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Introduction

This Organisational Capacity Assessment Workshop is taking place within a broader context.

The Civil Society Facility Project commenced work in April 2016, and is managed on behalf of the Governments of the Netherlands, Sweden and Norway by Ecorys Netherlands and in consortium with VNG International, AKVO and INTRAC.

The ultimate goal of the CSF project is: **More responsive and inclusive decision-making provides positive changes in the lives and wellbeing of communities and groups.** This is to be achieved through constructive engagement with authorities and decision makers with authorities and decision makers. In order to enable this, the project aims to improve organisational capacity of national Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in a number of areas: inclusive leadership, strategic vision and direction, good stewardship of resources, tracking results and learning to improve, and resourcing and resilience. The starting point for this is assessing organisational capacity – hence this workshop.

This workshop is taking place in the context of the Civil Society Facility’s rolling out of the first round of grants. These are four INGO Outreach Partners, who will be supporting local organisations in Aweil, Bor and Equatoria. These four partners are at various stages of starting their engagement with local partners. Some already have OCATs, others are under development. It is therefore a good time to take stock and share thinking about the whole process.

**Overall Aim of the Workshop**
- To develop understanding of how to carry out organisational capacity assessment processes.

**Specific Objectives of Workshop**
- To understand the role of organisational capacity assessment within the broader framework of organisational change and the CSF programme.
- To discuss the content of Organisational Capacity Assessment Tools (OCATS) and key elements which need to be included.
- To identify best practice principles for using OCATs.
- To understand how to use the results of OCATs to produce organisational capacity change plans.

This Handbook accompanies the workshop. It contains the key ideas that will be discussed in the sessions and are shown on the Power Points. The information in the Handbook is structured in the same order as the workshop sessions. This provides a reference for participants as they consolidate their learning at the end of each day and after the workshop.

It is suggested that participants should not read the relevant sections before we have each session. They will learn more if they approach the topic with a fresh mind and think through issues for themselves.

See the timetable on the next page to see how the workshop is structured to meet the aim and objectives.
## Workshop Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Mon 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Mar</th>
<th>Tue 20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jan</th>
<th>Wed 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.20</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Review of Previous Day</td>
<td>Review of Previous Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50 – 11:10</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15 – 15.30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Handbook accompanies the workshop. It contains the key ideas that will be discussed in the sessions and are shown on the Power Points. The information in the Handbook is structured in the same order as the workshop sessions. This provides a reference for participants as they consolidate their learning at the end of each day and after the workshop.

It is suggested that participants should not read the relevant sections before we have each session. They will learn more if they approach the topic with a fresh mind and think through issues for themselves.
Some Definitions for the Course

There are a huge variety of ways in which different terms are used in the field of capacity development. There is no ‘correct’ definition of any of these terms. In INTRAC we believe that each organisation engaged in this work needs to develop its own understanding and references, to facilitate a common approach amongst its staff and members. These definitions are a starting point.

**Organisational development** is a conscious, planned and systematic process of change aimed at improving the self-awareness, effectiveness or health of an organisation as a whole.

**Capacity** is the ‘ability to’ and ‘power to’ do something (functional)

**Capacity Development** is an organic process of capacity change, rather than a deliberate act to strengthen skills, introduce new systems, contract new people etc. Capacity development can be catalysed through diverse means - exposure to new contexts, engagement in new types of work, a change in funding etc.

**Capacity Building** is one such ‘catalyst’, being the purposeful, conscious effort to bring about capacity development. Capacity Building is a structured process that is framed around the answer to the question ‘capacity for what?’ It has a clear purpose and set of specific objectives. When directed at individual organisations and networks that are partners of International Agencies/NGOs then it can be referred to as ‘partner capacity building’.

**Organisational capacity assessment** is a systematic and holistic process used to assess the capacity of an organisation and to assess specific selected capacity areas.

**Organisational learning** is the process of change in individual and collective thought and action which is affected by and embedded in the systems, structures, culture and strategy of the organisation.
Session 2. Understanding Organisations

Inspiring Organisation 1: Ekta Parishad, India

Ekta Parishad evolved as a people’s organization in 1991. It first articulated the agenda of “people’s control over livelihood resources” in 1996 in the process of consolidating its vision around the key issues of land, forests and water rights. The majority of the people in Ekta Parishad at the time of its inception, were tribals (or ‘adivasis’), who had been increasingly alienated from their lands because of constant displacement. They were also suffering due to being barred from forest areas, because of the 1980 Forest Conservation Act. This problem was aggravated by the extraction of water resources for the use of industries and large-scale agriculture. Without land, forest and water, people (and especially forest-dependent communities such as the adivasi groups) could not hope to survive on the land. This was the impetus that brought the groups into a larger social formation after 1991. By the end of the 1990s, Ekta Parishad had gathered around it a constituency of about 200,000 members.

Ekta Parishad developed a methodology of mobilising local people to articulate for their rights. One such example was the Orissa yatra (march) was carried between 30 January and 24 February 2004. In Orissa, dozens of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) have been signed by the government to allow resource extraction industries to operate in the rural areas. These areas happen to be tribal pockets. The state government in their enthusiasm to develop, were ignoring existing legislation. This was one of the key themes of the yatra carried out by Ekta Parishad.

The jeep yatra covered a large area from Kalahandi to the Barbara Forest Reserve. The padyatra (foot march) began at Laligarh, the Vedanta site, a large bauxite mining company and then proceeded to Kalahandi from which there was a long march of three days into the state capital of Bhubaneswar.

The padyatra ended with a public meeting in Bhubaneswar (the Orissa State capital) that was attended by the Chief Minister of Orissa State and, which had gathered 5,000 people of the state’s deprived communities. This is when the task force was created to deal with the land problems of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

Adapted from Ekta Parishad Website: http://www.ektaparishad.com/en-us/about/history.aspx#history1
Inspiring Organisation 2: National Innovation Foundation, India

The NGO sector in India is comparatively well developed, with some organisations going back to the 19th Century and many others with many decades of experience. But many organisations do quite similar activities such as savings and loans groups, small scale local infrastructure and disaster response. Therefore it is interesting to find organisations doing things in a different way.

One such organisation is the National Innovation Foundation. This was founded Professor Anil Gupta. Many believe that poor people are stupid – that they need to be shown how to improve their lives by ‘experts’. But Professor Gupta believes that everyone can be an innovator and that they are best placed to come up with ideas that improve their lives. So he set up an organisation that would scout for new ideas all over the country – going into the deepest rural areas. They hold regular competitions and the best innovations are given prizes. More importantly the ideas are taken for further development and testing, linking with some of India’s top institutions. Those that prove viable are then marketed and have their intellectual property rights protected.

Kanak Das developed a bicycle which uses the rider and bumpy ground to propel it forward by charging a battery under the saddle, which then links to a small electric motor. He has also developed a kit which can be retrofitted to any normal bicycle.

Dulal Choudhary has mechanised the process of muga silk weaving, making modifications in the conventional mechanised loom. Muga silk weaved with the device becomes soft as well as blocks UV radiations up to 80 per cent as per laboratory tests at a university. Amongst other products, he has made an umbrella out of this material which is durable, stain free, and waterproof. It has a pleasing golden shine which illuminates colour, better than that offered by conventional umbrellas.

Another product featured on NIF’s website was developed by a woman innovator called Nisha Chaube in Uttar Pradesh State. Interestingly, this idea was inspired by Bollywood superstar Shah Rukh Khan. On the way to her grandmother’s home, Nisha saw a roadside advertisement for travelling bags that showed Shah Rukh Khan sitting on the floor beside them. She is a die-hard fan of Shah Rukh’s and thought that he should at least have had a chair to sit on, so came up with the idea for this suitcase seat.

