

Chapter Three Guidance Core Organizational Development Tools

- Tool 1:** The CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist (ProPak) for baseline assessments associated with designs.
- Tool 2:** MSI¹ Institutional Development Framework (IDF) for:
(a) Building and monitoring capacity building in local NGO partners and
(b) Tracking capacity building as an impact indicator.

1.0. Who, What, When, Where, and How?

What?

Two tools are proposed for measuring core organizational development of local NGO partners.

- **CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist:** This first tool is introduced in the CRS Project Package or ProPack. It was first developed by the CRS West Africa Regional Office (WARO). The checklist offers suggestions for how programs can rate organization capacity for key categories during project design.
- **MSI Institutional Development Framework (IDF):** The second tool, the IDF, is a self-assessment tool that local NGO partners can use to identify areas where they need institutional strengthening. This tool can also be used to track their progress in building the types of core institutional capacity that they need to administer a Title II project.

Who?

The primary audiences for the core organizational assessment tools, or the participants in a core organizational assessment exercise, are the local partners working with CRS.

When and Where?

Each tool has its respective strengths and weaknesses, which affect when and where it can be used most effectively with the greatest impact.

The CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist is a simple core capacity index. It can be used to assess the capacity of the partners in terms of organizational structure, resources, and



Initial meeting with village leaders to identify potential partners and sites for new Title II project in Tillaberi region of Niger (D. McMillan 2004)

¹ Management Systems International (MSI)

staffing to undertake the proposed project strategy. The CRS ProPack suggests it is most useful during project design.

The Institutional Development Framework (IDF) is a more detailed capacity index. It is more appropriate than the Checklist for long-term monitoring of capacity building as part of the project monitoring and evaluation system.

How?

Categories, Variables, and Indicators/Rankings: The Institutional Development Framework (IDF)

The IDF measures five capacity categories (oversight and vision, management resources, human resources, financial resources, and external resources). Each of these categories represents a resource that supports and contributes to the organization.

Each of these capacities is broken down into variables that are composed of the critical sub-categories of capacity. The number of variables in each category varies. Each variable is assessed using two to four indicators that are ranked. The rankings for the IDF describe four stages in an organization's development: start-up, development, expansion/consolidation, and, sustainability (Table 3.1). Each indicator is ranked 1-4 with "1" being start-up capacity. The highest ranking of "4" suggests that the local partner is both working to a higher standard and moving in the direction of being able to sustain the capacity once the Title II funding ends. These rankings are portrayed as "progress cells" going from left to right, with the far left being the weakest capacity (i.e., start-up) and the far right being the strongest (i.e., sustainability) (Table 3.1).

Categories, Variables, and Indicators/Rankings: The CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist

The CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist uses a template that is similar to the IDF. The key difference is that it ranks each variable at only three levels: very limited capacity, basic capacity, and high level of capacity.

Methodology

The steps needed to adapt and execute both indices are similar (Box 3.1)

Box 3.1 Recommended Steps for Conducting the Baseline Assessments and Annual Updates of the Core Organizational Development Tools

- *Step One:* Initial adaptation of the tool to the specificities of a particular project.
- *Step Two:* Participatory ranking by the local partner and CRS program for each indicator.
- *Step Three:* Data entry and analysis of the rankings on each indicator.
- *Step Four:* Joint strategy planning for staff capacity building (local NGO partner and CRS country program)

Step one: adaptation of the indices

The first step involves adapting the IDF or Checklist rankings to the specificities of a particular project.

Step two: ranking

Once the NGO partner has adapted the IDF or the Checklist to its institutional setting, the next challenge is to proceed row by row through the IDF or the Checklist and have the local partner staff rank themselves for each indicator. Both the Framework and the Checklist are intended to be completed during the project's baseline, mid-term, and final phases. If a project is already at mid-term, its baseline could be assessed retroactively. This retroactive assessment is helpful because it almost always shows that even if capacities are not at the desired levels, they are considerably developed compared to when the project started.

