A HKU project supported by The Hong Kong Jockey Club

ExCEL3 Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT): User Manual

Sihla Koop, Elsie Chien and Michele Wong

The University of Hong Kong

July, 2015

Acknowledgements:

The ExCEL3 Organisation Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) was updated by Koop, Chien & Wong for the ExCEL3 Project at the University of Hong Kong and is based on the original CCAT prepared by Dusayeva, Koop, Li & Mintz for the Wagner School at New York University. This guide and accompanying tool is available for use free of charge and may not be reproduced for sale.

Table of Contents

ORGANISATIONAL ASSESSMENT

Background and Introduction

In the past few decades, nonprofits have increasingly turned to organisational development concepts and management tools to build up capacity to achieve their mission, especially as philanthropists have begun to understand the need to invest beyond direct programs and services to focus on the ability of the organisation to make an impact (Malveaux, 2007). While there is a growing body of literature on the experience of capacity building, there has been far less research linking these experiences to theory (Millesen, Carman, and Bies, 2010).

In fact, the concept of nonprofit capacity building is as abstract and complex (Wing, 2004) as that of organisational effectiveness and has long been under debate by scholars (Mitchell, 2012). Nevertheless, anecdotal evidence suggests that the proper use of such tools can lead to greater success for organisations to deliver innovative, effective and sustainable solutions. Some of the literature on capacity building examines cases of unsuccessful initiatives. While there may be any number of reasons for failed attempts at capacity building, it is always useful for organisations to begin the process by first stepping back and taking the time to assess their current organisational capacities.

What is organisational capacity?

We can think of organisational capacity as all those components it takes for an organisation to achieve its mission, from physical resources to people to ideas. At any given moment, capacity is an output of basic organisational activities like managing budgets, recruiting board members, raising funds, serving constituents and so forth. As capacity is generated, it is spent on mission-related activities and then regenerated through those same organisational activities. The reason then for an organisation to engage in any capacity building effort is to generate more capacity to achieve program impact (Light, 2004).

The process of organisational assessment

Any attempt to build capacity should always be preceded by an organisational assessment in order to guide where, how, and if capacity building should even occur. Capacity building efforts should not be implemented in a vacuum; an organisation should always have a clear picture of its assets and deficits. There are a number of capacity assessment tools that have been created specifically for or adapted to suit the unique character of nonprofits such as McKinsey & Co.'s Capacity Assessment Tool and Innovation Network's Organisational Assessment Tool[1].

[1] See Appendix III for a summary of the tools.

Results from such assessment exercises serve as a baseline measure of how an organisation is currently doing in terms of its existing capacities and also provide a starting point for those areas on which to focus capacity building efforts. Ideally, a capacity assessment tool should be used on a consistent basis, for example annually, as a means of incorporating learning into the organisational culture.

THE ExCEL3 ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL (OCAT)

The Composite Capacity Assessment Tool (CCAT) was originally developed as part of a research project at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University in order to support the small-scale, start-up phase of grantee organisations for the Third Millennium Foundation. The preliminary version of CCAT was designed in accordance with the following methodology: a literature review on capacity assessment tools designed for and used by other non-profit organisations, a glossary of capacity assessment terms, an organisational survey to cross check results with findings of the literature review as part of the validation process, and pilot testing phase with revisions based on results.

The ExCEL3 OCAT is based on a revision of the original CCAT by members of the ExCEL3 team, and updated through current research on governance, leadership and philanthropy in the third sector in Hong Kong as well as a review of the latest literature on organisational assessment for nonprofits.

OCAT is a two-part tool consisting of a self-administered survey and a facilitator-led discussion section. The self-assessment part is included as Appendix I of this guide. Results from the individual self-assessment and group discussion can be used as a reference point for where an organisation stands at a particular time, help drive capacity building efforts, and contribute to the organisation's learning and culture.

Part I: Self-Assessment

The individual, self-assessment phase consists of sixty-seven questions divided across nine capacity areas as follows: Governance & Leadership; Human Resource Management; Financial Management; Organisational Planning; Innovation & Learning; Program Management; Performance Management; Partnerships & External Relationships; and Technology. Definitions of these capacity areas can be found in the section on interpreting capacity scores.

Respondents rank each statement on a five-point scale as follows:

0 – Don't know/Not applicable
1 – Strongly disagree
2 – Disagree
3 – Neutral

4 – Agree
5 – Strongly agree

The self-assessment survey attempts to measure the perceptions of respondents as to the extent to which each of the nine capacity areas exists within the organisation. It also attempts to measure the extent to which respondents agree with one another on the level of competency of each capacity area.

Part II: Discussion Session

In addition to the self-assessment portion, OCAT comprises a facilitator-led discussion section that should include, at the minimum, a cross-functional and cross-hierarchical representation of the organisation. The purpose of the discussion session is to better understand the organisation's strengths and weaknesses and to build social capital and trust by focusing on transparency and communication.

There are different ways to structure a discussion section although for the purposes of OCAT, this manual will only go over two. The first way is for the facilitator to open the session to all participants and allow a free-flow type of conversation. This less-structured approach may reveal important issues that would otherwise have not been revealed through responding to a series of set questions. This type of discussion, though, needs to be carefully monitored in order to keep the conversation on track and allow all present to participate in the discussion.

The alternative approach is more structured and uses a pre-designed set of questions around each capacity area. Usually no more than one or two questions per area can be addressed within the timeframe of the discussion session. The set of questions could be constructed from an initial analysis of results from the self-assessment or from the list of questions below:

A. Governance & Leadership

1. What do you feel are the core values of your organisation?
2. Are all stakeholders clear about the role that the Board plays in your organisation?
3. What is the division of labour between the Board and Senior Management?
4. How is strategy set in your organisation?

B. Human Resource Management

1. How do you feel about your organisation's HRVM policies and practices?
2. Do you feel that your organisation is adequately staffed?
3. What keeps you motivated and loyal to an organisation?

C. Financial Management

1. What concrete measures have been taken over the last year to diversify funding sources?
2. Are your organisation's fiscal objectives for this year reflected in your budget?
3. What policies and practices are in place to avoid deficits and enhance reserves?

4. Can staff understand and follow your organisation's financial policies and procedures?

D. Organisational Planning

1. What types of high-level planning activities does your organisation engage in and what types of tools are used?
2. What evidence is there that your organisation is meeting its strategic objectives?
3. Does your organisation review and update its plans on a regular basis?

E. Innovation & Learning

1. What type of feedback is gathered from internal and external stakeholders?
2. Do you feel that information is shared in a timely and appropriate manner in order to respond to organisational priorities and challenges?
3. How does your organisation consolidate learning?
4. What changes to operations have been made to reflect an enhanced understanding of the environment in which you operate?

F. Program Management

1. What is the process for planning and devising new programs in your organisation?
2. How do you ensure core programs align with your organisation's mission and goals?
3. How are programs documented and reviewed to assess growth and areas for improvement?

G. Performance Management

1. How is overall performance of the organisation being measured? Are there KPIs for performance? How is the data being collected?
2. Does the organisation practice internal/external benchmarking?
3. How is quality of services being ensured?

H. Partnerships & External Relationships

1. How does your organisation remain up-to-date on changes within the field/industry it works?
2. What are your key marketing and PR strategies?
3. How does your organisation differentiate its programs from similar ones in the field?
4. How does networking happen and how are partnerships formed for your organisation?

I. Technology

1. What role does technology play in facilitating good communication across your organisation?
2. Does the use of technology take into account the diversity of your stakeholders?
3. How is technology used in your organisation to improve how it functions?

USING EXCEL3 OCAT

As with any organisation-wide undertaking, there is a higher chance of successful completion with prior planning. Also critical to successfully conducting an organisational assessment is the commitment from stakeholders across the organisation along with the appropriate resources.

The first step in conducting a capacity assessment exercise utilizing OCAT is to select a facilitator. Ideally, this person will have experience using OCAT and is also external to the organisation.

The facilitator should work with the organisation's leadership to compose the appropriate messaging about the capacity assessment exercise for the rest of the organisation. This is an important step to garner support and buy-in. It may also be appropriate to hold a meeting following the announcement of the exercise to allow those involved to raise any questions or concerns.

Administering the Self-Assessment Component

The next step is for the facilitator to administer the individual, self-assessment portion of the tool to each participant. The questionnaire should take approximately one hour to complete with responses returned to the facilitator at least two weeks prior to the group discussion so that the survey can be scored and interpreted. The facilitator should code each participant's name so that responses remain confidential. All data should be aggregated at the organisational level.

A group of participants who are representative of the organisation should be selected to take part in the discussion. A discussion team should not exceed twelve persons in order to keep the time period for discussion within reasonable limits.

In completing the individual survey first, participants will have an idea of the topics to be covered in group discussion. Participants should review their completed self-assessment responses prior to the discussion section.

Conducting a Discussion Session

The facilitator should begin the discussion by leading introductions and describing the purpose of the discussion within the broader context. Throughout the session, the facilitator will help steer the focus of the discussion questions, manage time and ensure full and fair participation. The facilitator should come across as objective and embody the values of equality and cooperation. The tone of the discussion can be informal and friendly.

The site of the discussion session should comfortably accommodate the group, be free of distractions, and well stocked with materials such as pen and paper, a white board or flip chart with markers and water.