For more on the National Innovation Foundation, see their website: www.nif.org.in
The Life Cycle Model

The life cycle model is a tool to help organisations to understand their capacity development needs from a different perspective. A discussion of ‘where are we on the cycle?’ among staff, board members and stakeholders is a good starting point for identifying what kinds of steps are needed for the organisation to become more effective. The table overleaf describes possible strategies for the organisation at each stage in the life cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Life Cycle</th>
<th>Potential Danger</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infancy</strong></td>
<td>‘Infant Mortality’</td>
<td>Funding. Inexpensive support from other NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has been born! Only very basic policies/systems are developed at this stage. The NGO lacks experience (no track record). It is opportunity driven. Very vulnerable to changes in the external environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescence</strong></td>
<td>Founder’s Trap: smothering the newly emerging organisation with ‘love’ and preventing it from developing its own independent life. Danger of diversifying too soon and becoming over-stretched. May start unrealistic ventures which the organisation is not able to implement.</td>
<td>Sharing Responsibility with Other Members. Learning to prioritise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds many more opportunities for diversification but has little experience of prioritising. Everybody knows what everybody else is doing - good communication. Each person shares responsibilities with the others - very participatory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prime</strong></td>
<td>Inward focus may develop. Internal Conflict. Reduced commitment. Interest declines. Some doubt may arise about whether the organisation’s priorities are right.</td>
<td>Decentralise decision-Making. Diversify activities if necessary. Focus on human development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong ‘results orientation’. A balance of self-control, flexibility and responsibility has been reached. Institutionalised vision and creativity in all its work. Strategic approach is strong: knows what it is doing, where it is going and how to get there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of Life Cycle</td>
<td>Potential Danger</td>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still strong but losing flexibility and creativity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes fewer risks and becomes unwilling to change.</td>
<td>Lack of Vision</td>
<td>Renewal of Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides fewer incentives to visionary thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas are received without enthusiasm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower expectations for growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts focusing on past achievement instead of future visions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of growth period and start of decline (watch for signs to take corrective measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristocracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater proportion of budget spent on administrative control systems.</td>
<td>Stagnation</td>
<td>External Shake-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on how things are done rather than what and why things are done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low internal innovation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline of performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality at the expense of functionality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Bureaucracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much conflict: focus on internal battles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on who caused the problem rather than what to do with problem.</td>
<td>Lack of Credibility with constituency.</td>
<td>External consultant may be required to take a major look at almost all aspects of organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members do not feel responsible for what is happening.</td>
<td>Search for ‘scapegoats’ (people on whom to blame the organisation’s problems whether or not they are responsible).</td>
<td>Shedding Senior Staff may be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance declines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns are not directed for growth of organisation but survival or self-interest of individuals in the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of Life Cycle</td>
<td>Potential Danger</td>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureaucracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing of any importance gets done.</td>
<td>Lack of Activity</td>
<td>By this time death may be the best solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociates itself from its environment and focuses mostly on itself. Makes it difficult for outsiders (especially constituents) to gain access.</td>
<td>Red Tape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only remaining systems are administrative rules and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members know the rules but do not remember why they exist - they only answer &quot;it is a policy&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless revived death is imminent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Death</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation expires (either quietly in its sleep or painfully if the members are not prepared to move on).</td>
<td>May not accept that death is near.</td>
<td>Someone to provide a fitting funeral and mourn the organisation's demise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The earlier lessons from the organisation may be lost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Three Circles Model

**To do**
- Programme performance

**To be**
- Internal organisation

**To relate**
- External linkages
The Onion Skin Model

The outside and most visible layer of the onion represents the physical and financial resources that an organisation needs – the money, the buildings, the vehicles and equipment. Inside that layer are the human skills and knowledge required to carry out the organisation’s work – the individual staff competencies and abilities. Within that are the structures and systems (such as monitoring and evaluation, HR, IT, fundraising and financial management systems) needed to make the organisation work. Getting closer to the centre are the mission and strategy of the organisation – what it wants to achieve and how it plans to do so.

Finally – right at the centre – lies the heart of the organisation: its identity, values, and its vision of the future world it is trying to shape.

This model is based on the ideas that there is a need for coherence and consistency between the different layers and that any changes in one layer are likely to have implications for the other layers. The Onion Skin model also emphasises the importance of ensuring that the heart of the organisation is sound before embarking on a capacity-building process aimed at the other layers.

Remember: “The onion grows (and rots) from the heart”!
Session 3. Organisations and Change

Case Studies for Understanding Organisations

Questions to consider for each case study:

1. How could you use the 3 organisational models (3 circles, onion and life cycle) to analyse the organisation’s needs?
2. What might be the issues that you would need to help them to investigate further?

These case studies are fictional, based on experience of working with many different organisations.

1. Case Study 1: Environment Activists
   A group of young people have got together to do something to promote environmentally sustainable actions by citizens in their country. They are a social enterprise, and they work with other organisations and schools to run events, give talks and organise actions like ‘Plant a Tree Day’ or ‘Clean Up the Park – litter collection’ event. They do a lot of different activities, have a decentralised organisation, and lots of volunteers. They are growing fast, and starting new branches in many different towns. They produce a lot of leaflets, and have an active social media presence. Sometimes they come across other groups doing similar things that they didn’t know about.

2. Case Study 2: Charity for Disabled Children
   The CfDC aims to provide information and advice to parents of disabled children. They have a really good website with many useful resources and they run parent support groups so that people can share advice. They are funded by advertising on their site as well as an annual sum from an international donor. Their staff in the capital are really motivated but sometimes worry that they don’t have the resources they need. The donor who helped set them up has lost interest in them, and just gives them a grant every year but doesn’t really engage with them to talk about their future. The director worries about how sustainable they are, and whether their trustees are interested to help the organisation to grow and develop.

3. Case Study 4: Emergency Relief Organisation
   ERO is focussed on helping people in disasters. They jump in to distribute food, clothes and shelter when there is a drought, flood or other emergency. They have been working closely with government agencies for many years, and have a network of volunteers who are well trained in logistics. They have a great reputation. However, last time there was a drought in the country, they had so much donations that they couldn’t spend all the money. On top of that they were inundated with donations of clothing and food which they found hard to process, organise and distribute quickly. People are questioning why they didn’t help people fast enough and what happened to all the money.
Understanding the Client Organisation as a System

Organisations are complex entities made up of different interacting parts. System mapping involves identifying and understanding the elements of the system under consideration and their inter-relationships. Systems maps give a graphical snapshot of a set of inter-relationships at one point in time.

Below are two tools for mapping the client system graphically. These approaches capture a lot of information very quickly in a way that is easy to see and help us to analyse a situation holistically.

Rich Pictures

Drawing a Rich Picture is a tool taken from Soft Systems Methodology. The reason for using pictures is that complex issues always involve multiple inter-acting relationships. Pictures are a better medium than writing for expressing complex relationships because they encourage a more dynamic and holistic representation of a situation – in short they can provide a rich amount of information in an easily digestible form. For this reason drawing Rich Pictures is a very useful tool to use in community needs assessment, project planning and M&E.

The first thing to remember about Rich Pictures is that you don’t have to be an artist to produce one! All you need is a very large piece of paper (flipchart-sized or bigger), lots of coloured pens and some time to think.

Here are some guidelines for drawing rich pictures:

1. The focus of the picture should be the issue you are interested to explore – it could be in the community, the relationships between people and organizations, or the factors affecting an issue such as crime or the situation of elderly people.

2. Use all the space available – spread out the parts of your picture but leave some space for developing the picture (a Rich Picture is a dynamic tool and can be revised to incorporate new insights).

3. Include yourself in the picture – you don’t have to be at the centre but you should be in there somewhere!

4. Include key people, structures and resources in the community/project area.

5. Include other important stakeholders outside the project.

6. Represent the issues, problems and concerns of the people in the diagram using speech bubbles and thought bubbles (just like comic books).

7. Use metaphors – for example, if you think someone is acting like a bulldozer, draw them on one!

8. Represent types of relationships using arrows, lines or any other way you can think of.

9. Add short notes if you think they are needed.

10. Represent the climate or quality of the relationships using symbols (such as dark clouds, sunshine, lightning bolts) or any other way you like.
11. Include influencing factors in the wider environment.

12. Make it colourful and let your creativity flow.

Rich Pictures can be used with stakeholders in all sorts of ways, including:

- To explore problem situations (ask people who have different points of view to draw the situation and explain their picture to each other).
- As a data recording tool (the situation facing an organisation, before and after).
- To test out an analysis with colleagues (“Here’s how I see it. What do you think?”)

Examples of rich pictures
Venn diagram

The Venn diagram is one of the most commonly used tools for systems mapping. Venn diagrams are particularly useful for introducing people to the basic concepts of systems and system boundaries.

