff incentives, and staff career plans;
- Advanced networking with other NGO’s, government agencies, etc.;
- Improving information technology and communication, etc.

Some strategies require additional resources that need to be mobilised. Other strategies may be implemented within the regular program and with existing means. NGOs can also work on collaborative actions in capacity building by developing joint strategies and plans.

Tools for this part of capacity building are the Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop (see Chapter 4.) and the Collaboration Seminar for NGOs (see Chapter 5.).

**Implementing and Sustaining Capacity Building**

Implementation of Capacity Building strategies may be done by a special capacity team within the NGO or may be managed by one capacity manager. The human resource manager or executive director typically does this; however, a growth and development manager might do it.

Keeping track of capacity building activities is very important, in particular when ‘non tangible’ strategies are chosen like change management tools. One way to do this is to keep NGO staff informed about the things that are happening, for instance in a frequent capacity newsletter.

Other ways of tracking the capacity are follow-up meetings, regular PCB Impact assessments and doing an evaluating POET exercise with the NGO and NGOs in a ‘cohort’ to compare the results of capacity building activities.

Methods for this part described in this toolbox are Implementation Planning Workshops (see Chapter 6.) and Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building (see Chapter 7.).

**References:**
- Capacity.org, 2002, a gateway to capacity development, http://www.capacity.org
- Mbullu, Patrick, 1999: Capacity Building North and South: Links and Lessons, ICA:UK: internal paper
Participatory Capacity Building uses POET in its process. This section is to introduce this methodology and its origins.

What is POET?
POET is an acronym that stands for Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool. It's also two concepts rolled into one: a tool, and a process. As an organisational capacity assessment tool, CSOs (Civil Society Organisations) and their partners use POET to measure and profile organisational capacities and consensus levels in seven critical areas, and assess, over time, the impact of these activities on organisational capacity (benchmarking). As an organisational development process, CSOs and their partners use POET to build capacity by bringing staff together in cross-functional, cross-hierarchical groups for open exchange; to identify divergent viewpoints to foster growth; to create consensus around future organisational capacity development activities; and, to select, implement and track organisational change and development strategies.

POET was developed in 1998 by Beryl Levinger of Education Development Center and Evan Bloom of Pact with assistance from the United Nations Development Programme and numerous CSO colleagues. Based on a methodology called PROSE (Participatory, Results-Oriented Self-Evaluation), POET focuses on the needs of a very specific user population, Southern CSOs and their partners.

What is PROSE, the methodology behind POET?
PROSE stands for Participatory, Results-Oriented, Self-Evaluation, a new methodology for assessing and enhancing organisational capacities. PROSE is designed for use by service organisations, schools, and government units committed to dramatically improving their ability to promote significant, positive, and lasting change. PROSE is suitable for assessing capacity and catalyzing organisational change in relation to such concerns as: practices related to exceeding customer expectations, organisational effectiveness in achieving mission, community participation, equity, decentralisation, and managerial effectiveness.

The following steps outline the PROSE methodology:
- Critical organisational capacities are identified in relation to a potential user population
- Items are created to measure the critical capacities
- Facilitators are trained
- The tool is applied
- Scores are tabulated
- Scores are reported
- Capacity-building efforts are launched

Using the PROSE methodology, POET is designed to:
- Promote organisational learning and capacity-building among CSOs
- Assist CSOs in strengthening their local partners
- Enable UNDP to track the impact of its support to CSOs
- Facilitate communication and information-sharing about capacity-building within the CSO community

The Role of the Cohort in PROSE
A cohort is composed of organisations that want to improve performance, want to engage in deep organisational learning, and are open to change. Although most cohorts are comprised of organisations in related fields, what's most important is that cohort members agree, a priori, in general terms what issues they intend to focus on (e.g., quality of customer service; operational efficiency; the quality of linkages and partnerships with other institutions). Additionally, the cohort concept enables PROSE users to benchmark their organisation's performance against a wider group of like entities in order to accelerate progress toward goal achievement. A cohort data manager and member organisations may choose to employ internet technologies to maintain anonymity, report results or facilitate communication among cohort
members in different geographical areas. Cohort creation is intended to foster a network of innovative organisations that can lend support to one another as they pursue their individual change efforts.

**Using PROSE without a Cohort**

PROSE may be used to address the needs of a cohort, but it is also designed to assess and enhance the capacity building of a single organisation. Organisations that are not part of a cohort will not be able to study their scores in comparison with peer organisations for benchmarking purposes. However, individual organisations can still engage in the analysis of absolute and relative scores generated through the PROSE methodology and utilise companion tools.

**How POET works**

During a POET capacity-assessment session, team members alternate between group discussion and individual reflection as follows:

- The facilitator leads the assessment team through a set of two to four discussion questions about "critical incidents."
- Team members reflect independently on the discussion by responding anonymously to statements that can be answered using Likert-type scales ("strongly agree—strongly disagree").
- This sequence of group discussion and individual reflection is repeated until the group completes all 100 POET questions which usually takes five to six hours.

After the POET capacity-assessment session:

- Results are scored and profiled using a variety of reporting formats and POET companion tools.
- Additional capacity- and consensus-building work is planned based on POET results.

**How POET is unique**

POET was designed as a robust, easy-to-use assessment process that efficiently and effectively assists CSOs and their CSO partners in achieving meaningful, lasting change. POET differs from other organisational capacity assessment tools in several ways. It:

- uses a "critical incident" technique to focus group discussion on common data which bolsters reliability and validity.
- includes a consensus dimension that measures diversity of opinion among team members to enrich organisational analysis and encourage capacity-building through the analysis of divergent viewpoints.
- offers companion tools that help participants to apply their POET results to the design of change initiatives that are firmly rooted in organisational realities.
- employs advanced statistical techniques to ensure construct validity and reliability.
- is easy to administer (relatively little facilitator training is necessary for effective results)
- models of sound organisational learning processes that serve as a springboard for capacity building (i.e., POET is simultaneously a tool for measuring and building capacity)

In addition, when used with a cohort of peer organisations, POET:

- enables users to benchmark individual organisational results against a cohort of peer organisations.
- uses the Internet where appropriate to foster communication among CSOs concerning POET findings and results as well as capacity-building efforts within the CSO community

**What POET measures**

POET produces two kinds of measures, a capacity score, which indicates how an organisation perceives its strengths and weaknesses with respect to the capacity areas, and a consensus score, which indicates the degree to which assessment team members agree on their assessment of organisational capacity. These two scores reflect the key concept underlying POET: meaningful organisational development occurs at the intersection of two processes--identifying perceived
organisational strengths and weaknesses and exploring differences of opinion regarding these perceptions.

The seven capacity areas measured by POET are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Area</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Resource Management</td>
<td>staff development, recruitment, compensation (salary and benefits), personnel evaluation, and grievance and conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial Resource Management</td>
<td>budgeting, forecasting, fund-raising, and cash management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equitable Participation</td>
<td>field-based program practices related to project access and project benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainability of Program Benefits</td>
<td>the impact of environmental, economic, political, institutional, and cultural factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Partnering</td>
<td>collaboration with other CSOS, donors policy makers, and private sector entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Learning</td>
<td>teamwork, information-sharing and capacity for generating information that leads to improvement of current practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strategic Management/ Governance</td>
<td>Board practices; planning practices; and, commitment to goals, mission and philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POET was developed by

Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street Avenue, NW, 5th floor,
Newton, Massachusetts 02160
Tel: 617 969 7100
Fax: 617 332 6405
Email: beryl@edc.org

Pact, Inc
1901 Pennsylvania
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: 202-466-5666
Fax: 202-466-5669
Email: ebloom@pacthq.org

This introduction is based on the introduction from the POET User’s Manual. This manual can be downloaded from the internet at:
An edited version of the POET User’s Manual can be found on the PCB cd-rom.
1.4 What is Technology of Participation® (ToP®)?

Participatory Capacity Building uses ToP® in some of its processes. This section is to introduce the background and origins of these methods.

Introduction
Technology of Participation® is a world of methods that provide practical tools for enabling highly energised, productive inclusive and meaningful participation. All groups and organisations rely on how well leadership is able to inspire, catalyse, and sustain shared learnings and decision making in projects, programs, management and operational work. Structured participation enables deeper levels of commitment, greater capacity for sharing wisdom, and owning decisions arrived at collectively. ToP® methods enable groups to be more responsive to change and more creative in implementation. The methods encourage and develop broad-based initiative and responsibility. When used effectively and consistently, ToP® methods give groups a sense of both inner and outer well-being.

In 2003 ICA is present in 33 countries spread across six continents. The ICA office in each nation is autonomous. ICA International, headquartered in Brussels, acts as a clearinghouse for information and a co-ordination centre for national ICAs. Hallmark of the work of ICA is its use of participatory methods which help people plan together, reflect on their experience, and motivate them to action. ToP® methods have been invented, tested and refined in some four decades of working with communities and organisations around the world.

Variety of methods
Technology of Participation® consists of a large number of different tools and techniques that are interrelated. These include basic group facilitation methods and advanced tools for organisational development. Some of the ToP® methods are:
- Focused Conversation method
- Consensus Workshop method
- Action Planning process
- Participatory Strategic Planning process
- Participatory Project Management process

Within this participatory capacity building process ToP® methods are used in different ways. The Focused Conversation method is used in the ‘critical incidence’ method of Participatory Capacity Assessment. Parts of the Participatory Strategic Planning process are used in the Feedback and Capacity Planning workshop and in Implementation Workshops. Furthermore the philosophy and underlying principles of ToP® are leading threads throughout the Participatory Capacity Building process.

Technology of Participation® Methods are developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). Since the 1960’s ICA has been a presence in adult and child education, community projects around the world, in organising development, and in researching and testing the intellectual tools and social methods needed by people participating in social change.
Advantages of ToP® methods

1. ToP® methods apply a structure to group process, preventing a group from drifting aimlessly.

2. ToP® methods are extremely versatile, which means they work as well with groups of strangers as with long-term colleagues. They work well with groups that may never be together again and with well-established groups. They work with people of mixed backgrounds and ages, and with homogeneous groups.

3. ToP® methods provide excellent ways to focus people on a topic long enough to determine what direction is needed and to provide an effective way for a group of people involved in implementing a decision to think through issues or actions together.

4. ToP® methods provide room for real listening. People don’t have to raise their voices or fight for the floor to be heard. Nor do they have to repeat previously stated positions for emphasis or to indicate agreement or support.

5. ToP® methods have a way of eliminating politicking and power plays. They encourage understanding rather than criticism. They are helpful when bringing different information or perspectives together in order to create a commonly held comprehensive or “bigger” picture of an issue or objective.

6. ToP® methods help to discourage negative thinking. Each person’s comments are received, and none are disqualified or struck from the record.

7. ToP® methods draw out both the rational and emotional responses and experiences of the participants.

8. ToP® methods enable honesty: people who know that their responses will be accepted like everybody else’s feel free to say what they really think and feel. The experience of such honesty is often releasing, surprising, and refreshing.

ToP® and the ToP® symbol are registered trademarks of the Institute of Cultural Affairs.

References:

- The Institute of Cultural Affairs at large: http://www.icaworld.org
1.5 The Facilitator

Introduction
Use of participatory techniques for development purposes are widely accepted. This introduction focuses on different aspects of participation and facilitation in Participatory Capacity Building. Why do we want participation? What is the needed leadership style and what are the main tasks and qualities of the facilitator?

Participation
As its title indicates, Participatory Capacity Building wants to achieve maximum participation during the process. There are several advantages of participation in capacity building:
- **Consensus and ownership** will be reached to get capacity building plans implemented
- **Quality assessments** and plans can be made since they will use comprehensive input of available knowledge
- **Learning and growth** is established by information sharing and innovative approaches to enhance knowledge and skills within the organisation

Of course there are also misconceptions, pitfalls and disadvantages of participation and facilitation:
- **Participation is not easier.** Usually participation in capacity building does not come easy. Inviting broad participation in this process risks creation of unnecessary frustrations, especially when expectations are not met. It needs clear structures, guidelines and methods that, almost paradoxically, allow for creativity and innovation to surface.

- **Facilitation is not consulting, informing or training.** Very often participation or facilitation is used as a cover term for a "top-down" approach of advisory or consultative meetings. This is something different where outsiders come in to give advice or analyse problems. In the group facilitation we present in Participatory Capacity Building, we use tools and techniques to help members of a group share their expertise and insights and to collectively arrive at decisions they can uphold, own and implement. When the facilitator does not trust the group or when he has a second agenda, genuine participation will not be evoked.

- **Subjectivity in assessment and planning.** A real threat to the quality of the Participatory Capacity Building process may be the subjectivity or "narrowness" of the group. The process has a build-in comprehensive approach, but can never prevent subjectivity to prevail. However, it is the reality of the group that will create ownership and commitment to the process.

For inclusive participation to be successful, effective facilitation skills and methods are needed. Without methods, "participation" simply becomes a situation where anyone and everyone can say and do whatever they individually want to do. This often means that little of a capacity building plan is accomplished, and many involved feel their precious time, money and energy have been wasted. Effective methods make it possible for inclusive participation to happen as a creative, productive and even empowering experience.
Leadership Styles

The Participatory Capacity Building process needs a strong facilitator. This facilitator may be an outsider, e.g. someone from a supporting organisation, a governmental agency or a private consultant. However, an insider, e.g. a staff member or board member, may also facilitate the process.

The leader of a Participatory Capacity Building process moves away from the authority of hierarchical leadership and toward a dynamic and empowering style embodied by the facilitative leader. Though the facilitator must be sensitive to the hierarchical structures of the organisation, he seeks ways of going beyond the limits set by structure and helps to bring out the best in individuals and groups. Adopting the style of the facilitator in the Capacity Building process means accessing the power of a group’s diverse perspectives in assessing the capacity and analysing the current reality while maintaining respect and integrity within the group.

The facilitator is concerned with productive, inclusive and meaningful participation and knows methods how to engage people in the assessment and planning of the organisation’s capacity. The facilitator does not tell the group what is best for them, but is able to guide the process of the group to find out what is best for them.

In as much as the facilitator wants to arrive at the “right” decision for the group, he seeks and is open to analysis and decisions that will be owned and implemented by members of the organisation.

Rather than depending upon the charismatic abilities and influencing skills of one individual, the facilitator relies on and trusts in the wisdom and ability of the group, receives input without judgement and works toward an experience of success for the whole group.

Both hierarchical and facilitative leadership may be appropriate to different situations. For Participatory Capacity Building we propose the latter one that will build on the group’s reality rather than creating a new ‘outsiders’ perspective.
Tasks of the Facilitator

The facilitator's first task is that of enabling the group to succeed in the Capacity Building process. Finishing a process is empowering and motivating for the participants. The facilitator uses as much precision as possible as a tool for success. This results in the group creating the capacity building plan.

Team building is the second task of the facilitator. Team building is expanding, increasing and deepening the existing relationships within the group. The facilitator uses his or her own compassion for the group as a tool toward this end. The result of team building is a consensus.

Creating group resolve is the third task of the facilitator. Creating resolve in a group is aligning its collective will in the same direction and encouraging its decision to act. The facilitator uses indirection of ideas and comments so that the group comes to their own decisions. The result is action.

Enlarging the operating context of the group is the final task of the facilitator. Enlarging the context of a group is to extend the time frame and increasing the operating world in which it works. The facilitator uses objectivity and distance from the group as tools to enlarge the group's context. The result is motivation. The danger of being too objective and distant by the facilitator is a shallow group plan.

Qualities of a facilitator

Effective facilitation is an art requiring discipline about the method, in the use of time, and in one’s own relationship to the group. Facilitating capacity building requires discipline about the use of time and being able to help the group move quicker or knowing when to shorten a step. Facilitation requires rigor in pursuing the intent of the session. It is demanding as much depth of ideas from the group as they are willing to share. Facilitating is finally the discipline of respecting and honouring the group.

Effective facilitation is the art of knowing what to change when. Facilitating a capacity building process requires flexibility in style and method based on the specific group you are dealing with. Facilitating it requires that the facilitator responds to the specific situation of the session, the ideas that come up, the needs of the participants, the room, etc. and not his or her own needs. It is recognising that there is never an ideal session yet every one can be a good session. Facilitating capacity building means being flexible about following the specific procedures of the method.

Effective facilitation is being fully engaged in the process by being fully responsible for its outcome. An effective facilitator is willing to risk himself in seeing that the group succeeds. The facilitator is willing to do whatever necessary for the process to produce the products intended. Effective facilitation requires preparation: both intellectual and emotional. The facilitator is engaged with the group.

At the same time, effective facilitation requires detachment. An effective facilitator is detached from his or her own insights and ideas because it is the group's decision that has the higher priority in the capacity building process. A facilitator is detached from his or her own accomplishments; more important are the successes of the group. It is being detached from one's own emotional involvement in the process and people. The facilitator is detached from the group enough to enable it to become productive.

References:
1.6 Field Experiences: the NANGO Case

Facilitating sustainable change from within NGOs in Zimbabwe

Introduction
Capacity Building is a buzzword commonly encountered in the work of Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs). Unfortunately Capacity Building might easily be misinterpreted as training or staff development. In Zimbabwe NANGO (National Association for NGOs) together with an external consultant developed a method for participatory capacity assessment and planning. Facilitated by NANGO organisations took charge of a process of self-diagnoses, analysis and strategic capacity planning. This brought together NGOs from one sector to identify their similarities and to find ways to assist each other in building sustainable capacity.

NANGO
The National Association of NGOs in Zimbabwe (NANGO) is the recognised national umbrella organisation for the NGO sector in Zimbabwe with a membership of about 250 NGOs. Since its foundation in 1962 NANGO developed into a service oriented organisation. It promotes, co-ordinates and organises the participation and contributions of NGOs in Zimbabwe in social, economic and political development of the people in Zimbabwe. Key areas of NANGO’s work are information sharing between members and other stakeholders, advocacy and lobbying on NGO-issues and capacity building of NGOs.

From Training to Capacity Building
Traditionally NANGO would carryout training needs assessments and actually conduct the training for identified courses. This mainly focused on entrepreneurial and vocational skills for income generation projects. More recently NANGO shifted this role into the direction of co-ordinating and facilitating training by training needs assessments and information sharing of available courses of other NGOs.
So far, NANGO has regarded capacity building mainly as Human Capacity Building, focusing on training. It has now become clear that this perspective should be broadened and should include other than only the human capacities of organisations. Even when human resource capacity of NGOs have been improved, there is still need for a conducive environment to effectively make use of these human resources. The general capacity both at the organisational level and in its institutional context may very well be blocking the human resources to be effective. However, in most instances a clear picture about the NGOs capacity at different levels and taking it from different perspectives is not available. Consequently NANGO would find it difficult to effectively plan and implement capacity building exercises for them. Therefore NANGO decided to build its own capacity in NGO capacity assessment and capacity building. In 2002 NANGO contacted ICCO, a co-financing agency in the Netherlands, to assist in this exercise by giving technical assistance to the process.

NANGO NGO Capacity Building Program
The Capacity Assessment Program of NANGO intends to strengthen, mobilise and enhance the capacity of NGO personnel and to strengthen the overall organisational effectiveness of NGOs. The technical assistance to the program would enable NANGO to operate capacity building assessments independently in the future and should lead to the development of a broader capacity building concepts within the training and capacity building department of NANGO.
Target group of the program are 10-15 NGOs in the women/gender sector of Zimbabwe. This sector was prompted by the disadvantaged status of women in Zimbabwe and decreasing levels of interest in this sector. The NGOs selected for the exercise were those NANGO had already worked with in a Vocational Skills for self-employment project. Previous evaluations had also revealed that training of individual staff members was inadequate to ensure better performance. It was therefore easy to gain the confidence from the NGOs in this new approach.
Principles of Participatory Capacity Building

To address issues of 'lacking' capacity many organisations seek external assistance, expertise or resources. Capacity building often turns out to be externally driven: external experts define organisation's problems and bring in external solutions. Capacity building strategies will then fail due to lack of ownership and limiting internal understanding of the problems.

Participatory Capacity Building (PCB) intends to radically break with this tradition. Guiding principles are:

- **Maximum Participation:** capacity assessment is conducted by a wide variety of people involved in the organisation and is based on their realities.

- **Minimum external input:** processes may be externally facilitated but presentation and analysis of assessment results, prioritisation and decision making is done by the organisation. Capacity building strategies are mainly focused on internal solutions that do not need much external resources.

- **Comprehensiveness:** capacity assessment includes important internal and external aspects of an organisation and capacity planning is linked to all parts of the organisation. Moreover, the planning process integrates different capacity aspects when looking for underlying contradictions and strategic capacity building directions.

Activities in the NANGO Program

The NANGO officer in charge of capacity building, Mrs Judith Chaumba, was introduced to the participatory capacity building method by Mr Jouwert van Geene, a local consultant. From November 2002 to July 2003 activities in the program were:

- Participatory Capacity Assessments (1-day workshops) with each NGO, followed by comprehensive assessment reports.

- Feedback and Strategic Capacity Plannings (1-day workshops) with each NGO followed by NGO Capacity Action Plans implemented by NGOs themselves.

- One seminar on NGO capacity building to synthesise the efforts of all NGOs and to create a collaborative capacity building program.

The technical assistance to NANGO by Mr Van Geene consisted of demonstrating new capacity assessment and planning methodologies, coaching the NANGO training officer while conducting the workshops and contributing to the development of project proposals, operational plans and capacity planning manuals.

Reflection on the methodology

The experiences with Participatory Capacity Building showed several strong points in the methodology (as reflected by the participating NGOs during the co-ordination seminar):

- The participatory approach really created a lot of involvement and made NGOs aware of their own capacity to analyse and plan for themselves. The method creates a lot of energy for and ownership of capacity building.

- Groups composed of participants from all across the organisation have extensive knowledge to make a thorough analysis of their current capacity.

- PCB provides a good foundation for monitoring the capacity of the organisation, by repeating (parts) of the capacity assessment on a yearly basis.

Some challenges in the use of the tool were also discovered:

- When analysing the current capacity of organisation it was sometimes difficult to be completely honest about root causes of problems. Some causes would be very sensitive, such as hierarchical leadership, problems with the board, corruption. The method does not provide specific tools to tackle this challenge.

- During the capacity assessment some capacity areas (such as equitable participation and sustainability) might be quite difficult to understand to all participants, especially when they are not involved in the matter. Since a lot of ground must be covered during the assessment, sometimes time is short to clarify all topics. In general though, there will be sufficient knowledge available in the room to do the full assessment.

- The capacity assessment provides very detailed scores of the level of capacity and consensus in the organisation. Though the scores are based on answers from the participants after group discussions, they cannot be taken as fully objective, but they should be seen as general indicators.
The statistical analysis in the capacity assessment makes the results vulnerable to being anomalous due to some inadequately informed respondents. The fact that the assessments incorporate staff from all levels in the organisations result in a wide variety of levels of understanding. Even though there are discussions of critical incidents general support staff are less assertive so they may not make further inquiries on an unfamiliar issue and just go ahead and make an individual score. Though the questionnaire of the capacity assessment is designed to facilitate a certain depth of analysis it appears too sophisticated for CBO workers who may be of lower literacy levels. This makes the assessment sessions longer as more simplification and interpretation of terms will be necessary.

In the course of the program it became more difficult to keep organisations interested. It was clear to them that the assessments and planning sessions were very involving. It sometimes took great effort to convince them to participate, also since some organisations seemed to be afraid to be "judged" by outsiders. In the end all participating NGOs were still excited and motivated to carry on with program. To get maximum involvement throughout the process more groundwork may need to be done before the sessions. The process approach must also be adopted in the NGOs annual plans to ensure their participation.

**Future plans**

The program resulted in comprehensive capacity assessments and capacity building plans that have been adopted by all NGOs. It also engaged the organisations in networking and exchange with each other. In the final seminar an outline for collaboration in capacity building was formulated which will lead to a 3-year program of activities including training, exchange of staff, study tours, organisational consultations, etc. After one year all organisations will be offered to monitor the capacity using an adapted tool based on the participatory capacity assessment. This will allow organisations to keep track of their capacity.

For NANGO the program has strengthened the relationship with its members. Some participating NGOs said "this is what we have been waiting for, all these years". Without much expertise of organisational assessment it has been able to carry out very meaningful capacity assessments. It now has the capacity to expand this work to other NGO-sectors in Zimbabwe.

**The NANGO Capacity Building Program Team:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judith Chaumba</th>
<th>Jouwert van Geene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NANGO Training Officer</td>
<td>Capacity Building Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:info@nango.org.zw">info@nango.org.zw</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mselinda@africaonline.co.zw">mselinda@africaonline.co.zw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.nango.org.zw">www.nango.org.zw</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.facili.nl/partners">www.facili.nl/partners</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participatory Capacity Building*
2. Participatory Capacity Assessment
2.1 Introduction

Capacity assessment is the typical start of the capacity building process. Unfortunately Capacity Building might easily be misunderstood as training or staff development. Capacity building entails a wide variety of dimensions, at different levels of the organisation.

Therefore Capacity Assessment should focus on much more than human resources alone. Comprehensive assessment of NGO capacity can lead to meaningful and effective capacity building to counter weaknesses and build on strengths.

This tool for participatory capacity assessment tries to take away some misconceptions about capacity building. First of all capacity assessment and building is something that far and foremost should be employed by NGOs themselves, rather than by (relative) outsiders. Self-assessment or participatory assessment improves insights on the organisation to the people to whom it matters. It is a tool for team learning. Secondly, this Participatory Capacity Assessment tool for NGOs tries to be comprehensive in its approach and covers a wide variety of capacity areas, using organisational history as a reference.

In this Participatory Capacity Assessment Workshop the organisation discusses 7 capacity areas: Human Resource Management, Financial Resource Management, Equitable Participation, Sustainability of Program Benefits, Partnering, Organisational Learning and Strategic Management / Governance. These areas are broken down into some hundred different subjects allowing participants to thoroughly evaluate the capacity areas of the organisation and to attribute scores to different capacity items. During the workshop provisional assessment results may be presented. These results will later be analysed and interpreted in an assessment report (see Chapter 3.) and discussed with the organisation in the Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop (see Chapter 4.).

We propose that a full Participatory Capacity Assessment should be repeated at the end of a Capacity Building Program (e.g. after 3 years). See Chapter 7. for more information on how to develop a system for Monitoring and Evaluation System of capacity building.

This assessment tool uses Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET), developed by UNDP. Though some of the original questions used in POET are changed, the general methodology was maintained. We owe gratitude to the first designers of POET.

Participatory Capacity Assessment is a one-day workshop to do with an assessment team of an NGO. This section presents the preparations for the workshop and the steps for each session. It uses some of the materials in the Appendices and files on the PCB cd-rom.
2.2 Preparations

Preparing the NGO

We assume considerable time was spent with the NGO to discuss the whole process of Participatory Capacity Building. At least we expect the NGO to know the steps they will go through.

An introduction to the capacity building process may be sent to the organisation on beforehand. See appendix A. and PCB cd-rom for more information.

An important aspect of the capacity assessment is the composition of the Assessment Team. Members of the team should be staff or board members of the organisation. The team should have both junior and senior staff (support staff, technical, managerial) and should have a reasonable gender balance. The assessment team should consist of 5 to 10 people, who must be available during the whole day of the assessment.

Practical Preparations

Make sure you have a sufficient number of copies of the following documents (see appendices and PCB cd-rom):

- Assessment Questionnaires (Appendix C., for all participants)
- Assessment Score sheets (Appendix D., for all participants)

Prepare the following flip charts to present during the workshop:

- Workshop overview
- Definition of Capacity and the Capacity Building Process
- Objectives and benefits of Participatory Capacity Assessment
- Facilitator’s role and ground rules
- Explanation of the scoring process
- Overview sheet to present the preliminary assessment results (optional)

Other needed materials for this workshop:

- Flip charts and markers to make notes
- Computer to calculate initial results (optional)

One (experienced) group facilitator can easily facilitate this workshop. However it is helpful to have an assistant who can co-facilitate parts and who makes notes of the group discussions.
2.3 Participatory Capacity Assessment

Program Overview

9.00  Welcome
9.05  Introduction
9.30  Assessment 1: Human Resource Management

10.30  Break
11.30  Assessment 3: Equitable Participation
12.15  Assessment 4: Sustainability of Program Benefits
12.45  Presentation of first results

13.00  Lunch
14.00  Assessment 5: Partnering
14.30  Assessment 6: Organisational Learning

15.30  Break
15.45  Assessment 7: Governance / Strategic Management
16.30  Presentation of second results
16.45  Next Steps and Closing Reflection

17.00  Closing
2.3.1 Introduction to Participatory Capacity Assessment

In this part, in 30 minutes, introduce to the group:
1. What is Capacity and Capacity Building
2. Capacity Assessment and PCA Process
3. Workshop Objectives and Assessment Benefits
4. Role of the Facilitator and Ground rules
5. Assessment Questionnaire and Scoring Sheets

1. Capacity and Capacity Building

(First: ask group what they think “capacity” means, then present:)

**Capacity** is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

**Capacity areas** of NGOs that we can consider are:
- Human Resource Management: how you deal with staff
- Financial Resource Management: getting and dealing with money
- Equitable Participation: involvement of target groups
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: how your projects impact
- Partnering: effective liaisons with other stakeholders
- Organisational Learning: sharing and learning from information
- Strategic Management / Governance: looking at the bigger picture

**Capacity Building** is a process in 5 stages:
1. Setting the stage and formulating the ‘entry point’ of the process.
2. Capacity assessment
3. Strategic Capacity Planning and bench marking
4. Implementing capacity building strategies
5. Sustaining capacity by ongoing monitoring and bench marking

This capacity assessment workshop is just the beginning of the process.

2. Capacity Assessment

**Capacity Assessment** is the process of deliberately sharing information on different capacity areas of and processing this information into an organisational analysis that will help to create a capacity building plan.

Capacity Assessment involves:
- Collecting data by group discussions and individual ‘scoring’
- Documenting and analysing the data by a scoring team
- Reporting to the organisation and discussing the findings
- Planning the Capacity Building

The **Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET)** was developed in 1998 by the UNDP to assist NGOs in self-assessment for capacity building.

POET is build around the concept that NGOs are very able to assess their own capacity when they are sufficiently facilitated.

POET is a method that uses the “critical incident” technique to focus group discussions about organisational capacity. This assessment team is lead through a number of questions referring to incidents that have happened to their organisation in relation to capacity dimensions. Each member of the assessment team then ‘scores’ the level of capacity, based on discussions and their own views and experiences.

POET provides statistical information that can easily be administered and analysed also in comparison to other organisations. During the whole process anonymity of individual capacity scores and organisation scores (if shared with others) is guaranteed.
3. Objectives and Benefits

This assessment workshop has the following objectives:

- To discuss topics of the capacity of the organisation and share information and experiences of assessment team members.
- To create insight in capacity areas of the organisation by indicating the level of capacity on different dimensions.
- To create insight in the level of consensus that exists within the organisation about the present capacity.