Selecting a facilitator

The role of the facilitator is to ensure that the discussion team has a clear understanding of the rationale and objectives of the OCAT session. A competent facilitator should exhibit the following qualities:

- Ability to listen closely, comprehend and paraphrase back
- Remain neutral and objective
- Adjust the flow of conversation while protecting individuals and their ideas
- Gain cooperation and full participation from the group
- A collaborative style

Introducing a session

In opening the discussion, the facilitator should strive to create an environment in which participants:

- Know what to expect and what is expected of them
- Believe the session is a good investment of their time
- Develop trust in the facilitator and other participants
- Have the confidence the process will lead to results

At the beginning of each session, the facilitator should follow the steps below:

Step 1: Set the context for participants; explain why they are involved and how the session fits into the organisational assessment framework.

Step 2: Review the schedule, informing participants of the expected time frame, including breaks.

Step 3: Go over the agenda and the definitions of each capacity area.

Step 4: Present the objectives, specifically, what should be accomplished by the session, tying it back to the overall objectives of using the OCAT tool.

Establishing ground rules

Ground rules are set so that people know how to behave and what is expected of them. Two types of ground rules are typical of facilitators:

1. Process ground rules:
    a. Make decisions about breaks and time allocation by consensus
    b. Post decisions for all to see
    c. Track action items and follow-up points as you go

2. Behavioural ground rules:
    a. Attend all sessions and be on time
    b. Treat all ideas with respect
    c. Raise differences openly and constructively

Ground rules set the stage for a safe, respectful, and non-judgmental environment that invites full participation from everyone. This environment makes it easier for the facilitator to lead the process without being weighed down by the need to sort out issues amongst participants.

Promoting participation

To maximize impact of the discussion section requires full participation from all in attendance. The facilitator is responsible for fostering an environment in which everyone feels secure and has an equal opportunity to participate. Not all participants will contribute to the discussion at the same level or frequency however it is important that they feel comfortable expressing diverse opinions. If some participants seems shy and are not participating, it would be helpful to create an atmosphere that welcomes comments without singling out anyone in particular.

Responding to challenges

During the course of facilitating the discussion, a variety of issues may arise and the facilitator needs to be aware of how to handle these. At all times, the facilitator should maintain a level of professionalism and take a reasonable approach to all participants. The key is to keep the discussion session on track. Below are some common challenges along with examples of how one may respond to them:

Scenario 1 - One or more participants bring up a particular point or issue repeatedly:

In this case, the facilitator can acknowledge the point, jotting it down on the white board or flip chart. If it is brought up again, the facilitator can suggest the issue be saved for a conversation outside of the OCAT session in the interest of time.

Scenario 2 - One particular person hijacks the conversation:

If there is one person who seems to dominate the conversation, look around the room for others who want to talk and then call on them for a while. If necessary, give the too-talkative person a particular task, such as taking notes on the flip chart. This way the person is still making a contribution to the session but will have another focus.

Scenario 3 - The discussion topic becomes irrelevant to the capacity assessment exercise:

When a topic that has little to do with the assessment exercise is brought up, the facilitator can choose to either sidestep the issue or allow it to be discussed. If the facilitator does not focus on the topic, then persons are less likely to continue on that theme.

Scenario 4 - A particular person or group of people may become heated or disruptive:

This is one of the more difficult scenarios to manage and it is very important for the facilitator to remain calm. It can be time consuming and stressful to handle this situation if diffusing techniques are not employed right away. The facilitator should address the upset or angry participant and recognize his/her right to those feelings however he/she does not reserve the right to be manipulative or abusive. Ideally this should begin to alleviate the hostility however it may be beyond the control of the facilitator, in which case the ultimate goal is to simply manage the conflict in a way that allows the discussion to move forward with the group.

Scenario 5 - Participants may engage in side conversations that distract the entire group:

In this case, the facilitator should try to break up the side conversation without singling out participants, which may cause embarrassment. Subtle cues can be used to try to stop the conversation, such as making eye contact or moving in their direction without breaking the flow of the discussion. If the situation continues, then a gentle reminder to the previously established ground rules is a tactful way to deal with this.

When people get together to discuss issues about which they feel strongly, there is always opportunity for conflict. Much of the literature on the subject of facilitation emphasizes methods that lead to group consensus; however, it is important to note that for the purpose of the CCATHK discussion session, consensus is not the end goal. Constructive conflict can be productive when there is diversity of opinion, as this can generate fruitful discussion and debate that moves towards capacity building within an organisation.

Closing the session

The discussion should end with enough time for the facilitator to sum up what has been learnt through the process of capacity assessment as well as to provide a summary of the key issues and topics brought up. If the capacity assessment exercise has been conducted by an external facilitator, the results should be presented to the organisation through a formal report within the next week or two following the discussion session. If possible, internal stakeholders should determine a forum or strategy for addressing those issues and should arrange a follow-up meeting to review results of the OCAT exercise.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

OCAT is a composite tool based on several validated organisation capacity assessment tools. The degree of success of the tool relies on self-assessment by organisation staff and key stakeholders. Participants respond to the OCAT individual survey items using a 0-5 scale. The calculations for scoring this section of OCAT are outlined in detail in this portion of the manual.

An Excel workbook containing the self-assessment tool and scoring mechanism is also available separately.

Calculating the raw capacity score

The raw capacity score is the average group response to a given capacity area. The score is tabulated by obtaining each respondent's total score for the capacity area and then an overall average score for the capacity area. This will yield a total of nine raw capacity scores.

Step 1: To facilitate data entry, assign a code name to each of the respondents and enter that code in the top row of the columns of the 'Questions' worksheet in the OCAT Self-Assessment workbook.

Step 2: Enter each respondent's total for the capacity area in the row marked 'x' of the *Score Sheet* for that capacity area.

Step 3: Add all the values from row 'x' of the table and enter the new value into the column marked 'SUM' of the *Score Sheet*.

Step 4: Divide the value in the 'SUM' cell by the number of team members to get the raw capacity score.

The raw score suggests the following inferences:

Raw Capacity Score	Interpretation
0	The organisation has no capacity in this area
1	The organisation has little capacity in this area
2	The organisation's capacities fall below acceptable performance standards in this area.
3	The organisation approximates acceptable performance standards in this area.
4	The organisation's capacities are above acceptable performance standards in this area.
5	The organisation's capacities are well above acceptable performance standards in this area.

Calculating the standardized capacity score

The standardized capacity score uses an index to allow different OCAT capacities to be compared meaningfully. The standardized score is calculated by dividing a capacity area's raw score by the area's maximum number of points and then multiplying by 100 to get an indexed raw score.

Step 5: Divide the raw capacity score by the maximum number of points for that capacity area.

Step 6: Multiply the value from Step 5 by 100. This will give you the standardized capacity score. Repeat this step for each capacity area.

The standardized score suggests the following inferences:

Standardized capacity score	Interpretation
0 – 39	The organisation has little or no capacity in this area.
40 – 59	The organisation's capacities fall below acceptable performance standards in this area.
60 – 70	The organisation's capacities approximate acceptable performance standards in this area.
71 – 80	The organisation's capacities are above acceptable performance standards in this area.
81 – 100	The organisation's capacities exceed acceptable performance standards in this area.

Calculating the consensus score

The consensus score measures the degree to which team members agree with one another concerning their assessment of a given capacity area. The consensus score is obtained by taking the standard deviation to measure the spread of answers, and then calculating the coefficient of variation (i.e. the standard deviation as a percentage of the raw capacity score, *Worksheet #1*) to express how widely these answers are dispersed as a percentage.

Step 1: Multiply each respondent's total (the values in the columns marked by a letter) by itself and put that new value in a row x^2 of the *Score Sheet* (do not multiply the 'SUM' column).

Step 2: Add all the values from row x^2 of the table and enter that new value into the column marked 'SUM' of the *Score Sheet*. This will equal z*.

Step 3: Multiply the 'SUM' of row y by itself (i.e. square total) to get y*

Step 4: Multiply the number of participants by the number of participants minus one. This will equal n*.

Step 5: Multiply the number of participants by z* (from Step 2) and subtract y* (from Step 3). This will equal *m*.

Step 6: Divide *m* (from Step 5) by n* (from Step 4). This will equal *p*.

Step 7: Take the square root of *p* (from Step 6). This will equal SD.

Step 8: Divide SD (from Step 7) by the range of possible scores for that section. Then multiply by 100. This is the Raw Consensus Score.

Note: The range of possible scores is the maximum number of points possible for the section minus the minimum number of points possible for the section.

Calculating the standardized consensus score

The consensus score is attained using measures of dispersion, the standard deviation and coefficient of variance, which expresses disagreement. The raw consensus score must therefore be inverted and converted to a 100-point scale in order to be measured in the same way as the capacity dimension.

Step 9: To transform the score, first multiply the raw consensus score by 2.

Step 10: Subtract the new value (obtained in step 9 above) from 100 to get a consensus score that can be graphed as was done for the capacity dimension score. Repeat this process for each capacity area.

The consensus scores can be interpreted as follows:

Standardized consensus score	Interpretation
0	No consensus
1 – 39	Very low level of consensus
40 – 59	Low level of consensus
60 – 70	Moderate level of consensus
71 – 80	High level of consensus
81 – 100	Very high level of consensus

Interpreting Capacity Areas

The self-assessment tool presents a series of sixty-seven statements based on best practices in NGO governance and management. These statements are intended to gauge the perceptions of respondents as to the extent to which they believe each of the nine capacity areas is present within the organisation. The consensus score then measures the extent to which respondents agree with one another on the level of competency within each capacity area.