Step three: data entry and analysis

Once the group has ranked the indicators contained within each row, that ranking is recorded in the appropriate column (baseline, mid-term, or final) on the far right of a printed version of the Excel-based data entry form. The far right columns could be adjusted to reflect scores for FY01, FY02, FY03, or some other series of time. Once the data is entered into the excel file, the file itself will make the necessary calculations. These calculations include totals for the different capacity categories as well as the overall totals for the organizational capacity for each time period. The IDF has five capacity categories; the CRS checklist has four. To ensure that each category is given equal weight, the "raw scores" in each category are weighted. This means that the maximum value for each one of the five IDF capacity categories (oversight and vision, management resources, human resources, financial resources, and external resources) is 20 points. The maximum value for each of the Checklist categories (strategy, organizational skills, human resources, systems and infrastructure) is 25 points. The maximum total score for either the Checklist or the IDF is 100 points. The maximum total score represents the sum of the adjusted score for each category. The staff should discuss the baseline (if it was assessed retroactively in Step Two) and the current scores.

Step four: strategy planning

Based on this analysis, the local partner administrators will work with CRS to develop a local partner capacity building action plan.

2.0. Data Entry Forms

The data entry forms for the two core organizational development tools are attached as Excel files with formulas for automatically calculating scores. These two files represent sections 2.1 (IDF data entry form) and 2.2 (CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist data entry form) of this chapter. Below in Table 3.1 and 3.2 are samples of the two data entry

forms. These excerpts provide an idea of what these forms look like. They are not complete and have no formulas for calculating scores. The attached Excel files are to be used for actually assessing capacity development.

Table 3.1 Sample of IDF Data Entry Form (actual form attached as Excel file)

Resources		Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
		Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 5: External Resources								
Recognition	General	Organization little known outside the range of its direct collaborators.	Organization is known among technical peers, but does little to promote its activities or broader issues to public and key decision-makers.	Organization has limited contact with key decision-makers and has limited lines of communication with the public.	Organization and its work are well known to public and policy-makers. Able to engage decision-makers in dialogue on policy. Has a loyal constituency and commands respect outside that constituency.			
	Community	Work is centered in capital, or is based on top-down structure.	Work is focused on the field and organization is viewed as an ally of communities.	Community input is solicited for key decisions. Organization and efforts viewed as a service provided to communities.	Community input integrated into most management considerations. Organization viewed as a community resource.			
	Government	Viewed from an 'us' versus 'them' perspective. Tension is frequent between government and the organization.	Relations are friendly. Collaboration occasionally occurs on specific tasks and projects.	Collaboration is frequent, usually on an informal level. Relations are friendly, but too narrowly focused on a few institutions or individuals.	Formal mechanisms exist for collaboration and are often used. Relations are a full partnership.			
	NGOs	Organization does not have experience working with NGOs. Not known or trusted by the NGO community.	Organization increasingly known and trusted by the NGO community, but little experience with collaboration.	Organization works with international and/or local NGOs and participates in NGO networks, but has not played a leadership role in promoting NGO coalitions and projects.	Organization plays a leadership role in promoting NGO coalitions or projects, supports other NGOs, and can help resolve inter-NGO or NGO-gov't conflicts.			
Raw Scores--IDF								
Capacity Category 1: Oversight and Vision (G9-G14)				6 indicators	x4 pts=24 pts max raw	10	0	0
Capacity Category 2: Management Resources (G21-G39)				12 indicators	x4 pts=48 pts max raw	12	0	0
Capacity Category 3: Human Resources (G43-G57)				8 indicators	x4 pts=32 pts max raw	0	0	0
Capacity Category 4: Financial Resources (G65-G72)				8 indicators	x4 pts=32 ptsmax raw	0	0	0
Capacity Category 5: External Resources (G80-G83)				4 indicators	x4 pts=16 pts max raw	0	0	0
Adjusted Scores--IDF								
Capacity Category 1: Oversight and Vision (Max 20 pts)				To adjust: (capacity 1 raw score x 20) divided by (6 indicators x 4 pts max score)		8.33333	0	0
Capacity Category 2: Management Resources (Max 20 pts)				To adjust: (capacity 2 raw score x 20) divided by (12 indicators x 4 pts max score)		5	0	0
Capacity Category 3: Human Resources (Max 20 pts)				To adjust: (capacity 3 raw score x 20) divided by (8 indicators x 4 pts max score)		0	0	0
Capacity Category 4: Financial Resources (Max 20 pts)				To adjust: (capacity 4 raw score x 20) divided by 8 indicators x 4 pts max score)		0	0	0
Capacity Category 5: External Resources (Max 20 pts)				To adjust: (capacity 5 raw score x 20) divided by (4 indicators x 4 pts max score)		0	0	0
Adjusted Total Score: IDF (Max 100 pts)				Sum of all 5 categories adjusted scores		13.3333	0	0