Circles of different sizes are allocated to different stakeholders of the organisation. The size of the circles represents their importance. The degree of overlap (or proximity to the circle representing the organisation) represents the degree of contact with the stakeholder.

The following example represents a potato project in Pakistan. The top diagram is that produced by the head office in Islamabad. The other two represent the views of the provincial project staff. Those closer to the head office were more aware of linkages than those further away who had a very simple picture of relationships.

Session 4: The Purposes of Organisational Assessment

What is an OCAT?

A list of capacities - things an organisation needs to be able to do in order to deliver its mandate effectively. These capacities are each evaluated individually to see where the strengths and weaknesses of the organisation are.

Purposes of Using an OCAT

There are three possible purposes for using an OCAT:

- **Purpose 1**: Selection of partners.
- **Purpose 2**: For identifying priority organisational capacity development needs and priorities.
- **Purpose 3**: For the purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation – to establish some form of baseline and then measure progress over time.

In terms of simplicity, one tool and one process to cover all the three purposes is attractive – you do not want to overburden partners and yourselves with constant assessment processes. But there are significant problems with this. If using an OCAT for selection, the tendency will be for an organisation to show its best possible face to the prospective donor. This runs against the second purpose of identifying priority needs, which requires a frank assessment of the real situation – warts and all. This can again conflict with the third purpose, where the pressure is on to show improvements over time.

**Purpose 1 - Selection of Partners**

For the Purpose 1 (selection of partners), the onus should be on the donor to make its own assessment of capacity in order to decide whether to fund or not. Particularly important at this stage is due diligence – being sure that the resources transferred will be transparently used and properly accounted for. This assessment should then focus on some basic organisational information (some of which may be about checking what has been put in the proposal) and should include a strong focus on legal and financial issues. Due diligence assessments would normally be done by staff of the funder although they still need to be carried out in collaboration with staff of the grantee. The final scoring and report would be written by the staff of the funder and a recommendation made if the organisation can be funded or not. Issues raised through the selection process (e.g. that the organisation's financial systems need improving) may feed into a subsequent OCAT discussions and the resulting capacity building process.

Due diligence processes should collect basic factual organisational information that the programme will need on all grantees: reach and scope of the organisation; focus; budget and funding; finance issues; basic structure including available staff.

**Purpose 2 & 3 – identifying capacity needs and tracking capacity change.**

There are some challenges with joining these purposes together. For example, when using repeat OCATs and scoring as part of M&E, changes may be influenced by a number of factors, such as:

- Changes in the people involved in the assessment
- Greater awareness may lead to people scoring themselves lower the second time
- Purpose 3 requires a level of objectivity which may not be present in self assessments

On balance, the duplication of effort involved in doing separate process for both purposes does not seem justified, so there is a strong argument that these should be combined in one tool but taking measures to mitigate the challenges.
Steps in Organisation Capacity Assessment

1. Set up task force
2. Agree OA and other data needed and plan collection (who? how? what?)
3. Do OA and collect other data
4. Analyse data and explore causes (why?)
5. Prioritize changes needed and make plan
6. Implement changes and monitor process
7. Review changes and learn

Session 5: OCA Tools Characteristics and Standards

There are literally thousands of different types of OCAT that have been developed over the years. Most have something to offer, but none are perfect. CSF is not insisting on using a particular OCAT, but they should take account of the following:

The OCATs used by OPs with the National CSOs should take account of the following:

- Have a scalar ranking system with five steps for each element. These five steps are qualitative assessments of how strong/weak the organisation currently is in that area.
- It is necessary not just to consider how strong/weak an organisation is in specific areas, but also how important that area is for the organisation at this time. Some areas may be weak, but are not priorities for immediate attention (e.g. have a good website). Capacity development plans should only address a few issues at a time, if they are to be effective. This
is probably best done at the end, revisiting the completed elements of the tool to decide which ones (e.g. 3-5) should be addressed as a matter of priority. These can be highlighted in a summary at the end.

- The elements of an OCAT are usually broken into different sections to make it manageable and comprehensible. For example, ZOA structures it around 5 capabilities, while WVI has 11 sections. There is no one version that is perfect, but it is worth reviewing a few others to ensure that key elements are not omitted.

- The number of elements in an OCAT varies considerably. ZOA’s has 29, WVI’s has 104. There is no fixed rule on this, but the number of elements should allow sufficient scope for discussion in the time available. If it becomes a rapid tick-box exercise in which one or two people quickly decide the score, then it is not developmental. The time taken for capacity assessment needs to be factored in to this decision. For senior people in an organisation (e.g. Board Members) it is often hard to take a lot of time off. Also the organisation needs to actually be implementing projects, not just reflecting on themselves. So, OC processes need to be adequate, they should not be excessive. This will affect how many elements are chosen.

- In some OCATs, the elements are put as statements and sometimes as questions. For example, a statement might be,  
  ‘The organisation has a broad, diversified funding base.’

  The equivalent question would be:
  ‘Does the organisation have a broad, diversified funding base?’

  Either of these approaches is possible, although our feeling is that positive statements are preferable, with respondents asked to give scores on the basis of: 1 – strongly disagree; 2 – disagree; 3 – partly agree, partly disagree; 4 – agree; 5 - strongly agree.

- Some OCATs have descriptions for each of the five levels to provide an indication of what each score looks like. For example, for the above example, ‘The organisation has a broad, diversified funding base’, this might be from:

  1 – The organisation completely relies on a single donor.
  to
  5 – The organisation has a wide mix of donors (organisational members, public donors, private donors, customers) none of which provides more than 25% of total income.

  The problem with descriptions is that they can become complex and it is unclear what to do when part of a statement applies, but not all parts of it. Descriptions can also make the tool document very long. Generally, INTRAC would recommend making the statements a bit fuller and clearer, but then letting participants develop their own description. Descriptions can imply that there is a perfect blueprint for an organisation, whereas it is preferable if they can develop in their own individual ways.
### ATTACHMENT C: SAMPLE TOOL DESIGN FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passion for vision/mission</td>
<td>Quality outreach programs</td>
<td>Basic knowledge of HIV/AIDS issues</td>
<td>Transparency in financial management</td>
<td>Equipment for effective running of the programs</td>
<td>Information management skills</td>
<td>Skills to lobby government</td>
<td>Leaders inspire</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
<td>Team work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vision and mission</td>
<td>Community support and involvement</td>
<td>Ability to communicate HIV/AIDS impacts</td>
<td>Strong accounting system in place</td>
<td>Maintenance of infrastructure development</td>
<td>Documentation of activities</td>
<td>Understanding others for leadership position</td>
<td>Grooming others for leadership position</td>
<td>Baseline data on stake holders</td>
<td>Unity and cooperation among organ members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning skills</td>
<td>Spiritual support (FBOs)</td>
<td>Building skills of beneficiaries</td>
<td>Budgeting skills</td>
<td>Means for mobility to reach out</td>
<td>System for storing data</td>
<td>Understanding of institutional leadership structures</td>
<td>Effective Board</td>
<td>Skills to conduct needs assessments</td>
<td>Good management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in multisectoral response</td>
<td>Decentralized service provision</td>
<td>Mobilizing across sectors</td>
<td>Record keeping and skills</td>
<td>Monitoring of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding the culture of targeted community</td>
<td>Willingness to adapt to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good staff recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing services as close to beneficiaries as possible</td>
<td>Skills in using methodologies for participation</td>
<td>Good financial reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to create an environment for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills/knowledge shared among members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT’s Organisational Capacity Assessment, Facilitators Guide
Session 6: CSF OCA Tools Key Elements

The CSF programme is not just doing generic capacity building. It has a specific purposes [refer to the Theory of Change]. So to capture its achievement, there needs to be a particular focus on those areas where it is aiming to make most difference. The precise wording may be different, but all tools used should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas that must be included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Inclusive leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Strategic vision and direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Good stewardship of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tracking results and learning to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Resourcing and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ability to engage with and influence decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Cooperation and networking with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Relationship and contact with communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of these headings from the ToC, it would be useful to work out statements that cover what is required in terms of the above areas.
**Session 7: The Process of Using OCATs**

INTRAC would feel that, while there is always a lot of focus on the tool itself, this is in fact just 20% of facilitating a good organisational development process. The way a tool is used constitutes 80% of its success. By ‘success’, this means a process which clearly identifies areas of strength and weakness, provides the organisation with ownership and responsibility for its own capacity development and leads naturally into a coherent and appropriate capacity development plan. ‘Success’ also means an effective M&E process, based on a balanced assessment of the reality of the situation.