A description of each of the nine capacity areas is covered below, along with an interpretation of what a high and low score means per section. The self-assessment tool is prescriptive in the sense that organisations should be striving to accomplish each of the sixty-seven statements that are applicable to their situation.

A. Governance & Leadership

Governance is providing leadership in an organisation, primarily through the Board of Directors, to assure that the organisation's mission is appropriate and relevant, and that the organisation secures, uses and protects its assets to carry out its mission and maximize the benefits to its constituencies. Good governance of non-profit organisations means that boards fulfil their public trust by knowing and doing their jobs. Good governance is critical to ensuring that non-profit organisations are effective and that they are able to maximize resources on behalf of their constituencies.[2]

Items in this section focus on governance practices; leadership practices; organisation's commitment to goals, mission, vision and philosophy; capacity to adapt to changes in external environment; strategic objectives; diversity of the Board; communication between the Board and senior management; accountability of senior management to the Board; profession development of Board members and effectiveness of the Board.

High scores in the capacity area of Governance indicate that the Board (organisation's governing body):

- Meets regularly and members clearly understand their roles and responsibilities (with roles clearly documented)
- Sets strategy and conducts planning in support of the organisation's mission, vision and values
- Maintains oversight of senior management while remaining disengaged from the organisation's daily operations
- Regularly receives, reviews and reflects on operational and managerial updates on the organisation
- Is diverse and reflects the constituencies served

Low scores indicate that the above practices of good governance by Board members are not achieved.

B. Human Resource Management

The *Human Resource Management* (HRM) function includes a variety of activities, and key among them is deciding what staffing needs you have and whether to use independent contractors or hire employees to fill these needs, recruiting and training the best employees, ensuring they are high performers, dealing with performance issues, and ensuring your personnel and management practices conform to various regulations. Activities also include managing your approach to employee benefits and compensation, employee records and personnel policies. Nonprofits should always ensure that employees have -- and are aware of -- personnel policies that conform to current regulations. These policies are often in the form of employee manuals, which all employees should have.[3]

Volunteer Management (VM) involves finding volunteers, matching their skills and interests to the needs of the organisation, providing supervision and recognizing their contributions. Without a volunteer management professional on staff, whether the position itself is paid or not, volunteers may fall between the cracks of already busy organisations. In this case, the end result is a volunteer who doesn't feel valued or engaged. Such a volunteer will leave, taking

[2] Alliance for Nonprofit Governance. New York, NY. http://www.angonline.org/
[3] MAP for Nonprofits, http://www.mapnp.org

with them the energy and time they could have contributed to the mission as well as, potentially, ill will towards the organisation for how they were treated.[4]

Items in this section focus on staffing and work force planning; recruiting staff and volunteers; staff and volunteer development, deployment, training and supervision; and setting HRM and VM policies and practices, including solid retention practices.

High scores in HRM indicate that:

- The organisation is staffed appropriately with the right mix of skills and knowledge
- HR policies and practices are clearly documented and known to staff and volunteers
- HR policies and practices contribute directly to staff and volunteer retention, loyalty and motivation

Low scores indicate that sound HRM practices and policies have not been implemented, clearly communicated or followed.

C. Financial Management

Financial Management is a subset of management that focuses on generating financial information that can be used to improve decision-making. In public service organisations, the decisions are oriented toward achieving the various goals of the organisation while maintaining a satisfactory financial situation. Financial Management encompasses the broad areas of accounting and finance.[5]

Items in this section focus on policies, procedures and practices that maintain balanced books; accurate budgeting and forecasting; accuracy and utility of financial reports; management of cash flow and reserves; and measures to increase financial support for the organisation.

High scores in this section indicate the capacity to:

- Budget in a way that meets the organisation's operational priorities
- Avoid deficit operations and maintain adequate cash flows and reserves
- Appropriately allocate financial resources to support the organisation's mission
- Diversify and increase financial support
- Provide timely and accurate financial reporting and data

Low scores indicate that the organisation has not been able to implement or follow sound financial management practices.

D. Organisational Planning

Organisational Planning is one of the key functions of management. This category includes planning tools that help managers to determine what an organisation is doing presently and what it intends to do in the future, through a process of gathering information, creating

[4] Idealist.org. http://www.idealist.org/info/VolunteerMgmt/Important
[5] Steven A. Finkler, Financial Management for Public, Health, and Not-for-profit Organisations, 2001

ownership, and making strategic decisions, as well as to operationalize organisational goals and priorities on a year-to-year basis to support organisational focus.[6]

Items in this section focus on adequacy of organisational practices in relation to the external environment; ability to modify organisational objectives according to the findings of planning exercises; tracking progress in achieving objectives; ability to adapt to changing needs to stakeholders and to internal or external stimuli.

High scores in the area of organisational planning indicate that an organisation:

- Is attuned to and understands its place in the external environment
- Plans activities that are designed and executed in a manner consistent with organisational operating plans
- Can adopt immediate actions in response to evolving needs of stakeholders

Low scores indicate that an organisation does not regularly engage in planning or does not effectively implement or follow planning activities.

E. Innovation and Learning

Innovative or *learning organisations* are "organisations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together[7]." The basic rationale for such organisations is that in situations of rapid change, only those that are flexible, adaptive and productive will excel. For this to occur, organisations need to discover how to tap into people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels.

Items in this section focus on how information flows within an organisation; the benefits of learning from mistakes; the quality, timeliness and utility of shared information; the extent to which information is used to improve organisational performance; support for effective teamwork; participatory management practices; the quality and effectiveness of knowledge management.

High scores for innovation & learning indicate that:

- Communication flows in multiple directions within the organisation and is generated in a timely manner
- There is a culture of recording, understanding and sharing lessons learned to improve organisational performance
- The organisation employs whole systems to solve problems

Low scores indicate that an organisation does not share or use knowledge in the most efficient and effective manner.

[6] The Health Manager's Toolkit, http://erc.msh.org/mainpage.cfm?file=9.0.htm&module=toolkit&language=English
[7] Peter Senge, 1990, http://www.infed.org/thinkers/senge.htm

F. Program Management

Well-designed programs should include: valid assumptions for program design, equality of program participants, after-program evaluation to ensure programs achieved impact and also "did-no-harm" and feedback from stakeholders incorporated back into programs.

Program Management is the management of a related series of projects executed over a broad period of time, and which are designed to accomplish broad goals, to which the individual projects contribute.[8] It is also the activity consisting of the cohesive collection of all tasks that are primarily performed to manage a single service of related projects in order to fulfil the program's mission and to achieve its objectives.[9] The term 'Program Management' is more commonly used in the West to refer to 'Service' or 'Quality' management in the local Hong Kong context.

Items in this section focus on core programs and services in relation to the organisation's mission, overarching goals and stakeholders; use of various methods, resources and engagement of various activities to improve program management systems; the monitoring and evaluation of core programs and whether the programs have achieved any impact.

High scores in the area of program management indicate that:

- Core programs and services are aligned with organisational mission, vision and values
- There is a sound program management system in place
- Data is routinely collected and used to make decisions about programs
- The organisation regularly employs appropriate resources to improve programs

Low scores in this section indicate that an organisation does not have sufficient capacity in the area of program management.

G. Performance Management

Performance Management is a strategic and integrated process by which organisations align their resources, systems and employees to strategic objectives and priorities, in order to ensure that goals are consistently being met in an effective and efficient. This includes activities to improve the performance of the people who work in an organisation.

High scores in the area of the performance management indicate that:

- There is a comprehensive and integrated performance management system in place
- There are measureable and agreed upon performance targets and Key Performance Indicators that are shared within the organisation
- There is a data collection system across different units to collect

[8] Project Auditors, http://www.projectauditors.com/Dictionary/P.html
[9] OPEN Process Framework, http://www.donald-firesmith.com/index.html?Glossary/GlossaryP.html~Contents

Low scores in this section indicate that an organisation does not have sufficient capacity to ensure quality of services.

H. Partnerships and External Relationships

The primary purpose of cultivating productive *external relationships* is for social or business purposes. It is the continuous process of meeting and making use of contacts and the exchange of information and services among individuals, groups or institutions. This includes partnerships, marketing, and public relations.

A *partnership* is an arrangement where parties agree to the formation of a strategic alliance to advance mutual interests. Marketing for non-profit organisations takes into account the analysis, planning, control and implementation of programs to create, build and maintain beneficial exchanges with the target audience for the purpose of achieving organisational objectives. Public Relations is communication with various sectors of the public to influence their attitudes and opinions in the interest of promoting a person, product, or idea. There should be a planned and sustained effort to establish and maintain goodwill and mutual understanding between an organisation and the public.

Items in this section focus on the capacity to form meaningful alliances with other organisations, the private sector, policy makers, public institutions, stakeholders, the media, and community leaders in order to better achieve its mission. This section also focuses on the use of market analysis and data by an organisation to establish itself in the field, to understand the community and political culture in which it works, and to clearly articulate mission, objectives, and goals and set itself apart from other organisations.

High scores in this capacity area indicate that an organisation is:

- Active about networking and establishing contacts
- Strategic about partnering to gain benefits that may be otherwise difficult to get
- Viewed as trustworthy by other organisations
- Awareness about the context in which the organisation works
- The ability to positively "brand" and "sell" itself
- A level of influence within and beyond the community

Low scores indicate an organisation is not taking advantage of potential gains through partnerships and external relationships, and has not properly positioned itself within an industry and does not extend much influence.

