

## **ANNEX K: MEASURES OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY (PIVA AND OCAT)**

This annex provides some technical details on two very similar methods for measuring the level of, and changes in, institutional capacity. The PIVA and OCAT methods were designed mostly for use with one organization over time. Data quality issues in this limited context are confined mostly to the subjectivity of the scores and the consistency of scoring over time. When one contemplates using a tool like PIVA or OCAT across numerous operating units and institutions, as IEHA does, additional issues arise. The main ones are the comparability of scores across institutions and scorers. Regarding the validity of adding or averaging together scores for different institutions in different countries, one can say that in each case the mission in question has determined that the development of the institution is a highly worthwhile activity. Beyond that, it is not possible to determine which institution's development is a higher priority or deserving of more weight. In this situation, IEHA will combine all the scores giving them each equal weight (having first converted all scores to a 100-point basis). The scores combined will be for institutions performing similar functions: research, policy development, or market-related services; scores will not be combined across these technical lines. The subjectivity or objectivity of scores across institutions and countries is also an issue, but it is an issue for even one institution. In this regard, IEHA urges missions to use data collection techniques that are as objective as possible in the given context. While self-assessment is one of the possible uses of these tools, this is not the mode preferred by IEHA, which is counting on receiving objectively verifiable information from each reporting mission to combine with that from all other missions. More objective modes of data collection include document review and direct observation.

### **PIVA<sup>1</sup>**

The Partner Institutional Viability Assessment (PIVA) is a user-friendly management tool, with a numerical scale and matrix-method design, used to precisely and comprehensively identify changes and progress in the organizational development capacity of regional African partner organizations in East and Southern Africa. PIVA provides a framework for analyzing detailed information, data and evidence about the management and technical capacity of strategies and systems. PIVA examines the organizational track record in order to identify areas for strengthening, and improvement indicators for organizational viability. With this analysis, regional organizations can more formally and thoroughly identify long-term and leadership-oriented strategies, action plans, and measurable monitoring and evaluation approaches.

#### **Institutional Competency Areas**

Each of the six areas of competency is divided into sub-categories, which are further divided into main elements. For example, under "Governance," the sub-category of "Mission" has three main elements within it: 1) statement of purpose, 2) staff understanding of mission, and 3) links between mission and programs.

Each of these elements is described (and scored) according to its stage: start-up (1), developing (2), consolidating (3), or mature (4) Scores are determined based on how thoroughly a system or

---

<sup>1</sup> From Jefferson, 2001.

infrastructure operates to ensure continuous, effective management of a particular sub-category and main element. The rating is both quantitative and qualitative. It provides a multi-dimensional snapshot of the institutional positioning of a regional partner organization in 6 organizational development areas.

### **Stages of Organizational Development**

The four stages of development, from “start-up” to “mature/viable” are described as follows:

**Start-up/Nascent:** The beginning phase of organizational development. General characteristics of a start-up are few individuals involved; not much history; generally very small and not yet stable.

**Developing/Emerging:** The second stage of organizational development. Characterized by rapid growth, high energy and much activity. Much time is spent developing the service delivery side of the organization. Usually behind in its administrative functions because of the rapid growth rate. High level of learning necessitated by the rapid growth. A mature organization can move into this mode when it attempts a new area of focus or enters a new geographical area.

**Consolidating:** Third stage of organizational development. Characterized by continued high quality service delivery and intensified focus on the other five areas of organizational development. It is a time when the learning of the developing phase are incorporated into the organization.

**Mature/Viable:** Fourth stage of organizational development. The organization is fully functional in the competency areas. Being mature in each of the six competency areas is akin to achieving a level of true institutional viability.

Each of the six competency areas is assessed according to the four stages of development of each sub-category and main elements within a subcategory. A three-point scale with 1 indicating a low or poor level of development and 3 representing a very advanced management system and competency in a particular sub-category and main element. Continuing with the “Governance” example, the sub-category of “Mission” has three main elements within it: 1) statement of purpose, 2) staff understanding of mission, and 3) links between mission and programs. For each of the main elements under Mission, a score is given to indicate the level of development of the statement of purpose using the sub-elements identified.

All organizations evolve differently. The numerical-scored, matrix method of examining an organization’s components and competency areas in terms of these four development stages helps to present a fair, qualitative and quantifiable picture of a very complex structure. An organization could be in a different stage of development in *each* of the six competency areas at any one time. For example, an organization might be in the **consolidating stage** with respect to *governance*, but still in the **start-up stage** in terms of its *resource base*. This is to be expected, and helps an organization define what it needs to focus on in order to move to the next stage of development. Thus, the index produces a “snapshot” of all the pieces of an organization at a given moment.

Because many organizations must continually attempt to strike a balance between achieving a sufficient level of professionalism and avoiding becoming too bureaucratic, the method of pinpointing needs by **area of competency** and by **stage of development** can help to highlight necessary development steps over unnecessary steps.

The following table provides detailed descriptions of the stages of development by the sub-categories and main elements.

## A. GOVERNANCE & LEADERSHIP

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>GOVERNING BODY</b>				
<i>Existence of governing body</i>	Advisory committee or other pre-governing structure in place.	Governing Body members identified but not yet meeting regularly.	Governing Body is meeting regularly, but attendance is erratic.	Governing Body in place and meeting regularly with full participation.
Differentiation of oversight and management roles	No recognition of the need for such differentiation. Governing Body is involved in daily management or Management assumes task of formulating policy direction.	Governing Body and Management understand respective roles, but not yet following their designated mandates.	Differentiation between Governing Body and Management improving.	Governing Body fully focused on playing its role of providing vision, overall policy direction, fundraising, public relations, lobbying, financial oversight.
Managing transitions	Governing Body function vested in founders.	Frequent Governing Body member resignations; replacement process is ad hoc.	Majority of members filling all terms; process defined for selecting replacements but not always followed.	Most members filling full terms; replacement process fully respected.
Governing Body composition/diversity	Governing Body function assumed by founders or donors.	Governing Body relatively homogeneous, reflecting founders' background(s). Limited representation on basis of gender, class, stakeholder interest, etc. Includes few leaders in their professional field.	More representative of constituency and includes several leaders in professional fields related to organization's mission.	Fully representative of constituency and includes many leaders in the field of organization's mission.
Capacity to carry out roles	Limited because not organized.	Has capability in some of the functional areas required, but many functions still not performed.	Has most of the skills needed to perform full Governing Body function.	Includes people capable of carrying out key roles in policy direction, fundraising, public relations, financial management, and lobbying.
<b>MISSION</b>				
Statement of purpose, mission	Vague or incomplete articulation of the organization's purpose or mission and the efforts being made to achieve it; only founders and a few others understand mission.	Mission statement clearly identifies a problem or a set of problems; limited explanation of what its contribution will be.	Mission statement clearly identifies problems and states how the organization will contribute to the solution.	Mission statement, which clearly presents the organization's vision for addressing a particular problem or set of problems, serves as a motivating concept for staff and stakeholders.
Organization's understanding of mission	Mission understood by most Senior Management; other staff has vague notion.	The vision and mission are clear to all staff and to most major stakeholders.	The vision and mission are clear to staff, internal constituents, and stakeholders.	The vision and mission are clear to staff, internal constituents, stakeholders and the general public.
Links between mission & programs	Program activities not systematically developed in relation to their contribution to mission.	Strategic objectives established in relation to mission, but organization may be tempted to take on peripherally important activities in search of funding. Impact of strategic objectives not dis-aggregated by gender.	Programs more focused on mission-related activities and address gender-specific concerns and opportunities.	Strategic objectives and programs are in alignment with mission.
<b>LEGAL STATUS</b>				
Registration status	The organization is not legally registered.	The organization is legally registered.	The organization is legally registered and is able to renew or change its legal status.	Organization is able to assist organizations obtain the same legal status and compliance capacity.
Compliance with labor, tax and other reporting requirements	Has not obtained necessary fiduciary and taxation status. Does not comply with reporting and labor requirements.	Not in compliance with some reporting and labor requirements.	Organization is generally in compliance with reporting, tax and labor requirements.	Organization is in full compliance with reporting, tax and labor requirements.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>CONSTITUENCY</b>				
Definition of constituency	Characteristics of constituency not well defined.	Constituent group characteristics identified (may be by legal mandate, geographic locations, individuals and/or groups engaged in certain activities, special beneficiary populations, etc.).	Broad constituent group defined according to characteristics.	Well-defined constituency.
Constituent advocacy	Preoccupation with project-level activity.	Has growing awareness of how the "bigger picture" issues can affect constituency livelihoods and project outcomes; begins following policy, legal and institutional framework debates related to program area.	Identifies key advocacy issues; participates in meetings and opportunities organized by others.	Staff view advocacy as integral part of organization's responsibilities; initiates own lobbying and advocacy activities on behalf of constituency.
Constituent outreach	Weak links with constituency; viewed as worthy but passive beneficiaries of the services or benefits of the organization rather than as potential partners.	Growing recognition that constituency has a stake in the outcome of organization's endeavors; outreach improving, but on a need-to-know or ad hoc basis.	Constituency seen as important stakeholders to be consulted; outreach systems developed but not fully utilized.	Recognition of constituency as partners; effective outreach systems in place providing regular input from constituents into planning and programming decisions.
<b>LEADERSHIP</b>				
Governing Body & Senior Management understanding of roles	Leadership manifested mainly through founders' creation of organization itself.	Leadership seen primarily as controlling people to do right through system of rewards and punishments; administering rules and procedures rather than provision of direction to employees; monitoring of staff performance.	Leadership understands that direction and monitor performance of different organizational units, but is still concerned with control issues rather than with vision and motivation.	Governing Body and Senior Management provide clear direction and vision. Able to motivate staff and constituents to contribute their maximum towards accomplishing organizational mission.
Clarity and ownership of vision for the organization	Work guidance often not accompanied by a clear articulation of relationship between staff's contribution and organization's purpose. Vision rests with a few individuals.	May be evolving with Governing Body membership. Wider base of involvement in the articulation of the organization's vision.	Vision content essentially stable, though scope of activities may be expanding. Some ambivalence among staff with respect to ownership of vision.	Develops, through the participation of all stakeholders, a clear vision of the organization's goal(s); clearly and consistently articulates this to provide direction. The vision is truly a shared one.
Clarity of roles; balance in direction and authority	One or a few individual(s) controlling most functions.	Classically hierarchical; senior staff provides oversight, technical direction to junior staff.	Senior Management relationship to staff is more consultative.	Describes Senior Management style; provides staff authority to act along with responsibility; seeks to develop staff skills as well as to get work done.
Participation of staff in decision-making	Most decisions taken by Governing Body and executive, with staff primarily providing technical input; staff not consulted on policy-related decisions and have limited understanding of how they contribute to overall goals of the organization.	Staff consulted for information only. Decisions made in upper ranks of institution and passed down. Staff content to be passive.	Management decisions increasingly delegated to staff. Basis for decision-making increasingly understood by all, but staff are not systematically involved as working partners where appropriate.	Staff, Governing Body and Management appropriately involved in direction and policy development.