Table 3.2 Sample of CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist Data Entry Form (actual form attached as Excel file)

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: Precise wording should be adapted to the project)					
	Very Limited Capacity = 1	Basic Capacity = 2	High Level of Capacity = 3	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
<i>CATEGORY 1: Strategy</i>						
Does the organization have a strategy?	No strategy.	A strategy, but not necessarily clear.	Clear strategy with priorities.			
Does the strategy express commitment to food security and alleviating human suffering?	No commitment to food security.	Food security is mentioned, but not explicitly.	Strategy focused upon food security and the alleviation of human suffering.			
Funding: Is the organization dependent upon a few funding sources or is it relatively diversified?	Highly dependent on only a few funders.	Multiple types of funding.	Highly diversified funding.			

Catholic Relief Services
2.1. Data Entry Form: Institutional Development Framework (IDF)
 Note: Sample rankings inserted

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up = 1	Development = 2	Expansion/Consolidation = 3	Sustainability = 4	Ranking		
					Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 1: Oversight and Vision							
Board of Directors	Board partially identified.	Board identified, but in flux.	Board membership stable, and well-targeted.	Board compromised of recognized leaders.	1		
	Roles of members and of members vis-à-vis executive director are unclear.	Board understands role and how to relate to the executive director.		Board provides hands-on policy direction for political action.	2		
	Board not yet active partner.	Board becoming active and contributes and pursues resources.	Board provides some leadership. Committees formed, but only one or two active members.	Significant funds raised by board. Many members of the board play an active role.	1		
	Board sees the NGO partner as one and the same as the diocese.	Board understands the need for the local NGO partner to be semi-autonomous from the diocese, but doesn't fully understand what this means in terms of the local partner working with an external donor like USAID.	Board able to help advance organization, but chair not yet able to mobilize efforts to advance the organization.	Active, strong chair and board in place, helping advance the organization.	3		
Mission	No formal mission and vision statement. Group coalesces around general media or developmental objectives.	Mission and vision statements exist, but are unclear. Diverse portfolio of projects and proposals are not consistent with mission and vision.	Mission and vision statements clear and in general consistent with portfolio. However, staff are not uniformly capable of articulating them and outsiders may not identify the mission/vision with the organization.	Clear mission and vision statements that can be articulated by both board and staff, and is consistent with portfolio. Outsiders identify same mission with organization.	1		
Autonomy	Organization is the implementing agent of one donor	Organization is able to respond to the interests of more than one donor and its board.	Organization is able to obtain funding to support its programs, in consultation with the board.	In addition to managerial and financial autonomy, organization is able to advocate to government and private sector.	2		