I. Technology

Technology serves as the backbone of management, providing people with the information necessary to synthesize learning and knowledge that can then be translated into organisational effectiveness. Organisations that use technology smartly are able to better govern themselves, develop resources and market themselves more effectively. Technology is key to communication and, therefore to transparency and accountability, especially towards external stakeholders.[10]

Items in this section focus on the appropriate types of technology for an organisation to: enhance its programs; manage the flow of data and information; collect and synthesize knowledge; and communicate internally and externally.

High scores in the area of technology indicate that the organisation:

- Places a priority on the use of technology to improve how the organisation functions
- Has a suitable management information system in place to collect, share and analyse data and knowledge
- Uses communication technology appropriately across the organisation and to the outside world

Low scores indicate the organisation is not making proper use of technology to attain mission.

RESULTS OF A CAPACITY ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Setting Priorities

If the capacity assessment exercise was externally facilitated, results will usually be presented in a formal report and may include some recommendations based on results from both the self-assessment responses and the conversation during the discussion session. Whether internally or externally facilitated, those responsible for promoting the tool should prepare to go through the results of the exercise and prioritize areas on which to focus capacity building efforts.

To maintain momentum and interest, those leading the capacity assessment exercise should work on action plans that can be prioritized as short, medium and longer-term. In some cases, capacity may be lower in a particular area but the solution is a simple one and focusing on simpler issues that may not be high priority can still produce “easy wins” and foster a culture that values the effort to build up capacity.

On-going Organisational Learning

Organisations using OCAT to assess capacity are already engaging in organisational learning by bringing members from diverse areas of the organisation together for a facilitated discussion on key organisational capacities. Organisations can see benefits almost immediately in the form of increased focus on critical organisational capacities and improved information flows. Results from the OCAT self-assessment survey, as well as outcomes from the discussion session,

[10] http://news.gilbert.org/features/featureReader$3842

help to identify areas where change efforts are most important to stakeholders and will therefore have an impact on how the organisation achieves its mission.

Capacity assessment, and therefore, capacity building, is an on-going process and not a one-time prescription. As often as the tool is used, the organisation continues to grow and learn. At a minimum, OCAT should be revisited annually so that organisations can realign capacity building efforts with changing realities.

REFERENCES:

Connolly, P., and York, P. *Building the Capacity of Capacity Builders: A Study of Management Support and Field-Building Organisations in the Nonprofit Sector*. 2003. Retrieved in 2013 from http://www.tccgrp.com/pdfs/buildingthecapacityofcapacitybuilders.pdf.

Light, P. C. "*Sustaining Nonprofit Performance: The Case for Capacity Building and the Evidence to Support It.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2004.

Malveaux, A.M. "The Nonprofit as a Business Enterprise: Adapting to the Expanding Philanthropic Market," In S.U. Raymond and M.B. Martin (eds.), *Mapping the New World of American Philanthropy: Causes and Consequences of the Transfer of Wealth*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, 2007.

Wing, K.T. "Assessing the Effectiveness of Capacity-Building Initiatives: Seven Issues for the Field." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 2004, 33, 153-160.

APPENDIX I: EXCEL3 OCAT

ExCEL3 Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool: Self-Assessment Survey

Organisation:

Position:

Individual Name (encoded):

Directions: The following survey should be completed individually. Use the drop-down menu in Column D to respond to each statement. Refer to the legend for scale interpretation. This excel workbook is configured to calculate your score automatically. If you notice an error or have questions regarding this survey, please contact the OCAP facilitator.

Legend:

0 = Don't Know/Not Applicable

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

	A. Governance and Leadership	
1	Our organisation is guided by a clearly written set of shared core values.	
2	Our organisation has a clear mission and vision that reflects its values and purpose, and are frequently referred to in order to direct actions and set priorities.	
3	Members of our organisation are able to clearly and concisely describe our organisation's vision, mission and values.	
4	Our mission and vision are translated into a clear, bold set of goals that our organisation aims to achieve.	
5	Our organisation has a clear strategy that is actionable and measurable, and linked to overall mission, vision and goals.	
6	Our governing body reviews the mission statement regularly and modifies it when needed in order to reflect the needs of the people we serve.	
7	Our organisation strives for transparency and accountability (e.g., by making our annual report and financial report publicly available)	
8	The organisation of our governing body is documented with a description of each committee, position and their functions.	
9	Our governing body provides strong direction, support and accountability to the organisation and engages as a strategic resource.	
10	Communication between board and leadership reflects mutual respect, and appreciation for roles and responsibilities.	

11	Our governing body effectively sets performance targets and holds senior management fully accountable.	
12	Our governing body periodically evaluates its work and performance.	
13	Our governing body receives regular information and/or training about their roles and responsibilities.	
14	Members of our governing body are fully aware of and understand the legal liabilities they take on when joining our organisation.	
15	Our organisation has a clear organisational chart and reporting structure with clearly defined core roles and responsibilities.	
16	Our governing body are from diverse fields of expertise and sectors (e.g., nonprofit, government, business, academia, etc.)	
17	Our senior management (CEO and senior management team) is energetic, highly committed, and able to live the organisation's vision.	
18	Our senior management is highly experienced in nonprofit management and able to lead the staff through difficult times.	
19	Our senior management keeps up-to-date on issues relevant to our organisation (e.g., through attending sectoral conferences, meetings, professional development, etc.)	
20	Our management team are able to work independently, without overreliance on the CEO.	
21	Decision making is delegated to relevant staff as appropriate.	
22	Our organisation's decision making process is transparent.	
23	Disagreement among organisational leaders are handled in a constructive and appropriate manner	
24	Our organisation has a sound succession plan in place.	
	B. Human Resource Management	
25	Our organisation is able to develop and refine a realistic and concrete HR plan to ensure the appropriate number of staff for achieving our organisational goals.	
26	Our staff have the appropriate skills and professional knowledge to achieve our mission.	
27	Our staff are from a broad variety of backgrounds and experiences, and bring a diverse range of skills to the organisation.	
28	Positions within the organisation can always be filled in a timely manner and staff turnover is not a problem.	
29	Our organisation has a staff recruitment policy and practice to ensure the right person is in the right position.	
30	Our organisation has incentive systems (e.g., salary and benefits, career development opportunities, etc.) which are competitive enough and effective in motivating staff to perform their roles in an outstanding way.	

31	Our organisation has staff training, and a development policy and practice, to maximise employees' potential for achieving our organisation's goals and objectives.	
32	Our organisation has a staff performance management system in place (e.g., coaching, performance assessment, etc.) and annual performance review is conducted for all staff.	
33	Our volunteers are from diverse backgrounds who are capable individuals that can bring complementary skills to the organisation.	
34	We provide on-going training, support, coaching and supervision to our volunteers to ensure their service quality.	
35	Volunteers feel valued and appreciated.	
36	Our volunteers enjoy their work within the organisation and feel proud to be part of the organisation.	
	C. Financial Management	
37	Our organisation has an established financial management system with well written financial policies and procedures.	
38	Our organisation has a concrete financial plan, which is updated continuously and is able to reflect organisational priorities.	
39	Written financial policies and procedures are strictly followed.	
40	Our financial management practices (e.g., accounting, budgeting, reporting etc.) lead to accurate financial projections.	
41	Daily financial operations of our organisation are under formal systems and controls (e.g., management of cash flow).	
42	Internal audit for our organisation's books are conducted regularly.	
43	External audit for our organisation's books are conducted regularly.	
44	Our organisation has an annual financial report that is clear and easy to read.	
45	Our organisation makes the most efficient and effective use of its funding.	
46	Our organisation has a sufficient and appropriate amount of reserve to support services and development in times of need.	
47	Our organisation has developed sustainable revenue generating activities (e.g., fundraising, fee-charging services, social enterprise, etc.)	
48	Our organisation has highly a diversified funding source and is thus insulated from potential market instabilities.	
49	Our governing board actively supports and participates in our fundraising work.	
50	Our organisation has a clear and workable strategy for fundraising.	
51	Our organisation has dedicated staff that are responsible for fundraising.	
	D. Organisational Planning	

52	Strategic planning exercises are carried out regularly.	
53	Our strategic plan is used extensively to guide our organisation's development and operation as a whole.	
54	Our strategic planning process involves stakeholders (e.g., board members, service clients, staff, community leaders, etc.) in an on-going dialogue that ensures that our organisation's mission and programs are valuable to the people it serves.	
55	Our organisation keeps an eye on the community's needs and is knowledgeable about other service providers in the community and the alternative work models in our service areas.	
56	Our strategic plan is communicated within the organisation and is widely known by members of the organisation.	
57	Based on the strategic plan, our organisation develops a clear, realistic and detailed operational plan.	
58	The planning process is evidence-based, and supported with comprehensive and reliable data.	
59	We have a contingency plan in place to account for sudden changes in our internal or external environment.	
	E. Innovation and Learning	
60	Our organisation encourages and supports a culture of learning and innovation by making it part of organisational strategy (e.g., by integrating learning into the planning, monitoring and evaluation process).	
61	Our organisation gives adequate resources to knowledge and learning management.	
62	We keep informed of trends and issues relevant to our organisation.	
63	Our organisation makes learning explicit and legitimate, by providing the time and space for learning and reflection opportunities (e.g., to meet and share our work, coordinate our work, and develop ideas for working together).	
64	We have a knowledge management system that is easy-to-use, which gathers, documents, and circulates knowledge in comprehensive areas (e.g., organisation portal, guidelines and manuals, central database etc.)	
65	Our staff know about the knowledge management system and make frequent use of it. (Put '0' if your organisation does not have a knowledge management system).	
66	Ongoing communication, based on trust and openness, exists across all levels of our organisation.	
67	Staff feel that their ideas and concerns are valued.	
68	Our organisation values innovation and provides appropriate incentives and opportunities to share and implement new ideas.	
69	Our organisation is a safe place for risk-taking innovators.	