By taking part in the NGO assessment process your organisation will gain the following benefits:

- The assessment creates a clear picture of your organisation's strengths and weaknesses.
- It will allow the NGO to compare with other organisations from the same sector.
- It kicks off a focused plan for capacity building.
- It creates organisational learning, team building and understanding of different perspectives on topics of capacity.
- It forms the basis foundation for ongoing monitoring of your organisation's capacity.

4. Facilitator’s role and Ground rules

Assessment facilitator
During this assessment the facilitator will lead some focused group discussions. The role of the facilitator is to:

- Guide the group during the discussions by asking questions and probing;
- Make some notes of the discussions on flip chart for quick reference;
- Allow full participation of all assessment team members;
- Keep time and stay focused on the topics at hand, and to
- Clarify the questions and process whenever needed.

The assessment facilitator is non-judgemental and is not contributing to the discussions. S/he only collects answers and creates a platform for sharing of ideas. Facilitator will also collect the scoring data and facilitate the analysis of the data.

Ground rules
In order for the capacity assessment to be successful the group needs to be open for discussion and sharing of ideas.

Some ground rules for participants we would like to propose:

- Participate in the discussions
- Leave space for others to contribute
- Be open and sincere about the organisation's capacity
- Base your capacity scores on your own experiences, opinions and reflections of group discussions
- (add more ground rules from the group)

Everything that will be said during the discussions must be regarded as confidential. All capacity scores will be handled with strict anonymity.
5. Questionnaire

Each participant receives a list of questions that guide the group in the assessment. Make sure all participants have the copy of the questionnaire to refer to (see appendices B. and C.) and PCB cd-rom). Please note that the questionnaire for the Assessment Team Members is different from the one for the facilitator.

The facilitator will address questions that appear under the heading “discussion.”. The group will spend about 5 to 10 minutes discussing each set of questions as a whole group.

During this discussion some notes on flip chart will be made for quick referral. Everybody is encouraged to contribute to the group discussion. Please try to stay focused to the specific topic at hand since other topics will probably be dealt with later.

After each set of questions the group will be asked to score the specific capacity area on their scoring sheets.

There are 7 areas of capacity that will be assessed. The assessment of each area will take 30-60 minutes, depending on the number of discussions.

6. Scoring Sheets

After each set of discussion questions we will answer the **bold, numbered questions** from the list of questions.

Use the Likert-scale which appears on the accompanying score sheet: 5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3=neutral; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree.

So, for Item No 1, if you feel staff training is routinely offered by the organisation, you might give this item a “4” on your scoring sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These scores are given individually and anonymously **after** each group discussion. The scoring team will calculate the group scores from the individual scores.
2.3.2 Capacity Assessment: Human Resource Management

The first capacity area in the assessment is Human Resource Management. When the assessment team is clear about the instructions and the process, the assessment can start. Begin with a short context to outline the process and time. Continue with the 6 sets of discussion questions with the scoring in between (refer to questionnaire in appendix C.).

**Context**

The assessment of the Human Resource Capacity will take us through 6 group discussions about different aspects of this area, like staff training, skills and numbers of staff, staff diversity, systems of staff retention and supervision. After each discussion you will be asked to answer 1 or more questions individually on the score sheet.

This exercise will take about 60 minutes. I will make some notes on a flip chart while we discuss the topics for your reference. Let’s begin with discussion 1, on page 2 of your questionnaire.

**Discussion 1: Staff training**

A) "When was our most recent staff training?". These could be in-house or other training that any of our staff went to.

B) "How often over the last 12 months have we held staff training events?". Which levels of staff received the training? Are these training part of a staff development plan?

**Individual scoring:**

1 We routinely offer staff training.

**Discussion 2: Staff training**

A) "For the three most recent staff training events, what evidence is there that they strengthened staff capacity and performance?" What change in quality or quantity of work did we actually see?

B) "To what degree did these training events prepare staff to respond to our organisational priorities?" Focusing on the present priorities of our organisation, projects, changes we face: why were these training events important to the organisation?

C) "To what extent is our staff training relevant to our human resource needs?" Focusing on the specific human resources needed, the skills and knowledge it added to the people, why were these training events important.

**Individual scoring:**

2 Our staff training directly contributes to the achievements of our organisation’s priorities.

Continue with discussions 3 to 6 (refer to questionnaire in appendix C.).

When finished, ask the participants to calculate the totals for this capacity area and write these on the scoring sheets as well as on a single piece of paper for the scoring team to calculate the quick capacity and consensus scores (see section 4).
After a short break, continue with the next assessments: Financial Resource Management, Equitable Participation and Sustainability of Program Benefits. Again, start each assessment with a short context to outline the process and time. This should be easy when participants are familiar with the discussions and scoring procedures. Take about 3-5 minutes breaks in between the 3 assessments. This might be a good moment for a quick energiser to get people standing, stretching or moving. Energisers will also increase the level of participation.

After each assessment, ask the participants to calculate the totals for the capacity area to write these on the scoring sheets as well as on a single piece of paper for the scoring team to calculate the quick capacity and consensus scores (see next section).

**II. Financial Resource Management**

The assessment of Financial Resource Management Capacity is done by 7 group discussions about different aspects of this area, like financial and budgeting procedures, cash management, diversity of funding and the availability of resources. Again, after each discussion you will be asked to answer 1 or more questions individually on the score sheet.

You do not have to be a financial expert to be able to assess this capacity. Everybody has probably some experience with the finances of the organisation. You will all be asked to contribute to the discussions and make your individual scores on this topic.

This exercise will take about 45 minutes. I will make some notes on a flip chart while we discuss the topics for your reference. Let’s begin with discussion 1, on page 3 of your questionnaire.

**III. Equitable Participation**

Equitable Participation refers to the involvement of local knowledge and stakeholders related to project access and project benefits. You will be asked to relate this to representative projects that the organisation is currently running. We will have 6 sets of group discussion questions, each followed by the individual scoring.

Both input from field-based staff and supporting staff is valuable for these discussions since everybody might have different perspectives on the project reality.

Again, this assessment will take about 45 minutes. Let’s start with discussion 1 on page 4 of the questionnaire.

**IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits**

Sustainability of Program Benefits is an area of capacity that is quite complex. Basically it is about different aspects of the context of our projects like the physical environment, economy, politics, institutions and culture. We want to assess to what extent the organisation considers these aspects during the course of a project.

Some participants might be more knowledgeable about this subject than others. However, when discussing the subject everybody may equally contribute and everybody will be asked to make your individual scores.

This assessment will take about 30 minutes. Let’s start with discussion 1 on page 5 of the questionnaire.
2.3.4 **Presentation of First Assessment Results**

After each assessment collect the total scores of each assessment team member. Each member has written his or her total scores on a separate piece of paper to ensure anonymity of the scoring.

For Human Resource Management, Financial Resource Management, Equitable Participation and Sustainability of Program Benefits we can now make a quick calculation of the Capacity and Consensus Scores in MS Word (A computer with MS Word must be available).

### Calculating the Capacity and Consensus Scores

1. Open the empty PCA Score Calculator in MS Word (see PCB cd-rom).
3. In the first table enter the number of respondents in cell L4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Enter the total scores of each respondent for the HRM capacity in the second sheet (HRM) in row 12, columns B and further:

5. The Capacity and Consensus Scores will automatically be calculated in cells A5 and A6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Score: 80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus Score: 82.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Repeat this exercise for the other 3 capacity areas in the respective tables by double-clicking on the table.

### Presenting the Scores

Draw a flip chart to present the 4 capacity and consensus Scores.

- **Score Ranges**
  - 20-39: Far below average / acceptable level
  - 40-59: Below average / acceptable level
  - 60-70: Average / acceptable level
  - 71-80: Above average / acceptable level
  - 81-100: Far above average / acceptable level

Also provide a flip chart with the interpretation of the scores:

- Discuss results with the group:
  - What surprises you about the results? What are some conclusions?
  - These are preliminary results that will be refined by the scoring team, and may differ from the initial figures due to miscalculations.
2.3.5 Capacity Assessments: Partnering, Organisational Learning and Governance

After lunch, continue with the last assessments: Partnering, Organisational Learning and Governance / Strategic Management. Follow the same sequence: start with a short context followed by the discussions and the scoring. Again, take about 3-5 minutes breaks in between the 3 assessments, or allow for a tea break. Make sure the energy level stays high enough for people to discuss and resolve effectively. Throw in energisers at appropriate times to stimulate the group.

After each assessment, ask the participants to calculate the totals for the capacity area to write these on the scoring sheets as well as on a single piece of paper for the scoring team to calculate the quick capacity and consensus scores (see next section).

V. Partnering

Partnering obviously refers to relationships between the organisation, individuals and with other organisations. We will have 3 discussions on this topic. As before, after each discussion you will be asked to answer 1 or more questions individually on the score sheet.

Some participants might be more involved in partnerships or networking than others. However, everybody should be able to assess the effectiveness of these relations since effective partnerships are visible throughout the organisation.

This exercise will take about 30 minutes. I will make some notes on a flip chart while we discuss the topics for your reference. Let’s begin with discussion 1, on page 6 of your questionnaire.

VI. Organisational Learning

This capacity refers to the way the organisation collects information about projects, shares information effectively and solves problems through teamwork. It also concerns decision-making processes in the organisation.

Everybody is involved with organisational learning that means, everyone should be involved with it since it relates to all aspects and all levels of the organisation. We will have 8 sets of group discussion questions, each followed by the individual scoring.

This assessment will take about 60 minutes. Let’s start with discussion 1 on page 7 of the questionnaire.

VII. Governance / Strategic Management

Governance / Strategic Management has to do with the broader context of the organisation. Donor-relations, board practices and the mission, goals and philosophy of the organisation will be discussed.

Again, some participants might be more aware of strategic issues in the organisation. This is also a moment to share information about these issues and learn more about them. However, when discussing the subject everybody may equally contribute and everybody will be asked to make your individual scores.

This last assessment will take about 45 minutes. Let’s start with discussion 1 on page 8 of the questionnaire.
2.3.6 Presentation of Second Assessment Results

After each assessment collect the total scores of each assessment team member. Each member has written his or her total scores on a separate piece of paper to ensure anonymity of the scoring.

Based on the last result we can now calculate the final Capacity and Consensus Scores, as well as the average using the MS Word Score Calculator. (A computer with MS Word must be available).

Calculating the Capacity and Consensus Scores

1. In each table enter the number of respondents in cell L4.
2. Enter the total scores of each respondent for the Partnering capacity in that table in row 12, columns B and further.
3. The Capacity and Consensus Scores will automatically be calculated in cells A5 and A6.
4. Repeat this exercise for the other 3 capacity areas in the respective tables by double-clicking on the table.
5. Calculate the average scores by entering the capacity and consensus scores of the different capacity areas in the last table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>FRM</td>
<td>Eq Part</td>
<td>Sust</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presenting the Scores

Draw a flip chart to present all the capacity and consensus Scores.

Also provide the flip chart with the interpretation of the scores.

Discuss results with the group:
- What surprises you about the results?
- Which capacity areas reflect our strengths?
- Which are weaknesses?
- Where don't we seem to agree?

These are preliminary results that will be refined by the scoring team. They may differ due to miscalculations.
Next Steps

After this assessment all the scores will be collected and analysed using statistical methods. This will produce a comprehensive report including graphics and an analysis of all the different capacity areas. It will also show us the strengths and weaknesses within each capacity category.

We will perform a number of assessments with other NGOs. These data will also be analysed and compiled. The report for your organisation will also show you the results of other organisations to compare with.

After compiling these reports, we will conduct a feedback and planning workshop with your organisation to discuss and elaborate on the findings. This will allow the organisation to make a further analysis of the capacity, focusing on underlying causes of weaknesses. In this meeting you will also prioritise on capacity needs and plan strategies for capacity building.

Also share the time planning of this exercise and the means of communication.

Closing Reflection

Let’s take some minutes to reflect on this day and to close the meeting.

Objective level questions
- What are some phrases or words you remember from the sessions?
- What were some activities you took part in?
- What else do you remember from today?

Reflective level questions:
- Where were you most involved?
- What was less interesting?
- What was a highlight of today?

Interpretive level questions
- What did you learn about your organisation?
- What was important about this assessment?
- How can this assessment be helpful for our organisation?

Decisional level questions
- Look at the workshop objectives: have they been achieved?
- What will you tell your colleagues about today?
- What will we do before the next session?

Thank you for participating in this Capacity Assessment. It has been a good experience for us, and I hope the results will be helpful for your organisation.
3. Analysing and Reporting PCA Scores
3.1 Introduction

After the Participatory Capacity Assessment (PCA) there is a lot of work to do for the scoring team. This chapter discusses all the steps that need to be taken before the Feedback and Planning Workshop can take place:

- Calculating the Capacity and Consensus Scores using the PCA Score Calculator;
- Analysing the PCA Scores and writing a PCA report;
- Calculating the Cohort Scores for one NGO sector using the PCA Cohort Calculator.

The section on analysing the PCA Scores and writing a PCA report builds on the materials from the POET User’s manual. All the documents and files for this exercise can be found in the Appendices and on the PCB cd-rom.
3.2 Participatory Capacity Assessment Score Calculator

The Participatory Capacity Assessment Score Calculator is a software application using MS Excel sheets. Its purpose is to assist the scoring team in calculating and presenting the PCA scores. While it may be an easy instrument for score calculation, the Calculator does not analyse nor double-check the results. It is therefore important to be able to calculate and interpret the capacity and consensus scores manually.

**Step 1: How to Start?**

Open the empty Score Calculator on your computer from the folder where it is stored or from the PCB cd-rom (filename: PCA Score Calculator empty). This will automatically start MS Excel and open the file in the first calculation sheet. Since the file is ‘read-only’ you will have to save the file immediately under a new name by clicking on “file > save”. The empty Score File consists of 15 Excel sheets, which can be entered by clicking on the tab of the sheets at the bottom of the screen:

- **Overview** sheet gives an overview of all the calculated scores and the two graphs that represent the total results (GRID and the 7 capacity scores).
- **7 Score Sheets**, one for each capacity area to enter the individual scores for that area. This sheet will automatically calculate the capacity and consensus scores:
  - HRM: Human Resource Development
  - FRM: Financial Resource Development
  - EqPart: Equitable Participation
  - Sust: Sustainability of Program Benefits
  - Partn: Partnering
  - OL: Organisational Learning
  - Gov: Governance / Strategic Management
- **7 Graph Sheets** (Grap HRM, Grap FRM, Grap EqPart etc.), one for each capacity area, which will show the graphic illustration of the capacity and consensus scores for that capacity. These graphs will automatically be produced when the scores have been entered.
- An example of a completed PCA calculation can be found on the PCB cd-rom.

The Excel Sheets

The 15 Excel Sheets in the PCA Score Calculator are:

- The “overview” sheet gives an overview of all the calculated scores and the two graphs that represent the total results (GRID and the 7 capacity scores).
- 7 Score Sheets, one for each capacity area to enter the individual scores for that area. This sheet will automatically calculate the capacity and consensus scores:
  1. HRM: Human Resource Development
  2. FRM: Financial Resource Development
  3. EqPart: Equitable Participation
  4. Sust: Sustainability of Program Benefits
  5. Partn: Partnering
  6. OL: Organisational Learning
  7. Gov: Governance / Strategic Management
- 7 Graph Sheets (Grap HRM, Grap FRM, Grap EqPart etc.), one for each capacity area, which will show the graphic illustration of the capacity and consensus scores for that capacity. These graphs will automatically be produced when the scores have been entered.
- An example of a completed PCA calculation can be found on the PCB cd-rom.
Step 2: General Information

You can start entering the general information on the "Overview" sheet:
- Cell F1: Name of the organisation
- Cell M1: Date of assessment workshop
- Cell N2: Number of respondents (between 1-20). This number is important since it will be used in the other Excel sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12-8-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Start Entering Scores

- Take an Individual Score Sheet of one respondent (coding it “a”).
- Enter the scores of this respondent on Human Resource Management in the calculator HRM Score Sheet in columns B (under respondent a) from row 12 downwards:

Finish Entering Scores

- Continue with the Individual Score Sheet on Human Resource Management of respondent “b” and enter these in column C etc. until the results of all respondents have been entered.

Continue with the scores for the other 6 Capacity Areas, entering the scores from all the Individual Score Sheets into the Calculator Score Sheets.

The scores of 10 participants can be entered in the calculator in about 30 minutes.
Participatory Capacity Building

3. Analysing and Reporting PCA Scores

Step 4: Processing the Capacity and Consensus Scores

- All the Standardised Capacity and Consensus Scores are now automatically calculated in the “Overview” Sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>POET Scores Overview</td>
<td>NGO x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>Standardised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cap Score</td>
<td>Cons. Score</td>
<td>Cap Score</td>
<td>Cons. Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Human Resource Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.31</td>
<td>69.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2. Financial Resource Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td>62.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3. Equitable Participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>70.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4. Sustainability of Program Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td>66.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5. Partnering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>60.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6. Organisational Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7. Governance / Strategic Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The standardised capacity score uses an index to allow different capacities to be compared meaningfully. This score may vary from 20 to 100 and is calculated using statistical methods.

- The consensus score measures the degree to which team members agree with one another concerning their assessment of a given capacity area. This score is also obtained using statistical measures and may vary from 20 to 100.

- Please see next section for the interpretation of standardised capacity scores.

Step 5: Processing the results

- The outcomes of the assessment may be processed into different reports.

- In order to give a comprehensive overview of the results, all the Excel sheets may be printed. Make sure you only print page 1 (of 4) of all the Excel sheets. Other pages are only used for calculations and do not provide meaningful information. In total you can provide 15 pages with the scores and the graphs.

- Some NGOs prefer only to get the graphs, rather than the sheets with scores.

- It is helpful to check the graphs from each capacity area before printing. Some consensus scores might be less than 20. The label of these scores will then be printed under the horizontal axe. It is helpful to “drag and drop” these labels to the ‘zero-level’: The scores and graphs may also be copied into the preliminary report. This will be discussed in the next section.
Step 6: Calculating Scaled Scores

- To be able to benchmark the assessment results and search out standards of comparison, a scaled score may be used. The scaled scores are based on an exponential scale where the value between rankings increases approaching 100. These scores will be used to create the “GRID”.

- For each Standardised score, look for the corresponding Scaled Score in the Score table in Columns O and P of the Overview Sheet.

- For example: a HRM Capacity Score of 68.31 corresponds with a Scaled Score of 50. Enter this score in cell E5 (Scaled Capacity Score):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continue this exercise for all the standardised scores. The average scores will then be calculated automatically.

Step 7: Complete the Scaled GRID

- The Scaled GRID in the “Overview” sheet will automatically be plotted. However, the corresponding “labels” of each GRID score have not been given.

- Look for the scaled score of each capacity area in Columns E and F. “Drag and drop” the ‘label’ of the capacity area to the corresponding ‘dot’ on the graph. For example: If Human Resource Management has a scaled Capacity Score of 50 and a consensus score of 80, the label ‘HRM’ should be put next to the corresponding dot in the graph.
3.3 **Participatory Capacity Assessment Report**

The Participatory Capacity Assessment report contains an overview of the assessment process as well as a first presentation of the assessment results, including a brief analysis or interpretation.

The report should provide a clear overview of the information that will lead to further group analysis and conclusions.

**Processing the Assessment results**

The raw data of the individual PCA score sheets must be processed. This may be done through the PCA Calculator and Graphical Modulator in MS Excel. This is an easy process in which the scores are simply entered in MS Excel sheets that leads to calculated capacity and consensus scores (see previous section).

When MS Excel is not available, the capacity and consensus scores may also be calculated manually. This is a more time consuming process, but is still relatively easy when using the PCA Score worksheets (see appendix E.). However, these calculations will only give us the *total capacity and consensus scores* for each capacity area. The scores for the different capacity items cannot be calculated manually.

**Reporting the Assessment Process**

It is important to include an introduction of the assessment process in the assessment report. Failing to explain the background of the methodology might lead to misinterpretation of the results. Readers of the report who have not been present at the assessment may not understand the context of the assessment.

An example of this introduction can be found in the appendix F. It includes:
- Introduction or background of assessment
- Outline of the participatory capacity assessment workshop
- Workshop objectives and benefits for the organisation
- Role of facilitator and facilitating organisation
- Assessment methodology

**Interpreting assessment scores**

The assessment results (the capacity and consensus scores, and the "GRID") must be accompanied by an explanation and interpretation to make them understandable to the organisation.

The key for interpreting standardised capacity scores is offered in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Capacity Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>NGO has little or no capacity in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>NGO’s capacities fall below acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>NGO’s capacities approximate acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>NGO’s capacities fall above acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>NGO’s capacities are far above acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The standardised capacity score uses an index to allow different capacities to be compared meaningfully. This score may vary from 20 to 100 and is calculated using statistical methods.

The key for interpreting consensus scores is offered in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Consensus Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 39</td>
<td>Very low level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 59</td>
<td>Low level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 70</td>
<td>Moderate level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>High level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 100</td>
<td>Very high level of consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus score measures the degree to which team members agree with one another concerning their assessment of a given capacity area. This score is also obtained using statistical measures and may vary from –20 to 100.

Interpreting Capacity Areas

For the interpretation it might be helpful to include some of the results that are taken from each capacity area. The PCA Score calculator also provides scores for each item within the different capacity areas. Though a certain capacity score can point clearly in one direction (e.g. a standardised score of 45 in Financial Resource Management is clearly below the acceptable performance standard), some items within this area might be an exception to this (e.g. funding strategies might be very good). The most remarkable scores from each capacity area may be highlighted.

Moreover it might be helpful to include some of the essential issues from the focused group discussions when interpreting the scores. In some cases the particular "critical incidents" that lead to certain scores may be addressed to make the scores more practical.

The following overviews may be helpful to interpret the Capacity Areas:

**Capacity Area #1: Human Resource Management:**
Items in this section of PCA focus on staff development; staff deployment; recruitment; compensation (salary and benefits); personnel evaluation; opportunities for professional advancement; grievance and conflict resolution; and supervisory practices.

Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as having regular staff training; adequate staff in terms of numbers and skills; human resource practices that significantly contribute to staff retention, accomplishment and morale; and supervisory practices that contribute to the professional development of staff.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would be characterised as having little or no ongoing staff development; staffing patterns that are inadequate to accomplish assigned tasks; human resource practices that weaken staff retention, accomplishment and morale; and, supervisory practices that are more punitive than developmental.
Capacity Area #2: Financial Resource Management:
Items in this section of PCA focus on procedures and practices to maintain an appropriate balance between expense and revenue; budgeting; accuracy and utility of financial reports; management of cash flow and maintenance of appropriate levels of cash reserves; fundraising; and level of available resources.

Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as agile in avoiding deficit operations; highly prone to allocate financial resources in ways that support strategic priorities and overall mission; highly competent in generating accurate and timely financial reports that support managerial decision-making; consistent in making efforts to maintain adequate reserves and cash on hand to meet organisational needs; successful in gaining and diversifying financial support; and able to run operations with an appropriate level of resources.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would be characterised as frequently operating with little regard for the relationship between expenses and revenue; highly prone to allocate financial resources in ways that are unrelated to strategic priorities and overall mission; highly unlikely to generate accurate and timely financial reports to support managerial decision-making; inconsistent in their efforts to maintain adequate reserves and cash on hand to meet organisational needs; unsuccessful in gaining and diversifying financial support; and able to run operations with an appropriate level of resources.

Capacity Area #3: Equitable Participation:
Items in this section of PCA focus on stakeholder participation in project functions, especially with regard to traditionally under-represented stakeholders, constituent-initiated project change, and the role of local knowledge and best practice.

Capacity Area #4: Sustainability of Program Benefits:
Items in this section of PCA focus on five different kinds of sustainability that lead to the continuing, long-term flow of project benefits (environmental, economic, political, institutional, and cultural) within three phases of the project cycle: design, implementation, and assessment.

Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as giving thorough attention to all five types of sustainability throughout the project cycle.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would be characterised as giving attention to a more limited array of sustainability issues and/or focusing their concern for sustainability of program benefits on some, but not all, phases of the project cycle.

Capacity Area #5: Partnering:
Items in this section of PCA focus on an organisation’s capacity to forge meaningful alliances with other institutions in order to better achieve its mission.
Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as agile in creating partnerships to achieve institutional priorities; skilled in developing relationships with a diverse array of partners. Such organisations are also capable of negotiating and sustaining partnerships that are both equitable and beneficial to all participating entities.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would be characterised as having difficulties in working with other entities to achieve mission or priorities. These organisations, if they engage in partnership at all, are likely to work with a narrow array of partners. Typically, organisations scoring low in this area also have limited skills or practice in sustaining or negotiating partnerships that result in equitable and mutual benefit to all partners.

**Capacity Area #6: Organisational Learning:**
Items in this section of PCA focus on how information flows within organisations; quality, timeliness, and utility of shared information; the degree to which information is used to improve organisational performance; support for effective teamwork; participatory management practices; and the quality of staff meeting practices.

Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as having their internal communications flow in multiple directions; internally generated information accessible to those who need it that is timely, useful and accurate; a culture that successfully promotes the identification of lessons learned to improve organisational performance; highly effective deployment of teams to resolve organisational issues; highly participatory management practices; and successfully employing whole systems thinking to solve problems, and highly productive staff meetings.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would tend to be characterised as having a one-way, top-down communication flow; a culture that does not support or encourage the systematic gathering of lessons learned to improve organisational performance; poor or infrequent deployment of teams to resolve organisational issues; autocratic management practices; isolated islands of information, and ineffective staff meetings.

**Capacity Area #7: Strategic Management/Governance:**
Items in this section of PCA focus on strategic planning practices; governance practices; organisational commitment to mission, goals, and philosophy; capacity to adapt to changes in the external environment; and strategic objectives.

Organisations scoring highly in this category would be characterised as using strategic planning to “refit” the organisation to its environment in an ongoing fashion; having a system of governance that contributes significantly to the accomplishment of organisational mission; demonstrating a pattern of managerial decision-making that is highly consistent with mission, goals and philosophy; and employing a well developed system for setting and tracking strategic objectives.

Organisations scoring poorly in this category would tend to be characterised as engaging in little or no strategic planning to “refit” the organisation to its environment; a system of governance that makes little or no contribution to the accomplishment of organisational mission; a pattern of managerial decision-making that is highly inconsistent with mission, goals and philosophy; and a nascent or minimal system for setting and tracking strategic objectives.

**Interpreting the “GRID”**
Another component of the presentation is called GRID, which stands for Guided Reflections for Institutional Development. GRID provides a graphic representation of a NGO’s PCA results. The scales convert their consensus and capacity scores into plot points on a graph. An assessment team may choose to plot their scores by capacity area to explore their relative strengths and weaknesses of their individual organisation, this is called the GRID capacity area profile.

GRID uses four quadrants differentiated by horizontal and vertical axes. Capacity scores are measured on the horizontal axis while the level of consensus among assessment team members in assigning these scores is shown on the vertical axis. The point where the two axes intersect represents the mid-point scaled value for both the capacity and consensus scores.
Based on their capacity and consensus scores, organisations fall into one of four possible quadrants:

**Low Capacity / High Consensus**
The most highly leveraged change efforts are those that address issues of need and agreement. For capacity areas that fall in this quadrant, team members agree that there is a problem and agree on the nature of the problem. Success in harvesting these "low hanging fruits" builds the confidence and abilities of team members while preparing them to address, over time, more challenging and contentious issues.

**High Capacity / High Consensus**
Where capacity and consensus scores are both high, team members should make deliberate efforts to build on areas of strength. Capacity areas that fall in this quadrant may be models of excellence that can be studied for clues as the team seeks to determine how best to address weaknesses.

**Low Capacity / Low Consensus**
Where need is high but agreement is low and change can only come after the team reaches agreement on the nature of the problem to be addressed.

**High Capacity / Low Consensus**
Where the need is low but agreement is also low and further discussion is warranted to ferret out hidden problems and uneven performance. Capacity-building efforts should not be undertaken until greater agreement on the nature of the problems to be addressed is achieved.

GRID results are subject to a variety of influences, including, most importantly, organisational perception. If assessment team members hold challenging, high expectations for their organisation, capacity scores may be lower than those assigned by a team comprised of complacent individuals. In short, quadrant placement may reflect differences in internal standards as much as--or even more than--objective differences.
The GRID, therefore, should be viewed strictly as a tool that compares an organisation’s self-assessment in each of the seven capacity areas and to organisational self-assessments made by peer organisations, as presented by the assessment team. NGOs with high capacity scores are cautioned to challenge themselves by questioning the degree to which scores reflect complacency as well as capacity.

Including Overview of Scores

The PCA Report may also include an overview of the capacity and consensus scores for all the capacity items. This will allow the reader to get more insight about the different scores. This overview should also include the exact statements that were used in the assessment to actually score the capacity of the organisation. To create this overview, the document outline appendix G. (also to be found on the PCB cd-rom) can be used.

Following are the instructions to create the overview:

- Open the empty overview document in MS Word (see PCB cd-rom). Also open the PCA Score Calculator with the scores of the NGO.
- Copy the capacity and consensus scores for the total and all items of one capacity area from the Score Calculator to the overview sheet, using “copy and paste.”
- Make sure all the scores are in the correct places.

PCA in Monitoring and Evaluation

When the PCA will be repeated at the end of the Capacity Building Program it will reveal information on the progress of capacity building. Please note that Capacity Scores are not necessarily higher in this assessment, even when the organisation showed high Impact Scores in the course of the program (see Section 7.5). The PCA is a subjective tool; if the expectations or standards of the organisation increase during the program respondents will give relatively lower scores.

An example of a PCA Report can be found in appendix H.

Reference:
3.4 Participatory Capacity Assessment Cohort Calculator

Introduction

The Participatory Capacity Building process is very useful to implement with a group of NGOs. This would allow them to compare assessment results but also to build on each other’s strengths. For this process it will be helpful when NGOs are somehow similar in size and sector.

Usually it will take some months before all capacity assessments are finished. In that case the various assessment reports have already been sent out without the comparison of the NGOs using the cohort scores. When all assessments have been done it will be possible to make the final overview of the scores in the cohort. If available, the NGO’s results may be related to those of peer organisations that have been assessed in the cohort.

It should be considered that the organisations that are part of the cohort will not release their identity in the Cohort Scores. Most organisations prefer to keep their individual scores confidential. When presenting cohort scores each NGO will get a pseudonym, which is only known to them. In that way, the organisation is able to compare itself with other NGOs without giving away its own scores.

Presenting Cohort Scores

There are different ways of presenting the cohort results:

1. Presenting cohort results of all organisations for each capacity area.

2. Presenting Cohort Means in the Individual NGO scores:
3. Drawing Cohort “GRIDS“ for different Capacity Areas:

Calculating the Cohort Scores

The Participatory Capacity Assessment Cohort Score Calculator is another software application using MS Excel sheets. Its purpose is to assist the scoring team in calculating and presenting the PCA cohort scores. It uses the PCA scores from the individual NGOs that have been calculated by the PCA Score Calculator.