B. OPERATIONS & MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viability Stage
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>				
Existence of admin. Procedures	Some informal ways exist for getting things done, but not yet documented.	Administrative procedures increasingly formalized, but no operating manual exists.	Manual in place, but not considered authoritative.	Manual updated regularly and considered the arbiter of procedures.
Functionality of procedures	May not be completely or mutually understood.	Filing and recording systems utilized, but not comprehensively.	Administrative systems are functioning.	Systems accessible, flexible, and utilized by all.
Capacity to update/modify procedures	No modifications made despite changing circumstances, usually due to time and personnel constraints.	Attempts made to develop/improve procedures on basis of complaints or suggestions, but no systematic process of doing so.	Regular review and modification of procedures. Procedures codified in manuals and introduced in orientation and training session.	Staff continuously seeking best practice and allowed time and opportunity to make improvements.
Internal, external constituent surveys	Constituency or staff members may identify a variety of procedures that are unsatisfactory, but no mechanism exists to take note of problems or take action to change them.	Ad hoc information collection, emerging systematic collection and utilization of collected information.	System established to solicit staff and external input, but not always followed properly.	External donors, stakeholders and internal constituent and staff surveys conducted to determine procedural modification requirements.
<b>INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY</b>				
Existence of information system	Casual approach to information needs; it is collected randomly and manually.	The rudimentary manual or electronic Management Information System (MIS) is being developed but is not accessible to all staff.	MIS, manual or networked computer systems, security features, e-mail and dialup internet is operational and most staff have access, but may not have the skills to utilize properly.	MIS, manual or networked computer systems, database systems, web presence, domain, is operational and data/connectivity integrated into operational planning and decision-making. All staff [and primary constituents] have permanent internet and systems access as well as skills to utilize properly.
Data analysis capacity	Overshadowed by project implementation activities.	Individual staff members are incapable of data collection and analysis; inconsistencies in processing occur regularly.	All relevant staff is fully trained to use MIS; it provides regular analyses for some activities. Some errors still occur.	Management Information System (MIS) has capacity to store and process large amounts of baseline and survey data to monitor progress against indicators and to assess impact. Systems produces accurate, timely information.
Understanding of potential for data use to improve program performance	A concern, but no ability to respond because of other pressing issues.	Individual staff understands importance of data collection and use; however, there is no mechanism for comprehensive, regular integration of Management Information System (MIS) information into planning processes.	Staff analysis of data from the Management Information System (MIS) is used to improve project planning.	Manual or computer-based data collection and analysis are integrated into the planning process; Governing Body and staff understand their use.
Data dissemination capacity	Organization understands the value of its services, programs and activities and has little capacity for disseminating relevant data to its constituents and stakeholders. Unable to disseminate data because no budget resources are committed regularly to data dissemination.	Organization has prepared written documentation about the organization, descriptions of program activities. Capable of disseminating state-of-the-art information in a timely fashion to strategic partners and regional networks and organizations. Staff understands importance of data dissemination and is able to select what data to disseminate to which audiences. Budget resources committed for data dissemination.	Trained staff or external resources able to package and re-package data for diverse audiences and/or diverse needs within a pre-identified audience group on a regular basis and/or "as requested" basis. Organization documents who uses data and why. Staff use organization's data to promote understanding of the organization and its mission.	Organization has effective data dissemination plan and staff training. Data used by constituents, regional networks, partner organizations and others in decision-making, program planning, advocacy work, as a reference, etc. All staff understand the importance of data dissemination, are knowledgeable of data being disseminated, and provide inputs for improving the quality of data disseminated and refining audiences receiving data. Organization can document how data is used regionally.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Adequacy of ICT system	A small number of computer systems exist, mostly used for ad hoc tasks.	Increased awareness of the use of IT system as a business tool, awareness of different applications, accompanying increase in the number of stand alone computer systems and diversity of applications.	Deliberate effort to connect all systems to form a networked system with connectivity to the Internet, acquisition of a variety of ICT applications.	Organization-wide applications, databases in place with easy access from the desktops, technical support in ICTs available for operational as well as development purposes.
Existence of ICT procedures	Some informal ways exist for getting IT tasks done, but not yet documented.	ICT procedures increasingly formalized, but no operating manual exists.	Manual in place, but not considered operational, authoritative and user-friendly.	Procedures and guidelines well documented.
Functionality of ICT procedures	May not be completely or mutually understood.	Security, recording and maintenance systems utilized, but not comprehensively.	ICT systems are functioning.	Staff well aware of ICT procedures, monitoring system in place to ensure adherence to them.
Capacity to update/modify ICT procedures	No modifications made despite changing circumstances, usually due to time and personnel constraints.	Attempts made to develop/improve procedures on the basis of complaints or suggestions, but no systematic process for doing so.	Regular review and modification of procedures. Procedures codified in manuals and introduced in orientation and training sessions.	Established monitoring system to ensure that ICT procedural reviews and modifications are carried out comprehensively and with regularity.
<b>FACILITIES, PROPERTY &amp; EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT</b>				
Adequacy of contracts, leases, Agreements	Verbal agreements with modest if any written documentation describing arrangements for use of office space and property by the organization on a "gratis" or payment basis. No contractual coverage for loss or damage to organization's office space and furnishings, expendable supplies and property.	Process of formalizing and negotiating provisions for use of office space, acquisition of property, etc. in place.	All contracts, leases and agreements have been formalized and documented in writing. Provisions for losses and damages due to theft and fire are covered and organization is able to recoup partial and/or full compensation.	Written contracts, leases, agreements and procedures exist for all physical facilities, property, equipment and expendable supplies. Provisions are reviewed annually and re-negotiated as needed. Organization is able to employ competent reviewers if external expertise as needed.
Condition of physical plant	Grounds and office space need attention and repairs. Poorly lit with dirty and unsightly furnishings. No designated toilet and/or meeting facilities on site.	Offices, work and storage areas and grounds are clean and neat. Schedule for regular upkeep exists and is not followed. Safety and fire code requirements assessed.	Organization's offices and grounds are well maintained and entire staff recognizes the importance of well-groomed premises to the organization's image. All safety and fire code requirements met or exceeded.	Regular and thorough repair and maintenance of entire physical plant is scheduled, budgeted and completed in a timely fashion with minimal disruptions to organization's business and few injuries.
Adequacy of property, furnishings, equipment	Equipment and furnishings are in disrepair and/or are very outdated. Budget provisions for replacements and repairs are inconsistent or non-existent.	Developed short- and long-term plan with budget estimates for securing the requirements for office/staff space, furnishings, equipment and property needs.	Physical facilities, furnishings, equipment and property are in good condition and organization is addressing gaps in these areas.	Governing Body and staff are able to identify and respond to priority property, equipment, furnishings and physical plant needs in a timely fashion.
Existence of Inventory, maintenance program, procurement plan	Procedures for tracking, maintaining and replacing property, equipment and furnishings and office supplies are informal. No specific staff person assigned to oversee the inventory and assets of the organization on a day-to-day basis.	Few systems and procedures are in place for managing the inventory, maintenance and procurement responsibilities. One or more staff persons, with little formal training in facilities management and minimal experience, manage the organization's physical plant, equipment and furniture requirements.	Organized system for managing organization's assets and inventory in place. Responsible staff person being trained or hired but does not have authority or support to manage effectively.	Procurement plan and inventory and maintenance program and procedures in place. An experienced staff person effectively manages the work and provides timely and accurate documentation describing property, inventory and expendable supplies "on hand" and can identify current and future needs and procedures.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Security provisions	Governing Body and staff are minimally alert to security needs. Unable to secure organization's office space, desk drawers and files, etc. No security guard services are in place.	Management has control over who has access to office space at all times. Key access is controlled and storage of keys secured w/duplicate keys stored in alternate location. Organization has designed a security strategy for short-term implementation.	Comprehensive security plan has been implemented and updated/refined as needed to avoid thefts carried out internally and/or externally. Demonstrated capacity to provide a safe and secure workplace. Access controls designed.	Institutionalized security plan has resulted in few thefts of any kind. Organization-wide consensus to and support of strategy. Consistent adherence to security policy and procedures to effectively deal with transgressors in a swift and organized manner. Viable access controls in place.
Existence of short-, long-term facilities management plan	No plan has been developed for how the organization will ensure adequate space, equipment and furnishings to accommodate present and future activities.	Organization has reservations about adequacy of current facilities and is facing uncertainties about future base of operation. Governing Body and staff have developed a facilities management strategy and plan of action to address short- and long-term facility needs.	Organization successfully negotiating and carrying out improvements to facilities using a preventative approach. Currently working on permanent and viable office facilities to accommodate long-term vision of organization's programs and activities.	Comprehensive short- and long-term facilities management plan in existence and being implemented. Successes and lessons learned have been documented and used to refine the strategy and plan of action for improved facilities management on a regular and systematic basis.
<b>PLANNING</b>				
Regularity of planning activity	Planning is project-based, not annual.	Annual operating plans are developed and reviewed throughout year.	Strategic planning structured around mission and short-term operational planning.	Strategies and program objectives based on the mission statement.
Participation in planning	One or a few people may make all the decisions and plan events with little explanation to those responsible for implementation.	Senior staff elicit staff and constituent input on an ad hoc basis, but staff do not actually participate in the planning exercises. Their input may or may not be incorporated into resulting plans.	Staff invited to planning exercises but do not participate fully.	All organizational stakeholders are involved in annual operating plans; plans are in alignment with the mission and long-term strategies.
Review of achievements vs plans	Since the organization has a short track record, it cannot compare historical trends. It may look outside itself to similar organizations for same.	The organization has the capacity to do short-term review of project-level plans, but not comprehensive review of organizational achievements.	Some organizational-wide review of work achieved against annual objectives.	Regular review of long-term and annual plans conducted on basis of full environmental scan and baseline impact review.
<b>INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
Formal communications mechanisms	Poor, or largely ineffective.	Consciousness developing on part of staff and management that communication breakdowns and overlaps occur.	Mechanisms exist that promote vertical and horizontal communication and link organizational unit/project structures.	Communications are open and inter-hierarchical.
Regularity of meetings	No regular staff meetings.	Meetings irregular, dominated by interests of few, lack predetermined purpose and agenda, and do not reach concrete conclusions.	Regular meetings of staff are conducted with predetermined agenda; however, agenda often not followed, meetings take too much time, and concrete conclusions often are not reached.	Meetings held at appropriate frequency which follow predetermined agenda and stick to it. Meetings accomplish what they set out to do.
Staff participation in meetings	Meetings dominated by Senior Management.	Select staff speak up at meetings, but their input not actively encouraged by management.	Management actively encourages staff participation in meetings, and their input is given careful consideration.	All staff who wish to contribute speak up at meetings, and their input is actively encouraged.
<b>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</b>				
Programmatic framework for projects	Program development largely donor- or staff-driven and funded and managed on a project-by-project basis. No overarching programmatic framework.	Organization attempting to create programmatic framework around ongoing individual projects.	Programmatic framework established, but not well understood. New projects developed within framework rationale.	Framework is chief organization tool for organizing work and resources and for planning future activities to ensure complementary and synergistic activities.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Reporting systems	Largely donor-driven (sometimes donor's systems are used). Quite often the donor system is imperfectly understood and administered incompletely and incorrectly.	Occasional evaluations conducted at request of donor and implemented by outsiders.	Often the same system as that used by donor, or system developed by the organization. Both provide type and form of information required by donor.	Organization system and managers provide information required by donor in appropriate form.
Constituency input	Very limited.	Constituents involved as recipients of program.	Constituents consulted on program design and mobilized for implementation and evaluation.	Constituents serve as partners in comprehensive program design, implementation and evaluation.
Integration of monitoring & evaluation	No systematic method for designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating impact.	No comprehensive system for determining purpose or objectives of projects, monitoring implementation against plans, or measuring achievement against plans.	Monitoring and evaluation conducted by staff at regular intervals; results usually, though not always, integrated.	Full integration of monitoring and evaluation data into monitoring of key indicators and evaluation of impact. Lessons learned and better practices from this information applied to future activities.