70	Staff are not afraid to make mistakes as they are regarded as learning opportunities.	
71	Staff are eager to find ways for doing things more effectively.	
72	Our organisation regularly conducts Organisational Capacity Assessment and shares findings with appropriate staff.	
	F. Program Management	
73	All our programs and services are fully aligned with our organisation's mission and goals.	
74	Programs offered are clearly linked to one another and to our overall strategy.	
75	Our program designs are evidence-based and subject to continuous review, in order to adapt them to the changing needs of service clients.	
76	We routinely capture feedback from key stakeholders (including service clients) and make appropriate adjustments to our programs.	
77	We regularly collect data on program activities so as to monitor progress in achieving our objectives.	
78	Our organisation conducts formal program evaluations to measure whether our programs have made a difference to our service clients' lives/environment.	
79	Our organisation also conducts informal evaluations by documenting and/or sharing stories and anecdotes about how our programs achieved significant impact.	
80	Program evaluation results are shared with all staff and board members.	
81	Our organisation uses evaluation findings to decide whether to maintain, improve or end specific programs/services.	
	We regularly review our service portfolio to:	
82	Assess the possibility for program growth and replication.	
83	Discuss new ideas for program development.	
84	Phase out programs that no longer support our mission.	
	G. Performance Management	
85	Our organisation is committed to the high quality of programs and services and is determined to achieve excellent performance.	
86	We have a well-developed comprehensive, integrated system (e.g., balanced scorecard) used for measuring our organisation’s performance and progress on continual basis.	

87	Our organisation develops measurable and agreed upon performance targets for all areas which are output / outcome-focused, and have annual milestones.	
88	Our organisation makes good use of internal and external benchmarking and tries to make improvements from benchmarking.	
89	Our data collection system is coherently built in across different units and departments so that accurate and reliable performance data can be collected in a timely manner.	
90	Key Performance Indicators are shared and discussed among different departments so that staff can learn from each other about best practices.	
91	Areas of concern are identified from the key performance indicators, followed up by improvements, recommendations, and actions.	
92	Our organisation is keen to work on continuous improvement for both system and service quality.	
	H. Partnerships and External Relationships	
93	Our organisation has marketing strategies that promote a positive image of our organisation and its services.	
94	We are able to clearly and concisely identify our programs in a way that differentiates them from other similar programs.	
95	We regularly conduct market analysis in order to better position our organisation for the future.	
96	Our organisation is recognized within the community, and is seen as highly engaged and responsive to it.	
97	Many high profile members of the community are actively and constructively involved in our organisation (e.g., as board members or in fundraising).	
98	Our organisation has dedicated staff that are responsible for Marketing and Public Relations work.	
99	Our organisation is able to establish, leverage and nurture strong, synergy-building relationships with multiple stakeholders (e.g., government, media, business, other NGOs, educational institutions, funders, community organisations, etc.)	
100	When necessary, our organisation collaborates with other NGOs within the community to address the needs of our clients.	
101	Our organisation is well respected by our donors and we are able to have a free and open dialogue with them.	
102	Our organisation has developed long-term relationships with key donors.	
103	Our organisation is strong in identifying and cultivating new donors.	

104	Our organisation leaders promote and speak on behalf of our organisation (e.g., to government officials, business leaders, leaders of other NGOs, funders, constituents, media and community members).	
105	Our organisation proactively participates and responds in discussions on relevant social policies.	
106	Some staff and board members serve as board members to other organisations or government committees.	
	I. Technology	
107	Our organisation makes it a priority to use technology to enhance our programs to better achieve our mission.	
108	Different levels of staff are well trained and supported in using the different technology.	
109	Our organisation has enough manpower to provide technical support to individual staff.	
110	All staff have individual computer access and email.	
111	Our office(s) have fully networked computing hardware with a comprehensive range of up-to-date software applications.	
112	As the public image of our organisation, our website is regularly maintained, visually appealing and user-friendly.	
113	In terms of content, our website contains comprehensive information about our organisation and clearly shows members of the public how they can engage with our organisation (e.g., how to donate or volunteer).	
114	We take advantage of social networking (e.g., Facebook) to achieve our mission.	
115	Our organisation has the proper management information systems (MIS) in place to collect, analyze and share data (e.g., clients, staff, volunteer, program outcomes and financial information).	
116	Our organisation makes good use of technology to support our service delivery.	
	END	

APPENDIX II: EXCEL3 OCAT (CHINESE VERSION)

ExCEL3 機構能力評估: 自我評估問卷

機構：

職位：

姓名：

評分圖例:

0 = 不知道或不適用
1 = 非常不同意不適用
2 = 不同意
3 = 中性
4 = 同意
5 = 非常同意

	A、 機構管治及領導	
1	我們的機構受一套成文的核心價值所引導。	
2	我們的機構有一套明確的使命和願景，它反映了機構的價值和目標，而且經常參考它以指導行動和確定優先次序。	
3	我們的機構成員都能夠清晰簡潔地描述機構的使命和願景。	
4	我們的使命和願景轉化為一系列機構致力於達成的清晰、明確的目標。	
5	我們的機構有一套清楚的策略，它是可實踐和可量度的，而且這套策略和機構整體的使命、願景和目標是緊密聯繫的。	
6	我們的管治單位定期檢視使命宣言，並在必要時修訂它以體現服務對像的需要。	
7	我們的機構努力增加其透明度和問責度（例如，公開機構的年度報告和財務報告）	
8	在我們的機構，管治單位的架構、每一個委員會、職位及其職責都有清楚的描述，並記錄存檔。	
9	我們的管治單位為機構提供了清楚的發展方向、支援和問責，並作為一種策略資源。	
10	董事會和領導層之間的溝通體現了雙方對彼此角色和責任的相互尊重和欣賞。	
11	管治單位能有效地設定績效目標，並能使高級管理人員對其負責。	
12	管治單位定期評估它的工作和成效。	
13	管治單位定期獲取關於他們的角色和責任的資訊並接受相關的培訓。	
14	當加入我們的機構時，管治單位的成員能完全理解和明白他們所要承擔的法律責任。	

15	我們的機構有清晰的組織架構和報告結構，明確界定了核心的角色和責任。	
16	我們的管治單位來自於多元化的專業領域和部門（例如，非營利機構，政府，企業，學術界等）。	
17	我們的高級管理層（CEO 和高管團隊）充滿活力，高度投入，而且能夠實現機構願景。	
18	我們的高級管理層在非營利機構的管理方面經驗豐富，而且能夠帶領全體員工度過難關。	
19	我們的高級管理層對有關機構的課題保持最新的資訊（例如，通過參加界別的研討會，會議，專業發展等）。	
20	我們的高級管理團隊能夠獨立工作，而不是過分依賴 CEO。	
21	相關的員工被授予合適的決策權。	
22	我們機構的決策過程是透明的。	
23	機構領導人之間的分歧以建設性和適當的方式來處理。	
24	我們的機構有健全的繼任計劃。	
	B、人力資源管理	
25	我們的機構能夠制定和完善一套現實而具體的人力資源計劃以確保適當的員工人數來達成機構目標。	
26	為完成我們的使命，我們的員工具備相應的技能和專業知識。	
27	我們的員工具有廣泛的背景和經驗，並給機構帶來了多元化的技能。	
28	機構內的職位總是可以及時填補，員工的流失不是問題。	
29	我們的機構有一套員工招聘的政策和措施，以確保合適的人在合適的位置上。	
30	我們的機構有一套既具有足夠的競爭力又可以有效地激勵員工出色地履行職責的激勵機制（例如，薪金及福利，職業發展機會等）。	
31	為實現機構的宗旨和目標，我們的機構有一套員工培訓發展的政策和措施以充分發揮員工的潛力。	
32	我們的機構有一套合適的員工績效管理系統（例如，督導，績效評估等），而且所有員工都進行年度績效考核。	
33	我們的義工具有多元化的背景，他們能夠給機構帶來互補的技能。	
34	我們為義工提供持續的培訓，支援，訓練和督導以確保他們的服務質素。	
35	義工們覺得受到重視和欣賞。	
36	我們的義工享受他們在機構內的工作，並為自己是機構的一員感到自豪。	
	C、財務管理	
37	我們的機構制定了財務管理系統，具有成文的財務政策和程序。	