It is helpful to have the total capacity and consensus scores from each NGO (on a hard copy) ready at hand while entering the scores in the cohort calculator. Furthermore it is also efficient to enter these scores into the cohort calculator directly after calculating them for a single NGO. This will also give you some comparison of NGOs in the course of the assessments.

Step 1: How to Start?

Open the empty Cohort Calculator on your computer from the folder where it is stored or from the PCB cd-rom (filename: PCA Cohort Calculator). This will automatically start MS Excel and open the file in the score sheet. Since the file is ‘read-only’ you will have to save the file immediately under a new name by clicking on “file > save”.

The empty Cohort File consists of 10 Excel sheets, which can be entered by clicking on the tab of the sheets at the bottom of the screen.

The 10 Excel Sheets in the PCA Cohort Calculator are:
- The “Scores” sheet to enter all PCA scores and which calculates the cohort means.
- 2 Graph Sheets with a graphical representation of the total capacity and consensus scores of all NGOs, sorted by Capacity Score (Tot by Cap) and Consensus Score (Tot by Cons)
- 7 Graph Sheets, one for each capacity area which graphical representation of PCA scores of all NGOs:
  1. HRM: Human Resource Development
  2. FRM: Financial Resource Development
  3. EqPart: Equitable Participation
  4. Sust: Sustainability of Program Benefits
  5. Partn: Partnering
  6. OL: Organisational Learning
  7. Gov: Governance / Strategic Management
- 1 Graph Sheet with a graphical representation of the PCA mean scores for the different capacity areas.

All the graphs will be plotted automatically after entering the scores.
Step 2: Entering NGO Names

- Start the process by giving each NGO a distinct pseudonym to use in the reporting. The default names in the empty Cohort Calculator are colours. Of course you can pick any pseudonyms of your choice.
- Enter the pseudonyms and the keys to the real names from cells B43 and onwards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key to NGO Names</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Brown</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Names</td>
<td>ALCZ</td>
<td>NZg</td>
<td>dPV</td>
<td>alG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Start Entering the PCA Scores

- Start entering the PCA Scores of the first NGO (Pseudonym: “Black”) from Cells B4 downwards.
- The scores that you should enter here are the total standardised Capacity and Consensus Scores of the NGO. You can find them in the overview sheet of the PCA Score Calculator.
- Each Capacity Area has its own block of rows, e.g. rows 3-5 for Human Resource Management, rows 7-9 for Financial Resource Management etc.

Step 4: Processing the Total Scores

- The Total (average) PCA Scores for each NGO are automatically calculated and displayed in rows 32 and 33.
- To allow you to sort them by capacity score do the following: 1) Highlight the capacity and consensus scores. 2) Choose “Copy” from the menu “Edit”. 3) Go to cell B32. 4) Choose “Paste Special” from the menu “Edit”. 5) Tick option “Paste Values” and “OK”.

Finish Entering All PCA Scores

- Continue entering the PCA Scores for each NGO and each Capacity Area.
- The Cohort Means will be calculated automatically in column L.
- In case you have more than 10 participating NGOs in the cohort, simply “cut and past” column L to the right to create space for more NGOs. You can leave the columns empty if there are less than 10 NGOs.
### 3. Analysing and Reporting PCA Scores

#### Sorting Totals by Capacity Score

- To sort these Total PCA scores by Capacity Score do the following:
  1. Highlight all the names and scores in rows 32 an 33 you want to sort.
  2. Choose "Sort" from the menu "Data".
  3. Sort by "row 32", and "OK".

> The graphic will now automatically be generated in the sheet "Tot by Cap".

#### Sorting Totals by Consensus Score

- Again, to allow you to sort these total scores consensus score do the following:
  1. Highlight the capacity and consensus scores in rows 36 and 37.
  2. Choose “Copy” from the menu “Edit”.
  3. Go to cell B36.
  4. Choose “Paste Special” from the menu “Edit”. 5) Tick option "Paste Values" and "OK".

> The graphic will now automatically be generated in the sheet “Tot by Cons”.

- Enter the Cohort Mean score in the legend on the right hand side of the graph and drag the “mean” line to the right position.

- When there are more or fewer than 10 NGOs, change the source of the data for the graph by right-clicking the graph, choosing "data source". In this window simply highlight the data of the table that should be used for values in the graph.
### Step 5: Processing the Capacity Area Scores

- Each Capacity Area has its own graph to present the scores. These overviews are most informative when sorted by capacity scores. This will allow the reader to compare NGOs most easily.
- Start sorting the PCA scores for Human Resource Management:
  1. Highlight all the names and scores to be sorted in rows 35-37.
  2. Choose “Sort” from the menu “Data”.
  3. Sort by “row 4”, and “OK”.
- The graphic will now automatically be generated in the sheet “HRM”.

![Human Resource Management Graph](image)

- Enter the Cohort Mean score in the legend on the right hand side of the graph and drag and drop the “mean” line to the right position.
- When there are more or fewer than 10 NGOs, change the source of the data for the graph by right-clicking the graph, choosing “data source”. In this window simply highlight the data of the table that should be used for values in the graph.

### Step 6: Processing the Mean Scores

- It might be interesting to see which capacity area has the highest cohort means and which the lowest. To allow you to sort the Mean scores by Capacity Area do the following:
  1. Highlight the capacity and consensus scores in rows 40 and 41.
  2. Choose “Copy” from the menu “Edit”.
  3. Go to cell B36.
  4. Choose “Paste Special” from the menu “Edit”.
  5. Tick option “Paste Values” and “OK”.
- To sort these Mean scores by Capacity Area do the following:
  1. Highlight all the names and scores you want to sort.
  2. Choose “Sort” from the menu “Data”.
  3. Sort by “row 40”, and “OK”.
- The graphic will now automatically be generated in the sheet “Means”.

![Mean Scores for Each Capacity Area Graph](image)

- Enter the Total Average score in the legend on the right hand side of the graph and drag the “average” line to the right position.
Step 7: Processing the Mean Cohort Scores in the PCA Score Calculator

- Finally it is possible to create a graphical overview of the total capacity scores of one NGO including the cohort means.
- Open the PCA Score Calculator with the PCA scores of one NGO in the “Overview” sheet.
- Enter the cohort means for all capacity areas in columns A and B, row 38 downwards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Means</th>
<th>Scaled</th>
<th>Cap Score Cons Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>HRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>FRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Eq Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The graph with the total standardised capacity scores and lines with the cohort means will now automatically be drafted on the “Overview” sheet of the PCA Calculator.
4. Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop
Notes
4.1 Introduction

Project planning and capacity building very often use rational or mechanical approaches. These methods try to clarify and analyse problems to design logical solutions or interventions. Benefits of methods like the Logical Framework are that they provide clear overview of higher goals and concrete activities, and that they give clear indicators for monitoring and evaluation. Downsides of rational and mechanical approaches are that they seem very complicated and very often do not allow for much flexibility. Participants of rational or mechanical design processes often complain of the dullness and lack of creativity in the process and results. It often does not inspire them and at times this seems to create some distance between the design and reality. Neither do they have build-in participation to create commitment and ownership of the plans.

In participatory capacity building of NGOs it is critical to create full participation and involvement in the process. Conducting events to assess, analyse and develop organisation’s capacity already provides opportunities for organisational learning. These events must be highly creative and inspiring for participants to own the outcomes and directions of capacity building. Therefore we have chosen not to over-rationalise the processes. During the analysis our approach intends to simplify rather than to make things more complex.

In the feedback and planning workshop the participants present and interpret the assessment results from the assessment report. This allows them to prioritise the capacity areas that need most attention in capacity building. Next step in the workshop is to envision the future capacity: what do we want to see in place 3-5 years from now? The process continues with identifying blocks that keep the organisation reaching their envisioned capacity. This is followed by a session to develop strategic directions: new avenues of capacity building. The workshop ends with deciding on the first steps to start implementing the plan.

This feedback and planning workshop builds on the results from the capacity assessment of an organisation. The methods used in this workshop are based upon Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Group Facilitation Methods and the Participatory Strategic Planning process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

This Feedback and Strategic Capacity Planning event is designed as a one-day workshop to do with an NGO. This section presents the preparations for the workshop and the steps for each session. It uses some of the materials in the Appendices and files on the PCB cd-rom.
4.2 Preparations and Program Overview

Preparing the NGO

We assume considerable time was spent with the NGO to discuss the whole process of Participatory Capacity Building. At least we expect the NGO to know the steps it will go through.

After the Participatory Capacity Assessment we assume the organisation has received the first PCA Report. Preferably this report has been discussed with the organisation, and a number of staff have been involved in analysing the implications.

For the feedback and capacity planning workshop again it is important to look at the composition of the Planning Team. Unlike with the assessment team this time it is most helpful to focus on technical and managerial staff only. Members of the planning team could be staff or board members of the organisation, both from junior and senior levels. Again the team should have a reasonable gender balance. The planning team should consist of 5 to 10 people, who will be most involved with the implementation of the capacity building.

Needed Materials

- 20+ empty flip charts
- Markers (brown, green, blue) for all participants
- At least 100 empty half sheets as empty cards for brainstorming
- “Sticky Wall” / or other means of presenting and grouping cards with ideas (e.g. using masking tape, adhesive spray mount etc.)
- Presentation Preparation Instructions copied for all participants (see appendix I. or PCB cd-rom).

Overview Sheets of Capacity Scores

Before the workshop the facilitator must prepare and copy the overview sheets of all capacity scores for this organisation (see appendix G. for outline of these sheets or the PCB cd-rom.) These sheets consist of:

- An overview of the capacity and consensus scores for the 7 capacity areas, compared with other organisations from the cohort. To be copied for all participants.
- 7 separate sheets with all the capacity and consensus scores of the different capacity items within each capacity area. These tables include the actual statements that were used during the assessment to score the capacity in each of the items. Sheet for HRM to be copied for all participants, other sheets to be copied only twice.
- An interpretation sheet to clarify the standardised scores. To be copied for all participants.

One (experienced) group facilitator can easily facilitate this workshop. However it is helpful to have an assistant who can co-facilitate parts and who makes notes of the group discussions.
Flip charts to be prepared

- Workshop Program
- "Where are we now", "Next Steps", "Workshop Objectives" and "Ground Rules"
- Overview Score sheet for Human Resource Management to demonstrate a presentation of assessment results
- 7 sheets with empty frames for presentation of assessment results
- Overview of assessment results in all capacity areas, compared with peer organisations in the cohort, and general conclusions

Preparation of Consensus Workshop Method

This concerns the sessions Underlying Contradictions and Strategic Directions:
- Prepare 8 coloured Symbol cards for grouping, tag-naming and naming the underlying contradictions;
- Prepare 9 empty ½ flip charts for the action arenas in strategic direction workshop: spray them with adhesive spray mount;
- Prepare 4 "arrow"-flip charts for naming the strategic directions;
- Make workshop instruction cards: “one idea per card”, “write big”, “3-7 words per idea”;
- Make cards for introducing stories.

Program Overview

8.30   Welcome and Introduction
8.45   Presentation and Interpretation of PCA Scores
10.15  Break
10.45  Practical Vision: Envisioning the future
11.30  Underlying Contradictions: Determining the Blocks
13.00  Lunch
14.00  Strategic Directions: New Avenues for Capacity Building
15.30  Next steps and Closing Reflection
16.00  Closing
### 4.3 Overview: Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop

#### INTRODUCTION & PRESENTATIONS
*Feedback on assessment results (pages 61-66)*

1. Introduction to workshop. Where are we now, what are next steps, objectives and ground rules.
2. Demonstrating a presentation of assessment results.
3. Participants prepare their presentations.
4. Participant-led presentations of results.
5. Prioritising the capacity areas.

[1 hour 45 minutes]

Break

#### Rational Aim:
To provide a meaningful analysis and interpretation of assessment results that lead to strategic directions of capacity building and concrete next steps.

#### Experiential Aim:
To be involved in the capacity planning of the organisation and get committed to implement concrete capacity building activities.

#### PRACTICAL VISION
*Envisioning future capacity (pages 67-68)*

1. Context, explaining a practical vision and getting participants to think visionary.
2. Brainstorming what capacity people want to see in place 3-5 years from now.
3. Grouping the ideas according to similar accomplishments.
4. Naming the clusters of accomplishments.
5. Reflecting on the results.

[45 minutes]

#### UNDERLYING CONTRADICTIONS
*Determining the blocks (pages 69-72)*

1. Context, explaining underlying contradictions.
2. Brainstorming what is blocking us from achieving the envisioned capacity.
3. Grouping the ideas according to similar root cause.
4. Naming the clusters of underlying contradictions.
5. Reflecting on the results.

[1 hour 30 minutes]

Lunch

#### STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS
*New avenues for capacity building (pages 73-76)*

1. Explaining strategic directions and getting participants to think strategically.
2. Brainstorming the concrete actions to take dealing with the contradictions and moving toward the envisioned capacity.
3. Grouping and naming the ideas according to similar intent.
4. Developing and naming strategic directions.
5. Reflecting on the results.

[1 hour 30 minutes]

#### REFLECTION & NEXT STEPS
*Deciding first actions (pages 77-79)*

1. Explaining the next steps in the process including stakeholder roles.
2. Deciding about the initial implementing actions including concrete next steps.
3. Closing reflection.

[30 minutes]

**Total time: 7 ½ hours (including breaks)**
4.3.1 Introduction to the Feedback and Planning Workshop

In this part, in 15 minutes, introduce to the group:
1. Where are we in the Capacity Assessment Process?
2. Next steps in the process
3. Workshop Objectives
4. Role of the Facilitator and Ground rules

1. Where are we?

Capacity was defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

Capacity Assessment workshop was performed to collect data about the organisation’s capacity by groups discussions and individual ‘scoring’ of capacity areas. We used the Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET).

Capacity areas of NGOs that we looked at were:
- Human Resource Management: how you deal with staff
- Financial Resource Management: getting and dealing with money
- Equitable Participation: involvement of target groups
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: how your projects impact
- Partnering: effective liaisons with other stakeholders
- Organisational Learning: sharing and learning from information
- Strategic Management / Governance: looking at the bigger picture

Assessment Report was compiled by our organisation with a complete picture of the results, added with general conclusions on the capacity of the organisations.

2. Next steps

Feedback on results and Planning Capacity Building

Today’s workshop has the following parts:
- Presentation of the assessment results by members of the group
- Interpretation of results and prioritising the capacity areas to focus on
- Envisioning the future capacity
- Identifying the underlying contradictions that block us from realising our vision of Capacity
- Developing Capacity Building Strategies
- Deciding on next steps for implementation

The capacity building process continues...

After this workshop the organisation will:
- Develop a concrete and realistic action plan for capacity building, based on identified internal and external resources;
- Start implementing the capacity plan assisted by our organisation and peer organisations;
- Sustain the capacity by ongoing monitoring and bench marking.
3. Workshop Objectives

- To share the assessment results with the organisation;
- To create greater insight and awareness about differences in opinions on capacity areas and enhance the level of consensus;
- To prioritise the areas of capacity that need most attention according to the NGO’s objectives, internal structure and external environment;
- To create a broad vision on the future capacity, also related to capacities of peer organisations within the cohort;
- To explore and analyse the root causes of weaknesses in certain capacity areas and blocks that keep us from building capacity;
- To formulate implementing strategies to build the capacity based on real commitments;
- To explore internal and external resources to use for capacity building;
- To create initial steps to start implementing the capacity building plan;

To summarise this, the feedback and planning workshop intends to provide a meaningful analysis and interpretation of assessment results that lead to an appropriate, realistic and concrete capacity building plan.

4. Facilitator’s role and Ground rules

Workshop facilitator
During this feedback and planning workshop the facilitator will lead some focused group discussions and brainstorm sessions. The role of the facilitator is to:
- Guide the group during the discussions by asking questions and probing;
- Contribute to the presentation or interpretation of assessment results when needed;
- Allow full participation of all assessment team members;
- Keep time and stay focused on the topics at hand, and to
- Clarify the questions and process whenever needed.

Ground rules
In order for the feedback and planning workshop to be successful the group needs to open for discussion and sharing of ideas.

Some ground rules for participants we would like to propose:
- Participate in the discussions
- Leave space for others to contribute
- Be open and sincere about the organisations capacity
- (add more ground rules from the group)
4.3.2 Presentation and Interpretation of Participatory Capacity Assessment Scores

**CONTEXT**
Objective of presenting and interpreting the assessment scores is to create more insight in the organisation’s capacity.

Best way to do so is by having participants present the results themselves, which will make them more involved and helps them to present findings in their own words.

By the end of this part the group will have
- a clear overview of the most important assessment results;
- interpreted the results to allow feedback and give meaning;
- prioritised the most important capacity areas, based on the findings.

[5 minutes]

**Rational Aim:** To present and interpret the assessment results and to prioritise the capacity areas to focus on in planning.

**Experiential Aim:** To get involved in the capacity planning and to really understand the capacity of the organisation.

**DEMONSTRATING A PRESENTATION**
(page 64)

On beforehand the facilitator must prepare the sheets with overview of capacity scores.

1. Read and interpret HRM assessment results.
2. Look for 3 strongest and 3 weakest items and for areas of low consensus.
3. Brainstorm possible causes of strengths, weaknesses and items of low consensus.
4. Brainstorm specific recommendations in this capacity area.
5. Write most important items on cards.

[15 minutes]

**PREPARE PRESENTATIONS**
(page 65)

1. Participants sign up for capacity area to present.
2. Clarify assignment and hand out instructions and overview sheets.
3. Small group preparations: pairs or trios (or some individually) prepare their presentation flip charts.
4. Checking progress by clarifying process and emphasising on personal input of participants.

[20 minutes]

**PRESENTING RESULTS**
(page 66)

1. Each of 6 capacity areas to be presented by one participant: read flip chart (2.5 minutes).
2. Ask for questions of clarity.
3. Ask for any additions from the plenary.
4. Final presentation by facilitator of results of all capacity areas, compared to peer organisations in the cohort.

[35 minutes]

**REFLECTION**
(page 66)

1. Focus the group on the results by reading the most important causes and recommendations (½ sheets)
2. Which results are most surprising to you? Straightforward?
3. How do you see some capacity areas related to each other?
4. Which of the causes of weaknesses and strengths seem most important?
5. Which of the recommendations would be most effective?
6. Looking at the current reality of your organisation, which capacity areas seem to be most important to focus on?

[15 minutes]

**Total time: 1 ½ hours**
Demonstrating a presentation

Hand out copies of HRM capacity score sheet and interpretation sheet to all participants for them to read with you.

1. Prepare a copy of the HRM scores on flip chart (see example on the right upper side). Read total capacity score and the capacity scores for each item to the group. Explain the meaning of scores (refer to interpretation sheet): scores below 60 show a very weak capacity; between 60 and 70 refer to more or less acceptable level of capacity, which needs improvement; above 71 and particularly over 80 shows very strong capacity items.

2. Mark the capacity scores higher than 80 with a “+” and capacity scores below 70 with a “-“. Write down 3 strongest and 3 weakest items (with their scores) on the presentation flip chart (see example on the right down side).

3. Look for areas of low consensus (put circle around any consensus score below 60) and write down the areas of low consensus, with the scores.

4. Ask group for possible reasons or causes for strong capacity items and write down.

5. Ask group for possible causes or reasons of weak capacity items and write down.

6. Ask group for possible causes or reasons for low consensus on capacity items and write down.


8. Reflect on most important causes for low capacity and recommendations and write these on ½ sheets.

(Time: 15 minutes)
PREPARING THE PRESENTATIONS

1. Participants sign up for presentations

The presentations of assessment results will be prepared and performed by workshop participants. In principle, participants sign up to prepare presentations of their own choice. However, for the presentation it is important to have people in the small groups that are well informed and knowledgeable on a certain capacity area. At least people should have a specific interest to work on a certain topic.

In general it works best to have people prepare presentations in pairs or trios. When there are less than 12 participants, facilitators may opt to have people prepare presentations individually or in pairs, preparing 2 presentations per group. When participant numbers fall short, the facilitator may also join presentations, however s/he should not make subjective interpretations or recommendations.

2. Give instructions

All small groups (or individuals) should prepare one presentation on the capacity area they signed up for.

1. Read and interpret the capacity assessment results.
2. Look for 3 strongest and 3 weakest items and for areas of low consensus.
3. Brainstorm possible causes of strengths, weaknesses and items of low consensus.
4. Brainstorm specific recommendations in this capacity area.

Hand out the instruction sheet (see appendix I. and PCB cd-rom) and the copied sheets with overview of capacity scores for each capacity area. For each group, prepare a flip charts with the outline for the presentation.

3. Small group preparations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Area</th>
<th>Total scores: cap., cons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong capacity items:</td>
<td>Reasons or Causes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak capacity items:</td>
<td>Reasons or Causes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low consensus on:</td>
<td>Reasons or Causes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Check progress

Participants have 20 minutes to prepare their presentation. Check with the groups or individuals if they understand the assignment.

Emphasise on the interpretation of the scores, refer to the interpretation sheet.

Refer to the assessment statements on the overview sheets to clarify particular Capacity Items.

Emphasise on personal interpretation of scores and concrete and real analysis of the results.

From each group have one participant prepare the actual presentation.
Presentation of assessment results

Small group representatives will present the assessment results of each of 6 capacity areas. Have participants simply read the flip charts, and wait for questions of clarity before further explanation. Take about 2.5 minutes for each presentation.

Ask for questions of clarity from the group. Emphasise clarification only to prevent debates. Ask for brief explanations.

Ask for any additions from the group for causes of strengths, weaknesses, low consensus and recommendations. There are no wrong answers. Emphasise on collection of different opinions as a foundation for planning capacity building. As a group: decide on most important causes for low capacity, low consensus and recommendations, and write these on ½ sheets.

Final presentation by facilitator of results of all capacity areas, compared to peer organisations in the cohort. Prepare a flip chart with general overview (see sheet with overview of scores). For example:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Area</th>
<th>Cohort Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
<th>Cohort Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Resource Management</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial Resource Management</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equitable Participation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainability of Program Benefits</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Partnering</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Learning</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Governance / Strategic Management</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Briefly present the ranking of the organisation within the cohort. Present general conclusions about the performance of the organisation compared to others: which areas are lower and which are higher than peer organisations? Ask for general reactions or clarification of position of organisation from the group.

(Time: 35 minutes)

Reflecting

After presenting and interpreting the results we must focus on specific capacity areas that are most important given the present situation of the organisation. Aim of this part is to come up with 2-5 capacity areas that really need most attention. This does not fully exclude other areas from capacity planning, but it will direct the thinking during visioning the future capacity and further analysis.

Conduct a focused conversation about the presented assessment results.

1. Focus the group on the results by reading the most important causes and recommendations (the ½ sheets that were written for each capacity area).
2. Which results are most surprising to you? What was more straightforward or common knowledge?
3. Looking at the results in different capacity areas, how do you see them related to each other?
4. Which of the mentioned causes of weaknesses is most pressing according to you?
5. Which of the mentioned reasons of strong capacity seems most important?
6. Which of the recommendations would be most effective?
7. Looking at the current reality of your organisation, which capacity areas seem to be most important to focus on? What are current problems that need to be solved in this area? How will influence the organisation?

(Time: 15 minutes)
### 4.3.3 Practical Vision: Envisioning the Future Capacity

**CONTEXT**

1. State the purpose or aim of the Vision Workshop.
2. Highlight the Workshop Question: *What capacity do we want to see in place 5 years from now?*
3. Briefly outline the process and time frame of the workshop.
4. Direct the group’s thinking into the future by visualising or imagining in “their mind’s eye”.
5. Have people write their individual answers directly on a piece of paper.

   **Rational Aim:**
   - To identify the group’s hopes and dreams on the future capacity.

   **Experiential Aim:**
   - To feel a common practical vision of the future.

### BRAINSTORM

1. Have the people read through their ideas of what they see completed 3-5 years from now. Ask them to start the 5 most important ones.
2. Go around the room and get each person’s idea, one at a time.
3. Write them directly on a flip chart, in their words, then go to the next person. (at least 25 should be brainstormed in total)

### GROUP

1. Form 4-6 pairs that clearly go together. Look for similar accomplishments, using different symbols to mark different groups.
2. Continue through the list until all items have a symbol.
   - Some items may have more than one symbol at this point.

### NAME

1. Draw all symbols on second sheet of paper or on separate name cards.
2. Read all items with same symbol. Start with the biggest group. Ask what that group should be named. Look for a 3-5 word phrase that names the accomplishment. Encourage specific answers.
3. Continue until all symbols are named, working to the smallest groups.

**Rational Aim:**

**Experiential Aim:**

**BRAINSTORM**

**GROUP**

**NAME**

**Workshop Question:** What capacity do we want to see in place 3-5 years from now?

[5 minutes]

[10 minutes]

[10 minutes]

[10 minutes]

**Total time:** 45 minutes

---

*Participatory Capacity Building*
The Practical Vision: Context

The Practical vision provides an opportunity for individual participants to share with each other their hopes and aspirations for the future capacity of the organisation.

What a Vision is:
- Visions are dreams and hopes that are real to us. They are what we deeply believe must be in place. They exceed our grasp and often seem impossible to achieve. They require that people take a leap out beyond what is, to a future they imagine.
- Each participant carries some level of anticipation an hope for the future of a capacity, like pieces of a puzzle. Each individuals piece is needed to create the Shared Vision of the group.
- Sometimes the vision is very clear, other times it is more like feelings and difficult to state precise.

What a Vision is not:
- A Vision is not a mission. The Mission is a statement of what the organisation is about – what business they are in.
- A Vision is not a goal. Goals are part of strategies and tactical accomplishments and are formed toward the end of the planning process. Goals are quantifiable, realistic and achievable.

How the Vision Functions
Our visions are extremely powerful and they motivate us. They emerge from the depth of our consciousness and when stated objectively, they fuel us with energy and endurance.

In the capacity building process the Vision will encourage people to think outside their box and think of changes that are needed for their organisation. Their vision will be based upon the assessment results, but also carries their deeper hopes and aspirations.

This session uses the “Vision Workshop”, a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Strategic Planning (PSP), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

Facilitating the Vision Workshop

In the context of the session lead the group into the future by some kind of visualisation or scenario building, to get people think visionary: “Imagine it is 5 years from now and a documentary is being made to describe our successful organisation. Imagine you are hosting the documentation team. Lead the group through a series of questions, as they silently picture the answers in their imagination or mind’s eye. Have them write their answers on a piece of paper. You can include questions about the priority capacity areas, number of staff, skills available, financial systems, events happening, stories being told, people who are involved, physical structures, economic or fiscal matters, how decisions are made, resources, the way target groups are involved, comparison of the capacity to peer NGOs etc.”

When brainstorming their ideas on flip chart, ask them to come up with hard ideas: specific things, rather than soft ideas. E.g. All project officers skilled in facilitation methods, rather than more facilitation skills.

Example of a visual outcome of this part:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envisioned Capacity</th>
<th>What capacity do we want to see in place in 3-5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@ All project officers trained in facilitation skills</td>
<td>&lt;? &gt; Well managed, rewarded and motivated human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New financial system and procedures in place</td>
<td>(^) Well formulated, marketed successful corporate image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 3 new computers for our secretariat</td>
<td>% Enabling org’n environment established and kept in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Sustainable funds from a variety of donors</td>
<td># Well working financial system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 51 board mbmrs gone through fund-raising course</td>
<td>&amp; Sustainable funds from various donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% New office in more convenient place (transport)</td>
<td>@ High levels of participation of Target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ All target groups trained in facilitation methods</td>
<td>!! High levels of participation in own organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!! Ongoing staff reflection in monthly meetings</td>
<td>(*) Clear underst’ng of core business presented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONTEXT

1. State the purpose or aim of the Contradictions Workshop.
2. Highlight the Workshop Question: *What is blocking us from moving toward our envisioned capacity?*
3. Briefly outline the process and time frame of the workshop.
4. Introduce Not "lack of" or abstractions, but concrete blocks. Give examples.
5. Direct the group’s thinking into the contradicting thinking with a story.

### BRAINSTORM

1. Individually list 8-10 obstacles that block us from our vision. List one for each column of the vision. Select 5 most important ideas.
2. Meet in mini-teams to share ideas and write each on a card. Also have them work from the initial cards with causes of low capacity. (35-45 are needed from the whole group.) Write 1 idea per card, write big and 3-7 words.
3. Pass up first round of clearest cards.

### GROUP

1. Form 4-6 pairs that clearly go together. Look for issues, which share a common root cause.
2. Ask for cards that are different and develop clusters.
3. Discern the contradictions of each cluster by quickly naming the block with a 1-2 word tag name.
4. Mark remaining cards with tag and pass up.

### NAME

1. Talk through the largest cluster first. Ask: “what is dysfunctional? What has gone wrong?”
2. Give the cluster a 3-5 word name or title, which answers the Focus Question.
   - Name the block
   - How it blocks
   - What it blocks
3. Repeat naming process for remaining clusters, working to the smallest cluster.

### RESOLVE

1. Arrange the titles with the cards under them – longest columns at the left & shortest at the right. Read the titles.
2. Which of these titles did you expect to see? Which was a surprise?
3. Which call for closer analysis and need more information to be assessed?
4. Discuss the next steps.

Next we will develop strategies to take away contradictions and move to our envisioned capacity.

**Total time: 1 ½ hours**
Introducing Not to use “lack of”

In the workshop context it is helpful to remind participants not to use the phrase “lack of”. The following story is helpful to tell, after individual brainstorming but before the meeting in mini-teams to share ideas and write on cards.

“In this session, we are looking for patterns, attitudes, structures, and blocks, which we encounter. We are looking for what is there – not what is missing. It is like watering your plants. The water is running from the hose and it stops. Usually you don’t just stare at the hose and shout, “There’s no water!” However, you would turn and check to see if there’s a kink in the hose or if someone stepped on it or if someone turned off the water. In this exercise we are looking for the kinks or blocks rather than announcing what is missing.”

In place of “Lack Of”, describe the situation with words like:

- Outdated
- Fragmented
- Overlapping
- Inaccessible
- Unrealistic
- Uncoordinated
- Reluctant
- Disjointed
- Confusing
- Debilitating
- Undeveloped
- Unbalanced
- Unmotivated
- Conflicting
- Insecure
- Disorganised
- Unclear
- Restricted
- Sporadic
- Inflexible
- Discouraged
- Contradicting
- Neglected
- Narrow
- Obsolete
- Weakened
- Devalued
- Pervasive
- Misused
- Excessive
- Extensive
- Biased
- Closed

Introducing Naming

This following story is helpful to illustrate contradictions. It can be used after brainstorming and grouping as a context for the naming step.