### C. HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>STAFF ROLES</b>				
Relationship of staffing structure to strategic objectives	Little relationship between staffing structure and tasks needed to accomplish strategic objectives.	Organization reviews existing staffing structure in relation to work required and begins to make revisions, but has limited ability to actually recruit new people or alter existing staff structure.	Position descriptions developed and reviewed for fit with tasks needed to accomplish mission; some staffing changes occur as a result.	Clear relationship between the organization's current objectives and the functions to be performed by staff.
Job definition, documentation & updating	No organizational chart or individual job descriptions available. Limited staff do whatever work needs to be done.	Job descriptions developed after recruitment rather than as a tool for recruitment; thus do not provide clear guidelines that outline areas of responsibility.	Jobs well-defined and documented in regularly updated job descriptions or team assignments.	Staff have input into revising and/or expanding their job descriptions.
Staff capacity	Limited staff fulfill responsibilities beyond their expertise. Some essential tasks not regularly carried out by anyone.	Decreasing gap between skill requirements and staff abilities.	Most core skill requirements to perform jobs/work known and covered by staff.	Ability to adapt to or meet new staffing requirements as they arise.
<b>TASK MANAGEMENT</b>				
Work planning	Senior Management dictates work assignments. Little attention paid to balance of workload across staff or to staff's own input.	Staff review their workplans with supervisor, providing some opportunity for input; overall organizational workplan still centrally managed.	Intermediate objectives established by Management; staff able to develop own workplans to accomplish these objectives. Staff collaborate on workplans to ensure that everything is covered.	Workplans are developed that distribute tasks appropriately based on staff skills and workload, and that lead to progress in reaching objectives.
Work in teams	Little understanding of what it means to work in teams.	Management creates teams but has limited capacity to promote team-building and use teams effectively.	Team-building is actively promoted, although teams not yet fully effective.	Team work encouraged; Management and staff are skilled in team-building and are using teams effectively.
Coordination & work review	No mechanisms in place to coordinate work activities of different staff.	Individual, unit, or project work plans developed, but not coordinated across functions.	Workplans shared across units and work sites.	Formal mechanism in place for cross-team planning, coordination and work review.
<b>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT &amp; STAFF DEVELOPMENT</b>				
Recruitment	Formal hiring systems not yet in place; founder selects staff according to own criteria.	Positions advertised externally; however, no process or procedures for determining job qualifications, recruitment, hiring or termination decisions.	Formal hiring systems in place, but not always consistently utilized.	Formalized hiring procedures consistently utilized.
Performance assessment systems	Staff performance not yet assessed; no activities to change or improve staff performance through better work planning, training, development and promotion.	Staff evaluation system may exist, but not necessarily based on performance of job requirements as stipulated in job description. Evaluation typically carried out by supervisor alone.	Performance-based appraisal system in place (consisting of work performance review conducted mutually by employees and supervisor), but not consistently utilized.	Performance appraisal system in place and consistently utilized. Clear understanding of links between staff and organization's performance.
Staff morale	Founder(s) and initial staff motivated by original mission; no formal incentive structure in place.	Little direct attention paid to staff morale. Institution more concerned with other (i.e. project or work-related) issues, and assumes that staff morale will take care of itself. Ad hoc incentive structure in place.	Staff morale regularly on the agenda. Most team members pay attention to morale; institution at times obtains productivity at the expense of morale. A well-thought out incentive program now in place.	High level of productivity while maintaining good staff morale. Good incentive program in place.
Staff development plans	Plan not yet developed; training needs not addressed.	Better match between staff position and skill requirements. Resources identified for ad hoc training.	Staff development needs to be regularly assessed and results used to prepare training plan. Some elements of the training plan implemented.	Training plans regularly updated according to performance improvement and career development needs of individual and human resource plan of organization. Most of the training plan is implemented.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>SALARY ADMINISTRATION</b>				
System of salary & benefits	No mutually understood system of salary and benefits. Salary related to organization's ability to pay rather than on qualifications, performance, job history or market rates.	Recognize need to develop formal salary scale, but not yet sure how to create one.	System established but not always applied.	Salary scale and benefits package established with clear criteria for entry and advancement; system formally documented in policy and procedures manuals, and followed.
Jobs classification	Jobs not classified internally or given comparative value in relation to each other.	System embryonic, low on priority list; there may be resistance to classification. Some staff prefer flexibility of no classification.	Jobs classified according to internal value system, and salaries based on this classification.	Classification by function; system transparent to all.
Competitiveness of salary, benefits	Salaries not competitive; founder and initial staff primarily motivated by mission (may have more volunteers than paid staff).	Frequent staff turnover due to in part to poor compensation or lack of ability by organization to offer increases for good job performance.	Salary increases based on job performance, as determined by performance assessment procedures. Limited staff turnover due to salary-related issues.	Salaries and reward systems sufficiently competitive to attract and retain highly skilled staff.
<b>TEAM DEVELOPMENT &amp; CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b>				
Policies, methods for organizational development	Little understanding of need to cultivate enabling work environment. Inability to utilize staff relationships to achieve the organization's purpose.	Focus on individual achievement and little understanding of the value of collaborative work.	Recognition of need to foster collaborative work environment.	Organizational development recognized as a legitimate organizational management function. Organization has policies and methods to develop skills and manage relationships as well as performance.
Use of conflict mediation techniques	Conflict is unregulated.	Supervisors attempt to mediate conflict, but techniques and mechanisms regarded as unnecessary or divisive.	Grievance procedures in place. Supervisors trained in mediation technique.	Grievance procedures are used effectively. More staff trained.

D. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>ACCOUNTING</b>				
Existence of accounting procedures	No accounting manual either formal or informal.	Basic financial recording system in place.	Accounting procedures in place; periodic moves to adjust/edit/organize procedures. Full documentation not always followed.	Financial reports and data system well documented enough to provide sense of organization's financial health.
Timeliness & accuracy of accounting	Financial reports incomplete, difficult to understand, can be fictional. Organization needs to be prodded to produce them.	Financial reports clearer but still incomplete, with errors. Usually late.	Financial reports clearer and more complete, even as portfolio becomes more complex. Usually on time.	Financial reports clear and complete, even as portfolio becomes more complex. Reports are always timely.
Contribution of financial reports to planning process	None yet; formats are ad hoc or based on donor requirements.	Financial reports formats tend to be skewed toward presenting an optimistic picture rather than reflecting reality.	Reports are regular, but not always timed to contribute to planning processes.	Reports are always high quality, and feed back into financial planning process.
<b>BUDGETING</b>				
Development of/adherence to budgets	Budgets are a rough estimate, not a realistic assessment of project activities. Reliability of the projections questionable.	Often over- or under-spent by more than 20% by line item. Activities often diverge from budget projections.	Total expenditure usually is within 20% of budget by line item, but actual activity often diverges from budget projections.	Total expenditures always within 10% of budget by line item.
Budgeting as part of planning process	No history of actual expenditure patterns means that budget is a blend of educated guesses and assumptions. Lack of feedback loop between actual and planned expenses causes financial difficulties from time to time.	Budgets are adjusted on ad hoc basis. No formalized process to adjust budgets based on actual expenditure before negative effects take hold, but a growing realization that such a mechanism is required.	Budgeting process is integrated with the annual plans; a formalized process exists to adjust line item budgets as required, but gaps in expenditure feedback still persist.	Budgeting process is integrated with operational planning process. Budgets are integral part of project management and organizational unit management, and are adjusted as project implementation warrants.
Delegation of budget management	Highly centralized; executive director or accountant are only staff who know and understand budget information; they do not delegate responsibility.	Beginning to decentralize budget, but budget management is still centralized.	Delegation of management of project budgets is not universally applied throughout organization.	Organizational unit senior staff are responsible for preparation, justification and management of unit/project budgets.
<b>FINANCIAL CONTROLS</b>				
Physical assets	Internal control, procurement, stock control and property management procedures are not developed.	Internal control, procurement and property management procedures are informal and not documented; often ignored by those in charge.	Internal control, procurement and property management procedures are documented and usually adhered to.	Physical assets managed properly; future requirements planned for.
Creditors, debtors	No clear procedures exist for handling creditors and debtors.	Financial controls exist but lack systematic office procedure.	Improved financial and stock control systems exist, but not always followed.	Excellent stock and cash controls for creditors and debtors.
Cash	Cash management duties are not segregated.	Cash management duties only partially segregated.	Cash management duties are segregated to the extent possible, but separation not ideal according to accounting principles.	Cash management duties always segregated.
Fund management	Project and operating funds are not separated.	Regular co-mingling of project funds occurs.	Co-mingling of project funds occurs rarely, and for a short duration.	All project funds are separated; adequate controls exist to avoid co-mingling of project funds.
Labor monitoring	Staff time sheets are not prepared.	Staff time sheets are prepared, but not in timely fashion.	Staff time sheets are prepared in a timely fashion.	Staff time sheets are timely; analysis is integrated into planning process.
<b>AUDIT/ EXTERNAL FINANCIAL REVIEW</b>				
Ability to respond to audit recommendations	Organization on its own seeks and implements financial advice.	When audits are performed, little ability to respond to suggested changes.	Recommendations are followed, but sometimes in a tardy fashion.	Recommendations followed up consistently and in a timely manner.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Regularity of external audits	Audits or external financial reviews are not performed.	Independent audits or external financial reviews are only rarely performed.	Independent audits or external financial reviews are performed periodically.	Independent audits or external financial reviews are performed with regular and appropriate frequency.
<b>RESOURCE BASE</b>				
Diversity of funding	Funds come from only one source.	Still dependent on single or limited donors.	No single source provides more than 60% of funding.	No single source provides more than 40% of funding.
Financial autonomy	Little understanding exists of the need for the organization to eventually become self-supporting financially, and local fundraising for any income is untried or unsuccessful.	Developing awareness of local resource generation possibilities, but few funds actually mobilized.	Developing a financial planning process within the organization and significant percentage of core costs covered by internally generated resources (e.g. membership dues, income from services rendered/publications sold, regular fund-raising).	Processes are in place to conduct reliable income-generating activities.
Long-term financial plan	No long-term plan envisioned.	Organization can prepare multi-year program budgets, although still focused on project-derived income rather than long-term organizational financial health.	Attempts at long-term financial plan; frequent adjustments required.	Long-term financial plan exists that will result in organization becoming sufficiently self-supporting so as to continue basic operations if external funding is cut back.
Short-term operating margins	Project funding is insufficient to meet plans or to provide projected services.	Funding is available to cover short-term project costs, but operating costs are not fully covered by self-generated funds.	Funding is available for short-term costs, and medium-term funding strategies exist within financial plan.	All projects have long-term funding plans and current funds are adequate to meet needs of management plan.