38	我們的機構有具體的財務計劃，它不斷更新並能夠反映機構的優先次序。	
39	成文的財務政策和程序得到嚴格地遵循。	
40	我們的財務管理措施（例如，會計，財政預算，財務報告等）使得機構能準確預測未來的財務狀況。	
41	我們機構的日常財務運作受正式的系統所管制。	
42	我們機構的帳目定期進行內部審計。	
43	我們機構的帳目定期進行外部審計。	
44	我們的機構有清晰且易於閱讀的年度財務報告。	
45	我們的機構最高效和有效地利用其資金。	
46	在需要的時候，我們的機構有充足和相應的儲備資金來支援服務和發展。	
47	我們的機構已經發展了可持續的創收活動（例如，籌資，收費服務，社會企業等）。	
48	我們的機構有高度多樣化的資金來源，因而免受潛在的市場波動的影響。	
49	我們的董事會積極地支持和參與我們的籌款活動。	
50	我們的機構有清晰、可行的籌款策略。	
51	我們的機構有專門的員工負責籌款。	
	D、機構規劃	
52	策略計劃工作定期進行。	
53	總的來說，我們的策略計劃用來廣泛地指導機構的發展和運作。	
54	我們的策略計劃過程使相關持份者（例如，董事會成員，服務對像，員工，社區領袖等）能持續對話溝通，以確保機構的使命和服務計劃對服務對像是有價值的。	
55	我們的機構密切關注社區的需求，瞭解社區內的其他服務提供者和服務領域內的其他工作模式，	
56	我們的策略計劃在機構內部得到溝通，並為機構成員所周知。	
57	基於策略計劃，我們的機構制訂了清晰，現實和詳細的營運計劃。	
58	規劃過程是以實證為基礎的，並得到了全面而可靠的資料支持。	
59	我們有一套應急計劃以應對內、外部環境中的突發變化。	
	E、創新及機構學習	
60	我們機構鼓勵和支持學習和創新的文化，並使之成為機構策略的一部分(例如，將學習納入計劃、監控和評估過程）。	
61	我們的機構為知識和學習管理提供了充足的資源。	
62	我們掌握及瞭解有關我們機構的趨勢和議題。	
63	我們的機構為員工提供學習的時間和空間以及反思的機會，使員工學習變得明顯和合法化（例如，開會分享我們的工作，協調我們的工作，開	

	拓一起工作的思路）。	
64	我們有方便易用的知識管理系統，它可以全方位地收集，記錄和傳播知識（例如，機構的內聯網，工作指南和手冊，中央資料庫等）。	
65	我們的員工瞭解知識管理系統並且頻繁地使用。（如果您的機構沒有知識管理系統，請填答“0”）。	
66	我們機構的各個層級都能進行基於信任和開放的持續溝通。	
67	員工覺得他們的意見和關注得到重視。	
68	我們的機構重視創新並提供了適當的激勵機制和機會讓員工分享和推行新的意念。	
69	對於敢冒風險的創新者來說，我們的機構是一個安全的地方。	
70	員工不害怕犯錯誤，因為他們視錯誤為學習的機會。	
71	員工渴望找到更有效地做事方法。	
72	我們的機構定期進行機構綜合能力評估，並與相關的員工分享發現的結果。	
	F、程序計劃管理	
73	我們所有的服務和程序計劃完全符合機構的使命和目標。	
74	機構提供的服務項目彼此密切聯繫，並且與整體的策略相配合。	
75	我們的服務計劃設計是以實證為基礎的，並且不斷檢討，以使其適應服務對像不斷轉變的需求。	
76	我們定期回顧主要持份者（包括服務的客戶）的回饋意見並且對我們的項目做出適當的調整。	
77	我們定期收集服務的資料以監測在達成目標過程中的進展。	
78	我們的機構進行正式的服務評估來衡量我們的服務是否使服務對像的生活/環境有所轉變。	
79	通過記錄和/或分享關於我們服務成效的故事和趣聞，我們的機構也對服務進行非正式的評估。	
80	服務成效評估結果與全體員工和董事會成員共用。	
81	我們的機構根據評估結果來決定是否維持，完善或者終止特定的程序計畫/服務。	
	我們定期評審我們的服務組合，目的是：	
82	評估服務發展與複製的可能性	
83	探討服務發展的新構思	
84	逐步淘汰不再配合機構使命的服務項目	
	G、績效管理	
85	我們的機構致力於高品質的程序計畫和服務，決心爭取卓越的績效。	

86	我們有一套成熟的綜合系統（例如平衡計分卡）以持續地衡量我們機構的績效和進展。	
87	我們的機構為所有領域確立了可量度的、共同認同的績效目標，它們是產出/結果導向的並設有年度里程碑。	
88	我們的機構充分地利用內部和外部標杆，並嘗試由對照標杆做出改進。	
89	我們的資料收集系統已內置於不同的單位和部門，以便及時地收集到準確可靠的績效資料。	
90	主要績效指標在不同的部門分享和討論，以便員工可以互相學習最佳範例。	
91	通過主要績效指標識別出需關注項目，並跟進作出改善、建議和行動。	
92	我們的機構樂於持續地改善工作系统和服務質素。	
	H、夥伴及外部關係	
93	我們的機構有提升機構及其服務正面形象的市場策略。	
94	我們能夠以清晰、簡潔的方式，從其他類似的服務中區分我們的工作。	
95	為了在將來更適當地為我們的機構定位，我們定期進行市場分析。	
96	我們的機構得到社區內的認可，被認為是高度投入的並能及時對社區作出回應。	
97	許多具知名度的社區領袖積極、建設性地參與我們機構的工作（例如，作為董事會成員或籌資工作）。	
98	我們的機構有專門的員工負責市場推廣和公共關係。	
99	我們的機構能夠與多方持份者建立、網絡和培植具協同效應的關係（例如，政府，媒體，企業，其他的非政府機構，教育機構，捐助者，社區組織等）。	
100	必要時，我們的機構會與社區內其他的非政府機構合作以滿足服務對像的需求。	
101	我們的機構備受我們的捐助者的尊重，而且我們能和他們展開自由而開放的溝通。	
102	我們已經和主要捐助者形成了長期的關係。	
103	我們的機構擅於尋找和培育新的捐助者。	
104	我們的機構領導者代表機構向諸如政府官員，商業領袖，其他非政府機構領導人，捐助者，選民，媒體和社區成員進行推廣和發言。	
105	我們的機構積極參與和相應有關社會政策的討論。	
106	一些員工和董事會成員出任其他機構的董事會成員或政府委員會委員。	
	I、資訊科技	

107	我們機構把應用資訊科技以改善服務並達成機構使命視為優先項目。	
108	不同級別的員工在應用資訊科技方面都得到了良好的培訓和支持。	
109	我們的組織有足夠的人力為個別員工提供技術支持。	
110	所有的員工都有個人電腦和電子郵件賬戶。	
111	我們的辦公室具有全面網絡化的電腦硬件並配備了全方位的最新軟件應用程式。	
112	作為機構的公共形象，我們的網站會定期進行維護，並且是視覺上吸引和容易使用的。	
113	在內容方面，我們的網站包含了關於組織的全面的資訊，並且清晰地給公眾展示了他們可以如何參與我們的組織(如捐款，做義工)。	
114	我們利用社交網絡工具（例如，facebook）以完成我們的使命。	
115	我們的機構有合適的資訊管理系統（MIS）以收集、分析和共用資料（例如，服務對像，員工，義工，服務成果和財務資訊）。	
116	我們的組織擅於利用資訊科技來支持我們的服務運作。	
	END	

APPENDIX III: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The purpose of this glossary is to provide explanations for terms related to organisational assessment and development. The following terms have been identified and defined based on a variety of sources, which have been footnoted.

Accountability is answerability, blameworthiness, liability, and the expectation of 'account-giving'. In leadership roles, it is the acknowledgment and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies including the administration, governance, and implementation within the scope of the role and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences. Accountability cannot exist without proper accounting practices; in other words, an absence of accounting means an absence of accountability.

Benchmark is a reference point or set of standards against which to compare or assess performance or achievements. The term is also used to describe an intermediate target to measure progress in a given period of time.

Capacity is the ability to perform or produce a desired output.

Capacity Assessment Tool uses a structured and analytical process whereby the various dimensions of capacity are assessed within a broader context of systems as well as evaluated for specific entities and individuals within these systems.

Capacity building is the process by which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions and countries develop, enhance and organize their systems, resources and knowledge, as reflected in their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and achieve results (also referred to as capacity development or strengthening).

Constituencies are all those involved in or served by an organisation.

Core Competencies are those core knowledge, skills or resources of the organisation to which all activities relate.

Process evaluation is conducted during the course of a program with the primary purpose of gathering information on how to improve the overall performance of the program, especially on the implementation process and procedure. Formative evaluation occurs in the early stage of program implementation and focuses on collecting data on program operations so that modifications can be made before the program progresses further.

Leadership in an organisation is its capacity to assess and interpret needs and opportunities, to establish direction, to influence and align others towards a common aim, motivating and committing them to action, and making them responsible for their performance.

Lessons learned are generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.

Mission statement is the written declaration of an organisation's core purpose and provides the framework from which the organisation's strategies are formulated.

Needs assessment as related to capacity building is a decision-aiding tool for planning and resource allocation. It involves the gathering and analysing of information on the organisation, its environment, its capacity needs and problems, and possible solutions.

Organisational Effectiveness is evidenced by an organisation that is able to connect its vision to its goals, its goals to its plans, its plans to its actions, and its actions to results. It is a dynamic and ever-evolving mix of increasing self-awareness and internal development that keeps an organisation moving steadily towards its vision.

Organisational Efficiency refers to how efficiently an organisation uses its resources, for example, human resource, financial resources, funding etc.

Performance is the extent to which a program or project is implemented in an effective, efficient and timely manner to achieve results. Performance can also be defined in a broader sense to include the relevance and impact of a program or project.

Program logic is a picture of why and how one believes a program or policy will work and provides a chain of reasoning that links design and implementation with results.