“Once upon a time there were two villages connected by a single road. One village produced food for itself and its neighbour; the other provided both with hunting equipment. One day a huge dragon settled across the road, blocking travel between the two villages. Villagers attacked it with spears, which splintered against the beast’s thick hide. They tried to lasso it, but the dragon’s flames burned the ropes to ashes. Week after week they laboured, sacrificing many lives and finally giving up in despair. Their food was depleted and the supply of hunting equipment exhausted in the battle against the dragon. One day a young villager climbed a mountain to observe the dragon and discovered a remarkable thing; a farmer from a distant village was dumping garbage right under the dragon’s nose. An envoy was soon dispatched to ask the farmer to move his dump to a remote field. The dragon relocated to this new feeding area, and the two villages were once again able to travel the road and serve each other.”

When we look at naming the contradiction in this story:

- What is the block?
- How does it block?
- What does it block?

In the naming step we will name every cluster of cards in this way, naming the block, how it blocks and blocks.

Give an example to the group. E.g. undeveloped governance skills in board hinder effective internal and external communications.
Participatory Capacity Building

Contradictions are to be found in the blocks and irritants that restrain organisations from building capacity. Discovering them changes one’s perception and produces confidence. Underlying contradictions connect lacking capacity to negative patterns or behaviour in the organisation.

Facilitating the Underlying Contradictions Workshop

Context
- Refer to the presentation and interpretation of the assessment results: what were the priority capacity areas to focus on?
- The Contradictions Workshop asks the question: What are the issues and obstacles that block our progress toward our shared envisioned future capacity?
- We try to look for a phrase that describes the current reality rather than the “lack of” something. Moreover we try to focus on blocks that are in our sphere of influence rather than items over which we have little direct influence.

Brainstorm
- Ask the group to brainstorm what they see as blocks or obstacles to achieving each of the vision elements, and also let them focus on the mentioned causes of weak capacity and low consensus. One side of the room can start elements that block the vision of capacity and the other side on the causes of weaknesses. For this referral ensure visibility of the vision elements and the ½ sheets with most important causes of low capacity or consensus.
- Push for being specific. One-word items such as motivation, salaries or bad governance etc. do not provide enough specific data. More helpful are phrases that point to examples, such as, undeveloped staff moral, rather than motivation.
- It is important to avoid pointing fingers of blame at people. It is a pattern of behaviour that we are looking for. Ask for real and objective examples in the scope of their organisation.

Group
- When sticking up the cards, ask for questions of clarity.
- Cluster the cards as they are organised, rather than placing them in columns. This acknowledges the interrelateness of the brainstorm items.
- Pair and cluster by looking for items that share a common root cause, but within the cluster do not try to arrange a hierarchy.
- When placing symbol cards, name the arena of each cluster. That is, have the group tag name the block or common root cause for each cluster.

Name
- Introduce the naming story.
- What is the breakdown in this arena? What must we change if we are to move toward the vision?
- Look for a 3-5 word phrase that names the block, how it blocks capacity and what it is blocking, e.g. undeveloped governance skills in board hinder effective internal and external communications.
- When energy in the group is getting low, have names made in small teams and present to the group for consensus.

Resolve
- Read the workshop question and have the column titles read.
- Help the group step back and look at the whole. Are these our Underlying Contradictions? Is this what is blocking us?
- Which contradictions call for a deeper analysis?
- What kind of information do we need to make this closer assessment?
- Next we will come up with strategies how to take away the blocks and move to our envisioned capacity.

This session uses the “Underlying Contradictions Workshop”, a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Strategic Planning (PSP), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).
### UNDERLYING CONTRADICTIONS: VISUAL OVERVIEW

An example of a visual outcome of this workshop could look like:

#### What is blocking us from moving toward our envisioned capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inappropriate skills to develop required policies</th>
<th>Unstable / volatile economic &amp; political situation will cause unavailability and affordability of needed commodities of the organisation</th>
<th>Inappropriate management style blocks the organisational effectiveness</th>
<th>Unclear policies, confusion and conflicts hinder effectiveness and growth</th>
<th>Undefined financial resource mobilisation policy blocks organisation towards financial sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last HRM policy not finished</td>
<td>High prices and inflation</td>
<td>Top-down leadership</td>
<td>Beating around the bush</td>
<td>Unclear policy on income generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated policy development skills</td>
<td>Shortage of foreign currency</td>
<td>Hierarchical leadership styles</td>
<td>Unsettled conflicts between staff</td>
<td>Funding strategy is too limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy development responsibility</td>
<td>Political interference in budgets</td>
<td>Staff not involved in important decisions</td>
<td>Unclear policies on income generation</td>
<td>Only 2 main donors!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished HRM policy</td>
<td>Difficult to get commodities that are needed</td>
<td>Outdated management styles</td>
<td>Unclear tasks and responsibilities</td>
<td>High dependence on few donors!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysfunctional time management</td>
<td>Who does what in our organisation?</td>
<td>Not clear what is possible in fund-raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boar unclear on funding strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 Strategic Directions: New Avenues for Capacity Building

**CONTEXT**

1. State the purpose or aim of the Strategic Directions Workshop.

2. Highlight the Workshop Question: How can we deal with our contradictions and move toward our envisioned future capacity?

3. Briefly outline the process and time frame of the workshop.

4. Introduce Strategic Directions as part of capacity building.

5. Direct the group’s Strategic Thinking with stories.

   [15 minutes]

**Workshop Question:** How can we deal with our contradictions and move toward our envisioned future capacity?

**Rational Aim:** To identify new directions for capacity building, based on our priorities and organisational issues.

**Experiential Aim:** To feel shared directions for capacity building that are real to all.

**BRAINSTORM**

1. Individually list concrete actions that will lead to the intended capacity. Select 5 most important actions.

2. Meet in mini-teams to share ideas and write each on a card. Also have participants look at the ½ sheets with recommendations from the 1st session. (35-45 are needed from the whole group.) Write 1 idea per card, write big and 3-7 words.

3. Pass up first round of clearest cards.

   [20 minutes]

**GROUP**

1. Form 4-6 pairs that clearly go together. Look for similar intent.

2. Ask for cards that are different and develop clusters in boxes (there may be fewer than 9 boxes with data in them).

3. Discern focus of each column by quickly giving a 1-2 word tag.

4. Mark remaining cards with tag and pass up.

   [20 minutes]

**NAME**

1. Discern a strategic direction. Locate 2-4 boxes that together describe a common direction.

2. Group remaining boxes. Locate a second group of boxes and then a third group (or even 4th).

3. Name the strategic directions. Name all groups with 3-5 word phrases, beginning with an “ing”-word.

   [20 minutes]

**RESOLVE**

1. Focus the group by reading all Strategic Directions.

2. Which action is the key thrust?

3. Which one supports the key thrust?

4. Which actions build on our strength?

5. Which venture new directions?

6. Where were the breakthroughs?

7. How have we dealt with the underlying contradictions?

8. How did we cover our priority capacity areas?

Next will be reflecting and deciding next steps.

[15 minutes]

**Total time: 1 ½ hours**
Introducing Strategic Directions to start capacity building

In capacity building, many organisations focus on quick and tangible results that may not have long term impact. They look for instant solutions and continue business as usual.

Another way of looking at capacity building is the integrated or strategic approach. The organisation must try and formulate a limited number of capacity building directions, which will be walked along for 3-5 years. These directions will be quite broad or general, but they will hold a number of concrete ideas that are new and bold examples of doing things differently in the organisation. These strategic directions will integrate actions in different capacity areas to have both stronger and weaker areas complement each other. Strategic directions are not things an organisation can do. Many actions are needed to install a strategy.

Introducing Naming

In this session we first give quick names to the clusters of ideas in the action arenas. Later, 3-5 strategic directions will be named.

When starting to name the boxes and strategic directions it is helpful to use active verbs in the names: names that refer to action or movement. These may include “ing”, words, such as improving, developing, creating, enhancing, expanding, influencing, etc.

It should also be reminded that some participants may be very keen and involved in getting the names right, while others may be lost. This is not a problem as long as everybody still ‘buys into’ the names (consensus!). Finding strategic names may be a difficult process, but it is important since the names of these strategies may remain on the wall for 3-5 years.

Directing Strategic Thinking

At the end of the context it we must direct the group to think strategically about directions to get to effective capacity building. Things that we have found helpful as guidelines when doing this workshop are:

Down Board Thinking – This comes from the game of chess. They say that in chess you always want to be thinking down the board – “If he moves this way, I’ll do this. If he moves that way, I’ll do that”. Real champions can think 7 moves down the board. It is about proactive thinking as opposed to be reactive. As we begin to look at most strategic moves we can make to get to capacity building, we must become proactive and consider many possible ways that might work in the future.

Yin/Yang – This is the Chinese symbol representing the concept of “Yes/And”, rather than the western mode of thinking in “Either/Or” and “Black/White”. What are bold actions to take to move through the contradictions? On the other hand we want to be conserving our present directions that do work.

Catalytic Actions – Just as you’re looking to throw just one ball to knock down all the pins, we are looking for actions, which can impact more that one contradiction. We must see our organisational tasks and roles as interrelated and interdependent.
THE CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGIES

Facilitating the Strategic Directions Workshop

Context
- The Workshop Question for the Strategic Directions Workshop is: What creative and innovative actions will deal with the contradictions and move us to our envisioned capacity?
- Introduce strategic directions to start capacity building
- Direct the groups into strategic thinking by introducing stories on pro-active thinking, bold and conserving methods and catalytic actions.

Brainstorm
- Have the group focus on concrete actions that the organisation can do over 2-3 years, trying to cover as many contradictions and elements from the vision. If the action is not apparent ask the writer to rephrase it into an action.
- Make sure every one can see the outcomes of the contradictions workshop and vision process. Have half of the group work on the list of contradictions and the other half with the vision results. Also have the group look at the initial most important recommendations from the ½ sheets that were made in the first session.
- Aim for 30-40 cards with actions of the whole group. Have participants write 1 idea per card, write big and 3-7 words per idea.
- Place the first round of cards randomly on the 9 boxes.

Group
- When sticking up the cards, ask for questions of clarity.
- In organising, look for common intent. The actions may be very different but if there is a common intent, they can be put together.
- Put symbols on the action arena sheets and have small groups put last round of cards in the particular action area it belongs.
- When all actions are clustered, name each box to state the action area, e.g. Skills Development.

Name
- Strategic Directions – Clear directions are important here. Ask the group to look for three action arenas that have strong relationships and put the boxes in one direction. Ask the group in one line to describe a focus of thrust or strategic direction in which they see themselves moving over the next 2-3 years.
- Move the boxes so people see what it looks like and talk about the focus they see. Allow for conversation about the new relationships.
- If there are two title cards created for each action arena, the second set can be moved around to the side of the 9 boxes rather than moving the large sheets of paper.
- When energy in the group is getting low, have names made in small teams and present to the group for consensus.
- Emphasise on the fact that consensus is only obtained on the strategic directions only and NOT on the distinct actions or activities. These are examples of the strategies, which still need to be concretised in Implementing Actions.

Resolve (This part may be integrated with the next session to save time)
- Read the workshop question and have the strategic directions read.
- Help the group step back and look at the whole. Are these our strategic directions? Will they address our contradictions? Will they move us to our vision and address items mentioned in the assessment presentations?
- Looking at each direction, ask which contradictions or vision elements it will address. Take note that one direction may tackle more than one contradiction. Is the initial prioritisation of capacity areas followed?
- After this session the group will reflect on the process and develop first steps for action.

This session uses the "Strategic Directions Workshop", a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Strategic Planning (PSP), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).
Practical Tips:
For this workshop it is crucial to use enough space to present the ideas. A helpful aid is the "Sticky Wall", a large piece of nylon fabric on which cards will stick when adhesive spray mount is applied. For this particular session 9 flip charts may be put on the Sticky Wall, before starting. Again, these sheets may hold cards by applying adhesive Spray Mount. Brainstorm cards may be put in these boxes randomly, being organised later. These boxes with strategies can then be moved into 2-4 “thrusts” of action, the strategic directions.

An example of a visual outcome of this workshop could look like:

How can we deal with our contradictions and move toward our envisioned capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve target group participation</th>
<th>Developing sustainable partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all project officer go for training of facilitators</td>
<td>Include more members of target group in project committee and board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt participatory project management approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop sustainable partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Nango sub-committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market NGO-services at NGO-fair and develop more materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Better Learning from experiences

- Document all projects in standard way
- Project reports in quarterly magazine for bigger public
- Organise monthly lunch-presentations on running projects for exchange

Reflecting on managerial processes

- Regular reflection item on agenda of weekly staff meeting
- Ask external participants to sign up for capacity area in present

Doing more organisational research

- Assessing the skills of personnel
- External orientation: looking at opp's and threats
- Staff retreat for organisational analysis

Enhancing the financial system

- Refining the operational finances and budgeting procedures
- Monthly meetings of treasurer with finance department
- Go for participatory fundraising course

Improving enabling environment

- Budget for and purchase 2 new computers for secretariat
- Purchase copy machine and use strictly for own purpose
- Negotiate with donor on transport; write off old vehicle and one

Build strong network relationships for sustainable projects

- Formalise relationship with NGO x and Gov’t
- Improve target group participation
- Include more members of target group in project committee and board

Develop and use methods for organisational learning and reflection

- Better Learning from experiences
- Reflecting on managerial processes
- Doing more organisational research

Put enabling environment in place for higher project performances

- Enhancing the financial system
- Improving enabling environment
- Better Learning from experiences
4.3.6 Next Steps: Deciding on First Actions and Closing Reflection

In this part, in 30 minutes, facilitate a closing session covering the following items:
- The next steps in the process, and facilitator’s role
- Zooming in on strategic directions: deciding first actions
- Closing reflection

1. Next steps in the process

This capacity assessment and capacity building may be part of a larger exercise undertaken to strengthen the NGO capacity of a sector. There may be 10-15 organisations part of the program. It is needed for each organisation to come up with individual capacity building plans that are based on their own available resources. The facilitating organisation may play a part in this by guiding this process and giving technical back up in how to develop implementation plans.

Next step will also be to try and find ways to co-ordinate all the different strategic directions of organisations to develop a collective capacity building plan. This might be done during a collective workshop for all participating NGOs.

Such a plan may consist of:
- Training in certain capacity areas
- Exchange of expertise between the different NGOs
- Technical assistance in developing management procedures, legal issues, financial administration etc.
- Co-ordination of advocacy and lobbying
- Facilitation of further capacity assessment, monitoring and evaluation etc.
- Any other assistance to build local capacity of NGOs.

Discuss possible funding strategies for implementation. However the organisation should also start implementing plans itself.

(Time: 3 minutes)

2. Deciding first implementing actions

The strategic directions that have been developed so far need to be transformed into implementation plans. However, this cannot be done without consulting other staff, management or even your board and linking it to other existing plans. In this session we want to focus on the steps that can be done to ensure implementation will start.

1. What were the capacity areas that we wanted to focus on? How did we capture them in the strategic directions?
2. Which action arenas (the boxes that form the strategic directions) can implemented very soon?
3. What are other activities the organisation is currently running to build the capacity? How do the strategic directions link to other plans of the organisation, such as a strategic plan, annual plans, project plans? *(See next page box "A")*
4. What other types of assessment or organisational research would you like to see happening? What type of external assistance would you like to receive? *(See next page box "B")*
5. Who need to be consulted before we can start making a concrete implementation plan? *(See next page box "C")*
6. What are concrete steps we are taking to start implementing the capacity building plan? *(See next page box "D")*
   - Including: How will we document this workshop? *(options: facilitating organisation writes a short narrative, organisation types up all the flip charts and strategic directions, no documentation at all. Ownership of the results will be enhanced when organisation takes this commitment)*

(Time: 20 minutes)
4. Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop

**Current Capacity Building Activities**
- Staff going to training: quarterly skills training
- Network meetings with other NGO
- Technical assistance of NGO x who does financial audits
- Donor x consulted NGO on capacity building, process still in infant stage.

**Current plans to link to:**
- Strategic plan (2002) needs to be consulted to look for overlap
- Working plans of project officers (quarterly, monthly) could have a capacity building chapter
- Annual plan, to be revised
- Skills training plan, 2004
- Career planning documents 1999

**Other Organisational Research Needed**
- SWOT analysis
- Appraisal of Organisational Culture
- Communication Styles and Team Building

**External Assistance Needed**
- Facilitate developing an implementation plan
- Facilitating a new 5-year strategic plan
- Financial assistance!

**Consultation Needed with:**
- Members of network abcd about the capacity assessment process. Proposal to do same exercise with all 7 network members
- Donors XYZ: to see how best to fit these new actions into existing proposals
- Executive committee: to appoint a capacity building co-ordinator within the organisation and to come up with a new time line for capacity building and develop a proposal for the board
- Board: to decide about the capacity building proposal and to be informed about their own role to play in capacity building.

**Next Steps:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document this workshop</td>
<td>staff x</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult network members</td>
<td>staff b</td>
<td>April 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold NGO-feedback workshop</td>
<td>nango</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with donors</td>
<td>staff b</td>
<td>Aug 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning workshop</td>
<td>nango</td>
<td>Jul 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etc.

---

3. Closing Reflection

Facilitate a closing reflection to discuss the results and wrap up the meeting.

1. What were things we did today?
2. What words or phrases do you remember others saying?
3. Where were you most involved, did you feel excited?
4. When was energy low?
5. What new things about your organisation did you learn today?
6. What is the significance of today’s work?
7. How will we all benefit from these results?
8. What worries you about our commitments?
9. What are you most looking forward to do with this plan?
10. Look at the workshop objectives: have they been achieved?
11. What will you tell your absent colleagues about this day?

Thank you very much for participating!

(Time: 7 minutes)
5. Implementation Planning Workshop
5.1 Introduction

Capacity Building from within the organisation should not be seen as a new “project” that an NGO is engaging in. It is does not necessarily call for a separate implementation planning process, as many projects require. In fact it is most appropriate to try and fit implementation planning of capacity building in the regular planning cycle of the organisation to ensure cross-fertilisation of activities. For instance, if an organisation makes annual working plans in October for the upcoming year, that would be a great opportunity to include planning of capacity building activities in this exercise.

However, after the capacity assessment and feedback workshop there is need for a more medium-term planning event that will allow the organisation to plan for capacity building activities that stretch over a period of 2-5 years. The implementation planning workshop in this chapter might be a valuable tool for that exercise. For organisations that have just started with capacity building process it is also advisable to spend some time on planning, co-ordination and structure of the interventions. After this the yearly activity plans and quarterly plans, as proposed in this chapter, might be included in regular planning events of the organisation.

The implementation planning workshop starts with developing a 3-year timeline for each strategic capacity building direction. This is followed by a 1-year calendar and quarterly plans. The workshop ends with discussions on co-ordination and capacity building structure.

At this stage it is also helpful to start collaborating with other NGOs in developing joint strategies in capacity building. The outline for a co-ordination seminar may be a useful tool for this purpose and can be found in the next chapter. Monitoring and Evaluation of capacity building should be included as an aspect of design and planning of interventions. In this toolbox we have separated this aspect and made it into another chapter in order to create a comprehensive approach of Monitoring and Evaluation. Please see the last chapter to design and plan activities, which track progress of capacity building and which measure the impact of the efforts.

The tools used in this chapter are again borrowed from the Technology of Participation® (ToP®) series, developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

This Implementation Planning event is designed as a half-day workshop to do with an NGO. This section presents the preparations for the workshop and the steps for each session.
5.2 Preparations

Preparing the NGO

After the Feedback and Planning Workshop there is need to feedback the outcomes to all the involved people in the organisation.

First of all this includes the staff at all levels that might not yet have been part of the capacity assessment and planning. It is important to share the chosen capacity building directions and make them feel part of these. This may be done through information meetings or internal capacity building ‘newsletters’ or memos.

Secondly feedback must be given to the governing and managing bodies of the organisation. We assume they have been part and parcel of the process so far, but this stage calls for special attention. Capacity building has major implication on the strategic and operational activities of the organisation. It might involve changes in roles and responsibilities, working procedures, etc., and it will certainly need commitments on resources. It is therefore key to create sufficient awareness and commitment from management and board to continue with the planning process.

Before doing actual implementation planning there is need to clarify the following issues:
- What funds are available for new capacity building activities?
- What would be the proposed managing or co-ordinating structure for capacity building activities?
- How does the implementation planning of capacity building relate to other planning cycles of the organisation and how can they be combined?
- Who will be part of the Implementation Planning Workshop?

Practical Preparations

Be sure to have the following available for the implementation planning exercise:

- Copies of documented Feedback and Planning Workshop, including the Vision, Underlying Contradictions and Strategic Directions. It might be helpful to copy these outcomes on flip charts for quick referral during the sessions.
- 100 empty ½ sheets.
- Markers (blue, green, brown), one for each participant.
- 10+ empty flip charts papers.
- Calendar on a wall, allowing groups to visualise their 3-year and 1-year timelines.
- This workshop can easily be facilitated by 1 person who is experienced in the used methodology.
### 5.3 Overview: Implementation Planning Workshop

**Workshop Question:** What are the key actions to implement our capacity building?

**Rational Aim:** To identify the key actions & events, put them in a time frame and create overview.

**Experiential Aim:** To create commitment and ownership of key actions to be implemented.

#### 3-YEAR TIMELINE

*In small groups:*
1. Brainstorm events or accomplishments that will be done in the next 3 years.
2. Put distinct key events or accomplishments on cards and phase them over the time line.
3. Plenary reports by each team. Ask for questions of clarity.
4. Decide the time span of the capacity building efforts.

#### FIRST YEAR’S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

*In small groups:*
1. Work on the events and accomplishments in the first year. Define the victory of their results. Create launching and ongoing activities. Create list of needed resources: human, material, financial, etc.
2. Small groups finish work by completing a quarterly plan for 1 accomplishment.
3. Plenary reports by each team. Ask for questions of clarity.

#### CO-ORDINATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING STRUCTURE

1. Step back to co-ordinate: effectiveness, time and resources.
2. Conduct focused conversation about co-ordination, staff involvement and draw the capacity building structure.

#### RESOLVE

1. What stands out for you from this Implementation Planning Workshop? What do you remember?
2. Where were you involved? What frustrated you?
3. What has been a breakthrough during this process?
4. What is the importance of the work we have done?
5. What is still missing?
6. Confirm the next steps to be taken.

**Total time: 4 hours**
**THE IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING**

**Context**
- Objective of this session is to identify the key actions & events for capacity building, put them in a time frame and create overview. We also intend to create commitment and ownership of key actions to be implemented.
- We will focus on the question: *What are the key actions to implement the capacity building strategies?*
- Decide on the initial time span of the capacity building efforts (usually 3 years is a good framework).
- Look back at the results of the feedback and planning workshop: Vision Elements, Underlying Contradictions and Strategic Capacity Building Directions. Ask group what inspires them about the plan, how some directions seem to be related and which are the key strategic directions to focus on in this implementation planning.
- Discuss the current reality and givens in terms of budgets and co-ordination structure: how much money is already available to work on during this planning? What will be the proposed roles for co-ordination as discussed with or proposed by management?
- Have participants select the strategic direction of capacity building they want to work on during the workshop.

**Facilitating the 3-Year Timeline**

**Small Group Work**
- For this exercise is important to have people in the small groups that are well informed and knowledgeable on a certain capacity building direction. Preferably these will be the people who also implement the actions. At least people should have a specific interest to work on a certain topic. Again, people may decide where they feel their input is most valuable and sign up their name at one strategic direction.
- Make sure the participants are evenly spread over the different groups and persuade participants to shift groups to make sure all directions are equally represented.
- Give clear instructions before people get to their groups:
  - Each group discusses the intention of their strategic direction: which underlying contradictions and vision elements does it cover (look at the Feedback and Planning Workshop documentation!)? On which capacity areas does it focus?
  - What results will be accomplished by this strategic direction? Phrase the results or objective as a “victory” and put it on a card.
  - Have each group participant individually brainstorm 2-5 new actions, events or accomplishment in this strategic direction. Be SMART: Specific Measurable Appropriate, Realistic and Time specific.
  - Don’t use steps of reaching an event but distinct accomplishments. E.g. Use *New Conditions of Service in place by 11-05* rather than different steps such as: 1. Hire HRM-consultant; 2. Workshop to discuss; 3. Draft Conditions of Service; 4. New Conditions of Service adopted by board.
  - Ask 1 or 2 new actions from all small group members and ask for questions of clarity. Ask for remaining ideas that are different and prioritise.
  - Decide as a group which actions or events are key and phase them over the 3-year time line: at least one for each half year.

**Presentations**
- Put the cards of events on the timeline. Have each small group present the aimed Victory and key actions of their strategy.
- Ask for questions of clarity, additions and push for consensus.
- Keep a celebrating mood by asking for applause or slogans.
- Ask the group if these events will deal with all underlying contradictions and cover the priority capacity areas. Decide on the total time span of the capacity building, now the key actions are set.
1 YEAR’S ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND QUARTERLY PLANS

Facilitating the 1st Year’s Accomplishments

Small group work
- Participants continue in the same teams. Instructions:
  - Take the first year’s accomplishments or events from the main calendar.
  - Discuss what results or objectives will be accomplished by these events and phrase them as a “victory” and put it on a card.
  - As a group, brainstorm concrete activities that need to be done to reach the accomplishment or event.
  - Decide as a group which actions or events are key and phase them over time: 1 launching activity, at least one more activity for each quarter to maintain momentum.
  - Discuss and create overview of needed resources for the activities: human, material, and financial.

Quarterly Implementation Planning
- Participants finish their work by developing a quarterly plan for the first important accomplishment or event in the year. This exercise needs to be repeated after presentation of and agreement on the first year’s accomplishments.
- Quarterly Implementation Planning may be continued after the session or can be integrated in the regular planning process of the organisation, for instance using the different intervention methods as sub groups. For each group of activities an implementation sheet can be produced for that specific Quarter.
- These sheets are mainly for focusing the team members and documenting the intended steps.

Quarterly Implementation Steps (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishment Title: Yearly contributions to NGO fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 day Intent: To create a yearly presence at the most important National NGO marketing event (this year: June 8-9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Set up prep committee</td>
<td>Farai</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arrange stand at NGO fair</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and produce specific brochure and newsletter</td>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arrange target group presence</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NGO Fair</td>
<td>All!</td>
<td>June 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Produce manual for next year</td>
<td>Farai</td>
<td>July 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-ordinator: Farai

Members: Blessing, John, 1 board member, 2 others (to be appointed)
Resources: From communication budget (200 US$)

Presentations
- Put the cards of events on 1 year calendar. Have each small group present their victories, activities and 1st Quarter activities.
- Ask for questions of clarity, additions and push for consensus.
- Keep a celebrating mood by asking for applause or slogans.
- Ask the group if these are the key actions for the first year.
IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING: VISUAL OVERVIEW

An example of a visual outcome of a 3-year timeline could look like:

**Year 1**
- Build strong network relationships for sustainable projects
- An example of a visual outcome of the 1st year's accomplishments could look like:
  - Workshop with existing partners
  - Explore opportunities with Nango
  - Nango sub-committees joined
- Staff meeting on reflection

**Year 2**
- Develop and use methods for org. learning and reflection
- Regular reflection in weekly meeting
- Operational financing system refined
- Strategic fundraising plan in place
- Purchase copy machine + user policy
- Ongoing meetings with treasurer

**Year 3**
- Put enabling environment in place for higher project performances
- Evaluation of career planning
-to have a conducive working environment that allows the best of all to come out.

**Victory**
- To have regular reflection and documentation.
- To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Resources**
- Communication budget, training budget, hosting the workshops, 20 days of manpower.

**Quarter 1**
- Launch Resources Part. Project management policies
- Part. Project management policies
- Nango sub-committees joined
- Yearly contributions to NGO fair
- Nango sub-committees joined
- Workshop with existing partners

**Quarter 2**
- Launch
- Regular reflection in weekly meeting
- Operational financing system refined
- Nango sub-committees joined
- Yearly contributions to NGO fair
- Workshop with existing partners

**Quarter 3**
- To see high target group participation in sustainable projects supported by valuable network relations.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Meetings with other NGOs
- Partnership strategy in place
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Strategic fundraising plan in place
- Assessment of managing process
- Staff meeting on reflection
- Workshop on partnership strategy

**Resources**
- Communication budget, training budget, hosting the workshops, 20 days of manpower.

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation
- Nango sub-committees joined

To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Victory**
- To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Resources**
- Communication budget, training budget, hosting the workshops, 20 days of manpower.

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation
- Nango sub-committees joined

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation
- Nango sub-committees joined

To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Victory**
- To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Resources**
- Communication budget, training budget, hosting the workshops, 20 days of manpower.

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation
- Nango sub-committees joined

**Quarter 4**
- To see a well managed, vibrant learning organisation.
- Workshop on partnership strategy
- Community meetings on participation
- Nango sub-committees joined

To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Victory**
- To have needed policies and skills in place for partnering and Participatory Project Management.
- Budget to hire consultant, 10 days of

**Resources**
- Communication budget, training budget, hosting the workshops, 20 days of manpower.
Facilitating the Co-ordination and Capacity Building Structure

**Effectiveness**
- Reflect with the group on the planned accomplishments and actions: do we reach our intended results in this way? What seem to be critical actions? Which may be less important? Where do we need to make some changes or additions?

**Time**
- Focus on the total timeline first: is there any call for changes in the planning of actions? Which actions of one strategic direction are dependent on those of others? Will they work out this way?
- Focus on the first year to see which events may call for a second look at the timing.

**Resources**
- Looking at the preliminary resources: which strategy seems to take most budget? Are initial budget projections calling for adjustments?
- What other sources of income can we use or find to make this capacity building happen?
- What are some of the budget assumptions or ground rules we will take when making a more detailed budget and financial system?

**Co-ordination and organisational Structure**
Conduct a short focused conversation about the co-ordination of capacity building efforts in relation to the structure of the organisation.

**Objective level questions:**
1. Looking at these implementing actions: which actions or events call for co-ordination?
2. Who have been involved in the design so far?

**Reflective level questions:**
3. What have been some highlights in our work together? What seemed difficult?
4. How have we co-ordinated projects and capacity building before?
5. What are different ways to co-ordinate this capacity building?

**Interpretive level questions:**
6. What are advantages and disadvantages of these types of co-ordination?
7. Who must be involved in the co-ordination?
8. How do we ensure the input from all staff levels in capacity building decision making?
9. What are some implications of this co-ordination to our present organisational structure?
10. What issues must be resolved before we can implement this co-ordination structure?

**Decisional level questions:**
11. What are the necessary next steps?

**Organisation of Capacity Building**
Draw an organogram of the capacity building structure. Have the group think of different positions within the structure and the responsibilities they might have. Draw the direct relations between the capacity building structure and other organisations involved.

Discuss the decision making structure of the project organisation and the project accountability.