The process for using whatever OCATs are developed should include the following:

- Involve participants from both the Board and the Staff members from across the organisation. A meaningful discussion should not involve too many people (probably 20 maximum, preferably fewer), so there may be some selection necessary. But there should be some junior staff (e.g. extension workers) as well as the management team.

- The self-assessment process should be facilitated by an external person. This may be a staff member of the OP supporting that organisation or an outsider. If it is a staff member of the OP, during the OCAT discussion process, their role is to be a facilitator, raising questions and challenging responses, but not imposing their own view.

- The discussion is often more important as what the actual chosen ‘score’ is. A good way to carry out the process is to form sub-groups to answer clusters of questions and then compare scores. The interesting part is in discussing the reason for differences in perception and coming to a resolution. This can be captured on a ‘spidergram’ (see example below).
• This widens participation and enables a more considered response. The facilitator can play an important role in probing for evidence to back up the scores. The reasons for scores should be captured as part of the write up (brief bullet points).

• When an OCAT has been done with a national CSO through self-assessment, then the OP facilitator/other staff with knowledge (and possibly in consultation with other stakeholders who may have a view) should do the OCAT themselves for that same national CSO. The two sets of results should then be compared and discussed in a subsequent joint meeting. Areas of similarity and difference should be explored. The national CSO may want to make some changes as a result of this process.

• The outcomes of the process should then be translated into an organisational capacity development (OCD) plan. This can be separated into: what will be done over the next year and what will be done in the longer term. This OCD plan will be influenced by:
  - What has emerged from the OCAT;
  - Prioritisation of areas of critical importance;
  - Elements that are key for the CSF Theory of Change;
  - The ability to provide meaningful capacity development support in selected areas;
  - The ability of the organisation to absorb support and translate it into strengthened capacity (while carrying out other activities).

• As the intention is to repeat the process periodically to assess progress, this should be factored in too. An annual repeat exercise, should follow a similar process, but should probably focus mostly on the limited number of areas identified for attention in the OCD plan. In other words, the process should start with a wider, more comprehensive OCAT, but then narrow in subsequent reviews. But there should still be some space at the end of a review day, for other important areas of capacity needs. For example, if a key staff person has left during the year, there may be a particular need to address the skills gap this has left.

• The CSF and OP partners will be supporting a range of national CSOs: from larger, well-established organisations working in several states with multiple donors, to smaller, emerging organisations with few staff and systems. It would not be appropriate to put all organisations through exactly the same process. For smaller organisations, there could be a pre-selection of a smaller number areas to examine.
Planning for an OCA Process

Before starting an organisational assessment it is important to think through the following questions with the organisation concerned:

- Why are you thinking of doing the assessment now? Is this really the best time to do it? What else is going on?
- What is it coming out of (e.g. a successful year? A crisis?) or feeding in to (e.g. a new strategic plan)?
- What will you do with the results? Will they be used in a way that can lead to sustainable organisational development rather than ‘ad hoc’ initiatives?
- How much investment are you prepared to make in the process? (people’s time; money)
- Who will ‘own’ this process and its results? Who will be the ‘champion’ for the assessment?
- How engaged are the leadership team (Board; senior management)?

OA preparation checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appoint a ‘champion’ to lead / have an overview of the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create a task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decide what the purpose and scope of the OA will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decide who will be involved (board? Senior management? Staff? Beneficiaries?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Get familiar with the OA tool, and agree together what capacities need to be adapted or added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Make a plan for the stages of the process to allow time for data collection, analysis and discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communicate the broad outlines of the process, and its purpose to everyone in the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring the OCAT and Gathering Data

There are different ways of gathering data for the assessment. Each has resource implications as well as generating different kinds of logistical and facilitation requirements. There is no best way of gathering the data but bear in mind how much buy-in is needed from staff, and how much different sections of an organization might differ in how they assess the different capacities.

The assessment tool can be scored in different ways, for example:

- **Individually:** people across the organization are asked to score the assessment and then the results compiled by staff groups.

- **Existing meetings:** once individuals have scored the tool, the ‘lightest’ process would be to discuss sections of the tool at one or a number of existing meetings (such as staff meetings, trustee meetings, etc.).

- **A workshop:** gather together representatives from as many different areas or positions within the organisation as feasible. Optimally, participants would bring their scored assessment tool with them. The workshop would involve working through the different capacities systematically, with reference to examples and evidence in documents that should be made available on the day.

- **‘Well placed’ individuals** take the lead by providing a draft score for their areas of operation (using any of the data gathering options above or just by filling it in themselves). This is then taken into a workshop with a wider group of people, who would discuss and either validate or challenge the scoring.

- **A key person or OA ‘team’** take the lead in collating the data. They could do this by analysing surveys, group discussion notes or interviews where different people have provided their scores and produce a report summarizing key points and scores. This can then be presented to a workshop or to Senior Management and a final discussion and scoring exercise produces the final consolidated OA scores.

- **Involve an external facilitator** who is briefed to challenge the assumptions, and possibly also gather evidence in order to externally validate the analysis undertaken by the internal stakeholders.

**Who to involve?**

Whichever mix you choose, ensure that you are getting more than just one or two perspectives:

- Try to cover all of the main areas of the organization’s operations by getting the views of at least one person from each department (and region if you are field based).

- Consider whether and how to involve the Board.

- Try to get the views of partners and allies on the areas which they are most aware of such as partnership work or advocacy.

- Ensure that you are not just getting the perspective of the senior management.

- Incorporate considerations of including different genders, education levels etc. in your mix.
Session 8: Appreciative Inquiry

What is Appreciative Inquiry?

“The cooperative search for the best in people, their organisations, and the world around them. It involves systematic discovery of what gives a system “life” when it is most effective and capable in economic, ecological, and human terms.

- A reaction against problem-focused action research
- Shifts focus to strengths and positives, to the ‘positive core’ of a situation or organisation
- Focus on social construction & collective strengths
- A cooperative, co-evolutionary search for the best in people, their organisations, and the world around them.’

[Cooperrider & Whitney 2005]

App-prec’i-ate, verb,
1. valuing; the act of recognising the best in people or the world around us; affirming past and present strengths, successes, and potentials; to perceive those things that give life (health, vitality, excellence) to living systems.
2. to increase in value, e.g. the economy has appreciated in value.

Synonyms:
- VALUING
- PRIZING
- ESTEEMING
- HONOURING

In-quire’ (kwir), verb,
...the act of exploration and discovery.
To ask questions; to be open to seeing new potentials and possibilities.

Synonyms:
- DISCOVERY
- SEARCH
- SYSTEMATIC
- EXPLORATION
- STUDY
AI involves the art and practice of asking questions that strengthen a system’s capacity to heighten positive potential. It mobilises inquiry through crafting an “unconditional positive question” often involving hundreds or sometimes thousands of people.

**Background**

- Based on David Cooperrider’s doctoral work at Case Western Reserve University (1999)
- Eschews former Organization Development (OD) deficit models.
- Promotes a positive approach to change that builds a vision for the future based upon what already works well within an existing system
- Self-empowering philosophy
- ‘5-D’ process (Definition, Discover, Dream, Design and Destiny)
- Focus on collaborative working of all stakeholders
- Engages all stakeholders in systematic participation in a jointly constructed vision of an organisation’s future

**Comparison to Problem Focus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Appreciative Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What to fix</td>
<td>• What to grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underlying grammar = problem, symptoms, causes, solutions, action plan, intervention</td>
<td>• New grammar of the true, good, better, possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Breaks things into pieces and specialities, guaranteeing fragmented responses</td>
<td>• “Problem focus” implies that there is an ideal. AI breaks open the box of what the ideal is first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slow! Takes a lot of positive emotion to make real change.</td>
<td>• Expands vision of preferred future. Creates new energy fast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assumes organisations are constellations of problems to be overcome</td>
<td>• Assumes organisations are sources of infinite capacity and imagination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“..distinguishes itself from critical modes of action research by its deliberately affirmative assumptions about people, organisations, and questions”.