E. PROGRAM AND SERVICE DELIVERY

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>SECTORAL EXPERTISE</b>				
Service delivery track record	Organization has limited or no track record in sector and area of service delivery.	Growing expertise in sectoral/technical area and ability to access additional expertise in that area when required.	Efficient delivery of appropriate services; calls in external expertise as required.	Efficient delivery of appropriate services; has an extensive consultants roster for effective external inputs.
Cost recovery mechanisms	No cost recovery mechanisms; entirely dependent on donor due to heavy Nascent costs.	Recognition of necessity for cost recovery mechanisms, but either resistance to or lack of ideas on how to develop.	Fee-for-service and other cost recovery mechanisms being built into service delivery process.	Fee-for-service and other cost recovery mechanisms being built into service delivery processes.
Ability to adapt to changing constituent needs	Good ideas about how to meet needs of target community/constituencies; but little operational experience.	Improved targeting and redefined service/technical assistance package.	Beyond portfolio of projects, recognizes need to be more responsive to community needs.	Organization is able to adapt program and other service delivery capacities to changing needs of constituency and to extend service delivery to additional constituencies.
Reputation within local, regional and international community	Relatively unknown.	Grows as organization is able to attract more qualified staff and associates; awareness of organization's presence gradually increasing.	Organization recognized as having significant expertise in sectoral/technical area; invited to contribute to sectoral fora.	Full recognition as experts in sectoral/technical area; is given consultative status in those sectors; has partnerships with governments, private sector companies/corporations and civil society.
<b>CONSTITUENCY OWNERSHIP</b>				
Nature of constituents' input	Agenda and services influenced by donors and/or organization's managers, not by constituency. Input of constituency not routinely sought.	Stakeholders involved primarily as recipients of program results; input sought but not in a systematic manner.	Formal mechanisms exist to ensure regular communication regarding program design and management, though not all suggestions accepted.	Stakeholders have become partners with organization in defining services to be provided and management of projects/programs. Systems and procedures to ensure stakeholder input are institutionalized, and information gathered is regularly used.
Training plans reflective of constituents' needs	Training and services are not offered. Building institutional capacity to address constituent needs is not viewed as a possible strategy for sustainability.	Resources identified for ad hoc training of constituency members in program or technical areas, but not in project or financial management or other areas of institutional capacity-building.	Plans developed to share management responsibility with constituency and to provide training and institutional development services in constituency capacity-building.	Training and identification plans are regularly updated according to performance improvement and review of capacity of constituency-based groups, committees and networks.
<b>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
Concern for sustainability needs	Not yet an issue; short-term survival most important.	Staff are aware of need to build approaches to sustainability into project design, but not yet sure how to do so.	Organization incorporates a sustainability strategy into all program activities, although the quality of strategies is still weak.	Sustainability strategies have been successfully tested and replicated.
Importance of impact measurement	Organization does not systematically monitor or evaluate project/program achievements against planned activities.	Individual projects evaluated to determine if planned activities took place. Not yet assessing the impact of those activities.	Methodologies to assess impact are developed and used on an ad hoc basis.	Impact measurement system in place and functioning on a regular basis.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Use of impact indicators, baseline information	Has not determined impact indicators or baseline measures.	Collects baseline information but does not refer back to it; identifies impact indicators as part of proposal development process, but does not use it for project monitoring.	Baseline information and indicators are established for some projects and monitoring information collected; however, indicators may be poorly written or inappropriate, limiting utility for measuring progress.	Measurable and appropriate indicators of success and impact have been determined for projects and programs and are monitored regularly, providing useful information to measure progress and highlight any implementation difficulties or successes.
Regularity of planning activity	Planning is ad hoc, incremental.	Annual operating plans are developed and reviewed throughout the year.	Strategic planning structured around mission and short-term operational planning.	Strategic (3-5 years) and operational (1-2 years) planning conducted, along with annual work plans and reviews.