---

This session uses the "Implementing Actions Workshop", a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Strategic Planning (PSP), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).
6. NGO Capacity Building
Co-ordination Workshop
6.1 Introduction

This Participatory Capacity Building process can be used to facilitate capacity building of a single NGO. However, the methodology will be more effective when it is applied with a number of organisations. First advantage is the possibility to create cohort scores that will allow each participating NGO to compare its capacity with peer organisations. A second advantage is the opportunity to build on strengths of participating NGOs who may be able to assist in building capacity of other organisations. Last advantage is the efficient and effective use of facilitator's resources. The whole process of Participatory Capacity Building is very involving for the facilitating organisation. It requires a lot of time and energy, as well as knowledge and skills of the facilitators who guide the process. When the methodology can be applied several times, facilitators become more advanced and will be able to guide sessions more effectively, using less time for preparation and reporting.

When a group of NGOs is facilitated in the capacity building process there is need for co-ordination of efforts. After, or even during the individual planning processes this Co-ordination Workshop may be a helpful tool to maximise the potential synergy in the group of NGOs. This event reflects on the capacity building process so far and allows participating organisations to give constructive feedback on the program. It synthesises the different capacity building efforts of organisations and helps to develop a joint capacity building plan including initial thoughts on program management.

This NGO Capacity Building Co-ordination Workshop builds on the results from capacity planning workshops of the organisations. Some parts of this section are based upon Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Group Facilitation Methods developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

This NGO Co-ordination event is designed as a one-day workshop to do with a group of NGOs. This Chapter presents the preparations for the workshop and the steps for each session. It uses some of the materials in the Appendices and files on the PCB cd-rom.
6.2 Preparations and Program Overview

Preparing the NGOs

At this stage most of the participating NGOs will have gone through the Participatory Capacity Assessment and Feedback and Planning Workshops. Some of them might not yet have done an Implementation Planning. We assume the NGOs are aware of the capacity building program, which includes several organisations from one or more NGO sectors.

It is important on beforehand to explain the value of the co-ordination workshop to the participating organisations. This event will allow them to meet new NGOs and see how best they can benefit from strengths of others and how they may be able to assist other NGOs in capacity building.

For maximum results it is key to have the right participants to be present at the workshop. These should be people who have been part of the earlier stages and who have a clear overview of the capacity in their respective organisations. Typical participants would be program managers, managers or directors. 2 participants from each organisation would be ideal, for them to consult each other on issues during the workshop.

As part of the preparation the facilitating organisation could send out information forms to collect some general data from each NGO that can be compiled in a report or forthcoming capacity building proposal. An example of such a questionnaire can be found in the appendix J. and on the PCB cd-rom.

Needed Materials

- 20+ empty flip charts
- Markers (brown, green, blue) for all participants
- At least 50 empty half sheets as empty cards for brainstorming
- “Sticky Wall” / or other means of presenting and grouping cards with ideas (e.g. using masking tape, adhesive spray mount etc.)
- Copies of the PCA reports and Feedback and Planning Workshop documents of all organisations

Flip charts and papers to be prepared

- Workshop Program
- “The Process”, “Workshop Objectives” and “Ground Rules”
- 3 empty sheets with questions for the reflection of the process
- 8 coloured Symbol cards for grouping, tag-naming and naming the capacity building objectives
- Make workshop instruction cards: “one idea per card”, “write big”, “3-7 words per idea”
- 4 empty sheets with instructions for the group discussions on Program Management
### Program Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Reflection of Capacity Building process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Synthesising Strategic Capacity Building Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>Developing a Joint Capacity Building Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>Discussing Program Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Closing Reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3 Overview: NGO Capacity Building Co-ordination Workshop

**Rational Aim:** To reflect on the Capacity Building process and to co-ordinate capacity building interventions by developing a joint plan.

**Experiential Aim:** To feel part of a larger capacity building program and to create commitment for and ownership of collaborative actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>** INTRODUCTION AND REFLECTION (pages 95-96) **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction to workshop. Where are we now, objectives and ground rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small group reflections on the process so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plenary presentation of small group work and recommendations for the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYNTHESIZING CAPACITY BUILDING DIRECTIONS (pages 97-98)**

1. **Focus question:** What are the key capacity building objectives of our joint program?
2. Brainstorming capacity building activities.
3. Grouping the ideas according to similar intents.
4. Naming the clusters into capacity building objectives.
5. Reflecting on the results.

**DEVELOPING A JOINT PROGRAM (page 99)**

1. Context, explaining parts of the program.
2. Defining the overall goal of program.
3. Developing optional intervention methods.
4. Discussing indicators of success for program objectives.

**DISCUSSING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (pages 100)**

1. Explaining different parts of program management.
2. Small group work to develop program values, management responsibilities, information sharing and commitments.
3. Presentation of small group work and recommendations.

**REFLECTION & NEXT STEPS**

Let’s take some time to reflect on today’s work.

1. What were some of the highlights of the workshop?
2. Where were you less involved?
3. What is important about today’s work?
4. Look at the workshop objectives: have they been achieved?
5. How will we document this result?
6. What are the next steps?

Thank you for your participation!

**Total time: 7 hours 15 minutes (including breaks)**
6.3.1 Introduction to NGO Capacity Building Co-ordination Workshop

In 15 minutes cover the following:
1. Welcome, introduce participants and process so far
2. Workshop Objectives
3. Ground rules

1. Welcome

Have all participants briefly introduce themselves and their organisation. It might be helpful for the participants to also share with the group the parts of the capacity building process their organisation went through.

Process so far

Since the capacity building process started the following activities have been done with the organisations:

- Participatory Capacity Assessment: self-assessment of each NGO’s Capacity;
- Analysing and Reporting Participatory Capacity Assessment Scores, done by the facilitating organisation;
- Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop: reflection on results and strategic capacity planning by each NGOs;
- Implementation Planning: practical planning of capacity building activities by each NGO.

After this workshop we will try to develop a comprehensive capacity building plan for all the participating NGOs and implement the agreed follow up actions.

2. Objectives

The objectives for this NGO Capacity Building Co-ordination Workshop are:

- To reflect on the Participatory Capacity Building process.
- For all involved NGOs to get to know each other.
- To get clarity on expectations of collaborative capacity building program.
- To synthesise and co-ordinate capacity building interventions.
- To define concrete strategies of how to work together.
- To develop the general outline for a collaborative capacity building plan.
- To develop parameters for management of the capacity building program.
- To get commitment to participate in the program and decide on the first steps.

3. Ground rules

In order for the workshop to be successful the participants needs to be open for discussion and sharing of ideas.

Some ground rules for participants we would like to propose:

- Participate in the discussions and brainstorm sessions
- Leave space for others to contribute
- (add more ground rules from the group)
6.3.2 Reflection on Participatory Capacity Building Process

Process overview

Context
In this session we want to reflect on the process so far. This will make us remember all the steps we went through to allow us to plan for collaborative action later. This reflection also will give us hints and clues on how we can work together more effectively in the future.

Instructions
Three groups will work on a reflection of different aspects of the process:
A. Capacity Assessment Workshop and the report;
B. Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop and the report;
C. Roles of facilitating organisation and of participating NGOs.

Small group work
Divide the whole group in 3 subgroups. For the subgroup on the Feedback and Planning Workshop: make sure that participants in this group have actually gone through this process. The three groups receive reflection questions for group discussions (see right). Note that not all of the questions need to be answered on flip chart for presentations. The other questions are simply to make the group focus.

Plenary presentation
Small groups present their reflections to the plenary. Ask for questions of clarity and any additions from the whole group. The reflections will be documented by the facilitating organisation and the recommendations can be used in the session on Program Management.

(total time: 1 hour 15 minutes)

Small group instructions

Prepare the following reflection questions for the small groups:

A. Capacity Assessment Workshop and the report
- What were the steps of the workshop and the parts of the report?
- What did you like most on the workshop and report?
- What didn’t you like?
- What made the workshop successful? (write answers on flip chart)
- What are recommendations to improve the workshop or reporting? (write answers on flip chart)

B. Feedback and Capacity Planning Workshop and the report
- What were the steps of the workshop and the parts of the report?
- What did you like most on the workshop and report?
- What didn’t you like?
- What made the workshop successful? (write answers on flip chart)
- What are recommendations to improve the workshop or reporting? (write answers on flip chart)

C. Roles of facilitating organisation and of participating NGOs
- What were the different roles and responsibilities of the facilitating organisation and the NGOs? (write answers on flip chart)
- Where did both parties do well?
- Where could they improve?
- What are recommendations about the different roles in future? (write answers on flip chart).

Discuss in small groups, report to plenary by presenting 1 flip chart.
6.3.3 Synthesising the Capacity Building Directions

**CONTEXT**

1. Purpose of this session is to synthesise the capacity building directions of NGOs and set the joint program objectives.

2. Highlight the Workshop Question: *What are the key capacity building objectives of our program?*

3. Briefly outline the process and time frame of the session.

4. Have the participants read their capacity assessment reports and feedback and capacity planning workshop reports.

   [30 minutes]

**Workshop Question:** What are the key capacity building objectives of our program?

**Rational Aim:** To synthesise the capacity building directions of NGOs and set the joint program objectives.

**Experiential Aim:** To feel the joint program will be based on different directions of all participating NGOs.

**BRAINSTORM**

1. Have the people list up to 8-10 key capacity building directions or actions for their organisation. Select 5 most important ideas.

2. Meet in mini-teams to share ideas and write each capacity building direction or action on a card. (35-45 are needed from the whole group.) Write 1 idea per card, write big and 3-7 words.

3. Pass up first round of clearest cards.

   [15 minutes]

**GROUP**

1. Form 4-6 pairs that clearly go together. Look for cards with similar intent.

2. Ask for cards that are different and develop clusters.

3. Discern the objective of each cluster of capacity building directions and actions by quickly naming the column with a 1-2 word tag name.

4. Mark remaining cards with tag and pass up.

   [15 minutes]

**NAME**

1. Talk through the largest cluster first. Ask: “what is our common objective here? What do we want to achieve?”

2. Give the cluster a 3-5 word name or title, which answers the Focus Question.

3. Repeat naming process for remaining clusters, working to the smallest cluster. If energy level is low, have mini-teams develop names.

   [20 minutes]

**RESOLVE**

1. Focus the group on this consensus by reading all the title cards.

2. Which of these titles is most vivid for you? Which is hardest to imagine / fuzziest?

3. What is the significance of the change we have described?

4. Discuss the next steps.

   Next we will make an outline of our capacity building program.

[10 minutes]

**Total time:** 1 hour 30 minutes
**Synthesising the capacity building directions**

**Facilitating the session**

**Context**
Starting point of this exercise are the realities and intentions of the participating NGOs: the results of the assessment workshops and the strategic directions from the feedback and capacity planning workshop. Have all participants spend some time on reading through the reports of these workshops (bring copies of all reports to the workshop!).

**Brainstorm**
Ask the group to list the capacity building directions and key actions of their organisation. Participants who did not yet go through the planning session: brainstorm capacity building activities for the organisation based on the assessment results. What are the weakest capacity areas? Which actions may tackle these weaknesses?

**Group**
Group the cards with ideas according to similar intention or accomplishment. Some actions or directions might be of similar method (e.g. training) but might have completely different intentions. Group them according to their intent rather than by similar type or method.

**Name**
Name the capacity building objective of the columns. Use perfect tense for creating names: describe the capacity as it has been built. E.g. Improved publicity and awareness of the organisations.

**Resolve**
Reflect on the consensus by conducting a short focused conversation.

This session uses the "Consensus Workshop Method", a process that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Group Facilitation Methods (GFM), developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

**Visual Overview**

An example of a visual outcome of this session could look like:

| Improved publicity and awareness of organizations & Improved access to information |
| Improved participation by stakeholders at all program levels |
| Increased effectiveness and efficiency by improved relations between board and staff |
| Increased Financial Sustainability |
| Increased capacities and motivated staff |

- **Improve publicity of programs**
- **Mainstream HIV/AIDS in all programs**
- **Increased Financial Sustainability**
- **Decrease in fundraising**
- **Increased capacities and motivated staff**

- **Develop mangt. info systems**
- **Mainstream gender at community levels**
- **Strategic planning for board and staff**
- **Developing and implementing oper. policies**
- **Increased program focus on networking & improved understanding on benefits of networking**

| Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation |
| Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation |
| Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation |
| Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation |
| Improved efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation |

- **Increasing efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation**
- **Improved program focus on networking & improved understanding on benefits of networking**
- **Increased capacities and motivated staff**
- **Increased program focus on networking & improved understanding on benefits of networking**
- **Increased capacities and motivated staff**

**Participatory Capacity Building**

© The Institute of Cultural Affairs, 2003
**6.3.4 Developing a Joint Capacity Building Program**

**1. Context**

In the previous session we defined the capacity building objectives based on the different assessments and plans of the organisations. In this session we will try to develop the general outline of the joint capacity building program. At this point we will not yet design the program in full detail, but we want to get some recommendations for those who will work on a program document.

**2. Program Goal**

Looking at our project objectives, we now also can determine an overall objective or goal for the program. What will be the wider development purpose that our capacity building program wants to contribute to? This might involve an intended change for the target groups of the participating NGOs. The time frame is usually longer that the program itself.

What will be the benefits of the NGOs when the objectives will be achieved? What will be the impact on their target groups?

Define 1-3 goals for the capacity building program.

Examples from previous co-ordination workshops are:
- Peace, prosperity + justice for our target groups
- Empowered organisations at all levels
- Recognised NGOs by stakeholders

**3. Intervention Methods**

After defining the goals and objectives of the program we now can look into specific interventions to achieve these objectives. In the synthesising session the group already brainstormed action and strategies for capacity building. What were different types of methods that were mentioned there? Which seem to be the most important interventions for our program?

When we develop a more detailed and comprehensive proposal for capacity building, which intervention methods do we recommend to be included?

Examples from previous co-ordination workshops are:
- Training events
- Meetings and discussions
- Attachment of staff in NGOs
- Exchange visits
- Policy procedures and manuals
- Information dissemination

**4. Indicators of success**

Looking at our program objectives, what would be possible indicators of success? Which seem to be the most important ones? How do we like to measure them?

Examples from previous co-ordination workshops are:
- Reduced number of conflicts in NGOs
- Alternatives to operating on deficit
- Increased number of strategic alliances
- Increased availability of information
- Decreased staff turnover
- Increased number of successful projects

**Total Time: 1 hour**
### 6.3.5 Discussing Program Management

#### Process overview

**Context**
In this session we want focus on the management of the joint capacity building program. It is important to get some level of consensus on collaboration and on how roles and responsibilities will be shared. It is up to the participating NGOs to make recommendations.

**Instructions**
Four groups will discuss different parts of program management:
- A. Operating Values:
- B. Roles and Responsibilities;
- C. Monitoring and Evaluation;
- D. Commitments.

**Small group work**
Divide the whole group in 4 subgroups. The groups receive specific questions for group discussions (see right).

**Plenary presentation**
Small groups present their group work to the plenary. Ask for questions of clarity and any additional recommendations from the whole group. Push for consensus on important issues.

These discussions and recommendations will be used to formulate a more comprehensive capacity building document or proposal including implementing activities and program structure.

Next we will reflect on today's workshop and decide on Next steps (see page 94).

*total time: 1 hour 30 minutes*

---

#### Small group instructions

Prepare the following questions for the small groups:

**A. Operating Values**
- What are some operating values we want to uphold while implementing the program? *How do we want us to work together?*
- Some ground rules...
- Which of these are the most important ones, we can all commit ourselves to?

**B. Roles and Responsibilities**
- *This group can use the recommendations on roles and responsibilities from the first morning session on reflection of the process.*
- What are the general tasks or responsibilities in program management?
- Who would be responsible for them?
- What kind of organisational or governing structure do we propose for the program?

**C. Program information and Monitoring & Evaluation**
- What types of information or documentation of the program activities would you like to be shared?
- Who will be responsible for this?
- How do we monitor progress and evaluate the effectiveness of the program?

**D. Commitments**
- What are the participating organisations committed to?
- What is the facilitating organisation committed to?
- How do we ensure we will live up to these responsibilities?
7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building
7.1 Introduction

There is much debate and mystification about Monitoring and Evaluation in general and for Capacity Building in particular. How can we practically measure the progress and impact of capacity building in NGOs?

Main purpose of using Monitoring and Evaluation in Participatory Capacity Building is to create maximum learning out of the process. Monitoring and Evaluation are proposed to be systematically contributing to capacity building itself: to create stronger organisations that understand themselves better and that are capable of using internal information to adapt capacity building strategies.

In Participatory Capacity Building we focus mainly on qualitative and subjective methods of monitoring and evaluation. Although the initial Participatory Capacity Assessment (using POET) provides “hard statistical evidence” of the organisation’s capacity these remain the subjective perceptions and judgements of the people involved. The results mainly refer to indicators, which cannot easily be quantified.

Although some people might like to see more quantifiable and objective indicators being used this calls for a great deal of caution. Very often the ‘wrong’ objectively verifiable indicators might be chosen, which do not tell us anything about the real issues in the organisation. You might end up collecting massive amounts of useless data, without keeping in mind our focus question: what provides most learning to the organisation?

This chapter tries to demystify Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building by providing some tools to develop capacity indicators, to manage capacity building follow-ups, to facilitate focused qualitative evaluation sessions and to guide a more comprehensive Participatory Capacity Building Impact Assessment using the general methodology from the Participatory Capacity Assessment.

Tools in this chapter build on the results from capacity planning of an organisation. Some of the methods used in this chapter are based upon the Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Project Management processes developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). It uses some of the materials in the Appendices and files on the PCB cd-rom.
7.2 Developing a Monitoring and Evaluation System

Introduction

Before implementation of capacity building activities a system for monitoring and evaluation should be developed. Such a system may include indicators of capacity building, means of verification, sharing of monitoring responsibilities, ways of documentation, timing of feedback cycles and planning of impact assessment.

The Monitoring and Evaluation System should be comprehensive in the sense that it must cover the different levels of the intervention: efficiency of the used inputs and outputs, effectiveness of the results and impact of the whole intervention. At the same time the system should not add too much new workload on the shoulders of the involved staff.

Since many organisations already have systems for monitoring and evaluation of projects it might be difficult to convince them of the need to develop yet another M&E system. The time and energy put into it must be proportional to the benefits and learning of the organisation. Therefore we propose that whenever possible the organisation should try and use data that is already collected for other purposes.

This process of developing a system for monitoring and evaluation of capacity building can be facilitated in group sessions or being done as assignments for different task forces or sub-groups. Following are some facilitator’s instructions to be used in the different steps of the process. They may be tailored to the specific situation a facilitator finds himself in.

As part of the Monitoring and Evaluation System we propose a full Participatory Capacity Assessment should be done at the end of a Capacity Building Process. This can be the start of a new cycle.

1. Formulate indicators of success

Objective of this step is to develop appropriate measurable indicators of success and means of verification that will allow the organisation to track progress of capacity building making use of available sources of information.

Main activity in this step is to define appropriate indicators of success and means of verification for the Strategic Capacity Building Directions.

Indicators of success should be SMART:
- Specific: concrete about the quality of output or effect we desire;
- Measurable: concrete about the quantity of the output or effect;
- Appropriate: linked to the specific strategic direction or capacity area;
- Realistic: attainable by capacity building in real terms, not an illusion;
- Time specific: concrete about the time when the indicator must be achieved.

Focus of the indicators for monitoring and evaluation is on the Capacity Building Directions and Implementation Plans that are formulated in the Feedback and Planning Workshop and Implementation Planning Workshop.

Each Strategic Capacity Building Direction was made up out of several action arenas (see example on page 76). For each direction the organisation formulated implementation plans (3-year and 1-year timelines, see example on page 86), which included a “Victory”. The Victories consists of the results that will be accomplished by the particular strategic direction. These may be specified and refined as indicators of success.
Facilitator’s instructions: 
Indicators of Success and Means of Verification

- Have people work in groups focusing on one strategic capacity building direction.
- Each group discusses the intention of the strategic direction and action arenas, as well as the “Victories” from the implementation plan that they try to accomplish. Discuss which capacity areas are covered by this strategic direction.
- Reach consensus in the group on 5-10 indicators of success for that strategic direction. Try to be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic and Time specific.
- For each indicator define the means of verification. This should include the method of data collection, the type of ‘documentation’ it produces and the people involved.
- Have indicators of success and means of verification presented to the capacity building group or staff.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction:</th>
<th>Build strong network relationships for sustainable projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory:</td>
<td>To see high target group participation in sustainable projects supported by valuable network relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of success:</th>
<th>Means of verification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. After 1 year to have the needed policies and skills in place for effective partnering</td>
<td>1. Policy documents of management; qualitative evaluation of skills of involved program officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After 1 year to have the needed policies and skills in place for Participatory Project Management.</td>
<td>2. Policy documents of management; qualitative evaluation of skills of project officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After 3 years to be positively evaluated by at least 80% of the target groups on their level of participation.</td>
<td>3. Participatory evaluations of involved project communities by project staff (as part of regular 3-year evaluation system.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. After 3 years to see an increase of 200% in the number of active community groups</td>
<td>4. Existing annual project evaluations done by project staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. After 3 years to have 5 new effective and active strategic alliances.</td>
<td>5. Partnership documents in place; qualitative evaluation meetings with partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Develop Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

Objective of this step is to create an overview of monitoring and evaluation activities at different levels of the capacity building process and get clarity on the roles and responsibilities of involved staff.

The following categories of monitoring and evaluation activities can be helpful to create this overview:

- Primary data collection: interviews, observation, etc.;
- Secondary data collection: reviewing existing reports or evaluations;
- Progress meetings: meetings to follow-up activities, review efficiency and share data;
- Qualitative monitoring & evaluation: meetings to determine the level of effect and impact of activities based on judgement of participants.

Facilitator’s instructions:

- Categorise the different means of verification into monitoring & evaluation activities of the same methodology.
- For each strategic capacity building direction, put the activities on a timeline, starting with the first year (compare: 1-year timeline of Implementation Planning, page 86).
- Specify the different people who will be involved in the activities.
- Agree on the main responsible person for monitoring and evaluation of each strategic capacity building direction.
- Share monitoring and evaluation plans within the organisation.
### Introduction

The capacity building process is ongoing and dynamic. For the process to be successful there is need for regular updates of information, co-ordination and resolve of issues.

This calls for regular meetings to follow-up activities. These meetings may also be used to develop certain capacity areas, induce specific skills or knowledge or to do qualitative monitoring and evaluation.

These meetings should not just be gatherings of people who share their bits and then return to business as usual. Follow-up meetings must be inspiring learning events that will maintain the momentum of capacity building.

Follow-up meetings need thorough preparation and facilitation. On the next page you find a general format for a follow-up meeting that can be tailored to specific situations.

As for the frequency of follow-up meetings, this should of course be in conjunction with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. However, as a rule of thumb capacity building follow-up meetings could be held on a quarterly basis to keep the momentum, to see to it that activities take place and to show that capacity building is taken seriously.

This session uses the “Follow-up Meeting”, a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Project Management (PPM), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA).

### Preparation

#### 1. Setting of agenda

Obviously the first step in the preparation will be to explore issues that need to be discussed and to set the agenda for the meeting. Input for this will come from the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, as well as from other members of the capacity building team.

#### 2. Setting the objectives

For each part of the meeting there is need to clarify the objectives:

- **Rational Aim**: What is the outcome or product you expect from each part of the meeting?
- **Experiential Aim**: What is the intended inner impact of each part? How do you want the participants to experience the meeting?

#### 3. Inviting the participants

Given the set agenda, who needs to participate in the meeting in order to reach the rational and experiential aims? These might be the usual capacity building team members with additional guests.

#### 4. Preparing the process

Given the set rational and experiential aims the facilitator should carefully choose specific methods for each part. These may be focused conversations, consensus workshops, presentations, qualitative monitoring & evaluation, team study, practice, role-playing etc. The facilitator may very well delegate some parts to co-facilitators or team members.

#### 5. Practical preparations

Make sure that all materials are available and the meeting space set up conveniently.
**CONTEXT**

*Set the Stage*

1. Review Agenda of Meeting.
2. Add items from capacity building team members or task groups.
3. Brief focused conversation as check-in:
   - What were highlights since the past meeting?
   - Where did members feel discouraged?
   - What are the major issues on the agenda?
   - What are some of the anticipations for the meeting?

[8 minutes]

**Rational Aim**: Exchange capacity building team updates and information, co-ordinate as needed, resolve issues and agree on next steps.

**Experiential Aim**: Be inspired by the progress, motivated to continue and confident of success.

**TRACKING THE ACTIONS**

*Get Informed*

1. Capacity building teams / Sub-group reports.
2. Actions initiated since the last meeting.
3. Accomplishments.
4. Blocks or challenges.
5. Breakthroughs.
6. Needed focus.

[30 minutes]

**MOVING THE PROCESS FORWARD**

*Addressing the Issues*

The heart of the meeting involves whatever is needed for the capacity building team to move ahead. This might include:

- Sub-group work;
- A consensus workshop (e.g. to develop new directions, to do further analysis, preparing a report or policy paper etc.);
- Qualitative monitoring and evaluation;
- Research;
- Training.

[60 minutes]

**FINAL CHECK SIGNALS**

*Determine the Actions*

1. Assignments.
2. Next meeting.
3. Announcements.

[15 minutes]

**RESOLVE**

*Confirm the Resolve*

Brief focused conversation on the meeting and the team’s accomplishments and anticipations:

1. Focus the group by reviewing the agenda and listing the commitments made in the meeting.
2. Where were you really involved in today’s meeting?
3. Where was energy low?
4. What is something new you learned today?
5. What is the major accomplishment of this meeting?
6. To what extent did we achieve our objectives and anticipations?
7. What is missing?
8. What are next steps?

[7 minutes]

Total time: 2 hours
7.4 Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation

**Introduction**

In the capacity building process different types of monitoring and evaluation activities will take place. Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation is a participatory way to evaluate the performance or effect of any part of the capacity building.

The process focuses on one aspect or indicator only and it takes a group through a process of marking and commenting this particular aspect. The end product is a balanced group report including ways forward.

Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation workshops may be held with any group of participants involved in the capacity building activities. They can be staff of the organisation, but also community groups or target groups of the NGO’s projects.

An outline and example of a Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop can be found on the next pages.

This session uses the “Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop”, a session that is part of Technology of Participation® (ToP®) Participatory Project Management (PPM), a process developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). The tool is based on the “H-form”, a method for monitoring and evaluation, developed by Andrew S. Inglis, PLA-Notes 34, February 1999.

**Preparation**

1. **Clarifying the topic**

   First step in the preparation is to choose and clarify the topic, that is the indicator of success than needs to be monitored or evaluated. Indicators will already be specified in the Monitoring and Evaluation System, but in the course of the capacity building process new topics may have come up.

   *For example the indicator of success “After 1 year to have the needed policies and skills in place for effective partnering” can be evaluated in a workshop.*

2. **Define the scope workshop**

   After choosing the topic or indicator it must be clear what will be the boundaries of the monitoring and evaluation exercise: which activities or products are subject to the exercise; who were involved?

   *For example to monitor and evaluate the partnering the workshop may specifically deal with the newly developed policies and procedures on partnerships and the training of management and staff on partnering, lobbying and advocacy.*

3. **Invite participants**

   Given the subject and scope of the workshop, who should be participating in the monitoring and evaluation exercise?

4. **Prepare the facts**

   To enable the participants to give an “objective” judgement it is important to collect supporting information that provides some background to the subject.

   *For example an abstract of new policy papers on partnering may be included or an overview of training results can be prepared.*
## CONTEXT

**Set the Stage**

1. State the purpose or aim of the qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop.
2. Briefly outline the process and time frame of the workshop.
3. Set the topic of the evaluation and direct the group’s thinking by introducing the topic and workshop question.
4. Introduce the “facts” of the topic: what strategic capacity building direction is the indicator part of? What activities have taken place? What are products that are result of the activities?
5. Have all individuals place their individual score on the 0-10 score line.
   
   [20 minutes]

## OVERVIEW: QUALITATIVE MONITORING & EVALUATION

### Rational Aim:

To evaluate an indicator of success and make recommendations to the process.

### Experiential Aim:

To create commitment and ownership to the Capacity Building Process.

## BRAINSTORM

**Generate Ideas**

1. Individually list 3-5 negative and 3-5 positive reasons for their score. Select most important 2 positive and negative reasons.
2. Meet in mini-teams to share ideas and write each reason on a card.
   
   (10-20 positive and negative ideas are needed from the whole group.) Write 1 idea per card, write big and 3-7 words.
   
   [15 minutes]

## GROUP

**Form New Relationships**

1. Pass up first round of clearest positive reasons (right side).
2. Form 2-5 pairs of similar reasons.
3. Ask for cards that are different and develop groups.
4. Discern focus of each group of negative reasons by quickly giving a 1-2 word tag.
5. Mark remaining cards with tag and pass up.
6. Continue same process for negative reasons (left side).

   [20 minutes]

## CONCLUDE

**Discern the Consensus**

1. Have the group to decide on a group score based on all opinions.
2. As a group, brainstorm ways forward, in which the capacity can be improved.
3. Discuss ways forward and decide about next steps to be taken.

   [20 minutes]

## RESOLVE

**Confirm the Resolve**

1. Focus the group by reading all the title cards of negative and positive reasons, the group score and ways forward.
2. What seems the most critical about this topic?
3. What made you feel appreciated?
4. What appears to be the central issue in this area of capacity building?
5. So, just what have we decided?
6. Who will record these outcomes?

   [15 minutes]

---

Total time: 1 hour 30 minutes
Facilitating the Qualitative Monitoring & Evaluation Workshop

Context
In the workshop context the topic or indicator of success should be clarified to the group. Together with the group the workshop question is then formulated. A quick presentation about the “facts” of the particular topic can be given. At this stage all participants mark their individual scores along the score line: how do they mark the indicator on a 0-10 scale?

Brainstorm
Objective is to generate many points that support or bring down the score. Individual brainstorming followed by small team work seems to be most helpful to create a variety of ideas that are already shared between participants.

Grouping
The participants do not have to agree or disagree with any of the reasons that people have brought up. Key is to gain more insight and understand the different opinions by grouping them and giving them a quick tag name.

Conclude
Discerning the consensus about the score and deciding the ways forward should be easy when all opinions are already shared and discussed. This part of the session can also differ according to the specific aim of the workshop.

Resolve
Allow the group to step back, look at the results and reflect upon the decisions taken.

Visual Overview of the Qualitative M&E Workshop

These outcomes can easily be transferred into a report without losing any detail or changing any words or symbols people have used to record their own views and ideas. This can be done on a single flip chart paper or drawing it on A4.

With smaller groups (2-10 people) a single flip chart paper with adhesive “post its” notes can be used for this workshop instead of the ‘sticky wall’. On the flip chart a “H-shape” can be drawn to create the spaces for scoring, negative and positive reasons and ways forward.
### 7.5 Participatory Capacity Building Impact Assessment

#### Introduction

After about a year it is necessary to do a more comprehensive evaluation of the effect and impact of the Capacity Building activities. For this exercise a series of Qualitative Monitoring and Evaluation workshops may be held, with each of the 7 capacity areas as single topics. This would allow the organisation to score the effect of activities in each specific capacity area, analysing the positive and negative aspects of it and looking at ways to improve the capacity in the future.