Strategy is the means or tactics by which an organisation achieves its vision, mission and goals.

Success is a favourable result that is assessed in terms of effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and contribution to capacity development.

Survey reliability is the degree of stability exhibited when a measurement is repeated under identical conditions while ***survey validity*** is how well a survey measures what it sets out to measure.

SWOT analysis or matrix is a structured planning model that evaluates an organisation's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

Transparency implies openness and is one important criteria for accountability, both internally and externally. It is operating in such a way that makes it easy for stakeholders to understand what the organisation is doing.

Vision statement is a descriptive picture of what an organisation would like to accomplish over the long term and thus provides a future direction for the whole organisation.

Values are those core principles and beliefs of an organisation that instruct its practice and behaviour.

APPENDIX IV: SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEWED TOOLS

1. Participatory Organisational Evaluation Tool (POET)[11]

POET is an organisational capacity assessment tool that is based on the methodology of PROSE (Participatory, Result-Oriented Self-Evaluation). The tool can be applied to a cohort of organisations or a single organisation through the application of PROSE. A 'cross-functional, cross-hierarchical organisational capacity assessment team' is established and a POET-trained facilitator is selected.

The following seven capacity areas are assessed by POET: equitable participation, sustainability of program benefits, partnering, organisational learning, strategic management/governance, human resource management, and financial management.

A capacity assessment session involving facilitator-led team discussions of 'critical incident' questions related to the POET capacity areas is executed. Team members reflect independently on the discussion and respond anonymously to statements made by the facilitator. Based on the statement rankings, POET produces a capacity score and a consensus score. The capacity score measures how an organisation perceives its strengths and weaknesses with respect to the capacity areas below. The consensus score indicates the degree to which the assessment team members agree on their assessment or organisation capacity. Based on the results, future capacity and consensus building work is planned.

2. Discussion-Oriented Organisational Self-Assessment (DOSA)[12]

DOSA is a tool and process used for measuring and building organisational capacity. The same authors who developed POET tool created DOSA, which was a precursor in many respects. However, the capacity areas assessed by DOSA are slightly different from those in POET, as outlined below.

The capacity assessment process of DOSA and POET are essentially the same. The tool includes a consensus component in order to measure the diversity of opinions among team members through analysis of divergent viewpoints. To reiterate the process, a 'cross-functional, cross-hierarchical organisational capacity assessment team' is established and a facilitator is selected.

The capacity areas of financial resource management, human resources management, strategic management and organisational learning are identified in both DOSA and POET. DOSA also measures the capacity areas of external relations and service delivery.

A capacity assessment session involving facilitator-led team discussions of 'critical incident' questions related to the POET capacity areas is executed. Team members reflect independently on the discussion and respond anonymously to statements made by the

---

[11] Beryl Levinger of Education Development Center and Evan Bloom of Pact developed POET in 1998. The tool focuses on the needs of a specific user population, Southern civil society organisations (CSOs) and their partners.

[12] DOSA was developed in 1997 by Beryl Levinger of Education Development Center and Evan Bloom of Pact with assistance from the United States Agency for International Development/ Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (USAID/PVC) and numerous PVO colleagues.

facilitator. Based on the statement rankings, POET produces a capacity score and a consensus score. The capacity score measures how an organisation perceives its strengths and weaknesses with respect to the capacity areas below. The consensus score indicates the degree to which the assessment team members agree on their assessment or organisation capacity. Based on the results, future capacity- and consensus- building work is planned.

3. Sustaining Excellence Through Assessment, Networking and Target-Setting Tool (SEXTANT)[13]

Sustaining Excellence through Assessment, Networking and Target-Setting (SEXTANT) is a standards-based methodology for building and sustaining high organisational performance in any technical or managerial area. Organisations use SEXTANT to create a customized organisational capacity profile and action plan for users. The assessment tool is periodically reapplied, allowing for benchmarking and resetting of standards.

The tool identifies core competencies and key behaviours associated with excellence in these competencies. For this purpose a cycle of continuous performance improvement is used. An assessment team is assembled and members use a focus group approach combined with individual scoring to rate the organisation in relation to those behaviours. Raters also assess knowledge, motivation, and work context in relation to these behaviours.

SEXTANT authors note that capacity assessment should be capable of building social capital or links to other users or resources. Furthermore, capacity assessment is too often disconnected from capacity building and rarely indicates why organisations perform as they do. SEXTANT bridges these gaps by integrating capacity assessment and capacity building into one seamless process.

SEXTANT uses a truly discriminating scale of 1-10 that helps users identify knowledge voids, detect performance patterns, identify causes and plan next steps. The scoring areas include: knowledge, motivation, behavior, context, importance, and scale. SEXTANT provides detailed, fully analyzed results that are available immediately to users. The tool is presented in Excel format, which also allows quick and easy user-determined secondary analyses of data. The reports can provide customized, relevant web-based resources to support capacity-building efforts. The tool promotes cross-hierarchical, cross-functional dialogue within and across user organisations and supports institutional benchmarking and networking among users.

4. McKinsey & Co. Capacity Assessment Tool[14]

---

[13] The SEXTANT tool was created by Education Development Center (EDC) (Dr. Beryl Levinger is the EDC Director) over an 8-year Research & Development cycle. The tool was generated under the project of Global Learning Group (GLG), which helps USAID track and build the organisational capacity of its U.S. and international non-governmental organisation (NGO) grantees.

[14] This tool was created by McKinsey & Co. for Venture Philanthropy Partners/VPP (http://venturephilanthropypartners.org/) and was presented in the VPP report *Effective Capacity Building in Nonprofit Organisation* http://www.vppartners.org/learning/reports/capacity/capacity.html) in 2001.

McKinsey & Company, in partnership with Venture Philanthropy Partners (VPP) and other organisations launched a project to develop a definition of non-profit organisational "capacity" and easy-to-use tool for assessing capacity. During the study one of the lessons learned was that the best results were attained when organisations took a deliberate, proactive approach to capacity building and assessed their needs in relation to their entire enterprise.

Effective capacity building is rarely confined to addressing only one of the elements in isolation; as soon as a non-profit starts digging around in its systems, for example, it invariably discovers that it must also examine, analyse, and address the ramifications that making changes has on other elements *(a similar conclusion was also made by the authors of SEXTANT).* For this reason, capacity building must be firmly driven by senior management in the organisation.

The Capacity Framework of the tool defines non-profit capacity in a pyramid of seven essential elements: three higher-level elements – aspirations, strategy, and organisational skills - three foundational elements - systems and infrastructure, human resources, and organisational structure – and a cultural element that serves to connect all the others. The Capacity Assessment Grid is a diagnostic tool to measure an organisation's strength along each capacity element in the Capacity Framework. This grid enables an organisation to determine where it stands along the continuum of best practices for each element of capacity. A non-profit manager can use the grid to map his or her organisation's institutional evolution along each area.

The application of the tool is as follows. A point in time is chosen; it can be today or three years ago. The organisation can be assessed at two different points in time, in order to measure changes in capacity. The tool gives you a range of descriptive statements and the one that best describes the specific situation should be chosen. Sometimes the text may be interpreted loosely: if no statement fully describes your situation, one should choose the closest one. The tool uses a scale of 1-4 with "Not applicable" and "No knowledge" options. This grid should be used in conjunction with the Capacity Framework, which explains the seven elements of organisational capacity and their components. The tool is time-consuming; however, it provides a good idea of where the organisation stands with regard to the seven core competencies in the Capacity Framework.

5. Marguerite Casey Foundation Capacity Assessment Tool

The starting point for the Marguerite Casey Foundation's Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool comes from the Capacity Assessment Grid created by McKinsey and Company for Venture Philanthropy Partners. It was adapted to the needs of the Marguerite Casey Foundation to be used for systematic assessment of the organisational capacity of smaller, grassroots organisations working in community organizing and advocacy. Marguerite Casey Foundation uses this tool to "create baseline data to help them understand the aggregate capacity strengths and weaknesses of the organisations with which Foundation works."[15] The Foundation views this as primarily a diagnostic and learning tool.

The tool is for self-directed use by organisations. It is recommended that individuals in senior management complete the tool first then solicit views from other staff members. Participants should then discuss the results and decide which ones represent best represent the organisation. Such a team approach helps to reduce individual bias.