F. EXTERNAL RELATIONS & ADVOCACY

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
<b>PUBLIC RELATIONS</b>				
Strategy to attract support	Organization has no strategy to gain recognition of organization, mission, or track record in order to mobilize support (e.g. new members, financial resources, private sector contributions).	Organization develops a few materials articulating mission and track record, but distribution is ad hoc (i.e. made available in office, distributed when visiting a donor, etc.).	Organization refines materials for various target audiences and is more proactive about distribution. Other promotional activities beginning.	Organization has numerous materials clearly outlining mission and track record, tailored to different audiences; materials are distributed on a timely and cost-effective basis. Other promotional activities organized on a regular basis.
Media relations	Organization does not yet recognize need to mobilize media resources.	Recognition of need for media relations, sporadic implementation of media campaigns. Tend to be one-time events.	More or less systematic media campaigns, but not thoroughly integrated into overall public relations strategy.	Able to mount media campaigns in different forms, e.g. TV, newsprint, magazine, radio. Integrated into long-range strategic plan.
Relationship with external stakeholders	Limited ability to mobilize stakeholder participation in programs due to either geographic distance from stakeholder or some other barrier to communications and mobilization.	Growing recognition that external partner(s) have a stake in the outcome of organization's endeavors. Organization ensures greater contact with partners.	Organization actively and systematically solicits stakeholder input and uses it in planning and programming. Stakeholders view organization as ally/facilitator/resource.	Stakeholders actively solicit support from organization for activities that they have identified. Organization and stakeholders view relationship as full partnership serving common purpose.
External stakeholders' perception of organization	Unknown to wider community; a few key individuals support the organization's mission.	Widening circle of influence within the technical or geographic area of the organization's operations.	Organization beginning to receive requests for information from the public. Name recognition among donors, private sector, and general public increasing.	Organization regularly receiving requests for information from the public; now widely perceived as an effective organization.
<b>REGIONAL COLLABORATION</b>				
Nature of relations with regional organizations	Relations with regional organizations are based on an "us-them" viewpoint; contacts are avoided and may be viewed with suspicion.	Regional collaboration not seen as a threat. Common interests have been identified.	Organization engages in open dialogue with regional organizations on operational and policy issues.	Organization establishes itself as a credible partner of regional organizations, and as one willing to hold regional organizations accountable for their actions.
Networking	Organization lacks experience working with regional organizations. Collaboration with other regional organizations not yet perceived by organization as necessary.	Organization involved in one or two collaborative efforts with regional organizations and sees value in working together. Increasingly known and trusted by regional community	Organization works with more regional organizations as partners and becomes active participant in networks of regional organizations.	Organization works with regional organizations and provides leadership role in promoting regional partnerships and networks.
Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	Little collaboration or joint planning with regional organizations working in same sectors, geographical or service delivery areas.	Collaboration established with various regional organizations/networks around specific geographical areas, services and/or sectors of activity	Collaboration with regional organizations is frequent -- often on informal level -- in addition to specific project or sectoral collaboration on contracts that organization now performs with other regional organizations.	Formal collaboration mechanisms now in place (e.g. designation of organization's officer for regional relations and lobbying procedures).
<b>GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION</b>				
Nature of governmental relations (regional, national & local)	Relations with government outside of constituent contacts are limited; some contacts are avoided and may be viewed with suspicion.	Government partners no longer seen as "unwilling" and common interests have been identified.	Organization engages in open dialogue with government on technical, operational and policy issues.	Organization establishes itself as a credible partner of government, and as one willing to strengthen government accountability.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	Little collaboration or joint planning with government officials working in same sectors or geographical areas.	Collaboration established with various government agencies, organizations, groups and projects around specific areas/sectors of activity.	Collaboration with government is frequent -- often on informal level -- in addition to specific project or sectoral collaboration on contracts and agreements.	Formal collaboration mechanisms now in place (e.g. designation of organization's liaison/officer for government relations and lobbying procedures).
<b>PRIVATE SECTOR COLLABORATION</b>				
Nature of private sector relations (regional, national & local)	Relations with private sector are limited; some contacts are avoided and may be viewed with suspicion.	Private sector no longer seen as uninterested. Common interests have been identified.	Organization engages in open dialogue with private sector on technical, operational and policy issues.	Organization establishes itself as a credible partner of private sector, and as one willing to hold private sector accountable for its actions.
Networking	Organization lacks experience working with private sector companies/corporations, either regional, national, international or local. Private sector collaboration not yet perceived by organization as necessary.	Organization involved in one or two collaborative efforts with private sector companies/corporations, and sees value in working together. Increasingly known and trusted by private sector companies/corporations community	Organization works with more private sector companies/corporations partners and becomes active participant in private sector networks.	Organization works with local, national, regional and/or international private sector companies/corporations and provides leadership role in promoting regional partnerships with private sector networks.
Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	Little collaboration or joint planning with private sector officials working in same sectors or geographical areas.	Collaboration established with various private sector companies/corporations around specific areas/sectors of activity.	Collaboration with private sector is frequent -- often on informal level -- in addition to specific project or sectoral collaboration on agreements and contracts.	Formal collaboration mechanisms now in place (e.g. designation of organization's liaison/officer for private sector relations and lobbying efforts).
<b>NGO COLLABORATION</b>				
Nature of relations with NGOs	Relations with NGO community are limited; some contacts are avoided and may be viewed with suspicion.	Government partners no longer seen as "pushy" and common interests have been identified.	Organization engages in open dialogue with NGOs on technical, operational and policy issues.	Organization establishes itself as a credible partner of NGOs, and as one willing to strengthen NGO accountability.
Networking and coalition-building	Organization lacks experience working with NGOs, either regional, national, international or local. NGO collaboration not yet perceived by organization as necessary.	Organization involved in one or two collaborative efforts with NGOs, and sees value in working together. Increasingly known and trusted by NGO community.	Organization works with more NGO partners and becomes active participant in NGO networks.	Organization works with local, national, regional and/or international NGOs and provides leadership role in promoting coalitions and NGO networks.
<b>ADVOCACY</b>				
Policy Analysis	Organization's not yet aware of potential of policy analysis.	Organization exposed to some policy analysis, but conducts none of its own.	Regular attempts made at analyzing policy, one issue at a time.	Policy analysis a high priority; organization can conduct analysis on a number of items simultaneously.
Developing advocacy strategies	Organization has no advocacy strategies.	Advocacy strategies of secondary importance relative to main direction of the organization.	Advocacy integrated into overall organization's long-term strategies: viewed as essential to organization's mission.	Organization can implement own advocacy strategies while being effective member of coalition(s).
Advocacy approaches	Organization begins to develop advocacy approaches.	Organization views itself as the specialist, providing advocacy as experts. No fully developed practice involving appropriate clients, members or other stakeholders.	Organization uses specialists to mobilize policy change among stakeholders. Increasing recognition of importance of participatory process to advocacy work.	Organization advocacy methods are highly participatory, and are appropriate to the organization's purpose.
Evaluating organization's advocacy impact	Organization sees no need to assess its own impact in advocacy.	Organization aware of need to assess impact of advocacy efforts, but is unable to do so because is too engaged in the process itself.	Organization takes steps to integrate impact results into its regular reporting system; is successful some of the time.	Organization aware of how its advocacy efforts impact policy, and uses this information for setting strategy. Has comprehensive framework to measure impact.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Agenda setting strategy	Organization unable to get policy issue on the society's agenda.	Organization has sporadically set agenda in the public domain, but not continuously or systematically.	Organization has a systematized approach to getting agenda into the public domain.	Organization can meaningfully interact with other coalitions to increase impact of efforts.
Formulation [and enactment] of government-set policy	Organization has a notion of how to influence policy formulation.	Organization can identify the steps to policy implementation, but is not connected to the actual players.	Organization comprehends how policy is implemented, and has relationships with actual decision-makers which result in positive responses.	Organization's opinion solicited by government authorities during formulation process.
Implementation [and enforcement] of government-set policy	Organization does not track policies which impact its work.	Organization understands the implementation process of a relevant policy, but is inactive in securing enforcement where necessary.	Organization actively tracks implementation of policy, and ensures enforcement of the policy for constituents.	Organization can track implementation and enforcement in more than one jurisdiction at a time.
Formulation [and enactment] of regional organizations' initiatives	Organization has a notion of how to influence the formulation of regional initiatives.	Organization can identify the steps to adoption and implementation of regional accords/resolutions, but is not connected to the actual players.	Organization comprehends how regional accords/resolutions are operationalized, has relationships with actual decision-makers which result in positive responses.	Organization's opinion solicited by reputable authorities in regional organizations during formulation of regional accords/resolutions.
Implementation [and enforcement] of regional organizations' Initiatives	Organization does not track regional initiatives that impact its work.	Organization understands the implementation process of a relevant initiative, but is inactive in securing enforcement where necessary.	Organization actively tracks major activities relevant to regional initiatives, [facilitates] ensures actualization of the initiative on behalf of constituents.	Organization can track implementation and operationalization of regional accords, resolutions, initiatives and/or special pronouncements in more than one country at a time.
Formulation [and enactment] of international organizations' initiatives	Organization has a notion of how to influence the formulation of international initiatives.	Organization can identify the steps to adoption and implementation of international accords/resolutions, but is not connected to the actual players.	Organization comprehends how international accords/resolutions are operationalized, and has relationships with actual decision-makers which result in positive responses.	Organization's opinion solicited by reputable authorities in international organizations during formulation of regional accords/resolutions.
Implementation [and enforcement] of international organizations' initiatives	Organization does not track international initiatives that impact its work.	Organization understands the implementation process of a relevant initiative, but is inactive in securing enforcement where necessary.	Organization actively tracks major activities relevant to international initiatives, ensures actualization of the initiative on behalf of constituents.	Organization can track implementation and operationalization of international accords, resolutions, initiatives and/or special pronouncements in more than one country at a time.
Monitoring and evaluation of government policy, regional initiatives. Accords, resolutions	Organization unaware of policy impact.	Organization partially aware of full ramifications of a relevant policy.	Organization monitors impact of policy, accords, resolutions and initiatives as needed and promotes changes as required.	Organization able to monitor policy and advocacy impact in multiple domains and jurisdictions.
<b>MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES</b>				
Mobilizing regional and international support	Organization has no strategy for regional fundraising/resource development or attracting other forms of human and material support.	Organization experiments with regional, national and local fundraising efforts (e.g. member state expansion, improved volunteerism, fellowship and exchanges of technical expertise, private sector financing, international donor mapping for long-term program and institutional development support if relevant).	Organization identifies most effective resource development activities and is working to improve and to expand its programs.	Organization regularly schedules fundraising efforts; local fundraising generates small percentage of income but raises profile for other forms of resource mobilization.

Category	Nascent Stage	Emerging Stage	Consolidating Stage	Viable Stage
Mobilizing private sector resources	Organization tends to view private sector as exploitative, and, in some instances, with suspicion and distrust.	Organization begins to view private sector as potential resource; expands contacts with private sector seeking areas of mutual interests. Organization working to educate/encourage corporate sense of responsibility.	Private sector individuals recruited to serve on Governing Body. Private sector collaboration actively sought to solicit financial, material and/or technical resources.	Private sector active on Governing Body. Organization successful in more than one instance in obtaining support from private operators.
Mobilizing donor resources	Organization "follows the money" irrespective of relation to mission or existing capabilities.	Organization has one major donor, is focusing on one or two areas of activity and beginning to attract resources to those areas.	Organization quite focused on its mission, and has generated much interest and funding from multiple donor sources. Still some short-term opportunism.	Organization has wide range of contacts in areas related to mission; diversified funding base, which includes multi-year funding from a variety of donors. Long-term program development with donors underway.

The following table is an example of how an institution's capacities could be scored and recorded using the PIVA tool. Note the 116 competencies and the rating scale of from 1 to 4, corresponding to Start-Up/Nascent through Mature/Viable. The maximum total score possible on this particular PIVA tool is thus 464.