Another way of doing an impact assessment would be to use the original Participatory Capacity Assessment results as a point of reference to assess whether improvement in capacity areas has been made. In this section we present the outline for this workshop, which builds on the methodology used in the Participatory Capacity Assessment.

This Participatory Capacity Building Impact Assessment may be repeated on a yearly basis.

After a period of about 3 years (or at the end of the planned activities) it is needed to repeat a full Participatory Capacity Assessment, followed by a new Feedback and Planning Workshop and Implementation Planning Workshop. This will give new input to the ongoing capacity building efforts of the organisation. Refer to Chapters 2. and 3. for these processes.

#### Preparing the NGO

The Impact Assessment should be part of the developed Monitoring and Evaluation System. The staff involved in the capacity building activities has been part of ongoing follow-up meetings and other monitoring and evaluation activities.

In order to be ready for the Impact Assessment information on the different implemented activities of all the Strategic Capacity Building Directions must be available. To make a balanced Impact Assessment it is therefore needed to have the key informants about the activities present at the assessment.

Other participants to be invited can be members of the management and board or people from peer organisations of the capacity building cohort.
Practical Preparations

Needed Materials
- 20+ empty flip charts
- Markers (brown, green, blue) for all participants
- At least 50 empty half sheets as empty cards for recommendations
- “Sticky Wall” or other means of presenting and grouping cards with ideas (e.g. using masking tape, adhesive spray mount etc.)
- Impact Assessment Questionnaires and Impact Score Sheets copied for all participants (see appendix K. and L. or cd-rom).

Flip charts to be prepared
- Introduction
- Objectives and anticipations
- Ground rules
- Overview of Strategic Capacity Building Directions and Action Arenas
- For the context of impact assessment of each capacity area: an overview with the items in that capacity area, the Capacity Score (from the initial Participatory Capacity Assessment) and the analysis of the PCA results (from the Feedback and Planning Workshop report).

Workshop Program

8.30 Welcome and Introduction
9.00 Assessment 1: Human Resource Management
10.30 Break
10.45 Assessment 3: Equitable Participation
11.30 Assessment 4: Sustainability of Program Benefits
12.15 Assessment 5: Partnering
13.00 Lunch
14.00 Assessment 6: Organisational Learning
14.45 Assessment 7: Governance / Strategic Management
15.30 Break
15.45 Ways Forward in Capacity Building
16.30 Closing Reflection
7.5.1 Introduction to Impact Assessment

In 30 minutes cover the following topics:
1. Introduction of the Impact Assessment
2. Objectives of the workshop
3. Ground rules
4. Context to the process

1. Introduction

Capacity is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

Capacity areas of our organisation that we have considered are:
- Human Resource Management: how we deal with staff
- Financial Resource Management: getting and dealing with money
- Equitable Participation: involvement of target groups
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: how our projects impact
- Partnering: effective liaisons with other stakeholders
- Organisational Learning: sharing and learning from information
- Strategic Management / Governance: looking at the bigger picture

Since the beginning of our Capacity Building program we have been working in most of these areas to improve our level of capacity.

This impact assessment is to establish what progress we have made looking at the activities in all capacity areas and assessing the effect of them on our organisational capacity. Focus is on the effect or impact that our efforts have had on our work, and not so much on evaluation of capacity building activities itself.

2. Objectives and Anticipations

Objectives of this Participatory Capacity Building Impact Assessment:
- To review Capacity Building activities;
- To assess the impact on the organisation’s capacity areas;
- To make recommendations for Strategic Capacity Building Directions;
- To make recommendations for Implementation Planning.

Write down the group’s anticipations for the impact assessment on a flip chart. Both the objectives and the anticipations will be checked in the closing reflection.

3. Ground rules

In order for the impact assessment to be successful the group needs to be open for discussion and sharing of ideas.

Some ground rules for participants we would like to propose:
- Participate in the discussions
- Leave space for others to contribute
- Be open and sincere about the effect and impact of activities on the organisations capacity
- Base your impact scores on your own experiences, opinions and reflections of group discussions
- (add more ground rules from the group)

Everything that will be said during the discussions must be regarded as confidential. All impact scores will be handled with strict anonymity.
4. Context to the process

During the assessment we will discuss and assess the impact on each of the 7 capacity areas in the same way. The assessment of each capacity area will take about 30 minutes.

First step is to look back at our initial Participatory Capacity Assessment results. What was the capacity score of this area and what did it mean?

Second step is to establish the link between the capacity area and the Strategic Capacity Building Directions. This will allow us to see which activities have taken place to build the capacity in this area. We will discuss which activities went on well and also where we found difficulties on our way.

Third step is to define the major accomplishments of the activities: what positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area? Here we also want to discuss other factors that might have contributed positively and negatively to our capacity in this area.

Finally the group will be asked to score the impact on the specific capacity area on their scoring sheets.

After the discussions we will also make recommendations for future capacity building activities.

During discussions some notes on flip chart will be made for quick referral. Everybody is encouraged to contribute to the group discussion. Please try to stay focused to the specific topic at hand since other topics will probably be dealt with later.

Make sure all participants have a copy of the Impact Assessment Questionnaire and Impact Scoring Sheet (see appendix K. and L. and the PCB cd-rom).

Scoring Sheets

After each discussion we will all individually score the impact of the capacity building efforts on the capacity area using the scores sheets.

The question for scoring is: **What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on this capacity area?**

Use the following scale to establish your score:

1. The Capacity has severely decreased
2. The Capacity as decreased
3. The Capacity has remained more or less the same
4. The Capacity in this area has improved
5. The Capacity has very much improved

So, for instance after the discussions on Human Resource Management, if you feel the capacity in this area has remained more or less the same you might give this item a ”3” on your scoring sheet:

These scores are given individually and anonymously after the group discussion. The scoring team will calculate the group scores from the individual scores.
## 7.5.2 Impact Assessment of Capacity Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>OVERVIEW OF IMPACT ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>RESOLVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduce the capacity area by reading through the different items that make up the area.</td>
<td>Rational Aim: To evaluate the impact of capacity building activities in one capacity area and make initial recommendations.</td>
<td>1. Discuss the group impact score: does it seem reflect the discussions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What was the initial capacity score for this area?</td>
<td>Experiential Aim: To create inspiration for and learning on capacity building efforts.</td>
<td>2. As a group, brainstorm ways forward, in which the capacity can be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which capacity items scored very high and which very low?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Write these recommendations on ½ sheets: 1 idea per card, 3-7 words per recommendation, write big.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What was the analysis made during the feedback and planning workshop?</td>
<td></td>
<td>These recommendations will be used in our final discussions on ways forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERVIEW OF CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES

1. Which strategic capacity building direction(s) is this capacity area part of?
2. Brainstorm all the capacity activities that have taken place in this area over the past year on a flip chart.
3. Discuss about the activities: which went on well, which were difficult.

### DETERMINE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. What are outcomes that are result of the activities?
2. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
3. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
4. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

### ESTABLISH IMPACT

1. Looking at the initial capacity score in this capacity area, what has been the impact from the capacity building activities?
2. Have all individuals make their individual scores on the score sheets.
3. Calculate the group impact score.

Total time: 45 minutes
IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF CAPACITY AREAS

Facilitating the Impact Assessment of Capacity Areas

Context

- It is critical that participants are familiar with the items in the capacity area that is being discussed.
- It is sometimes helpful to have participants read through the items of a capacity area in the Impact Assessment Questionnaire individually, in pairs or as a group.
- Be sure to have a copy of the initial Participatory Capacity Assessment results at hand, including the analysis made during the feedback and planning workshop. It might be helpful to present a summary of the scores and analysis on a flip-chart or hand out.

Overview of Capacity Building Activities

- Here we focus on the relationship between the particular capacity area and the Strategic Capacity Building Directions. It might be helpful to have an overview of the strategic directions and the different action arenas at hand.
- Brainstorm of the implemented activities can also be done by reviewing quarterly or annual reports or by presentations of capacity building team members responsible for this area.
- Briefly discuss the activities: what went well and what was difficult? At this point this is simply to provide some more background information, without making a thorough analysis.

Determine accomplishments

- Emphasis is on the effect of the activities rather than the mere outputs or results of them. What did they mean to our capacity in this area?
- Also other contributing factors should be explored as well as the current level of capacity in this area: critical issues or problems.

Establish Impact

- In this step it is critical that all members are well informed to score the impact of the activities on the capacity in this area. When the discussions have provided sufficient information, members can directly put their individual scores on their score sheets.
- Have participants make their scores on the score sheet as well as on a separate piece of paper. Collect these scores immediately and calculate the group score by adding up all the scores, dividing the total by the number of participants and then multiplying the outcome by 20. You now have the total standardised impact score for this capacity area. For example: if the total of all individual scores in one area is 28 and there are 8 participants the calculation of the Impact Score is \((28 / 8 = 3.5) \times 20 = 70\).
- At a later stage the facilitator or scoring team can use the PCB Impact Calculator to verify this Impact Score and to calculate the consensus score (see the last part of this section).

Resolve

- Briefly discuss the group impact score to see if it reflects the initial discussions. This is simply to acknowledge the diversity of viewpoints and common judgements.
- The recommendations made at this point will give input to the part on ways forward to make specific changes in Strategic Capacity Building Directions or proposals for Implementation Plans.
### 7.5.3 Planning Ways Forward in Capacity Building

**Grouping the Recommendations**

Objective of this part is to synthesise the different recommendations according to similar strategic capacity building directions.

- Review the different strategic capacity building directions and action arenas: are they clear to everyone?
- Divide all cards with recommendations over 3-5 sub-groups. Give each group a “mix” of recommendations from different capacity areas.
- Pass up a first round of clearest cards from each group and put them randomly on the wall. Ask for questions of clarity.
- Have the participants cluster the recommendations according to the same strategic direction. Look for similar intention of the recommendations rather than similar methodology.
- Pass up a second round of most different cards and put them on the wall.
- Continue clustering them according to the same strategic direction.
- Pass up remaining cards and put in the right cluster.

**Naming Ways Forward**

This step aims at reaching consensus on the intention of the recommendations and will smoothly lead into developing next steps.

- Talk through the largest cluster of recommendations first.
- What are some of the key recommendations in this cluster? What seems to be the way forward that we recommend?
- Give the cluster a 3-7-word title that answers the question: **How can we improve our Strategic Capacity Building Directions and Actions to increase the impact of our efforts?**
- Repeat naming for remaining clusters working to the smallest cluster. If energy of the group is low, have sub-groups do the naming step and check for consensus of the names in the plenary.

**Next Steps**

- What are some implications of our recommendations for the work of the Capacity Building team, the Strategic Directions and the Implementation Plans?

**Total time: 45 minutes**
Let’s take some minutes to reflect on this day and to close the meeting.

**Objective level questions**
- What are some phrases or words you remember from the sessions?
- What were some activities you took part in?
- What else do you remember from today?

**Reflective level questions:**
- Where were you most involved?
- What was less interesting?
- What was a highlight of today?

**Interpretive level questions**
- What did you learn about the impact of our Capacity Building activities?
- What was important about this Impact Assessment?

**Decisional level questions**
- How will this Impact Assessment help us to increase the impact of our capacity building efforts?
- Look at the workshop objectives and anticipations: have they been achieved?
- What will be our next steps?

Thank you for participating in this Impact Assessment. We will document the results and have it distributed in the organisation.

**Total time: 15 minutes**
7.5.5 Calculating Impact Assessment Scores

PCB Impact Calculator

The PCB Impact Calculator is a software application using MS Excel sheets to calculate the results from the Impact Assessment.

To start, open the empty Impact Calculator on your computer from the folder where it is stored or from the PCB cd-rom (filename: PCB Impact Calculator). This will automatically start MS Excel and open the file in the overview sheet. Since the file is ‘read-only’ you will have to save the file immediately under a new name by clicking on “file > save”.

The empty Score File consists of 2 Excel sheets, which can be entered by clicking on the tab of the sheets at the bottom of the screen:
- The “Overview” sheet gives an overview of the calculated impact and consensus scores and a graphical representation of the results.
- The “Data” sheet is used to enter the scores from the individual score sheets.

An example of a completed PCB Impact Calculation can be found on the PCB cd-rom.

Calculating the scores

Use of the PCB Impact Calculator is similar to the PCA Score Calculator:

- Enter the general information in the “Overview” sheet: the name of the NGO (cell E1), the date of the assessment (cell M1), the period which is being assessed (e.g. the last year, in cell M2) and the number of respondents (cell N3). This number of respondents is used in the calculations.

- Enter the individual scores of the respondents in the “Data” sheet in columns B, C, D etc. in cells 5 downward. Each respondent has scores on the 7 capacity areas, so simply copy the scores of one respondent in one column.

- The total Impact and Consensus Scores will automatically be calculated on the “Overview” sheet (cells E+F 5-11). The graph will also automatically be plotted when the scores have been entered.

- Keys to interpret the scores can be found on the “Overview” sheet.

- Print the “Overview” sheet to include in the Impact Assessment documentation.
INFORMATION ON NGO CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

Background

<Introduce you organisation and the reason why the capacity assessments are being undertaken e.g.>

As the umbrella organisation of NGOs in our country, we want to facilitate our members to be effective in their work. We have been active in conducting and co-ordinating training courses for NGO to assist in NGO staff development. We want to extend our services in capacity building to other aspects that are important for NGOs. Our organisation will identify 10-15 NGOs from your sector to take through an exercise of capacity assessment and to follow up on their capacity building.

Capacity

Capacity is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

In this assessment we want to focus on 7 core capacities of NGOs:

- Human Resource Management: the most valuable of the entity’s resources and upon which change, capacity and development primarily depend.
- Financial Resource Management: both operating and capital, required for the efficient and effective functioning of the NGO, including fund-raising.
- Equitable Participation: involvement of local knowledge and stakeholders related to project access and project benefit.
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: impact of the NGOs work looking at different aspects like environmental, economic, political, institutional and cultural factors.
- Partnering: collaboration with other NGOs, donors, policy makers, and private sector entities.
- Organisational Learning: teamwork, information-sharing and capacity for generating information that leads to improvement of current practice.
- Strategic Management / Governance: board practices, planning, commitment to goals, mission and philosophy or culture.

Capacity Building Process

The general process of NGO capacity building has 5 stages:

1. Setting the stage and formulating the ‘entry point’ of the process.
2. Capacity assessment
3. Strategic Capacity planning and bench marking
4. Implementing capacity building strategies
5. Sustaining capacity by ongoing monitoring and bench marking

We have invited your organisation to be part of this Capacity Building Process. We are planning to go through the capacity assessment and planning from August to November 2003. This will involve a number of workshops with your organisation. After that a longer (2-
3 year) program of capacity building will be offered, depending on the outcomes of the assessment and planning.

**Capacity Assessment Process**

The assessment of capacity of your organisation will be carried out by our organisation in collaboration with your own staff. We will use the Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET) to cover 7 main capacity areas of your organisation. During a 1-day workshop information on the capacity will be gathered by the assessment team. POET produces two kinds of measures, a capacity score, which indicates how an organisation perceives its strengths and weaknesses to the capacity areas, and a consensus score, which measures the degree to which assessment team members agree on their assessment. Since we will perform this exercise with 10-15 NGOs from the same sector, the assessment also provides an overview of capacities of other organisations. In this process anonymity of NGOs will of course be guaranteed.

The assessment outcomes will be shared with your organisation to analyse the capacity and to focus capacity building strategies.

**Capacity Assessment Workshop**

For this workshop we invite your organisation to form an internal assessment team. Members of the team should be staff or board members of the organisation. The team should have both junior and senior staff (support staff, technical, managerial) and should have a reasonable gender balance. The assessment team should consist of 5 to 10 people, who must be available during the whole day of the assessment.

The capacity assessment workshop leads the capacity assessment team through focused group discussions on various topics on capacity areas. After each discussion all team members individually (and anonymously) will give a score to the capacity of the organisation concerning the single topic. The scoring team facilitate the discussions and will take the outcomes of the assessment for analysis and reporting.

An overview of topics and subjects of the capacity discussions can be found in the appendix.

**Advantages of the Capacity Assessment**

Your organisation will benefit from the assessment in several ways:

- The assessment creates a clear picture of your organisations strengths and weaknesses.
- It will allow the NGO to compare with other organisations from the same sector.
- It kicks off a focused plan for capacity building
- It creates organisational learning, team building and understanding of different perspectives on topics of capacity.
- It forms the basis foundation for ongoing monitoring of your organisations capacity.

For more information about the NGO Capacity Assessment, please contact:

...
Appendix: Topics of the Capacity Discussions

The discussions of during the capacity assessment will focus on concrete and relevant experiences or examples of events related to the following topics:

- Staff training events
- Staff retention; Recruitment; compensation; personnel evaluation; promotion; conflict resolution; staffing; and supervision?
- Financial procedures and practises
- Budget Projections
- Cash flows
- Diversity of financial support
- Stakeholders involvement in projects
- Local leadership and local knowledge
- Policy development and advocacy
- Sustainability of project benefits
- Technical support to target groups
- Partnering and networking
- Organisational learning and team work
- Information sharing
- Participatory decision making
- Donor reporting
- Board practises
- Governance and decision making along consistent goals, mission and philosophy
- Strategic Planning
Appendix B.

Participatory Capacity Assessment

Facilitator’s Questionnaire

*Using Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool to Measure the Capacity of Civil Society Organisations to Support Sustainable Human Development*

**Directions:**

Questions that appear under the heading “discussion,” should be addressed through facilitated, whole group review. Team members should spend *approximately* five to ten minutes considering each set of discussion questions as a whole group. Despite the fact that discussion questions appear as a set, they should be addressed sequentially, one by one. Each team member should score numbered items that follow each discussion question *individually* before the facilitator invites the group to consider the next set of discussion questions. Team members who cannot participate in the full set of structured, group discussion questions should not submit their answer sheets for scoring.

Make sure all team members have a member questionnaire and a score sheet.

All 100 numbered, bold-faced items should be scored individually by each member of the organisational assessment team using the following scale which appears on the accompanying score sheet: 5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3=neutral; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree.

Please refer to the *Participatory Capacity Building Facilitator’s Toolbox* for additional information on administration, scoring and interpretation.

**Anonymity of scoring is guaranteed.**
I. Human Resource Management

Discussion 1: Staff Training
a) When was our most recent staff training? This can be in house, on-the-job, etc.
b) How often over the last 12 months have staff members been sent to training events?

1  We routinely offer staff training.

Discussion 2: Staff Training
a) For our three most recent staff training events, what evidence is there that they strengthened staff capacity and performance?
b) To what degree did these training events prepare staff to respond to our organisational priorities?
c) To what extent is our staff training relevant to our human resource needs?

2  Our staff training directly contributes to the achievement of our Organisation’s priorities.

Discussion 3: Staff Skills and Numbers
a) What are three primary, ongoing functions that we carry out to achieve our mission?
b) To what extent do staff, as a group, have the necessary skills to carry out these functions?
c) To what extent is the number of employees carrying out these functions appropriate?

3  We have the appropriate staff skills to achieve our mission.
4  We have the appropriate staff numbers to achieve our mission.

Discussion 4: Staff Diversity
a) For the same three functions identified in the proceeding question set, to what degree are female employees in critical leadership positions?
b) To what extent does the composition of our staff reflect the population we serve?

5  Our staff reflects the diversity of our constituents.

Discussion 5: Staff Retention
a) Over the last 12 months, to what extent have we experienced loss of competent staff?
b) How (if at all) have the following factors contributed to this loss: recruitment; compensation; personnel evaluation; promotion; conflict resolution; staffing; and supervision?
c) How (if at all) have the following factors contributed to retention of competent staff: recruitment; compensation; personnel evaluation; promotion; conflict resolution; staffing; and supervision

The following systems or practices help us to achieve desirable levels of staff retention:
6  Recruitment
7  Compensation (salary and benefits)
8  Personnel evaluation
9  Promotion (professional advancement)
10  Grievance and conflict resolution policy
11  Staffing (allocation of tasks and responsibilities)
12  Supervision
Discussion 6: Supervision  
a) Consider three recent supervisor-supervisee interactions with which you are familiar (these examples should be representative of prevailing supervisory practices).  
b) To what degree did these interactions enhance the supervisee’s ability to meet organisational expectations?

13 Supervisory practices enhance our staff’s capacity to meet the Organisation’s objectives.

II. Financial Resource Management

Discussion 1: Balancing Revenues and Expenditures  
a) What practices and procedures do we have in place to help us avoid deficits?  
b) How effective are these practices and procedures?

14 We regularly use established procedures to maintain our revenue and expenses in balance.

Discussion 2: Financing our Priorities  
a) What are our organisational priorities this fiscal year, and, to what extent are these priorities mirrored in our current budget?  
b) How did you take these priorities into account when making this year’s budget? How are they reflected in the budget?

15 The budgeting process leads us to allocate funds in a way that closely reflects our organisational priorities.

Discussion 3: Financial Projections  
a) How accurate were last year’s financial projections in relation to our final results?  
b) How timely is the distribution of reports on financial projections versus our final results?  
c) How can we prevent organisational disruptions if projected revenues fail to materialise?

16 Our financial projections are accurate.  
17 We modify our expenditures on a timely basis whenever we have revenue shortfalls.  
18 Our financial system and procedures prevent operational disruptions.

Discussion 4: Cash Management  
a) Over the past year, what problems, if any, have we had regarding delayed transfer of funds to projects or to our target groups?  
b) What mechanisms are in place to ensure that money flows to projects or to target groups in a timely manner?  
c) How effective are these mechanisms?

19 Our cash management procedures lead to the timely disbursement of funds.
Discussion 5: Levels of Financial Support
a) What are the current levels of financial support provided by donors in each of the following categories: private individuals or corporations; public sector/government; donors (bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)?
b) For the following three categories, how do the current levels of financial support compare to those of last year: private individuals or corporations; public sector/government; donors (bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

The level of financial support from donors in each of the following categories is remaining steady or increasing:
20 Private individuals, corporations or income generation
21 Public Sector/Government
22 Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

Discussion 6: Diversity of Financial Support
a) What concrete measures have we taken over the last 12 months to diversify our funding?
b) How effective have these measures been?
c) To what degree is our organisational viability dependent upon the continued support of just a few large donors?

We take concrete measures to increase our financial support from each of the following donor categories to make our organisation less dependent on few financial sources:
23 Private individuals, corporations or income generation
24 Public Sector/Government
25 Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

Discussion 7: Levels of Resources
a) Over the past year, what are problems or challenges, if any, we faced with regards to the level of available resources for the following categories: project activities; infrastructure; communication; transport?
b) To what extent are these problems or challenges blocking us from carrying out our core functions to achieve our mission?
c) What mechanisms do we have in place to counter-balance these problems?

The level of available resources for each of the following categories is appropriate to achieve our mission:
26 Project activities
27 Infrastructure and equipment (offices, supplies)
28 Communication (computers, telephones)
29 Transport

III. Equitable Participation

Discussion 1: Stakeholder Involvement
a) Identify three representative projects in our current program portfolio. Who are the stakeholders in these projects?
b) For the three projects identified, what are some concrete examples of stakeholder involvement in each of the following processes: needs assessment; project design; implementation; monitoring, and impact assessment?
Our projects reflect high levels of participation of most important stakeholders in:
30 Assessing needs
31 Designing projects
32 Implementing projects
33 Monitoring projects
34 Assessing project impact

Discussion 2: Equitable Access and Benefits
a) For the three projects identified in the preceding question set, what specific measures have we taken to ensure that traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups (e.g., rural poor, women, ethnic minorities) have equitable access to project activities?
b) For these same three projects, what specific measures have we taken to ensure that traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups derive equitable benefit from project activities?
c) For the same three projects, to what degree are traditionally under-represented groups engaged in each of the following processes: needs assessment; project design; implementation; monitoring, and impact assessment?

35 Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups have equitable access to project activities.
36 Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups derive equitable benefit from project activities.
37 Our projects consistently promote equity at all stages of their design and implementation.

Discussion 3: Modifying to Changing Target Group Needs
a) Choose three projects that are at least three years old. To what degree have the needs of our project participants changed since each of these projects began?
b) For these same three projects, what modifications have we introduced over the last 12 months to meet the changing needs of our participants?
c) Who (e.g., staff, project participants, funders, evaluators) were important in identifying these needs and proposing the modifications?

38 We regularly examine project participant needs to assess if they are changing.
39 We modify projects to reflect changing participant needs.

Discussion 4: Capacity of Local Leadership
a) For the same three projects identified in the preceding question set, who are the formal and informal leaders at the local level who help implementing these projects?
b) What steps were taken over the last twelve months to examine the capacities of these leaders?
c) For the same three projects, what specific measures were taken over the last twelve months to build the capacity of these formal and informal leaders?

40 We ensure that local leadership has the necessary skills to carry out programs.

Discussion 5: Local Knowledge
a) For the same three projects identified in the preceding question set, what examples can we cite of local knowledge (expertise, strengths, and best practice) that we used in the projects?
b) For the same three projects, what activities have we undertaken to help us identify specific areas of local knowledge related to project objectives?
41 Our programs routinely build on local knowledge and available best practices.

Discussion 6: Lobbying and Advocacy
a) Over the past 12 months, what has been the frequency and nature of our organisational contacts with policy makers?
b) To what degree are these contacts part of a formally defined advocacy strategy?
c) To what degree do these contacts promote equitable and participatory development?

42 We regularly engage relevant policy makers and institutions in dialogue that contributes to equitable and participatory development.

IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits

Discussion 1: Sustainability of Project Design
a) For the three most recent project design efforts in our current portfolio, to what degree did we address the following five kinds of sustainability: (a) environmental (how project activities influence the quality of water, air, soil, and bio-diversity); (b) economic (how recurrent costs associated with project activities will be met); (c) political (how project-supported innovations will be accommodated within the framework of existing laws, policies, and political institutions); (d) institutional (how the long-term viability of institutions created through project activities will be maintained); and, (e) cultural (how project-supported innovations fit within the framework of existing norms, values, roles, and practices)?
b) For which kinds of sustainability (environmental, economic, political, social, cultural) do we have written policies that influence how we design projects?

When doing project design work, we routinely give adequate attention to:
43 Environmental sustainability
44 Economic sustainability
45 Political sustainability
46 Institutional sustainability
47 Cultural sustainability

Discussion 2: Sustainability of Project Implementation
a) Select three current projects from our portfolio that are at least three years old. To what degree have we addressed each of the following kinds of sustainability during the project’s implementation: environmental, economic, political, social, and cultural?
b) For these same three projects, to which kinds of sustainability (environmental, economic, political, social, cultural) have we paid most and least attention during implementation?

When implementing projects, we routinely give adequate attention to:
48 Environmental sustainability
49 Economic sustainability
50 Political sustainability
51 Institutional sustainability
52 Cultural sustainability
Discussion 3: Sustainability of Monitoring and Evaluation

a) For the three most recently completed projects in our portfolio, to what degree have we addressed each of the following categories of sustainability in our monitoring and impact assessment activities: environmental, economic, political, social, and cultural?

b) For these same three projects, to which kinds of sustainability (environmental, economic, political, social, cultural) have we paid most and least attention when doing monitoring and impact assessment?

When doing project monitoring and impact assessment we give adequate attention to:

53 Environmental sustainability
54 Economic sustainability
55 Political sustainability
56 Institutional sustainability
57 Cultural sustainability

Discussion 4: Sustainability of Technical Support

a) Choose three projects that are representative of our current portfolio. What technical support to grassroots communities and Organisations have we provided through these projects?

b) To what degree has this technical support been timely and appropriate?

c) What discernible impact has this technical support had on meeting project objectives?

58 The quality of technical support for our field-based activities contributes to project sustainability.

V. Partnering

Discussion 1: New Linkages

a) Over the past 12 months, what were our most important new contacts with policy makers, private business, and other NGOs?

b) Which specific organisational priorities did we hope to advance through these new contacts?

c) To what degree were these new contacts useful in advancing our organisational priorities?

We establish valuable new linkages to:

59 Relevant policy makers.
60 Private business sector representatives.
61 Other NGOs.

Discussion 2: Partnerships

a) Over the last 12 months, in what formal institutional partnerships have we engaged?

b) What evidence is there that each of these partnerships is helping us to meet our organisational objectives? Think of financial benefits, technical skills or new networks.

c) What have been our most and least successful partnership efforts over the last 12 months?

62 We actively engage in productive partnerships with other Organisations.
63 We monitor the effectiveness of our partnerships with other Organisations.

Through partnering we gain:

64 financial benefits that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
65 technical skills that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
66 new networks and relationships that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
Discussion 3: Partnerships

a) For our three most significant partnerships, what practices, if any, demonstrate the partners’ commitment to work openly?

b) For these same three partnerships, to what degree do all partners both contribute and benefit appropriately?

c) What mechanisms are in place in these three partnerships to foster information-sharing and to resolve disputes among partners to foster trust and co-operation?

67 Partners openly share information.
68 Partnerships have mechanisms in place to foster trust and co-operation.
69 Individual partners contribute appropriately to shared goals.
70 Individual partners share in the benefits of the co-operative effort.

VI. Organisational Learning

Discussion 1: Measuring Progress and Impact

a) For three representative projects in our current portfolio, what are indicators that we use to monitor and evaluate our project objectives to see if our project had any impact?

b) For these same three projects, what indicators do we use to monitor whether project implementation matches project plans?

c) What are some lessons that we have learned through our review of these impact indicators? What can we say about the intended impact?

We routinely:
71 use results-based indicators to assess project impact on those we serve.
72 monitor project implementation against project plans.
73 achieve intended impact as captured through internal or external evaluation.

Discussion 2: Integrated Problem Solving

a) Over the last 12 months, what are some significant organisational problems or internal or external challenges that we have chosen to address?

b) How did we involve the different departments or units of our organisation in solving these problems?

74 We routinely recognise the interdependence of our Organisation’s units, departments or divisions when analysing problems.
75 We routinely involve multiple units, departments or divisions in meeting our major organisational challenges.

Discussion 3: Information Sharing

a) What are two or three current internal or external organisational priorities?

b) What information must be shared with people throughout our Organisation to respond effectively to these priorities?

c) To what extent is this sharing currently occurring?

76 Important information is openly shared throughout our Organisation.
77 We have adequate information to respond to our priorities.
Discussion 4: Information Sharing
a) Over the last month, what examples do we have of information that has been widely shared? Is this common practise?
b) How timely was this information?
c) To what degree did this information help people do their jobs more effectively?

78 Shared information is timely.
79 People routinely have the information they need to do their jobs effectively.

Discussion 5: Teamwork
a) Over the last 12 months, what are some of the most difficult organisational challenges that we have faced?
b) To what degree have we used teamwork to resolve these challenges?
c) To what degree did team efforts help us meet these challenges?