“Human systems grow and construct their future realities in the direction of what they most persistently, actively, and collectively ask questions about.”
The Process

“What in this particular setting or context makes organising possible? What gives life to our organisation and allows it to function at its best?”

“What are the possibilities, latent or expressed, that provide opportunities for even better (more effective and value-congruent) forms of organising?

1. Definition
“What is it we want to focus on?” Scoping

2. Discovery
“What gives life?” (The best of what is) Appreciating

3. Dream
“What might be?” (What is the world calling for) Envisioning

4. Design
“What should be—the ideal?” Co-constructing

5. Destiny
“How to empower, learn, and adjust/improvise?” Sustaining
What is Definition?
Definition defines the project’s purpose, content, and what needs to be achieved. It is used for outcomes and contract details.

What is Discovery?
Discovery is based on a dialogue, as a way of finding ‘what works’. It rediscovers and remembers the organisation or community’s successes, strengths and periods of excellence.

What is Dream?
Dreaming uses past achievements and successes, identified in the discovery phase to imagine new possibilities and envisage a preferred future. It allows people to identify their dreams for a community or organisation; having discovered ‘what is best’. They have the chance to project it into their wishes, hopes and aspirations for the future.

What is Design?
Design brings together the stories from discovery with the imagination and creativity from dream. We call it bringing the ‘best of what is’ together with ‘what might be’, to create ‘what should be – the ideal’.

What is Destiny?
The fifth stage in the 5Ds process identifies how the design is delivered, and how it’s embedded into groups, communities and organisations.
Generic Questions to Start

- Best experience. A time when...
- What do you value about... yourself, work, the organisation?
- What do you think is the core life-giving factor or value of your organisation – that which if it did not exist would make your organisation totally different than it currently is?
- If you had three wishes for this organisation, what would it be?

Ways to Use Appreciative Inquiry Questions in Healthcare

- To improve patient care
- To establish a therapeutic relationship
- To identify family capacities for care
- To inspire healthy behaviours in our patients
- To strengthen interdisciplinary teams
- To build camaraderie and trust
- To celebrate success
- To create a healthy work environment
- To make the most of meetings
- To foster appreciative leadership
- To illuminate “best practices” in quality and safety
- To promote learning

Example of the Creative Dream Stage
Session 9: Data Gathering Methods, Analysis & Planning

These are the most frequently used methods to supplement the information gathered in an OCAT.

1. Document Review
   What information already exists?
   e.g. Annual reports, project reports, online information, written policies and procedures, accounts, financial data etc.

2. Direct Observation
   This helps to get a ‘feel’ of the organisation’s culture. Includes visits to the office, observation of project workers, observation of meetings, notice boards, how people relate to each other, who can talk in meetings, atmosphere in the office etc. Best if done by several people (to cross check information) and documented with a checklist or a short report.

3. Questionnaires and surveys
   Questionnaires can be face to face, on the phone, posted, or picked up and filled in by staff, board members or volunteers. Often they are now done online with Survey Monkey or similar software. Beware of ‘survey fatigue’. Keep them short!

4. Semi-Structured Interviews
   Interviews based on a check list of questions but which also can address new questions which arise. They usually include discussion and allow feedback on opinions about the organisation. They are useful for collecting information aspects of an OCAT which you need to understand better. Often used to answer the question ‘why?’.

5. Case Studies
   Used to document the sequence of events over time relating to a person team, project or the whole organization. Can explore a significant event in the organisation’s life and analyse in more detail what happened and the lessons learnt.

6. Time lines (see next page)
**Historic Timelines**

**Purpose:**
This method supports organisation assessments by generating a whole picture of the organisation’s history as seen by all the different stakeholders (staff, board, volunteers etc). This helps the group to share a common starting point, can help identify patterns from the past, and then see what learning can be applied in the future.

**Materials:**
A long sheet of flipchart paper or several stuck together on a long wall horizontally (or a roll of wallpaper lining is ideal); A5 cards of different colours; markers for everyone.

**Time:** Depends on size of group – ideally about 1 hour

**Group Size:** Minimum 8 people

**Procedure:**
1. Place cards with years or months (depends on the time scale you are using) across the top of the sheet.
2. Ask participants to work in groups of 4 and write significant events relevant to the project or issue on the cards (one event per card).
3. Collect the cards, read them, clarify items, and place them under the appropriate year/month on the time line.
4. Summarize and review the results briefly.
5. Groups continue to write new cards, to fill in gaps, or add details.
6. Look for patterns and periods of change. Label the patterns above the years with new cards.
7. Discuss with the group what new insights the time line brings. What have they learnt from this? What forces have shaped the present? What can be learnt for the future?
8. If appropriate, ask the group for projections about the future.

**Comments / Options:**
- This method relies heavily on the shared knowledge of the group, bringing out a rich history greater than the knowledge of any one individual.
- The historical scan can help frame future steps for strategic planning for the organisation.
- The time line can be colour coded with different groups of stakeholders using different coloured cards or pens (e.g. for a project dealing with drug abuse: medical staff; police; social workers; community leaders; and young people etc. could each have a different colour).
- The time line can also be used to draw out positive and negative events more clearly: positive above the line, negative below the line.
- External events impacting on the organisation can also be added (e.g. change of government policy; refugee influx; funder pulling out etc.).
- It can be done with pictures instead of words and labels.
- This activity is a good context setter in the early stages of a workshop. It is a means of establishing a common ground for future thinking. It does not have a final outcome and needs to be followed up with other planning and analysis tools.
Data Analysis

It is not enough to understand just to describe the situation with an organisation. To bring about positive change, we also need to be able to explain the situation. It is necessary to understand the underlying causes and effects of what we are finding. That way we can identify the key issues that need to be addressed.

There are some useful tools to help us do this.

The Problem Tree

When the group prioritises one major issue that they think they can address, it is sometimes a good idea to look at it in more depth. This helps them to think about how a community can respond to that need. One way to do this is to use the Problem Tree.

How to construct a problem tree

Agree on a main problem and write it on the tree trunk. First identify the effects or symptoms of the main problem and write those on the leaves and branches of the tree. Start by asking for an effect and then say “what does that lead to?” and so on until you have thought of all the effects of a problem. Use pieces of card or paper or post-it notes.

Then identify the root causes of the problem and write those on the roots of the tree again using pieces of card, paper or post-it notes. To discuss the root causes, use the “But why?” method. Ask your group why does this problem exist and to every answer they give you, ask them, “but why?” You continue this until you reach the deepest root causes of a problem.

Encourage discussion and ensure participants feel able to move the cards around. Draw vertical lines to show the relationship between the root causes and the effects.
Here is an example of a management issue problem tree:

**Problem Tree Worked Example**

**Shortage of safe water**

- Reduced incomes
- Increased mortality
- Less time for farm work
- Increased disease
- Poor nutrition
- Used dirty sourced
- Buy water

**Roots**

- Increased cost of water collection
- Increased demand for farm use
- Population pressure

**Trunk**

- Borehole hand pumps broken
- Open well dried up
- Water table lowered
- Water intensive farming methods

**Branches**

- No money set aside for repairs
- Lack of unity in the community

**NGO staff have too much to do**

- Quality of work declines
- They remain in poverty
- They become stressed

**Roots**

- Poor recruitment
- Stretched HR department

**Trunk**

- Few staff with enough management skills
- Not enough staff

**Branches**

- Too many diverse programmes
- No money to pay for more staff
- Lack of funding

- Chasing pots of money
- No strategy or plan

- Low project impact
- Beneficiaries suffer from poor service
- Projects become ineffective

- In sufficient attention to projects
- Low improvement in livelihood

- They can’t concentrate

- They remain in poverty
The problem tree is good for seeing whether a group should be addressing an effect of the problem or a root cause. In general, addressing an effect is much easier but is often only a short term solution. Addressing a root cause is often more challenging but may bring about lasting change.

**Force Field Analysis**

Force Field Analysis is a useful decision-making technique. It helps you make a decision by analysing the forces for and against a change, and it helps you communicate the reasoning behind your decision.

You can use it for two purposes: to decide whether to go ahead with the change; and to increase your chances of success, by strengthening the forces supporting change and weakening those against it.

**About the Tool**

Force Field Analysis was created by Kurt Lewin in the 1940s. Lewin originally used the tool in his work as a social psychologist. Today, however, Force Field Analysis is also used in business, for making and communicating go/no-go decisions.