The tool helps organisations rate themselves on a variety of capacity elements that are grouped into four "dimensions of non-profit organisational capacity first outlined by The Conservation Company"[16]

1. Leadership Capacity – the ability of organisational leaders to inspire, prioritize, make decisions, provide direction, and innovate.
2. Adaptive Capacity – the ability of a non-profit organisation to monitor, assess, and respond to internal and external changes.
3. Management Capacity – the ability of a non-profit organisation to ensure the effective and efficient use of organisational resources.
4. Operational Capacity (originally technical capacity) – the ability of a non-profit organisation to implement key organisational and programmatic functions. [17]

The tool is very convenient to use; definitions are clear and easily understandable, an Excel format allows automatic calculations of results. The tool also provides a chart representing a visual presentation of the results. The instructions to the tool advise users to underestimate, rather than overestimate. During the testing process the Foundation discovered that "organisations which were able to engage the Executive Director and their Board Chair or other key board members in the process found the tool and process much more useful and productive"[18]

6. Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA)[19]

The OCA is a process developed for the purpose of providing organisations with to tools to effectively grow as an organisation. The process has been applied to hundreds of non-governmental organisations, private-sector corporations, and municipal governments around the world. Recognizing that each entity is different, the design of a tool specific to a particular organisation is included in the capacity assessment process. OCA is outlined by the following four stages:

Stage 1: Participatory tool design

- The organisation determines which capacity areas to focus on

[15] www.caseygrants.org/documents/misc/CapAssessmentOverview.pdf
[16] Connolly, P. & York, P. *Building the Capacity of Capacity Builders: A Study of Management Support and Field-building Organisations in the Nonprofit Sector.* June 2003.
[17] Definitions of the capacities were taken from Introduction to Marguerite Casey Foundation Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool.
[18] www.caseygrants.org/documents/misc/CapAssessmentOverview.pdf
[19] Pact, Inc. with Education Development Center and USAID's Office of Private & Voluntary Cooperation created the Organisational Capacity Assessment Methodology. 1998. http://www.icomp.org.my/OE/OEAccess-OCA.htm/

- Facilitators work with the organisation to develop indicators to evaluate and monitor performance in the capacity areas

Stage 2: Guided Self-Assessment

- Facilitators guide representatives of organisation stakeholders participate in discussions about organisation performance using critical incidents
- Following each discussion session, representatives individually score indicators, which are in the form of scaled questions
- The stage provides both qualitative and quantitative measurements

Stage 3: Data-guided action planning

- Facilitators assist the organisation in interpreting the results of the previous stage
- The organisation can assess the results by comparing them to data from another organisation or it can review them independently
- The organisation understands its strengths and weaknesses and determines a strategy to take action on determined changes

Stage 4: Reassessment for continual Learning

- Organisations reassess themselves every 8-12 months
- The purpose of this stage is to track the effectiveness of capacity building
- This stage allows organisations to change their action plan in order to ensure maximum effectiveness

7. Organisational Assessment – United Way[20]

This tool is designed for internal use by non-profit organisations and aims at strengthening their administrative capabilities. It consists of checklists of the organisational capacities where management can use these checklists to identify their organisation's administrative strength and weaknesses. The process of assessment is based on either a series of interviews or a group interview. It is not clear from the description whether all stakeholders and staff are interviewed.

The tool includes checklists for the following areas:

- Legal Indicators
- Governance (Board) Indicators
- Human Resources Indicator
- Planning
- Financial Indicators
- Fundraising Indicators

Each indicator is rated based on its importance to the operation and effectiveness of any non-profit organisation. The ratings are: E, R and A that mean that the indicator is essential, recommended/standard or additional/advanced correspondingly.

The system of assessment is simple and does not need additional tools to interpret results/responses. There are three types of the responses to the checklists: "needs work," "met," and "N/A." Indicators checked "n/a" due to uncertain applicability to the organisation or due to the lack of assessors' knowledge of the indicator, or due to the failure of having been met

[20] United Way Website: http://www.managementhelp.org/org_eval/uw_list.htm

required immediate attention. Technical assistance, consulting, or training may be required to implement these indicators.

8. CARE Nepal NGO Assessment Tool[21]

The CARE Nepal NGO Assessment Tool[22] is based on the experiences and practices of eight non-governmental and community-based organisations in Nepal. The tool was created for external use however it should not be used for funding purposes. The objectives of this tool are to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the NGO; to monitor the progress of the NGO capacity development; to raise internal (staff) awareness of various dimensions of the organisational development; and to facilitate strategic planning for further organisational development.

The tool uses a participatory approach via a number of group meetings and individual interviews with representatives from the NGO. Total estimated time spent on assessment is about 8 hours, with group interviews (for components #1, 3 and 4 outlined below) taking up to three hours and each individual interview (for component #2) taking up to one and a half hours. Also, the tool requires a professional facilitator to conduct meetings and interviews.

The tool assesses four major capacities (referred to as "components" by the authors):

1. Program planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
2. Organisational structure and management
3. Resource mobilization (finance and fundraising)
4. Coordination and networking

Each capacity is assessed through a number of indicators. The scoring system uses a scale of 1 - 4, 1 being undesirable and 4 being the ideal situation. There are different numbers of indicators under different components; therefore, the scoring of a component should not be calculated as the total scores of the indicators, neither should it be averaged.

9. Innovation Network's Organisational Assessment Tool (OAT)[23]

Innovation Network's Organisational Assessment Tool (OAT) is based on years of research and experience in the field of organisational effectiveness. The tool is intended to measure areas of strength as well as areas needing improvement within an organisation. The results of the tool can be used to build a plan of action for organisational effectiveness. There are six main areas of development that OAT focuses on, which are:

---

[21] CARE International created this tool for the CARE Nepal office in 1998. The information is accessible at http://www.careinternational.org.uk/resource_centre/civilsociety/inventory_of_resources/section_2/section_a/a11_nepal_ngo_assessment_intro.pdf.

[22] Institutional capacity, institution building, institutional strengthening, organisational capacity and organisational development all address the same set of issues and are used here interchangeably.

[23] The tool can be accessed online through Innovation Network's website at http://www.innonet.org/.

1. Organisational Planning
2. Organisational Structure
3. Fundraising
4. Finance and Accountability
5. Communication
6. Evaluation

The organisation selects an individual to gather information about the organisation from staff and Board members. The person then registers online and fills out a survey comprised of 98 questions concerning the six areas above. The available responses are mainly, "Yes," "No," or "Don't Know" to most questions. However, there are a few questions where it is necessary to enter information, such as the percentage of funding, according to a pre-set list.

A report is then generated under a profile providing a summary of elements already in place at the organisation, a list of items to consider implementing, and a number of points to think over. Innovation Network also provides a work plan template that can be used to enter 'next steps' that would come from reviewing the results of the report with other staff members and the Board.

10. The capacity of academic units: A Participatory Capacity Assessment Tool[24]

The design of Flemish Interuniversity Council's (VLIR) Participatory Capacity Assessment Tool is based on the tool created by CARE International and was adapted to an academic setting. The purpose of this tool is to assess capacity building needs of academic units and design appropriate interventions on a continuous basis. The tool is also meant to be more of an indication of the current status of a unit and so fits best for smaller units that have been operating for some time.

The tool should be used to reflect on the needs of the organisation, thus contributing to the learning process. A baseline of organisational effectiveness should be established to measure progress against, diagnose potential issues and take remedial steps. The tool should also facilitate teamwork amongst all levels of the organisation and external stakeholders for strategic management and organisational development

The tool is meant to be flexible so that users are able to select only those capacity areas and activities that pertain to their needs. A trained facilitator should administer the tool using an informal and educational process for participants. Application can occur through one-on-one semi-structured interviews or in small group meetings using a variety of data gathering tools such as story-telling, role-playing or drawing. Group meetings should be comprised of participants across all sections of the organisation and should focus on remaining positive.

The tool takes measures at three levels: the category, subcategories of the category, and indicators of subcategories. The scoring range is 1 – 5 where a score of 1 denotes the need for major improvement and a score of 5 means the organisation should maintain its current level

[24] Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad (VLIR) - Flemish Interuniversity Council

of effectiveness. Computation of a final score per category is then done by taking the average of scores at the indicator and subcategory levels first. An assessment is made by comparing the organisation to four stages in human development from infancy to prime. The facilitator and staff members jointly determine the life cycle stage of the organisation based on the final score.

11. The Drucker Foundation Self-Assessment Tool[25]

This management tool is a process for new organisations to plan out their strategic direction or for established organisations to reassess their strategic position by clarifying mission, setting goals, defining results and developing a plan of action. The tool attempts to convert organisational knowledge into effective action through the use of workbooks and workshops run by facilitators. The focus is on the following five important questions:

1. What is our mission?
2. Who is our customer?
3. What does the customer value?
4. What are our results?
5. What is our plan?

To ensure success, all levels of the organisation, the Board and customers should be involved in the process of self-assessment. There are 3 phases of implementation that span a number of months. These are: preparation, conducting the process, and final completion. In the first phase, internal and external information is gathered, senior management and the Board endorse the project and an assessment team is formed.

The second phase involves responding to the above five questions through group discussions onsite or at a retreat led by a team facilitator. Customer research may also be conducted at this stage. Finally, the Board approves the mission, vision, goals and resources for the strategic plan generated while management develops and implements objectives and activities. Throughout the process, the assessment team is responsible for confirming and or revising the goals and results set forth.

12. The Core Capacity Assessment Tool, TCC Group[26]

The TCC Group's Core Capacity Assessment Tool (CCAT) is an online survey consisting of 146 questions that aim to measure a non-profit organisation's effectiveness across four core areas, leadership, adaptability, management and technical capacities, as well as in relation to organisational culture.

The survey is generally taken by all senior staff members and at least 2-3 board members. The organisation selects one person to take the lead and this person is responsible for administering CCAT, including providing descriptive information about the organisation (such

[25] This tool was created by Peter F. Drucker for the Leader to Leader Institute (formerly the Drucker Foundation); information can be found at http://leadertoleader.org/leaderbooks/sat/index.html.
[26] http://www.tccccat.com/about-the-ccat/

as mission, budget size, number of staff, etc.). After all identified members have completed the survey, the lead receives an email report that shows an aggregate response.

The TCC's CCAT helps identify at which stage of the lifecycle an organisation lies and provides real-time findings, along with a prioritized capacity building plan in a report format. Additionally, the tool provides the technology to generate self-selected benchmark reports from a national database of over 2,500 nonprofits.