80 We use teamwork effectively to respond to organisational challenges.

Discussion 6: Participation in Decision-Making
a) Over the last 12 months, what are two or three important general decisions that we have had to make?
b) For each of these decisions, to what degree did we get an appropriate mix of viewpoints and an appropriate level of staff participation?
c) In each of these instances, how influential was staff input in the shaping the decisions taken by our leadership?

81 Our leadership effectively uses staff input to strengthen decision-making.

Discussion 7: Staff Meeting
a) To what degree did staff meetings held during this past month lead to progress in achieving organisational objectives?
b) What are some specific examples of organisational learning that emerged from these meetings?
c) To what degree did these meetings help us to identify new and better ways of achieving our organisational mission? Is this common practise?

82 Our staff meetings directly contribute to organisational learning.

Discussion 8: Innovations
a) To what degree did meetings held during this past month include the expression and discussion of different or innovative opinions?
b) Over the last twelve months, what examples of innovation can we identify within our Organisation that have led us to do things differently?
c) To what degree are these innovations the product of personal or organisational risk-taking?

83 Even when they know that their opinions are not widely shared by colleagues or supervisors, people generally feel comfortable expressing themselves in staff meetings.
84 Our Organisation is a safe place for risk-taking innovators.
VII. Governance and Strategic Management

Discussion 1: Donor Reporting

a) Over the last 12 months, to what kinds of donors (e.g., bilateral, multilateral, major foundations, corporations) have we submitted narrative or financial reports?

b) What is the quality of the information we have provided in these reports, looking at what they require?

c) To what degree have these reports increased donor confidence in our work?

85 The information contained in our reports to donors is of high quality.

86 Our reporting to donors demonstrates a clear understanding of their needs and requirements.

Discussion 2: Board Practises

a) With respect to each of the following areas, what are some representative actions (not necessarily decisions) that our board has taken in the last 12 months: fund raising; public relations; advocacy; financial oversight; policy definition; and, strategic direction-setting?

b) What has been the discernible impact of these actions on our Organisation?

c) To what degree is our board representative of our key constituencies and stakeholders?

Our board has contributed competently in carrying out such functions as:

87 Fund raising
88 Public relations
89 Advocacy
90 Financial oversight
91 Policy definition
92 Strategic direction-setting

93 Our board has adequate representation from our key constituencies

Discussion 3: Commitment to Mission, Goals and Values

a) Identify two or three major decisions that our board has taken in the last 12 months. To what degree have these decisions been consistent with our mission, goals, and values?

b) Identify two or three major decisions that our staff has taken in the last 12 months. To what degree have these decisions been consistent with our mission, goals, and values?

c) For the last two months, what are some actions taken by junior staff that demonstrate commitment to our mission, goals, and philosophy?

Commitment to our mission, goals, and values is routinely reflected in:

94 decisions made by staff.
95 decisions made by board members.
96 the day-to-day actions of junior staff.

Discussion 4: Strategic Planning

a) Over the last 12 months, in what strategic planning activities have we engaged? These can be any activity that uses analysis of the external environment as a tool for goal setting or project planning.

b) What conclusions about our external environment did we draw as a result of these activities?

c) What changes did we make in our internal operations to reflect an enhanced understanding of the external environment in which we operate?

97 We use strategic planning to examine ourselves in relation to our external environment.

98 We modify our strategic objectives based on findings generated through strategic planning exercises.
Discussion 5: Strategic Operating
a) What are the three projects or events over the past year that have accounted for the most staff time and organisational resources?
b) To what extent do these initiatives reflect our strategic and operating plans?

99 Our initiatives are developed and implemented in ways that are consistent with our strategic and operating plans.

Discussion 6: Tracking Progress
a) What are our major strategic objectives?
b) What evidence do we have that we are meeting our strategic objectives?

100 We routinely track progress in achieving our strategic objectives.

Thank you for taking part in this capacity assessment!
Appendix C.

Participatory Capacity Assessment

Team Member’s Questionnaire

Using Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool to Measure the Capacity of Civil Society Organisations to Support Sustainable Human Development

Directions:

Items that appear under the heading “discussion,” should be addressed through facilitated, whole group review. Team members should spend approximately five to ten minutes considering each set of discussion items as a whole group.

Each team member should score numbered items that follow each discussion question individually before the facilitator invites the group to consider the next set of discussion questions. Team members who cannot participate in the full set of structured, group discussion questions should not submit their answer sheets for scoring.

All 100 numbered, bold-faced items should be scored individually by each member of the organisational assessment team using the following scale which appears on the accompanying score sheet: 5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3=neutral; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree.

Anonymity of scoring is guaranteed.
I. Human Resource Management

Discussion 1: Staff Training
- Most recent staff training?
- Number of training events last 12 months?
1  We routinely offer staff training.

Discussion 2: Staff Training
- Effectiveness of training events?
- Responding to organisational priorities?
- Relevant to our human resource needs?
2  Our staff training directly contributes to the achievement of our Organisation’s priorities.

Discussion 3: Staff Skills and Numbers
- Availability of staff skills and numbers to carry out ongoing functions?
3  We have the appropriate staff skills to achieve our mission.
4  We have the appropriate staff numbers to achieve our mission.

Discussion 4: Staff Diversity
- Female employees in critical leadership positions?
- Representation of the population we serve?
5  Our staff reflects the diversity of our constituents.

Discussion 5: Staff Retention
- Loss of competent staff?
- Influence of recruitment; compensation; personnel evaluation; promotion; conflict resolution; staffing; and supervision to staff retention?
The following systems or practices help us to achieve desirable levels of staff retention:
6  Recruitment
7  Compensation (salary and benefits)
8  Personnel evaluation
9  Promotion (professional advancement)
10  Grievance and conflict resolution policy
11  Staffing (allocation of tasks and responsibilities)
12  Supervision

Discussion 6: Supervision
13  Supervisory practices enhance our staff’s capacity to meet the Organisation’s objectives.
II. Financial Resource Management

Discussion 1: Balancing Revenues and Expenditures

14 We regularly use established procedures to maintain our revenue and expenses in balance.

Discussion 2: Financing our Priorities

15 The budgeting process leads us to allocate funds in a way that closely reflects our organisational priorities.

Discussion 3: Financial Projections

16 Our financial projections are accurate.
17 We modify our expenditures on a timely basis whenever we have revenue shortfalls.

Discussion 4: Cash Management

18 Our financial system and procedures prevent operational disruptions.

Discussion 5: Levels of Financial Support

The level of financial support from donors in each of the following categories is remaining steady or increasing:

20 Private individuals, corporations or income generation
21 Public Sector/Government
22 Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

Discussion 6: Diversity of Financial Support

We take concrete measures to increase our financial support from each of the following donor categories to make our organisation less dependent on few financial sources:

23 Private individuals, corporations or income generation
24 Public Sector/Government
25 Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

Discussion 7: Levels of Resources

Problems or challenges in level of available resources?
What mechanisms to counter-balance these problems?

The level of available resources for each of the following categories is appropriate to achieve our mission:

26 Project activities
27 Infrastructure and equipment (offices, supplies)
28 Communication (computers, telephones)
29 Transport
III. Equitable Participation

Discussion 1: Stakeholder Involvement
- Stakeholders involvement in three representative projects
Our projects reflect high levels of participation of most important stakeholders in:
30 Assessing needs
31 Designing projects
32 Implementing projects
33 Monitoring projects
34 Assessing project impact

Discussion 2: Equitable Access and Benefits
35 Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups have equitable access to project activities.
36 Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups derive equitable benefit from project activities.
37 Our projects consistently promote equity at all stages of their design and implementation.

Discussion 3: Modifying to Changing Target Group Needs
- Changing needs of project participants
- Modifications to meet the changes?
38 We regularly examine project participant needs to assess if they are changing.
39 We modify projects to reflect changing participant needs.

Discussion 4: Capacity of Local Leadership
40 We ensure that local leadership has the necessary skills to carry out programs.

Discussion 5: Local Knowledge
41 Our programs routinely build on local knowledge and available best practices.

Discussion 6: Lobbying and Advocacy
- Organisational contacts with policy makers
- Formally defined advocacy strategy
- Promote of equitable and participatory development
42 We regularly engage relevant policy makers and institutions in dialogue that contributes to equitable and participatory development.
IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits

Discussion 1: Sustainability of Project Design

- Addressing of sustainability:
  a) *environmental* (how project activities influence the quality of water, air, soil, and bio-diversity);
  b) *economic* (how recurrent costs associated with project activities will be met);
  c) *political* (how project-supported innovations will be accommodated within the framework of existing laws, policies, and political institutions);
  d) *institutional* (how the long-term viability of institutions created through project activities will be maintained); and,
  e) *cultural* (how project-supported innovations fit within the framework of existing norms, values, roles, and practices)?

When doing project design work, we routinely give adequate attention to:

43 Environmental sustainability
44 Economic sustainability
45 Political sustainability
46 Institutional sustainability
47 Cultural sustainability

Discussion 2: Sustainability of Project Implementation

When implementing projects, we routinely give adequate attention to:

48 Environmental sustainability
49 Economic sustainability
50 Political sustainability
51 Institutional sustainability
52 Cultural sustainability

Discussion 3: Sustainability of Monitoring and Evaluation

When doing project monitoring and impact assessment we give adequate attention to:

53 Environmental sustainability
54 Economic sustainability
55 Political sustainability
56 Institutional sustainability
57 Cultural sustainability

Discussion 4: Sustainability of Technical Support

- Technical support to grassroots communities and Organisations
- Impact of technical support on meeting project objectives

58 The *quality* of technical support for our field-based activities contributes to project sustainability.
V. Partnering

Discussion 1: New Linkages
- New contacts with policy makers, private business, and other NGOs?
- Organisational priorities we hope to improve?

We establish valuable new linkages to:
59 Relevant policy makers.
60 Private business sector representatives.
61 Other NGOs.

Discussion 2: Partnerships
- Formal institutional partnerships
- Relevance and benefits of partnerships
62 We actively engage in productive partnerships with other Organisations.
63 We monitor the effectiveness of our partnerships with other Organisations.

Through partnering we gain:
64 financial benefits that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
65 technical skills that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
66 new networks and relationships that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.

Discussion 3: Partnerships
67 Partners openly share information.
68 Partnerships have mechanisms in place to foster trust and co-operation.
69 Individual partners contribute appropriately to shared goals.
70 Individual partners share in the benefits of the co-operative effort.
VI. Organisational Learning

Discussion 1: Measuring Progress and Impact
- Indicators to monitor and evaluate project objectives
- Indicators to monitor project implementation
- What can we say about the intended impact?

We routinely:
71 use results-based indicators to assess project impact on those we serve.
72 monitor project implementation against project plans.
73 achieve intended impact as captured through internal or external evaluation.

Discussion 2: Integrated Problem Solving
- Significant organisational problems or internal or external challenges
- Involvement of different departments or units to solve problems
74 We routinely recognise the interdependence of our Organisation’s units, departments or divisions when analysing problems.
75 We routinely involve multiple units, departments or divisions in meeting our major organisational challenges.

Discussion 3: Information Sharing
- Internal or external organisational priorities?
- Needed information to respond to these priorities
76 Important information is openly shared throughout our Organisation.
77 We have adequate information to respond to our priorities.

Discussion 4: Information Sharing
78 Shared information is timely.
79 People routinely have the information they need to do their jobs effectively.

Discussion 5: Teamwork
- Organisational challenges
- Teamwork to resolve challenges
80 We use teamwork effectively to respond to organisational challenges.

Discussion 6: Participation in Decision-Making
- Important general decisions
- Level of staff participation
81 Our leadership effectively uses staff input to strengthen decision-making.

Discussion 7: Staff Meeting
- Effective meetings
- Examples of organisational learning
82 Our staff meetings directly contribute to organisational learning.

Discussion 8: Innovations
- Different or innovative opinions in meetings
- Examples of innovation
83 Even when they know that their opinions are not widely shared by colleagues or supervisors, people generally feel comfortable expressing themselves in staff meetings.
84 Our Organisation is a safe place for risk-taking innovators.
VII. Governance and Strategic Management

Discussion 1: Donor Reporting
- Narrative or financial reports to donors
- Quality of the information
- Donor confidence

85 The information contained in our reports to donors is of high quality.
86 Our reporting to donors demonstrates a clear understanding of their needs and requirements.

Discussion 2: Board Practices
Our board has contributed competently in carrying out such functions as:
87 Fund raising
88 Public relations
89 Advocacy
90 Financial oversight
91 Policy definition
92 Strategic direction-setting
93 Our board has adequate representation from our key constituencies

Discussion 3: Commitment to Mission, Goals and Values
Commitment to our mission, goals, and values is routinely reflected in:
94 decisions made by staff.
95 decisions made by board members.
96 the day-to-day actions of junior staff.

Discussion 4: Strategic Planning
- Strategic planning activities
- Conclusions on external environment
- Changes in our internal operations

97 We use strategic planning to examine ourselves in relation to our external environment.
98 We modify our strategic objectives based on findings generated through strategic planning exercises.

Discussion 5: Strategic Operating
99 Our initiatives are developed and implemented in ways that are consistent with our strategic and operating plans.

Discussion 6: Tracking Progress
- Major strategic objectives
100 We routinely track progress in achieving our strategic objectives.

Thank you for taking part in this capacity assessment!
Appendix D.

Individual PCA Score Sheet

Organisation name: ____________________  Individual Name (encoded): ____________________

Scale: 5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Neutral; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree

Individually, give a score on each of the following items after the focused group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = | Total = | Total = | Total = | Total = | Total = | Total = | Total = |

After completing each capacity area, please calculate the total for that dimension by adding up all the scores in that particular column. Also write this total figure on a separate piece of paper if provided.
I. Human Resource Management

Score Worksheet: In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2 = Total$ *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

Step 4: $/ = ________ = Raw Capacity Score

Step 5: $/ 65 = ________$

Note: 65 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)

Step 6: $\times 100 = ________ = Standardised Capacity Score$

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

Step 2: $= ________$

Step 3: $= ________$

Step 4: $\times ( - 1 ) = ________$

Step 5: $\times - = ________$

Step 6: $/ = ________$

Step 7: $= ________$

Step 8: $/ 52 \times 100 = ________ = Raw Consensus Score$

Note: 52 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible

Step 9: $100 - [ \times 2 ] = ________ = Standardised Consensus Score$
II. Financial Resource Management

Score Worksheet: In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x² = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

Step 4: \[rac{\text{Sum of Row } x}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \text{Raw Capacity Score}\]

Step 5: \[rac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{80} = \text{Standardised Capacity Score}\]

Note: 80 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

Step 2: \[rac{\text{Sum of the row } x^2}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \text{Step 2 Result}\]

Step 3: \[rac{\text{Sum of Row } x}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \text{Step 3 Result}\]

Step 4: \[\text{Step 2 Result} \times \left(\frac{\text{Step 3 Result}}{-1}\right) = \text{Step 4 Result}\]

Step 5: \[\text{Step 4 Result} - \text{Step 3 Result} = \text{Step 5 Result}\]

Step 6: \[rac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{\text{Square Root of Step 6 Result}} = \text{Step 6 Result}\]

Step 8: \[rac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{64} \times 100 = \text{Raw Consensus Score}\]

Step 9: \[100 - \left(\frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{2}\right) = \text{Standardised Consensus Score}\]

Note: 64 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible.
### III. Equitable Participation

**Score Worksheet:** In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(x = \text{Total})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2 = \text{Total})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

- **Step 4:** \(\frac{\text{Sum of Row X}}{\text{Number of Participants}}\) = ______ = Raw Capacity Score
- **Step 5:** \(\frac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{65}\) = ______
  
  **Note:** 65 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)
- **Step 6:** \(\frac{\text{Step 5 Result} \times 100}{\text{Number of Participants}}\) = ______ = **Standardised Capacity Score**

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

- **Step 2:** \(\frac{\text{Sum of Row X}^2}{\text{Number of Participants}}\) = ______
- **Step 3:** \(\frac{\text{Sum of Row X}}{\text{Number of Participants}}\) = ______

- **Step 4:** \(\frac{\text{Number of Participants}}{\text{Number of Participants}} \times (\frac{\text{Step 3 Result}}{\text{Step 2 Result}} - 1)\) = ______

- **Step 5:** \(\frac{\text{Step 5 Result} \times \text{Step 4 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}}\) = ______

- **Step 6:** \(\frac{\text{Step 7 Result}}{\text{Step 5 Result} \times 52 \times 100}\) = ______ = Raw Consensus Score
  
  **Note:** 52 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible

- **Step 9:** \(100 - \left[\frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score} \times 2}{\text{Step 7 Result}}\right]\) = ______ = **Standardised Consensus Score**
IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits

Score Worksheet: In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x^2 = Total*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

- **Step 4:** \( \frac{\text{Sum of Row X}}{\text{Number of Participants}} \) = ________ = Raw Capacity Score
- **Step 5:** \( \frac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{80} \) = ________
  
  *Note: 80 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)*

- **Step 6:** \( \frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{100} \) = ________ = **Standardised Capacity Score**

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

- **Step 2:** \( \frac{\text{Sum of the row}}{\text{Number of Participants}} \) = ________
- **Step 3:** \( \frac{\text{Sum of Row X}}{\text{Number of Participants}} \) = ________

- **Step 4:** \( \text{Number of Participants} \times \left( \frac{\text{Step 2 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}} - 1 \right) \) = ________

- **Step 5:** \( \text{Step 5 Result} \times \text{Step 4 Result} \) - Step 3 Result = ________

- **Step 6:** \( \frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{\text{Step 7 Result}} \) = ________

- **Step 8:** \( \frac{\text{Step 7 Result}}{64} \times 100 \) = ________ = Raw Consensus Score

  *Note: 64 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible*

- **Step 9:** \( 100 - \left[ \frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{2} \right] \) = ________ = **Standardised Consensus Score**
V. Partnering

Score Worksheet: In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2 = \text{Total}^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tabulating Capacity Score

Step 4: \(\frac{\text{Sum of Row } X}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \) _______ = Raw Capacity Score

Step 5: \(\frac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{60} = \) _______

**Note:** 60 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions \(\times 5\))

Step 6: \(\frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{100} = \) _______ = **Standardised Capacity Score**

### Tabulating Consensus Score

Step 2: \(\frac{\text{Sum of the row } x^2}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \) _______  
Step 3: \(\frac{\text{Step 2 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}} = \) _______

Step 4: \(\frac{\text{Number of Participants}}{\text{Number of Participants}} \times (\frac{\text{Step 2 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}} - 1) = \) _______

Step 5: \(\frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{\text{Step 4 Result}} - \) _______

Step 6: \(\frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{\text{Step 6 Result}} = \) _______  
Step 7: \(\frac{\text{Step 6 Result}}{\text{Step 7 Result}} = \) _______

Step 8: \(\frac{\text{Step 7 Result}}{48 \times 100} = \) _______ = Raw Consensus Score

**Note:** 48 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible

Step 9: \(100 - [\frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{2}] = \) _______ = **Standardised Consensus Score**
### VI. organisational Learning

**Score Worksheet:** In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x = \text{Total} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = \text{Total} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

**Step 4:** \( \frac{\text{Sum of Row } X}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \) _______ = Raw Capacity Score

**Step 5:** \( \frac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{70} = \) _______

*Note: 70 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)*

**Step 6:** \( x \times 100 = \) _______ = *Standardised Capacity Score*

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

**Step 2:** \( \sqrt{\frac{\text{Sum of Row } x^2}{\text{Number of Participants}}} = \) _______

**Step 3:** \( \frac{\text{Sum of Row } x}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \) _______

**Step 4:** \( \text{Number of Participants} \times (\frac{\text{Step 2 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}} - 1) = \) _______

**Step 5:** \( \text{Number of Participants} \times \frac{\text{Step 2 Result}}{\text{Step 3 Result}} - \) \( \) _______

**Step 6:** \( \frac{\text{Step 5 Result}}{\text{Step 4 Result}} = \) _______

**Step 7:** \( \frac{\text{Square Root of Step 6 Result}}{56} \times 100 = \) _______ = Raw Consensus Score

*Note: 56 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible*

**Step 9:** \( 100 - \left[ \frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{2} \right] = \) _______ = *Standardised Consensus Score*
VII. Governance / Strategic Management

Score Worksheet: In columns 2-16 place the encoded name of each individual respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2 = \text{Tot}^* \text{ Total}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tabulating Capacity Score**

Step 4: \[
\frac{\text{Sum of Row } X}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \_\_\_\_\_ = \text{Raw Capacity Score}
\]

Step 5: \[
\frac{\text{Raw Capacity Score}}{80} = \_\_\_\_\_
\]

Note: 80 is equal to the maximum number of points for this section (number of questions X 5)

Step 6: \[
\times 100 = \_\_\_\_\_ = \text{Standardised Capacity Score}
\]

**Tabulating Consensus Score**

Step 2: \[
\frac{\text{Sum of Row } X^2}{\text{Number of Participants}^2} = \_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 3: \[
\frac{\text{Sum of Row } X}{\text{Number of Participants}} \times \frac{\text{Sum of Row } X}{\text{Number of Participants}} = \_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 4: \[
\times (\_\_\_\_\_ - 1) = \_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 5: \[
\times \_\_\_\_\_\_ \times \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 6: \[
\_\_\_\_\_\_ \times \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_\_ \times \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \times \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 7: \[
\frac{\text{Square Root of Step 6 Result}}{\_\_\_\_\_} = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
\]

Step 8: \[
\_\_\_\_\_\_ \times 64 \times 100 = \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \text{Raw Consensus Score}
\]

Note: 64 is the maximum number of points minus the minimum number of points possible

Step 9: \[
100 - \left[ \frac{\text{Raw Consensus Score}}{2} \right] = \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \text{Standardised Consensus Score}
\]
GRID Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Area</th>
<th>A Standardised Score</th>
<th>B Scaled Score</th>
<th>Capacity Area</th>
<th>A Standardised Score</th>
<th>B Scaled Score</th>
<th>A Standardised Score</th>
<th>B Scaled Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 - 32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 - 39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td>64 - 67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability of Program Benefits</td>
<td>72 - 74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 - 78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable Participation</td>
<td>85 - 87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Learning</td>
<td>88 - 89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 - 92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93 - 95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Management/Governance</td>
<td>96 - 98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99 - 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.

Capacity Assessment Workshop Report

1.1 Introduction

As the umbrella organisation of NGOs in our country, we want to facilitate our members to be effective in their work. We have been active in conducting and co-ordinating training courses for NGO to assist in NGO staff development. We want to extend our services in capacity building to other aspects that are important for NGOs. Our organisation will identify 10-15 NGOs from your sector to take through an exercise of capacity assessment and to follow up on their capacity building.

<the organisation> is part of this capacity assessment program. <date> we conducted a capacity assessment workshop at the x office in which information about the capacity of x was collected.

1.2 Assessment Workshop Overview

The assessment workshop was conducted by <x>. Participants were x staff members of x:

Program overview:

- 9.15 Welcome and Introduction
- 9.45 Assessment 1: Human Resource Management
- 10.30 Tea break
- 10.45 Assessment 2: Financial Resource Management
- 11.30 Assessment 3: Equitable Participation
- 12.15 Assessment 4: Sustainability of Program Benefits
- 12.45 Presentation of first results
- 13.00 Lunch
- 13.45 Assessment 5: Partnering
- 14.15 Assessment 6: Organisational Learning
- 15.00 Assessment 7: Governance / Strategic Management
- 15.45 Presentation of second results
- 16.00 Next Steps and Closing Reflection

1.3 Workshop objectives and benefits for x

The assessment workshop has the following objectives:

- To discuss topics of the capacity of the organisation and share information and experiences of assessment team members
- To create insight in capacity areas of the organisation by indicating the level of capacity on different dimensions
- To create insight in the level of consensus that exists within the organisation about the present capacity

By taking part in the NGO assessment process x will gain the following benefits:

- The assessment creates a clear picture of your organisation's strengths and weaknesses.
- It will allow the NGO to compare with other organisations from the same sector.
- It kicks off a focused plan for capacity building
- It creates organisational learning, team building and understanding of different perspectives on topics of capacity.
- It forms the basis foundation for ongoing monitoring of your organisation's capacity.
1.4 Role of facilitator
During the assessment workshop the facilitators will lead some focused group discussions. The role of the facilitators is to:
- Guide the group during the discussions by asking questions and probing
- Make some notes of the discussions on flip chart for quick reference
- Allow full participation of all assessment team members
- To keep time and stay focused on the topics at hand
- To clarify the questions and process whenever needed and to translate the discussions in a local language when necessary.

The assessment facilitators are non-judgemental and is not contributing to the discussions. They only collect answers and create a platform for sharing of ideas. They will also collect the scoring data and facilitate the analysis of the data. Everything that will be said during the discussions must be regarded as confidential. All capacity scores will be handled with strict anonymity.

1.5 Introduction to Capacity Assessment
Capacity is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

Capacity areas of NGOs that will be included in the assessment are:
- Human Resource Management: how you deal with staff
- Financial Resource Management: getting and dealing with money
- Equitable Participation: involvement of target groups
- Sustainability of Program Benefits: how your projects impact
- Partnering: effective liaisons with other stakeholders
- Organisational Learning: sharing and learning from information
- Strategic Management / Governance: looking at the bigger picture

Capacity Building is a process in 5 stages:
1. Setting the stage and formulating the ‘entry point’ of the process.
2. Capacity assessment
3. Strategic Capacity planning and benchmarking
4. Implementing capacity building strategies
5. Sustaining capacity by ongoing monitoring and benchmarking

This capacity assessment workshop is the beginning of the process.

1.6 Assessment Methodology
The Capacity Assessment workshop uses the Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET) as a method for data collection and analysis. POET was developed by UNDP in 1998 to assist NGOs in self-assessment for capacity building.

POET is a method that uses the “critical incident” technique to focus group discussions about organisational capacity. This assessment team is lead through a number of questions referring to incidents that have happened to their organisation in relation to capacity dimensions. Each member of the assessment team then ‘scores’ the level of capacity, based on discussions and their own views and experiences.

POET provides statistical information that can easily be administered and analysed also in comparison to other organisations. During the whole process anonymity of individual capacity scores and organisation scores (if shared with others) is guaranteed.
### Overview of the Capacity Assessment of ...

Capacity Assessment Workshop date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Capacity Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cohort Means</strong></th>
<th><strong>Consensus Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cohort Means</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equitable Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainability of Program Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Partnering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Governance / Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rule of thumb:

**Scores below 60** indicate a weak or very weak capacity and consensus, which causes reason for concern.

**Scores between 60 and 70** indicate a level of capacity and consensus that is more or less acceptable, but that still needs improvement.