You use the tool by listing all of the factors (forces) for and against your decision or change. You then score each factor based on its influence, and add up the scores for and against change to find out which of these wins.

You can then look at strengthening the forces that support the change and managing the forces against the change, so that it's more successful.

**How to Use the Tool**

To carry out a Force Field Analysis, use a blank sheet of paper or whiteboard, or download our worksheet.

Then describe your plan or proposal for change in a box in the middle of the paper. List the forces for change in a column on the left-hand side, and the forces against change in a column on the right-hand side.

As you do this, consider the following questions:

- What business benefit will the change deliver?
- Who supports the change? Who is against it? Why?
- How easy will it be to make the change? Do you have enough time and resources to make it work?
- What costs are involved?
- What other business processes will be affected by the change?
- What are the risks?

**Tip:**

It’s important to identify as many of the factors that will influence the change as you can. Where appropriate, involve other people, such as team members or experts in your organization.
Next, assign a score to each force, from, say, 1 (weak) to 5 (strong), and then add up the scores for each column (for and against).

For a visual representation of the influence that each force has, draw arrows around them. Use bigger arrows for the forces that will have a greater influence on the change, and smaller arrows for forces that will have less of an influence.

Below are two examples, one for launching a new initiative such as youth vocational training and the second one explores the challenge of downsizing programmes in an NGO.
Key stages of using Field Force Analysis

1. **Define the change you want to see.** Write down the goal or vision of a future desired state. Or you might prefer to understand the present status quo or equilibrium.

2. **Brainstorm or Mind Map the Driving Forces** - those that are favourable to change. Record these on a force field diagram.

3. **Brainstorm or Mind Map the Restraining Forces** - those that are unfavourable to, or oppose change. Record these on the force field diagram.

4. **Evaluate the Driving and Restraining forces.** You can do this by rating each force, from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong), and total each side. Or you can leave the numbers out completely and focus holistically on the impact each has.

5. **Review the forces.** Decide which of the forces have some flexibility for change or which can be influenced.

6. **Strategise!** Create a strategy to strengthen the driving forces or weaken the restraining forces, or both. If you've rated each force how can you raise the scores of the Driving Forces or lower the scores of the Restraining Forces, or both?
7. **Prioritise action steps.** What action steps can you take that will achieve the greatest impact? Identify the resources you will need and decide how to implement the action steps.

**Hint:** Sometimes it's easier to reduce the impact of restraining forces than it is to strengthen driving forces.

Criticism of the force field analysis usually focuses on the subjectivity of attributing scores to the driving or restraining forces.

Some writers suggest the model applies within limited settings and that there are situations outside of these settings in which Lewin’s theory may be less applicable.

At the end of the day this model of analysis is a tool that may or may not be useful in your situation. You can decide this or allow others to make a decision.
Data Collection Plan

Data collection can be a complicated and messy business. It can become a massive task without end. So you need an organised and systematic approach, which addresses the key questions.

You need to **clarify what you are trying to find out and from whom.**
- What is the key question you are trying to answer? What are the sub-questions under that key question?
- Who has the answers to the key question and sub-questions? Where are there likely to be different perspectives that you need to research? (Need to think about different stakeholders such as board members, senior management, mid-level managers, junior staff, volunteers, other stakeholders).
- Which are the most important questions for the future of the organisation?
- What data will provide the answers to the questions you are trying to answer?
- What types of data will be more persuasive with different actors in making the case for change?

Then you need to consider **who should be involved in the data collection process.**
- What size of team would be appropriate?
- Who has the necessary skills?
- Who has the necessary time?
- Who has the necessary authority and credibility?

Notes:
1) It is also worth thinking about **when** particular people need to be involved in the process. For key decision makers, if they are brought in too late, they are less likely to ‘own’ the results.
2) Participants from the organisation will have their own views, and this is legitimate. But the data collection process and the way it is fed back will need to be seen to be **impartial if it is to be credible.**

You also need to consider **practical issues.**
- How much resources do you have available for this?
- When is it needed by?
- What scope is there to analyse the collected data?

You also need to consider **the usage and feedback of data.**
- Who will be interested to see the results?
- Who will make the key decisions? Who has most influence and authority?
- How much time will they have to consider and discuss results?
- What formats do they most easily engage with?

You can then develop a Data Collection Plan. An example of a possible format is given below:
Overall Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions/Areas</th>
<th>Who to answer questions</th>
<th>Methodologies to answer questions</th>
<th>Who to implement</th>
<th>Practical issues (e.g. timing, resources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This may all be feeding into one tool. But to complete different parts of that OCA will require different approaches.

For example to answer questions about **programme effectiveness**, recent evaluations could be used, beneficiaries and other external stakeholders, such as relevant government officials interviewed.

For questions about overall **organisational governance and management**, this would addressed to the Board, senior management and junior staff too.

To answer questions about **staff development**, this would likely be a question more for staff and their managers.

For **financial management**, then recent audit reports, the auditors themselves, the finance team and managers responsible for budgets would be the most likely respondents.
### Session 10: Producing an Organisational Capacity Change Plan

The 7 Dynamics of Change model, developed by Ken Blanchard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Consultant’s role to support the organisation’s leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People will feel awkward, ill-at-ease and self-conscious</td>
<td>Recognise and empathise with the discomfort. Communicate the rationale for the change and the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People will think first about what they have to give up</td>
<td>Acknowledge and empathise with the sense of loss; give people time before emphasising the positives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People will feel alone, even though everyone is going through the change together</td>
<td>Give people a chance to talk to each other and share their reactions to the change (even if it is not all positive!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People (believe they) can only handle so much change</td>
<td>Be clear and firm in communicating that people will be able to change more than they think (direction). Provide support, resources, encouragement and recognition (support).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People are at different levels of readiness for change</td>
<td>Treat people as individuals. Identify who is responding well to the change and give them encouragement. Identify who needs more direction and / or support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People will be concerned that they do not have enough resources</td>
<td>Show them the resources that are available; encourage them to find additional resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you take the pressure off, people will revert to their old behavior</td>
<td>Keep communicating and providing direction and support until your team has consistently adopted the new behaviours and the change has become accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritising the changes needed

The capacity assessment may indicate a significant number of areas where the organisation may need to change and develop. The prioritization of what changes are needed should be carried out through discussion, taking into account a number of factors:

- The need to strengthen capacities critical to the success of the organisation
- The need to address relevant serious capacity deficits
- Where a capacity deficit creates a problem in meeting important stakeholder requirements
- Where improvements to one capacity would have positive effects on a number of other related capacities (e.g. improving governance).
- Where potential to improve the capacity is high
- Where improvement in capacity could be achieved quickly or relatively easily to give confidence to those involved and send a signal to others in the organisation that change is achievable and leads to tangible benefits
- The resource implications of making any required changes
- For members of a (con)federation or other ‘family’ – where your internal standards have not been reached
- The need to avoid over-committing the organisation with the development of too many capacities at the same time
- An awareness of other change processes that are happening in the organisation and the potential for synergy.

Matrix Tool for prioritising changes

This tool is most helpful to use when you are facilitating a group in the organisation to decide for themselves what areas to prioritise.

a) Remind everyone what is the purpose of the OCA – What is your answer to the question “Capacity Development for What?” Write this up on the wall – this will guide your decisions.
b) Use four sheets of flipchart paper to prepare a large matrix on the wall and add the row and column headings as shown in the table.
c) Explain that each capacity card will be placed in one of these rows by considering the cards using the agreed prioritisation criteria as a whole.
Ask a small group to take responsibility for putting cards within each flipchart into priorities and then open a discussion only where there is disagreement. Ensure that the capacity cards always remain in the column/flipchart for their level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to success</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important for meeting stakeholder requirements / internal standards</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important at this time / low priority</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embryonic (Level One)</td>
<td>Moderately Developed (Level Two)</td>
<td>Well Developed (Level Three)</td>
<td>Best Practice (Level Four)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider in this order:
- Capacity cards in boxes A1 and A2 as these are high priority according to the prioritisation criteria but have a relatively low score.
- Capacity cards in boxes B1 and B2 because although they are only medium priority in terms of the prioritisation criteria, but they also have a relatively low score.
- Cards from any box (but particularly those with scores of level one or two) that are ‘low hanging fruit’ i.e. where improvement in capacity could be achieved quickly or relatively easily to give confidence to those involved and send a signal to others in the organisation that change is achievable and leads to tangible benefits.
- Capacities where the resource implications of making any required changes are minor.