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

**I. Governance System:**

<b>A. Governing Body:</b>										
(1) Existence of governing body	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(2) Differentiation of oversight & management roles	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(3) Managing transitions	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(4) Governing Body composition/diversity	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(5) Capacity to carry out roles	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
<b>Sub-Total - Governing Body</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B. Mission:</b>										
(6) Statement of purpose, mission	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
(7) Organization's understanding of mission	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
(8) Links between mission programs	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
<b>Sub-Total Mission</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>C. Legal Status:</b>										
(9) Registration Status	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
(10) Compliance with labor, reporting requirements	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Legal Status</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>D. Constituency:</b>										
(11) Definition of constituency	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(12) Constituent advocacy	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(13) Constituent outreach	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
<b>Sub-Total Constituency</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>E. Leadership:</b>										
(14) Governing body and senior management understanding of roles of the organization	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(15) Clarity and ownership of vision for the organization	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
(16) Clarity of roles; balance in direction and authority	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	0
(17) Participation of staff in decision-making	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Leadership</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Governance Points:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

**II. Operations and Management System:**

**A. Administration:**

(18) Existence of administrative procedures	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(19) Functionality of procedures	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(20) Capacity to update/modify procedures	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(21) Internal and external constituent surveys	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Administration</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>

**B. Information Communication Technology:**

(22) Existence of information system	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(23) Data analysis capacity	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(24) Understanding of potential for data use to improve program performance	1	1	2	0	4	3	0	0	4	0
(25) Data dissemination capacity	1	1	2	0	4	3	0	0	4	0
(26) Adequacy of ICT system	1	1	2	0	4	3	0	0	4	0
(27) Existence of ICT procedures	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(28) Functionality of ICT procedures	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
(29) Capacity to update/modify procedures	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	4	0
<b>Sub-Total Information Communication Technology</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>

**C. Property, Facilities and Equipment Management:**

(30) Adequacy of contracts, leases and agreements	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(31) Condition of physical plant	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(32) Adequacy of property, furnishings and equipment	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(33) Existence of Inventory, maintenance program, and procurement plan	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(34) Security provisions	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(35) Existence of short/long-term facilities management plan	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Property, Facilities and Equipment Mgt.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>

**D. Planning:**

(36) Regularity of planning activity	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(37) Participation in planning	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(38) Review of achievements vs. plans	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Planning</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

**E. Internal Communications:**

(39) Formal communications mechanisms	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(40) Regularity of meetings	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(41) Staff participation in meetings	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Internal Communications</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

**F. Program Development and Implementation:**

(42) Programmatic framework for projects	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(43) Reporting systems	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(44) Constituency input	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(45) Integration of monitoring and evaluation	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b><i>Sub-Total Program Development and Implementation</i></b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Operations &amp; Management System Points:</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

III. Human Resources Development System:

**A. Staff Roles:**

(46) Relationship of staffing structure to strategic objectives	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
(47) Job definition, documentation and updating	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
(48) Staff capacity	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
<b>Sub-Total Staff Roles</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

**B. Task Management:**

(49) Work planning	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(50) Work in teams	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(51) Coordination and work review	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Task Management</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

**C. Performance Mgt. and Staff Development:**

(52) Recruitment	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(53) Performance assessment systems	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(54) Staff morale	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(55) Staff development plans	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Performance Mgt. and Staff Development</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>

**D. Salary Administration:**

(56) Systems of salary and benefits	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(57) Jobs classification	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(58) Competitiveness of salary and benefits	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Salary Administration</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

**E. Team Development and Conflict Resolution:**

(59) Policies, methods for organizational development	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(60) Use of conflict mediation techniques	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Team Dev. and Conflict Resolution</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

**Total Human Resources Development System Points:**

<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>
-----------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	----------

**IV. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:**

<b>A. Accounting:</b>										
(61) Existence of accounting procedures	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(62) Timeliness and accuracy of accounting	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(63) Contribution of financial reports to planning process	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Accounting</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B. Budgeting:</b>										
(64) Development of and adherence to budgets	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(65) Budgeting as a part of the planning process	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(66) Delegation of budget management	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Budgeting</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>C. Financial Controls:</b>										
(67) Physical assets	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(68) Creditors, debtors	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(69) Cash	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(70) Fund management	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(71) Labor monitoring	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Financial Controls</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>D. Audit/External Financial Review:</b>										
(72) Ability to respond to audit recommendations	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(73) Regularity of external audits	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Audit/External Financial Review</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>E. Resource Base:</b>										
(74) Diversify of funding	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(75) Financial autonomy	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
	<b>0</b>									
(77) Short-term operating margins	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Resource Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Financial Management Points:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>

**V. PROGRAM AND SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM:**

	02 B/L	02 A	03 B/L	03 A	04 T	04 A	05 T	05 A	06 T	06 A
<b>A. Sectoral Expertise:</b>										
(78) Service delivery track record	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(79) Cost recovery mechanisms	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(80) Ability to adapt to changing constituent needs	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(81) Reputation within local, regional and international community	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Sectoral Expertise</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B. Constituency Ownership:</b>										
(82) Nature of constituents' input	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(83) Training plans reflective of constituents' needs	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Constituency Ownership</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>C. Impact Assessment:</b>										
(84) Concern for sustainability needs	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(85) Importance of impact measurement	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(86) Use of impact indicators and baseline information	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(87) Regularity of planning activity	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Impact Assessment</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Program and Service Delivery System Points:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

**VI. External Relations and Advocacy System:**

<b>A. Public Relations:</b>										
(88) Strategy to attract support	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(89) Media relations	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(90) Relationship with external stakeholders	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(91) External stakeholders' perception of organization	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Public Relations</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B. Regional Collaboration:</b>										
(92) Nature of relations with regional organizations	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(93) Networking	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(94) Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Regional Collaboration</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>C. Government Collaboration:</b>										
(95) Nature of governmental relations (regional, national & local levels)	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(96) Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Government Collaboration</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>D. Private Sector Collaboration:</b>										
(97) Nature of private sector relations (regional, national & local)	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(98) Networking	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(99) Existence of formal collaboration mechanisms	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Private Sector Collaboration</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>E. NGO Collaboration:</b>										
(100) Nature of relations with NGOs (regional, national & local)	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(101) Networking and coalition-building	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total NGO Collaboration</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

Organization Development Systems

02 B/L 02 A 03 B/L 03 A 04 T 04 A 05 T 05 A 06 T 06 A

**F. Advocacy:**

(102) Policy analysis	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(103) Developing advocacy strategies	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(104) Advocacy approaches	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(105) Evaluating organization's advocacy impact	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(106) Agenda setting strategy	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(107) Formulation of enactment of government-set policy	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(108) Implementation of enforcement of government-set policy	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(109) Formulation of enactment of regional organizations' initiatives	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(110) Implementation of enforcement of regional organizations' initiatives	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(111) Formulation of enactment of international organizations' initiatives	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(112) Implementation of enforcement of international organizations' initiatives	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(113) Monitoring of evaluation of government policy, regional initiatives, accords, resolutions	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Advocacy</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>

**G. Mobilization of Resources:**

(114) Mobilizing regional, international support	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(115) Mobilizing private sector resources	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
(116) Mobilizing donor resources	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0
<b>Sub-Total Mobilization of Resources</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

---

**Total External Relations and Advocacy System Points:** 29 29 0 0 58 58 0 0 87 0

---



---

**GRAND TOTAL POINTS (I - VI)** 119 119 11 0 243 249 0 0 365 0

---

B/L = Baseline; A = Actual; T = Target

## FACILITATOR’S GUIDE: CUSTOMIZING PIVA TO PARTNER PRIORITIES

Objective	Actions
<p><b>Step 1.</b>  <b>Determine SO and Partner Teams’ Interest and Willingness to Integrate PIVA into Results Frameworks</b></p>	<p>Mission OD Team consults with SO Team, agrees on how to achieve results using I/OD technical concepts and program framework. Mission OD team consults with Executive and Senior Management of partner organization and reviews their strategic plans, work programs and “strategic approaches/experiences with operationalizing institutional/organization development concepts; review Mission Results Framework and SO Team program objectives; reach agreement on how to begin introducing PIVA to organization, and, how to ensure that executive and senior management remain fully engaged. Debrief with SO Team and reach agreement on “way forward” technical and management priorities, work planning, and performance monitoring efforts with partners including regional African partner organizations/networks, and, US contractors/private voluntary organizations.</p>
<p><b>Step 2.</b>  <b>Design Participatory Approach for Conducting Orientation to Concepts of Institutional/Organization(al) Development (I/OD) and Relevance of PIVA Approach</b></p>	<p>Mission OD Team uses consultation with partner organization/network to prepare a 1-2 hour discussion with all staff about concepts of I/OD; uses a “systems analysis” perspective to show linkages between how an organization’s goals are linked to (institutional development, i.e., improving a condition, situation and integrating improved “ways of thinking, acting, doing business) and how an organization is structured and how it does its work in order to achieve its goals (i.e., organizational development efforts undertaken to ensure the organization is doing excellent, quality work); talks briefly about generic “governance and management systems” that are found in diverse types of organizations; prepares and disseminates a 1-2 page briefing sheet on PIVA to expand the group discussion and focus on PIVA, a communications and management tool, that organization’s can use to guide internal and external assessments of an organization’s performance and viability; discuss how PIVA is being introduced by Mission in order to help organization’s adopt better internal management and auditing practices; facilitate “question and answer” session and reach agreement about how use of PIVA can help/strengthen performance of organization; reaches agreement on a smaller group (i.e., PIVA Team) from partner organization to work with Mission OD Team to identify a participatory methodology for designing multi-year I/OD work plan (e.g., overall activity includes facilitating one rapid internal and carrying out one external PIVA, setting baselines, targets, identifying I/OD priorities and work plans, etc.). Mission OD Team meets with small group to facilitate identification of skills/time needed for carrying out PIVA work, role of PIVA Team Liaison (a lead person, back-up contact person in partner organization) with Mission OD Team.</p>