**Scores above 71** indicate a high or very high capacity and consensus, which may point at strong elements of the organisation to build on.
### Human Resource Management

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item</th>
<th>Assessment Statement</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff training</td>
<td>We routinely offer staff training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training effect</td>
<td>Our staff training directly contributes to the achievement of our Organisation’s priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff skills</td>
<td>We have the appropriate staff skills to achieve our mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff numbers</td>
<td>We have the appropriate staff numbers to achieve our mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff diversity</td>
<td>Our staff reflects the diversity of our constituents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective:</strong></td>
<td>The following systems or practices help us to achieve desirable levels of staff retention:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compensation</td>
<td>Compensation (salary and benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Person evaluation</td>
<td>Personnel evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion (professional advancement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Grievance and conflict resolution policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Staffing</td>
<td>Staffing (allocation of tasks and responsibilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Superv. Interactions</td>
<td>Supervisory practices enhance our staff’s capacity to meet the Organisation’s objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Standardised Scores in this Capacity Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Scores in this Capacity Area:**
## Financial Resource Management

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item:</th>
<th>Assessment Statement:</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Balancing finances</td>
<td>We regularly use established procedures to maintain our revenue and expenses in balance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Budgeting = prioritising</td>
<td>The budgeting process leads us to allocate funds in a way that closely reflects our organisational priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Accurate projections</td>
<td>Our financial projections are accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Modifying expenditures</td>
<td>We modify our expenditures on a timely basis whenever we have revenue shortfalls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Contingency measures</td>
<td>Our financial contingency measures prevent operational disruptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Cash management</td>
<td>Our cash management procedures lead to the timely disbursement of funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present level of:</td>
<td>The level of financial support from donors in each of the following categories is remaining steady or increasing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Private funding</td>
<td>Private individuals or corporations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Public funding</td>
<td>Public Sector/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Foundations / Bilaterals</td>
<td>Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to increase:</td>
<td>We take concrete measures to increase our financial support from each of the following donor categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Private funding</td>
<td>Private individuals or corporations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Public funding</td>
<td>Public Sector/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Foundations / Bilaterals</td>
<td>Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present level of:</td>
<td>The level of available resources for each of the following categories is appropriate to achieve our mission:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Project activities</td>
<td>Project activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure and equipment (offices, supplies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Communication</td>
<td>Communication (computers, telephones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Transport</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equitable Participation

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item:</th>
<th>Assessment Statement:</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder participation in</td>
<td>Our projects reflect high levels of stakeholder participation in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Needs assessment</td>
<td>Assessing needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Project design</td>
<td>Designing projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Implementation</td>
<td>Implementing projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Impact assessment</td>
<td>Assessing project impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Equitable access</td>
<td>Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups have equitable access to project activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Equitable benefit</td>
<td>Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups derive equitable benefit from project activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Equity promotion</td>
<td>Our projects consistently promote equity at all stages of their design and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Changing needs</td>
<td>We regularly examine project participant needs to assess if they are changing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Modify to needs</td>
<td>We modify projects to reflect changing participant needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Local leadership skills</td>
<td>We ensure that local leadership has the necessary skills to carry out programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Local knowledge</td>
<td>Our programs routinely build on local knowledge and best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Dialogue for participation</td>
<td>We regularly engage relevant policy makers and institutions in dialogue that contributes to equitable and participatory development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Standardised Scores in this Capacity Area

Scores in this Capacity Area:
# Sustainability of Program Benefits

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

## Total Standardised Scores in this Capacity Area

### Scores in this Capacity Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item:</th>
<th>Assessment Statement:</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In project design:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>When doing <em>project design</em> work, we routinely give adequate attention to: Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Economic sustainability</td>
<td>Economic sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Political sustainability</td>
<td>Political sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Institutional sustainability</td>
<td>Institutional sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Cultural sustainability</td>
<td>Cultural sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In project implementation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Economic sustainability</td>
<td>Economic sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Political sustainability</td>
<td>Political sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Institutional sustainability</td>
<td>Institutional sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Cultural sustainability</td>
<td>Cultural sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Monitoring &amp; Evaluation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Economic sustainability</td>
<td>Economic sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Political sustainability</td>
<td>Political sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Institutional sustainability</td>
<td>Institutional sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Cultural sustainability</td>
<td>Cultural sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Sustainable support</td>
<td>The quality of technical support for our field-based activities contributes to project sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participatory Capacity Building

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

### Total Standardised Scores in this Capacity Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scores in this Capacity Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item:</th>
<th>Assessment Statement:</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable linkages to:</td>
<td>We establish valuable new linkages to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Policy makers</td>
<td>Relevant policy makers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Private sector</td>
<td>Private business sector representatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. NGO’s</td>
<td>Other NGOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Active partnerships</td>
<td>We actively engage in productive partnerships with other Organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Monitor effectiveness</td>
<td>We monitor the effectiveness of our partnerships with other Organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships bring:</strong></td>
<td>Through partnering we gain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Financial benefits</td>
<td>Financial benefits that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Technical skills</td>
<td>Technical skills that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. New networks</td>
<td>New networks and relationships that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Share information</td>
<td>Partners openly share information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Foster trust</td>
<td>Partnerships have mechanisms in place to foster trust and co-operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Partner contributions</td>
<td>Individual partners contribute appropriately to shared goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Share benefits</td>
<td>Individual partners share in the benefits of the co-operative effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organisational Learning

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

### Total Standardised Scores in this Capacity Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item</th>
<th>Assessment Statement</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Impact assessment</td>
<td><em>use results-based indicators to assess project impact on those we serve.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Project monitoring</td>
<td><em>monitor project implementation against project plans.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Impact achieved</td>
<td><em>achieve intended impact as captured through internal or external evaluation.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Integral analysis</td>
<td><em>We routinely recognise the interdependence of our Organisation’s units, departments or divisions when analysing problems.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Integral solutions</td>
<td><em>We routinely involve multiple units, departments or divisions in meeting our major organisational challenges.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Sharing information</td>
<td><em>Important information is openly shared throughout our Organisation.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Information availability</td>
<td><em>We have adequate information to respond to our priorities.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Timely information</td>
<td><em>Shared information is timely.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Routinely information</td>
<td><em>People routinely have the information they need to do their jobs effectively.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Effective teamwork</td>
<td><em>We use teamwork effectively to respond to organisational challenges.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Participatory dec-making</td>
<td><em>Our leadership effectively uses staff input to strengthen decision-making.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Meeting = learning</td>
<td><em>Our staff meetings directly contribute to organisational learning.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Open discussions</td>
<td><em>Even when they know that their opinions are not widely shared by colleagues or supervisors, people generally feel comfortable expressing themselves staff meetings.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Safe environment</td>
<td><em>Our Organisation is a safe place for risk-taking innovators.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and Strategic Management

The following scores were given during the Capacity Assessment of your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Item:</th>
<th>Assessment Statement:</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
<th>Consensus Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85. Quality donor reports</td>
<td>The information contained in our reports to donors is of high quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Report meets needs</td>
<td>Our reporting to donors demonstrates a clear understanding of their needs and requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Board contributes to:</em> Our board has contributed competently in carrying out such functions as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Fund-raising</td>
<td>Fund raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Public relations</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Financial oversight</td>
<td>Financial oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Policy definition</td>
<td>Policy definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Strategic direction</td>
<td>Strategic direction-setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Representative board</td>
<td>Our board has adequate representation from our key constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic:</strong></td>
<td>Commitment to our mission, goals, and philosophy is routinely reflected in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Staff decisions</td>
<td>decisions made by staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Board decisions</td>
<td>decisions made by board members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Operational work</td>
<td>the day-to-day actions of non-supervisory staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Strategic planning</td>
<td>We use strategic planning to examine ourselves in relation to our external environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Modifying strategies</td>
<td>We modify our strategic objectives based on findings generated through strategic planning exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Consistent initiatives</td>
<td>Our initiatives are developed and implemented in ways that are consistent with our strategic and operating plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Tracking progress</td>
<td>We routinely track progress in achieving our strategic objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interpretation of Standardised Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation for Capacity Scores</th>
<th>Standardised Score</th>
<th>Interpretation for Consensus Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO has little or no capacity in this area</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>Very low level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s capacities fall below acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>Low level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s capacities approximate acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Moderate level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s capacities fall above acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>High level of consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s capacities are far above acceptable performance standards in this area</td>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>Very high level of consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rule of thumb:**

**Scores below 60 indicate a weak or very weak capacity and consensus, which causes reason for concern**

**Scores between 60 and 70 indicate a level of capacity and consensus that is more or less acceptable, but that still needs improvement**

**Scores above 71 indicate a high or very high capacity and consensus, which may point at strong elements of the organisation to build on.**
Appendix H.

Participatory Capacity Assessment Workshop Report (example)
<this sample report includes data from a real assessment. All names of organisations, except
that of NANGO, have been changed>

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

As the umbrella organisation of NGOs in Zimbabwe, NANGO wants to facilitate its members
to be effective in their work. NANGO has been active in conducting and co-ordinating
training courses for NGO to assist in NGO staff development. In 2002 NANGO has extended
her services in capacity building to other aspects that are important for NGOs. NANGO has
identified 10-15 NGOs from the women/gender sector to take through an exercise of
capacity assessment and to follow up on their capacity building.

NGO x is part of this capacity assessment program. 14 November 2002 NANGO conducted a
capacity assessment workshop at the NGO x office in which information about the capacity
of NGO x was collected.

1.2 Assessment Workshop Overview

The assessment workshop was conducted by Mr. Jouwert van Geene, a Dutch consultant,
assisted by Mrs. Judith Chaumba, NANGO Training Officer. Participants were 12 staff
members of NGO x: country program co-ordinator, 1 program officer, 6 field officers and 4
support staff.

Program overview:

9.15  Welcome and Introduction
9.45  Assessment 1: Human Resource Management
10.30 Tea break
11.30 Assessment 3: Equitable Participation
11.45 Assessment 4: Sustainability of Program Benefits
12.15 Assessment 5: Partnering
13.00 Lunch
13.45 Assessment 6: Organisational Learning
14.15 Assessment 7: Governance / Strategic Management
15.00 Next Steps and Closing Reflection

1.3 Workshop objectives and benefits for NGO x:

The assessment workshop has the following objectives:

- To discuss topics of the capacity of the organisation and share information and
  experiences of assessment team members
- To create insight in capacity areas of the organisation by indicating the level of capacity
  on different dimensions
- To create insight in the level of consensus that exists within the organisation about the
  present capacity

By taking part in the NGO assessment process NGO x will gain the following benefits:
• The assessment creates a clear picture of your organisation's strengths and weaknesses.
• It will allow the NGO to compare with other organisations from the same sector.
• It kicks off a focused plan for capacity building.
• It creates organisational learning, team building and understanding of different perspectives on topics of capacity.
• It forms the basis foundation for ongoing monitoring of your organisation's capacity.

1.4 Role of NANGO and facilitator
During the assessment workshop the facilitators lead some focused group discussions. The role of the facilitators is to:
• Guide the group during the discussions by asking questions and probing
• Make some notes of the discussions on flip chart for quick reference
• Allow full participation of all assessment team members
• To keep time and stay focused on the topics at hand
• To clarify the questions and process whenever needed and to translate the discussions in Shona when necessary.

The assessment facilitators are non-judgemental and is not contributing to the discussions. They only collect answers and create a platform for sharing of ideas. NANGO will also collect the scoring data and facilitate the analysis of the data. Everything that will be said during the discussions must be regarded as confidential. All capacity scores will be handled with strict anonymity.

1.5 Introduction to Capacity Assessment
Capacity is defined as the ability of individuals and organisations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. Capacity is the power of something (a system, an organisation, a person) to perform or to produce.

Capacity areas of NGOs that will be included in the assessment are:
• Human Resource Management: how you deal with staff
• Financial Resource Management: getting and dealing with money
• Equitable Participation: involvement of target groups
• Sustainability of Program Benefits: how your projects impact
• Partnering: effective liaisons with other stakeholders
• Organisational Learning: sharing and learning from information
• Strategic Management / Governance: looking at the bigger picture

Capacity Building is a process in 5 stages:
1. Setting the stage and formulating the 'entry point' of the process.
2. Capacity assessment
3. Strategic Capacity planning and benchmarking
4. Implementing capacity building strategies
5. Sustaining capacity by ongoing monitoring and benchmarking
This capacity assessment workshop is the beginning of the process.

1.6 Assessment Methodology
The Capacity Assessment workshop uses the Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET) as a method for data collection and analysis. POET was developed by UNDP in 1998 to assist NGOs in self-assessment for capacity building.

POET is a method that uses the “critical incident” technique to focus group discussions about organisational capacity. This assessment team is lead through a number of questions referring to incidents that have happened to their organisation in relation to capacity dimensions. Each member of the assessment team then ‘scores’ the level of capacity, based on discussions and their own views and experiences. The items for all scoring can be found in the appendix.

POET provides statistical information that can easily be administered and analysed also in comparison to other organisations. During the whole process anonymity of individual capacity scores and organisation scores (if shared with others) is guaranteed.

2. Findings
2.1 Capacity and Consensus Scores
In general most capacity scores of NGO x are average or above average. As in the figure below governance / strategic management, human resource management and organisational learning are scoring above average levels according to the standardised score interpretation. As for the consensus, all the scores are far or above average. The staff shows highest agreement on the level of capacity of governance, partnering, financial resource management and target group involvement (equitable participation).

The GRID stands for guided reflections for institutional development. GRID provides another graphic representation of the capacity scores. In the GRID we make use of Scaled Scores. The
Scaled Scores provide an overview of scores brought back to a 1-100 Capacity and Consensus scale. It converts the standardised scores to an exponential scale. The average level of all capacity areas is 52; the average of all consensus areas is 68. Financial Resource Management, Partnering and Sustainability of Program Benefits has a Scaled score of less than 50. The other areas score above 50.

In this case its reflecting that financial resource management, partnering and sustainability of program benefits are the areas where the capacity is below 50 whereas the rest of the items are in the quadrant where there is high capacity and high consensus.
2.2 Human Resource Management

Items that are far above average are regular staff training, staff diversity, division of tasks and responsibility to staff (staffing) and supervision. The assessment shows that critical and varied positions existing in NGO x have got skilled personnel and the staff have consistent technical back up to perform their duties. Staff numbers seem to be adequate to perform the activities. Staff turnover is very low (not a single staff member left the organisation in the past twelve months). The motivation that is evident in the current staff complement is both intrinsic and due to systems or practices that help NGO x to achieve desirable levels of staff retention such as recruitment, compensation (salary and benefits), personnel evaluation and conflict resolution. Opportunities for promotion within are low but positions allow for much personal growth through training. Supervision practices are strong and enhance staff capacity to meet organisational objectives. The overall consensus level for human resource management is very high, though consensus on capacity of promotion opportunities, personnel evaluation and staff training were below average.
2.3 Financial resource management

As shown in the figure below, within NGO x there is average to very high capacity in procedures to balance finances, to budget according to priorities, to make accurate projections, to apply measures to cushion against unpredictable events, to modify the budgetary provisions and to timely disburse funds for project activities.

In spite of the financial procedures being in place the current rate of inflation has limited the organisation to achieve all set objectives. The level and diversity of funding of NGO x seems to be low from the public and private sector, though high from foundations and other donors. They make efforts to diversify funding by approaching individuals and corporations and new donors, however these measures to increase level of funding have not been very effective so far. The level of resources available for project activities and infrastructure are adequate, but those for communication and transport are inadequate to achieve the organisation’s mission. There is general consensus about the capacity of financial resource management, though opinions on some individual items are below average.
2.4 Equitable participation

As shown in the figure below NGO X has got an average to very high level of stakeholder participation in all aspects of the project cycle.

There are high levels of participation by traditionally underrepresented groups. The organisation has very well developed systems for adapting programs to changing target groups needs and has well developed capacity to build on local strengths and best practices. Examples were given of current projects that were modified to address HIV/AIDS-related problems and the economic hardship. The capacity to dialogue with policy makers to promote equitable participation and development is rather low.
2.5 Sustainability of Program Benefits

NGO x gives average to high attention to most sustainability factors throughout the project cycle. As shown in the figure below during project implementation, monitoring and impact assessment the attention to political sustainability (how project-supported innovations will be accommodated within the framework of existing laws, policies, and political institutions) is below average level.

![Bar chart showing sustainability scores](chart.png)

Also cultural sustainability (how project-supported innovations fit within the framework of existing norms, values, roles, and practices) is a just below average in the monitoring and impact assessment phase. Attention to environmental sustainability (how project activities influence the quality of water, air, soil, and bio-diversity) scores highest since NGO x is active in projects like organic gardening. The attention to economic and institutional sustainability is above average in the design stage since beneficiaries initiated the projects themselves: NGO x supports existing efforts. The technical support to projects in order to achieve sustainability is above acceptable level. The overall level of consensus in this capacity area is above average, though on individual items the opinions may differ.
2.6 Partnering

As shown in the figure below, NGO x has average to high capacity to establish linkage to policy makers and other NGOs.

Examples of these linkages are a local consultancy organisation, a corporate business (telecom) and a Ministry. Linkages with the private sector are below average level. NGO x actively involves in new partnerships such as with a corporate business, an NGO and Women’s Coalition. Through these partnerships NGO x gains an average level of financial benefits, technical skills and new networks. NGO x has average capacity of negotiating and sustaining partnerships that are both equitable and beneficial to all parties. The overall consensus about the level of capacity to engage in partnering is above average level, though some individual items score lower.
2.7 Organisational Learning

NGO x has average capacity to use impact assessment and project monitoring to assess achieved results. It has an average capacity to use internal communications in multiple directions for problem solving.

As shown in the figure above NGO x has internally generated information that is highly accessible to those who need it and that is timely, useful and accurate. NGO x uses a very high level of effective teamwork, participatory decision making and learning in staff meetings. The organisation provides a safe environment for risk-taking innovators and provides open and effective staff meetings. Consensus on the level of capacity in this area is generally high, though there seems to be less consensus on the level of capacity in integrated analysis and solving of problems as well as on the effectiveness and openness of staff meetings.
2.8 Governance and Strategic Management

NGO x has very high capacity to perform effective and quality report writing to donors to meet their needs and requirements. The NGO x Board has a high level of capacity to assist in fund-raising, public relations, advocacy, financial oversight, policy definition and strategic direction setting. The board has adequate representation from NGO x’s key target groups. NGO x demonstrates a pattern of managerial decision-making that is consistent with its mission, goals and philosophy and it has a well developed system for setting and tracking strategic objectives. Examples of recent strategic initiatives are mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS activities and integrating gender in all programs. There is average or high level of consensus for all items in this capacity city area, as shown in the figure below.
3. Conclusions and Recommendations

NGO x in general has adequate level of capacity to perform its key functions and to achieve its mission. It has high levels of consensus about this capacity, which makes it easier to address issues.

There are 3 capacity areas of NGO x that can characterised as “low” capacity with “high” consensus, meaning below 50 on the Scaled Capacity Score, and on or above 50 Scaled Consensus Score:

- Financial Resource Management. Within this area, clear weaknesses are the lack of funding diversity and constraints in availability of resources, particularly for project activities and infrastructure.

- Sustainability of Program Benefits. This area is average overall, but not all categories of sustainability get enough attention in project implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Since NGO x is already trying to improve the system of monitoring and evaluation the aspect of sustainability might be build in.

- Partnering. This capacity area is just average and might not be priority to address first.

For these areas team members agree there is lower capacity and they agree on the nature of the problems. Focusing on these areas for improvement might build the confidence and ability of team members.

All other four capacity areas are existing in the “high” capacity and “high” consensus area, with Governance and Human Resource Management scoring highest both on capacity and consensus. NGO x should make deliberate efforts to build on these areas of strength. These capacity areas may be models of excellence that can be studied for clues as the organisation seeks to determine how best to address weaknesses.
**Appendix**

List of Capacity Items of all capacity areas

Following statements were individually scored by the assessment team members on a 1-5 scale, with the following interpretation: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree. The scores were given after a focused conversation about each item, referring to practical examples of capacity in that area.

**I. Human Resource Management**
1. We routinely offer staff training.
2. Our staff training directly contributes to the achievement of our Organisation’s priorities.
3. We have the appropriate staff *skills* to achieve our mission.
4. We have the appropriate staff *numbers* to achieve our mission.
5. Our staff reflects the diversity of our constituents.

The following systems or practices help us to achieve desirable levels of staff retention:
6. Recruitment
7. Compensation (salary and benefits)
8. Personnel evaluation
9. Promotion (professional advancement)
10. Grievance and conflict resolution policy
11. Staffing (allocation of tasks and responsibilities)
12. Supervision
13. Supervisory practices enhance our staff’s capacity to meet the Organisation’s objectives.

**II. Financial Resource Management**
14. We *regularly* use established procedures to maintain our revenue and expenses in balance.
15. The budgeting process leads us to allocate funds in a way that closely reflects our organisational priorities.
16. Our financial projections are accurate.
17. We modify our expenditures on a timely basis whenever we have revenue shortfalls.
18. Our financial contingency measures prevent operational disruptions.
19. Our cash management procedures lead to the timely disbursement of funds.

The *level of financial support* from donors in each of the following categories is remaining steady or increasing:
20. Private individuals or corporations
21. Public Sector/Government
22. Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)

We take concrete measures to increase our financial support from each of the following donor categories:
23. Private individuals or corporations
24. Public Sector/Government
25. Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations)
The *level of available resources* for each of the following categories is appropriate to achieve our mission:

26  Project activities
27  Infrastructure and equipment (offices, supplies)
28  Communication (computers, telephones)
29  Transport

**III. Equitable Participation**

Our projects reflect *high* levels of stakeholder participation in:

30  Assessing needs
31  Designing projects
32  Implementing projects
33  Monitoring projects
34  Assessing project impact

35  Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups have *equitable access* to project activities.
36  Traditionally under-represented stakeholder groups *derive equitable benefit* from project activities.
37  Our projects consistently promote equity at all stages of their design and implementation.
38  We regularly examine project participant *needs* to assess if they are changing.
39  We modify projects to reflect changing participant needs.
40  We ensure that local leadership has the necessary skills to carry out programs.
41  Our programs routinely build on local knowledge and best practices.
42  We *regularly* engage relevant policy makers and institutions in dialogue that contributes to equitable and participatory development.

**IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits**

When doing project *design* work, we routinely give adequate attention to:

43  Environmental sustainability
44  Economic sustainability
45  Political sustainability
46  Institutional sustainability
47  Cultural sustainability

When *implementing* projects, we routinely give adequate attention to:

48  Environmental sustainability
49  Economic sustainability
50  Political sustainability
51  Institutional sustainability
52  Cultural sustainability

When doing *project monitoring and impact assessment* we give adequate attention to:

53  Environmental sustainability
54  Economic sustainability
55  Political sustainability
56  Institutional sustainability
57  Cultural sustainability

58  The *quality* of technical support for our field-based activities contributes to project sustainability.
V. Partnering
We establish valuable new linkages to:
59 Relevant policy makers.
60 Private business sector representatives.
61 Other NGOs.
62 We actively engage in productive partnerships with other organisations.
63 We monitor the effectiveness of our partnerships with other organisations.

Through partnering we gain:
64 *financial benefits* that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
65 *technical skills* that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
66 *new networks* and *relationships* that enhance our ability to accomplish our mission.
67 Partners openly share information.
68 Partnerships have mechanisms in place to foster trust and co-operation.
69 Individual partners contribute appropriately to shared goals.
70 Individual partners share in the benefits of the co-operative effort.

VI. Organisational Learning
We routinely:
71 use results-based indicators to assess project *impact* on those we serve.
72 *monitor* project implementation against project plans.
73 achieve intended impact as captured through internal or external evaluation.
74 We *routinely recognise* the interdependence of our organisation’s units, departments or divisions when *analysing* problems.
75 We *routinely involve* multiple units, departments or divisions in meeting our major organisational challenges.
76 Important information is openly shared throughout our organisation.
77 We have adequate information to respond to our priorities.
78 Shared information is timely.
79 People routinely have the information they need to do their jobs effectively.
80 We use teamwork effectively to respond to organisational challenges.
81 Our leadership effectively uses staff input to strengthen decision-making.
82 Our staff meetings directly contribute to organisational learning.
83 Even when they know that their opinions are not widely shared by colleagues or supervisors, people generally feel comfortable expressing themselves in staff meetings.
84 Our organisation is a safe place for risk-taking innovators.

VII. Governance and Strategic Management
85 The information contained in our reports to donors is of high quality.
86 Our reporting to donors demonstrates a clear understanding of their needs and requirements.

Our board has contributed competently in carrying out such functions as:
87 Fund raising
88 Public relations
89 Advocacy
90 Financial oversight
Policy definition
Strategic direction-setting

Our board has adequate representation from our key constituencies.
Commitment to our mission, goals, and philosophy is routinely reflected in:
- decisions made by staff.
- decisions made by board members.
- the day-to-day actions of non-supervisory staff.

We use strategic planning to examine ourselves in relation to our external environment.
We modify our strategic objectives based on findings generated through strategic planning exercises.
Our initiatives are developed and implemented in ways that are consistent with our strategic and operating plans.
We routinely track progress in achieving our strategic objectives.
Appendix I.

Instructions to prepare the presentation
Take overview sheets with capacity and consensus scores for all subgroup members. Also take the empty presentation flip-chart to prepare your presentation. Prepare this presentation in 20 minutes.

1. Read your overview sheet with capacity and consensus scores of your capacity area. Copy the total capacity and consensus scores on the presentation flip-chart? What do they mean?  
2. Mark the capacity scores of items higher than 80 with a “+” and capacity scores below 70 with a “-”. Write down 3 strongest and 3 weakest items (with their score) on the presentation flip chart.  
3. Look for areas of low consensus (put circle around any consensus score below 60) and write down the areas of low consensus, with the scores on the presentation flip-chart.  
4. Brainstorm for possible reasons or causes for strong capacity items and write on the presentation flip-chart.  
5. Brainstorm possible causes or reasons of weak capacity items and write down on the presentation flip-chart.  
6. Brainstorm possible causes or reasons for low consensus on capacity items and write down on the presentation flip-chart.  
7. Brainstorm specific recommendations in the capacity area of concern and write on the presentation flip-chart.

One sub-group member will perform the presentation to the plenary. You only need to read the flip-chart to the group on 2 or 3 minutes. There will be room for plenary questions or additions after this.

Instructions to prepare the presentation
Take overview sheets with capacity and consensus scores for all subgroup members. Also take the empty presentation flip-chart to prepare your presentation. Prepare this presentation in 20 minutes.

1. Read your overview sheet with capacity and consensus scores of your capacity area. Copy the total capacity and consensus scores on the presentation flip-chart? What do they mean?  
2. Mark the capacity scores of items higher than 80 with a “+” and capacity scores below 70 with a “-”. Write down 3 strongest and 3 weakest items (with their score) on the presentation flip chart.  
3. Look for areas of low consensus (put circle around any consensus score below 60) and write down the areas of low consensus, with the scores on the presentation flip-chart.  
4. Brainstorm for possible reasons or causes for strong capacity items and write on the presentation flip-chart.  
5. Brainstorm possible causes or reasons of weak capacity items and write down on the presentation flip-chart.  
6. Brainstorm possible causes or reasons for low consensus on capacity items and write down on the presentation flip-chart.  
7. Brainstorm specific recommendations in the capacity area of concern and write on the presentation flip-chart.

One sub-group member will perform the presentation to the plenary. You only need to read the flip-chart to the group on 2 or 3 minutes. There will be room for plenary questions or additions after this.
Appendix J.

Questionnaire: Organisational Overview
Capacity Building Program

For the development of a comprehensive capacity building program we will need some input from your organisation. This is mainly focused on general information to attach to the proposal. We also ask you to emphasise on the need for capacity building.

Please send us an Organisational Overview including the following items on maximum of 2 pages:

1. **Name Organisation**

2. **Contact details**
   - Contact person
   - Physical and postal address
   - Telephone, fax
   - E-mail

3. **Mission and Vision**

4. **Staff**
   - # of employed staff + # volunteers
   - gender balance

5. **Organisational Structure (organogram)**

6. **Programs**
   - current major activities or projects
   - direct target group,

7. **Members**
   - Information about the type of membership and number of members you have (if applicable).

8. **Budget**
   - Total project budget (optional)
   - Total overhead / organisational budget (optional)
   - number of donors

9. **Infrastructure**
   - Office spaces
   - Supporting structure (tel, fax, PC, internet etc)
   - Vehicles

10. **Partnerships**
    - Main partnerships with other NGOs and private sector
    - Public Sector relations

11. **Need for capacity building**
    - What is the biggest capacity challenge for your organisation?
    - What will be the benefits of this capacity building program for your organisation?
Appendix K.

Participatory Capacity Building Impact Assessment

Questionnaire

Measuring the Impact of Capacity Building Efforts

Directions:

Items that appear under the heading “discussion,” should be addressed through facilitated, whole group review. Team members should spend approximately 30 minutes considering each capacity area as a whole group.

Each team member should score the impact of capacity building activities on the capacity area following the discussion individually. Team members who cannot participate in the assessment of all capacity areas should not submit their answer sheets for scoring.

All 7 capacity areas should be scored individually by each member of the impact assessment team. The question for scoring is: What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on this capacity area?

Use the following scale to establish your score:

1. The Capacity has severely decreased
2. The Capacity as decreased
3. The Capacity has remained more or less the same
4. The Capacity in this area has improved
5. The Capacity has very much improved

Anonymity of scoring is guaranteed.
I. Human Resource Management

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Staff training events
- Staff retention:
  - Recruitment;
  - Compensation;
  - Personnel evaluation;
  - Promotion;
  - Conflict resolution;
  - Staffing;
- Supervision

**Discuss:**
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

**Scoring Question:**
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Human Resource Management?
II. Financial Resource Management

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Financial procedures and practices
- Budget Projections
- Cash flows
- Diversity of financial support from
  - Private individuals, corporations or income generation;
  - Public Sector/Government;
  - Donors (Bilaterals/multilaterals, foundations).

Discuss:
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Financial Resource Management?
III. Equitable Participation

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Stakeholders involvement in projects
- Access to and benefits of projects for traditionally under-represented groups
- Local leadership and local knowledge
- Policy development and advocacy in field of equal participation of traditionally under-represented groups

Discuss:
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Equitable Participation?
IV. Sustainability of Program Benefits

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Environmental sustainability
- Economic sustainability
- Political sustainability
- Institutional sustainability
- Cultural sustainability

In
- Project design;
- Project implementation and
- Project monitoring and evaluation.

- Sustainability of technical support to target groups

Discuss:
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Sustainability of Program Benefits?
V. Partnering

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- New contacts and linkages with
  - Relevant policy makers;
  - Private business sector representatives;
  - Other NGOs.
- Type of current partnerships and their effectiveness

Discuss:
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Partnering?
VI. Organisational Learning

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Learning from project evaluations
- Integrated problem solving and team work
- Information sharing
- Participatory decision making

Discuss:

1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:

What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Organisational Learning?
VII. Governance / Strategic Management

The following items are considered in this capacity area:

- Donor reporting
- Board practices
- Governance and consistent decision making along goals, mission and philosophy
- Strategic Planning

Discuss:
1. Which Strategic Capacity Direction(s) was this capacity area part of?
2. What activities have taken place in this area?
3. Which went on well? Which encountered difficulties?
4. What are outcomes that are result of these activities?
5. What positive contribution did they make to improve our capacity in this area?
6. What other factors might have contributed positively or negatively to our capacity in this area?
7. What remain the critical issues or problems in this capacity area?

Scoring Question:
What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on Governance and Strategic Management?
Individual PCB Impact Score Sheet

Organisation name:_____________________ Individual Name (encoded): ______________

Individually, give a score on each of the following capacity areas after the focused group discussions.

The question for scoring is: **What has been the impact from the capacity building activities on this capacity area?** Use the following scale to establish your score:

1. The Capacity has severely decreased
2. The Capacity as decreased
3. The Capacity has remained more or less the same
4. The Capacity in this area has improved
5. The Capacity has very much improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M.

About the Toolbox and cd-rom

The Participatory Capacity Building toolbox and cd-rom were developed in 2003 for the Institute of Cultural Affairs in Zimbabwe by Jouwert van Geene in collaboration with the National Association of NGOs in Zimbabwe (NANGO) with the support of ICCO-PSa and PSO, the Netherlands.

The toolbox and cd-rom were designed for facilitation purposes only. Large-scale reproduction, widespread distribution, or inclusion of any materials in publications for sale or third party training is prohibited without prior written permission. Please send requests to:

ICA-Zimbabwe
P.O. Box CY 905 Causeway, Harare, Zimbabwe
(e) icazim@africaonline.co.zw

For updates and new experiences with Participatory Capacity Building please visit the PCB-website:
www.geocities.com/part_cap_building

About the Author

Jouwert van Geene (1970) has a Masters in Business Administration from the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands. During his studies he took several subsidiary courses at the Centre for International Development Issues in Nijmegen.

Jouwert worked for several Dutch and international organisations in the field of international development both as a free-lance consultant and on long term contracts. He is specialised in group facilitation methods, participatory project cycle management and organisational development. Jouwert has developed and conducted several training programs on these topics for a wide variety of participants including public and NGO-sectors.

Work has brought him to Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, South-Africa, USA and Armenia.

Jouwert is a partner of Facilicom Consult, a Dutch consultancy and training firm, he is an individual associate member of ICA-International (Brussels) and capacity building advisor of ICA-Zimbabwe. Jouwert is a qualified trainer in Technology of Participation®.
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Who is ICA-Zimbabwe?

The Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) – Zimbabwe is a unique facilitation, training and research organisation providing effective participatory skills to thousands of people across Zimbabwe and in thirty-five other nations. Globally we have a successful experience spanning over 35 years and a network of world-wide independent and autonomous organisations. ICA-Zimbabwe uses facilitation methods that result in improved organisational effectiveness and output.

Our **Vision** is to be a high quality provider of services in facilitation, community building and organisational development and transformation in Zimbabwe.

Our **Mission** is to promote social innovation through participation.

At the heart of ICA-Zimbabwe is the Technology of Participation® (ToP®), a series of methods that promote dialogue, produce consensus and solve problems in today's working environment.

Some programs of ICA-Zimbabwe:
- Community development programs, which engage youth and other community members in community building;
- Capacity Building programs that focus on integrated organisational strengthening of NGOs, business and Government agencies;
- HIV/AIDS programs that take on this issue at community level by engaging the whole community in research, awareness and action.

ICA-Zimbabwe has a pool of experienced trainers and facilitators. We offer training and facilitation services in, amongst others:
- Group Facilitation Methods;
- Participatory Strategic Planning;
- Participatory Project Management;
- Participatory Capacity Building.

All services of ICA-Zimbabwe are customised to the specific situations.

ICA-Zimbabwe
P.O. Box CY 905 Causeway, Harare, Zimbabwe
(tel & fax) + 263 4-705197
(cell) + 263 91 309335
(e-mail) icazim@africaonline.co.zw