It is important to consider a number of different practical and realistic interventions aimed at facilitating progress in the capacity areas you have prioritized. Ideas on these could be generated and analyzed in a small internal workshop, which could also include discussion of possible consequences of the interventions – both intended and unintended. It will be helpful at this stage to also identify those forces that may resist or support change and devise a strategy to work with those forces. A force-field analysis can be very helpful here.
Session 11: Overview of Capacity Development Options

There is a wide range of possible options for capacity building. These include:

- One-off intensive training course
- Modular training course
- Technical expertise/advice
- Mentoring
- Coaching
- Management or OD Consultancy
- Facilitated workshop exercise
- Leadership development
- Shadowing or observing
- Internships
- Exposure or exchange visit
- Community of practice
- Action learning set
- Peer support groups and peer assists
- Peer review
- Partner meetings
- Joint monitoring and evaluation
- Signposting information and resources
- Opening doors and facilitating access
- Harvesting experiences
- Accompaniment

(Note: See below for more detailed explanation and elaboration of these).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB Method</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Useful for?</th>
<th>Helped by?</th>
<th>Resource implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most common name for the method</td>
<td>Description of the method</td>
<td>Applications of the method</td>
<td>Factors which help ensure the method is as effective as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-off intensive training course</td>
<td>A structured event held in the workplace or in another venue. Often following a Training Needs Assessment, it will be designed around a number of learning objectives. Each session will have predefined objectives and content materials, with a detailed session plan to guide the trainer. Training methods vary - from traditional ‘classroom’ style to the highly participative action-learning approach. Participants may be from one organisation or team (in-house training) or from a variety (the ‘open training’ event).</td>
<td>✓ Enhancing capacity at an individual level (competencies) ✓ Conveying knowledge in a structured way ✓ Ensuring that ‘core’ content is covered ✓ Ensuring that members of one team/organisation are exposed to the same content and materials</td>
<td>• See key points from PSO action research and seminar on Training as a Capacity Building Strategy (annexed) • Combining another support method with the training course, such as follow-up coaching; peer support groups etc.</td>
<td>• High overall cost (preparation and event costs such as venue; food etc) • Access to good training venue • Requires quality control of trainer/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular training course</td>
<td>Based on action-reflection cycle, this is a series of structured events held over a pre-defined period of time. Participants often are asked to do an exercise on the topic of each module between each time they meet, or put the content of the module into practice in their workplace.</td>
<td>✓ Combining theory with practice ✓ Enhancing capacity at an individual level (competencies) ✓ Conveying knowledge in a structured way</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the same as the PSO paper • Support by the facilitator/trainer in between modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expertise/advice</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The focus is on the technical or professional content, or the technical systems required for the work to be effectively implemented and managed. Delivery may be as part of on-the-job accompaniment or it may be delivered during a special visit to the organisation.

- Very focused interventions which have clear outputs or products
- Particularly useful for developing new systems at organisational level
- Ensuring quality standards
- Can be used at the level of enhancing individual knowledge and skills
- Appropriate for role of ‘reflective observer’ at low intervention stage

- Building individual confidence
- Reinforcing individual attitudes
- Networking
- Leadership development

- Ensuring that ‘core’ content is covered
- Ensuring that members of one team/organisation are exposed to the same content and materials

- Visiting workplace if at all possible

- Requires clear and specific terms of reference
- Advisor needs strong adaptive skills and sensitivity to the context for the application of the technical content

- Important that the individual ‘mentee’ has choice of who will be their mentor

- Availability of timing that suits both mentor and mentee

- High overall cost
- Access to good training venue
- Requires quality control of trainer/s

- Investment in preparation time
- Advisor may need access to infrastructure, people etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coaching                         | Coaching is similar, but does not usually require that the coach has direct experience of their client’s formal occupational role unless the coaching is particularly skills focused. The expertise of the coach is more in the coaching method itself. | ✓ Enhancing individual skills
✓ Strengthening the application of newly-acquired knowledge
✓ Structured reflection at individual level | • Needs to have clear goals
• Focus on performance improvement
• Links to programme or organisational obj.s. | • Coaching skills
• Strong interpersonal communication skills |
| Management or OD consultancy     | Intervention of an external consultant working to a specific Terms of Reference related to the internal functioning of the organisation, or helping the organisation through a change process. | ✓ Facilitating ‘deeper’ organisational change
✓ Addressing leadership issues
✓ Team building | • Most effective when located within holistic context or framework
• Requires careful matching of consultant to client
• Realistic ToR | • Availability of individuals with consultancy skills |
| Facilitated workshop or exercise | An event which is designed around specific objectives. These objectives can focus on the development of ideas and knowledge, or on the production of a specific output. | ✓ Advancing particular initiatives via collaborative production of relevant outputs.
✓ Useful for intensive reflection and harvesting | • Clarity of purpose and outputs
• Identification of appropriate methods to be used during event | • Facilitation skills
• Availability of appropriate participants
• Can be costly |
| Leadership development | Usually applied in a medium-term programme targeting existing or potential future leaders. This programme may draw on a mix of methods. | ✓ May support and encourage individuals without formal leadership positions but who play an important influencing role within the organisation or team  
✓ Useful as part of a leadership renewal strategy  
✓ Useful as part of an overall organisation change process | • Requires close facilitation to ensure objectives are met  
• Identification of appropriate participants  
• Clear criteria for selection of participants  
• Support from line manager or supervisor  
• Clarity within the organisation or Unit about the role of leaders and the ideal competencies required to effectively fulfil the role  
• Openness of ‘recipient’ organisation/individual being shadowed, plus time available | • Need to ensure commitment of time to the programme  
• Funds available for an extended programme | | Shadowing or Observing | Observing someone as they go about their day-to-day job, or undertake a specific task. | ✓ Very helpful for learning about practical applications of knowledge and skills in ‘real life’ situations  
✓ Useful to gain an exposure to the ways of working of others | • Clear and specific objectives  
• Identification of appropriate opportunity  
• Clarity about how the learning will be applied |
<p>| <strong>Internships</strong> | The placement of an individual within a team or organisation for a pre-determined period of time. Usually it is someone who is recently graduated or embarking upon a career. | ✓ Can help access to new methods, technical knowledge etc. | ✓ Receptivity from ‘host’ team/organisation | ✓ Time to support the intern | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ ‘Could be costly if shadowing takes place at a distance from learner’s workplace’ | ✓ Can help access to new methods, technical knowledge etc. | ✓ Useful for gaining a new perspective i.e. if the recipient team is a bit ‘stuck’ in their ways | ✓ Respect for the intern and responsiveness to their needs | ✓ Intern’s costs will need to be covered | ✓ Can help access to new methods, technical knowledge etc. |
| Internships | | ✓ An additional human resource | ✓ Clarity on roles and responsibilities re: support to the intern | | | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ Can help access to new methods, technical knowledge etc. | ✓ Clear and specific objectives | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ An additional human resource |
| Exposure or exchange visit | A pre-arranged visit aiming to learn about a specific experience, or gain an exposure to the ways of working of another organisation, institution, team etc. | ✓ Similar benefits to ‘shadowing’ | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ Similar benefits to ‘shadowing’ | ✓ Can be used to address many different capacity areas | ✓ Identification of appropriate ‘host’ | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ Similar benefits to ‘shadowing’ |
| Exposure or exchange visit | | ✓ Can build relationships beyond the one-off visit | ✓ Clarity about how the learning will be applied | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Potentially high cost | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Can build relationships beyond the one-off visit | ✓ Useful for gaining new perspective | ✓ Clarity about how the learning will be applied | ✓ ‘Host’ needs to make time available | ✓ Can build relationships beyond the one-off visit |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Community of Practice</strong></th>
<th><strong>Action Learning Set</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often ‘virtual’ in nature (i.e. exchanges are held over the internet), this is a group of individuals who share their experiences and build their knowledge together. They are focused on specific themes, technical or professional areas, processes etc.</td>
<td>A group meets on a regular basis and uses a specific method to support each member in turn to reflect and act upon a work issue. See <a href="http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/5230-action-learning-set-process">http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/5230-action-learning-set-process</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances individual knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Contributes to innovation and to bringing in fresh perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Encourages ‘ownership’ of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ May benefit organisations as well as the individual participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear criteria for selection of individual participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow-up mechanisms, including via performance management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria would help process of self-selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purpose and scope of the CoP need to be clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational benefits more likely if there is clarity about the ‘feedback’ mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘face to face’ launch if at all possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires access to reliable internet service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants need to identify a strategic issue or work problem to focus attention on over an extended period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time commitment over extended period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to facilitator with ALS skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support groups and Peer Assists</td>
<td>In general terms, Peer Support groups can be time-bound, and ‘virtual’ gatherings of people working in similar areas who are open to supporting each other. Peer Assists is when one individual has something they want to move forward with, and brings together others with experience in that area to help him/her think about alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear criteria for selection of participants</td>
<td>Peer Support groups and Peer Assists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-assists/publications-opinion-files/6427.pdf</td>
<td>Support from line manager or supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ObmQyW3EiiE">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ObmQyW3EiiE</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete problem solving</td>
<td>Selection of appropriate participants (peers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building up a peer network</td>
<td>They may benefit from facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge development (particularly on technical methods and approaches)</td>
<td>Strong communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of appropriate participants (peers)</td>
<td>Attitudes of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They may benefit from facilitation</td>
<td>Familiarity with Peer Assist technique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Peer Review | Peers engage in reviewing the work of another peer. This can take place at individual, team, unit, or organisational levels. It can be part of a formal evaluation, or as an approach to peer learning. |
| Relationship building | Selection of appropriate peers |
| Exchange between more/less experienced partners | Clarity on roles during the Review |
| Ensure diversity of perspectives during an evaluation | Relatively high degree of trust amongst participants |
| | Strong communication skills |
| | Attitudes of respect |
| | Familiarity with Peer Assist technique |
| | Time available for participating peers |
| | Can increase evaluation costs |
| **Partner meetings** | Regular meetings with partners may include the provision of some specific input with the aim of enhancing capacities. For example, inviting a guest speaker to discuss new developments in the sector. | ✓ Focused knowledge development  
✓ Ensuring a common understanding amongst all partners | • ‘fit’ within overall meeting agenda  
• Participatory approach to selection of topic  
• Selection of topic appropriate to all | • Access to external resource person if required |
| **Joint Monitoring and Evaluation** | Inclusion of individuals from partner organisations in the monitoring or evaluation of specific programmes. | ✓ Particularly useful for enhancing M&E capacity  
✓ As for ‘Peer Review’ above | • Especially effective if partner participates in the development of the M&E tools being used | • Increased costs of the M&E activities |
| **Signposting information and resources** | The provision of information and materials, or the indication of where to gain access to such materials and information. | ✓ Enhancement of technical knowledge  
✓ Obtaining ‘good practice’ reference material and examples (e.g. of policies, curriculum, standards etc)  
✓ Enhancement of knowledge management | • INGO itself would need a strong knowledge management culture and systems  
• Close relationship with partner facilitates identification of resource needs in a ‘fluid’ manner | • Time to source relevant materials |
| Opening doors and facilitating access | Facilitating partners’ access to new contacts, decision makers and other influential people and institutions as a contribution towards enhancing relational capacity and achievement of objectives. | ✓ Building relationships in a new technical area  
✓ Enhancing relationships for policy influencing | • Requires high levels of trust (with partner, with contact)  
• Careful briefing of partner about the contact | • Time for communication work |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Harvesting experiences               | Systematization of experience with a view to sharing key points with others. The process of gathering the experiences is often done in a way which can help collective reflection on the advances of the work, lessons learnt etc. | ✓ Building a shared understanding within and across organisations  
✓ Useful as part of learning exercise, particularly if it enters the ‘triple’ loop of transformation (change or renewal of basic assumptions and mental models)  
✓ If a product emerges from the ‘harvest’, this can be used to enhance profile and credibility of the partner/s | • Clarity of purpose and output/outcomes  
• Clarity on methodology  
• Realistic timeframe  
• Clear roles | • Knowledge and skills for harvesting  
• Time implications  
• Cost could be a factor (particularly if an expensive product is desired) |
When examining options for the capacity building interventions, you should consider those which the organisation can do themselves; those which they can do with other organisations and those where they may wish to bring in additional, external help. This can be expressed visually as a pyramid, with the ideal being that they place a greater effort on taking charge of their own development, or doing it in collaboration with others and only bring in that external help when they are clear on its value-added.