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<p><b>Step 3.</b>  <b>Identify Participatory Methodology for Designing Multi-Year I/OD Work Plan (with illustrative budget)</b></p>	<p>Mission OD Team facilitates internal assessment (orient organization to how PIVA tool is organized and conducts group exercises to role play how to rigorously conduct internal assessment); Mission OD Team conducts external assessment (using documentation that come out of internal assessment, reviews reports, conduct one-on-one interviews, focus groups discussions, interviews cross-section/representative sampling of organization’s stakeholders, constituent/beneficiary groups; collects and analyzes data; analyzes results and vets results with partner organization; reports results based on documentation and sets baselines; consults with partner organization on baseline and target setting); designs consultation with organization to review gaps/opportunities and to analyze problems that contribute to poor systems management and performance issues; coaches organization to identify problems holistically against need for systems strengthening interventions to avoid people level changes that may not improve performance of a system or performance of organization over time; define I/OD priorities and develop work plan (with illustrative budget, etc); define criterion for identifying what can be done by organization, what can be done with externally-funded technical assistance and support services (e.g., USG investments) against expected results and targets; adjust targets and facilitate development/refinements to performance monitoring plan and reporting protocols.</p>
<p><b>Step 4.</b>  <b>Provide Specialized I/OD Technical Assistance and Support Services</b></p>	<p>Mission OD Team designs, customizes and disseminates I/OD tools, reading materials, clinics and strategic consultations so that during the processes and activities described above partner organization, USPVO/contractor and SO team improve working relationships, overall implementation of technical work plan, and SO-level results framework; OD Team responds to and coordinates requests from SO team, partner organization and USPVO/contractor (i.e., tri-partite partnership) for targeted assistance with diverse OD needs.</p>
<p><b>Step 5.</b>  <b>Facilitate Monitoring and Reporting on I/OD and SO Results Frameworks</b></p>	<p>Mission OD Team initiates discussions with SO Team, its partner organizations and contractors on I/OD work plan implementation, performance monitoring to assist with surging/scaling up dividends and problem solving, as needed. Assist with drafting I/OD information/documentation for annual reports, tri-annual and internal portfolio reviews.</p>

## **Guidelines for the Institutional/Organizational Development Process Using PIVA**

### **1. Consultations and discussions on PIVA**

- a. Objective(s) of the partner organization's activities
- b. ID/OD interventions so far and those planned. How they relate to organizations' core business and expected results
- c. ID/OD concepts
- d. Objective of PIVA ring
- e. Document review: strategic plans, work programs and strategies

### **2. Baseline assessment through PIVA**

- i. Internal PIVA by the organization's staff
  1. Formation of groups to conduct PIVA (information reference is people's knowledge and documents). Process facilitator and rapporteur to be in place
  2. All staff members review the group based assessment outputs in order to come up with common organizational rankings
- ii. External PIVA by Mission. Categories of groups usually consulted are:
  1. Partner's staff and governing body
  2. USAID teams that have previously or are working with the organization
  3. Partner's primary collaborators, host government, other donors, etc.
- iii. Finalizing PIVA scores
  1. Generally accepted by the different primary groups listed above
  2. Documentation of explanations for choosing the scores
- iv. Development of institutional strengthening (IS) priorities

3. **Institutional strengthening (IS) work plan.** The design of the plan is based on gaps and opportunities identified. Issues Mission has come to realize need attention among most partners are: unclear or outdated mandates - identification of a strategic area of focus and hence development of a strategic plan and implementation strategy; improvement of organizational systems and structure – to move away from being project oriented systems - such as policies and procedures for the management of all organizational resources; documentation; making IS a culture in the organization; improvement of partners' governing bodies and of strategic linkages with critical organs.

4. **Implementation of the IS plan.** This is the most challenging phase probably because it calls for change from what an organization has always done. The IS interventions are aimed at improving systems and hence performance of the partner's objectives. Mentoring of the partners is key for the internalization and institutionalization of the new aspects.

5. **Monitoring and evaluating the IS interventions.** The PIVA assessment is repeated periodically (usually every year or two) to establish the effect of the IS interventions. The basic objective is to find out whether the IS interventions have helped the partner

improve its performance in whatever it does. If not, further action, e.g., revisions of the IS plan and implementation strategy, may be called for. In addition, the exercise is intended to measure the progress made in as far as the achievement of mission's expected intermediate results and overall results are concerned. At the end of a pre-agreed length of time, another PIVA is carried out; for comparability purposes, the procedure should be as close as possible to the one used for the baseline.

## OCAT<sup>2</sup>

### Background

Pact developed the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) in response to a need to examine the impact of NGO capacity-building activities. Like the Institutional Development Framework, OCAT is better suited for measuring one organization over time. The OCAT ... is designed to identify an organization's relative strengths and weaknesses and provides the baseline information needed to develop strengthening interventions. It can also be used to monitor progress. The OCAT is well known; other development organizations have widely adapted it. Designed to be modified for each measurement situation, the OCAT can also be standardized and used across organizations.

### Process

The OCAT is intended to be a participatory self-assessment but may be modified to be an external evaluation. An assessment team, composed of organizational members (representing different functions of the organization) plus some external helpers, modifies the OCAT assessment sheet to meet its needs (annex 3). The assessment sheet consists of a series of statements under seven capacity areas (with sub-elements). The assessment team then identifies sources of information, assigns tasks, and uses a variety of techniques (individual interviews, focus groups, among others) to collect the information they will later record on the assessment sheet. The assessment team assigns a score to each capacity area statement (1=needs urgent attention and improvement; 2=needs attention; 3=needs improvement; 4=needs improvement in limited aspects; but not major or urgent; 5=room for some improvement; 6=no need for immediate improvement). The assessment team would have to develop precise criteria for what rates as a .1. or a .2., etc.

The capacity areas and sub-elements are:

- **Governance** (board, mission/goal, constituency, leadership, legal status)
- **Management Practices** (organizational structure, information management, administration procedures, personnel, planning, program development, program reporting)
- **Human Resources** (human resources development, staff roles, work organization, diversity issues, supervisory practices, salary and benefits)
- **Financial Resources** (accounting, budgeting, financial/inventory controls, financial reporting)
- **Service Delivery** (sectoral expertise, constituency, impact assessment)
- **External Relations** (constituency relations, inter-NGO collaboration, public relations, local resources, media)
- **Sustainability** (program/benefit sustainability, organizational sustainability, financial sustainability, resource base sustainability)

---

<sup>2</sup> From TIPS, 2000, Number 15.

After gathering data, the assessment team meets to reach a consensus on the rating of each element. With the help of an OCAT rating sheet, averages can be calculated for each capacity area. These numeric scores indicate the relative need for improvement in each area. They also correspond to a more qualitative description of the organization's developmental stage. Each capacity area can be characterized as nascent, emerging, expanding, or mature. OCAT provides a table ... that describes organizational capacities at each stage of development.

### **Product**

The OCAT provides numeric ratings for each capacity area. In addition, it gives organizations a description of their capacity areas in terms of progressive stages of organizational development. This information can be presented graphically as well as in narrative form.

### **Assessment**

The OCAT identifies areas of organizational strength and weakness and tracks related changes from one measurement period to the next. ...The OCAT uses an assessment team that conducts research before completing the assessment sheet. ...The OCAT's data-gathering step allows for systematic cross-checking of perceived capacities with actual or observable facts. ...The OCAT categorizes an organization's capacity areas into one of four developmental stages. ...the OCAT uses them as descriptors once the rating has been done.