Writing the plan

A written change plan should take the form that best fits the organisation’s purpose – it can be a stand-alone document, or form part of an overall organisational strategy or business plan. It can also be fed into departmental work plans. However, whichever format is chosen, it will be helpful if it contains the following elements:

- For each area to be addressed in the plan, a reference to current level and to the ‘goal’ level that is to be achieved within the timeframe of the plan. It may also be helpful to include the indicators of the capacity at that ‘goal’ level (from the assessment tool), as a reminder of what is being aimed for, without the need to refer back to the tool.
- An indication of how the capacity building intervention will be implemented – by the organisation itself, with others or with external help
- A brief description of the proposed capacity building intervention or activity
- Timescales
- Resource requirements (time, finances, tools, specialists)
- Who is responsible for the activity
- How progress will be monitored, when, and by whom
- A space for comments e.g. noting when activity completed, delayed etc.
Sequencing Capacity Development Activities

Here are some things to bear in mind when deciding on the order of capacity development activities. There is no strict rule to follow.

1. Put activities in a logical sequence.
2. Some activities need to be done before others can begin.
3. An activity might have positive ‘knock-on’ effects on other related activities.
4. Pick ‘low hanging fruit’ early on - activities that can be done quickly or relatively easily.
5. Be realistic about how many activities can be carried out at the same time.
6. The overall timescale of the plan is likely to be longer than you think – be realistic.
7. Some areas may need a 2-3 year timescale to achieve the changes you want.
8. Keep a balance between short-term and longer term activities.
9. Make use of external or internal opportunities to support capacity building activities.
10. Consider timescales for the availability of resources (sources of expertise, venues, and funding).
11. Work around other demands on the organization (external and internal). For example, if the organization is conducting a major evaluation or launching a new project.

External events may impact on the plan. Review progress regularly and be flexible in the choice and sequence of capacity development activities.
Example of an Organisational Capacity Change Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPACITY TO BE DEVELOPED</th>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>Desired Level</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF TARGET INDICATOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Membership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>We have nearly reached our ideal number of members. Many of them are active.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOCUS AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO WITH?</th>
<th>ACTION TO BE TAKEN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define a realistic membership target for end of year</td>
<td>Management Committee (MC) discusses and agrees</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force responsible for membership</td>
<td>Management Committee (MC) designate two people to form Membership Task Force</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop recruitment skills</td>
<td>Task Force to attend training course</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Membership task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a recruitment drive</td>
<td>Contact other membership CBOs to learn what they do and see examples of a recruitment plan</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Membership task force + other CBOs (to be identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a recruitment drive</td>
<td>Development and presentation of recruitment plan</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Membership task force + MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of plan</td>
<td>Membership task force coordinates activities which are carried out by themselves plus other members</td>
<td>May - October</td>
<td>Task force + members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity on activities for new members to do</td>
<td>Membership task force discusses with others and produces a range of possible activities for new members to choose from.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Task force + members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further Reading

Resources for facilitation

Reimagining groupwork: Bill Crooks and Jackie Mouradian 2012
Facilitator’s guide to participatory decision-making: Sam Kaner with Lind, Toldi, Fisk and Berger 1996
Participatory learning and action- a trainer’s guide: Jules N Pretty, with Guijt, Thompson and Scoones

Deeper look at Organisation Development

Organization Development, A practitioner’s guide for OD and HR: Meen-Yan Cheung-Judge and Linda Holbeche, 2015
Capacity Building Framework, A values-based programming guide: Brenda Lipson and Martina Hunt, INTRAC 2008
The Fifth Discipline: the Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation; Peter Senge, 1994

Online resources

www.mindtools.com has many tools to help with prioritizing, analysing and visualising information
www.businessballs.com free online ethical learning resources for people and organisations
www.betterevaluation.org although focussed on evaluations, this website include many interactive tools, and ways to analyse and visualise data that can also be used in organisational assessments.