Catholic Relief Services--IDF							
Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 2: Management Resources							
Leadership Style	All leadership from founder.	Leadership comes from founder and one or two board members.	Vision increasingly comes from the board, with increasing input from staff.	All employees participate to some degree in management.	2		
	Staff provide technical input only.	One or two staff provide organizational impetus in addition to the founder.	Staff increasingly provide vital drive to organization.	Staff understand where boundaries of their participation lie. Organization would survive without the current board president and executive director.	1		
Participatory Management	Decisions handed down to organization from executive director with little or no feedback.	Most decisions taken by executive director and board. Some input from one or two staff members.	Management decisions increasingly delegated to line managers.	Management decisions delegated to appropriate level.	1		
	Organization run by executive director, but criteria for decisions are over-personalized and unclear.	Management decision criteria generally shared with the board.	Decision-making is increasingly transparent to staff.	Transparent decision structure.	1		
	Staff roles and responsibilities unclear and changable.	Staff roles better understood, but fragmented.	Staff understand their role in the organization more clearly and how to participate in management.	Staff increasingly able to shape the way in which they participate in management.	2		
	Poor intra-staff communications.	Modest amounts of staff communications.	Communications are open and inter-heirarchical.	Organization periodically reviews communication flow to ensure free flow of information.	2		
Planning	Planning is predominantly ad hoc, incremental, and reactive to circumstances. Planning is scattered on diffuse and unrelated matters.	Planning is structured around the mission statement and is more forwar-oriented. Annual organizational workplans are developed, but not tracked during the year. Planning is hierarchically imposed.	Annual <i>individual staff</i> and <i>organizational</i> plans are developed and reviewed during the course of the year. Mid/long-term strategic plan is developed. Wide participation in planning among staff. Plans are result of cooperative board/staff effort. Plans relate specific resources needed to accomplish objectives.	Annual plans continue as operative instruments, supplemented by updated long-term plans. Data is gathered and analyzed to track progress against plans. Annual and strategic plans are specific enough to permit accurate budgeting, but flexible enough to be modified as warranted. Beneficiaries participate in planning.	3		

Catholic Relief Services--IDF							
Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 2: Management Resources (cont.)							
Monitoring & Evaluation	No formal evaluation mechanisms exist. Word of mouth, popular perceptions, and/or government statistics are reported. No systematic monitoring system exists.	Occasional evaluations are undertaken, usually at request of donors and are implemented by outsiders.	Evaluations are initiated by staff; staff increasingly involved in their execution; some management decisions are taken based on data; ongoing M&E system is in place. M&E still an isolated management function.	M&E data and analysis are integrated into organization's decision-making.			
	No feedback from beneficiaries and clients.	Informal feedback channels for beneficiary and client feedback.	Formal mechanisms exist for beneficiary and client feedback via evaluations, surveys, etc.	Continuous feedback and input from beneficiaries and clients used in planning and decision-making.			
Management Systems	No formal personnel systems, job descriptions, recruitment, and firing procedures, etc.	Some, but not all, necessary personnel systems exist. Informal employment practices persist.	Virtually all necessary personnel systems are institutionalized; occasionally informal mechanisms are used.	Formal personnel systems are institutionalized, understood by employees, and redress can be pursued.			
	No formal file system exists.	Files are maintained, but are not comprehensive or systematic.	Files are systematic and accessible, but significant gaps remain.	Files are comprehensive, systematic and accessible.			
	Few administrative procedures.	Administrative procedures increasingly formalized. No operating manual.	Administrative manual in place although not up-to-date or considered the 'Bible.'	Administrative manual updated as needed. Considered the arbiter of procedures.			
CATEGORY 3: Human Resources							
Staff Skills	Too few people are filling too broad a range of technical skills.	Specialists are brought on (contracted) for key skill areas, such as accounting and fund raising, but some gaps remain.	All core skill areas are covered with staff.	All skill areas are covered and capacity exists to contract out for other needed skills.			
	Staff not fully capable of providing skills required of their positions.	Staff capable of providing technical skills of their positions.	Staff recognized for excellence outside the organization. Papers and speeches solicited from staff (but staff still leave when offered higher pay).	Staff offered higher paying employment (UN, WB, USAID, etc.) and refuse them.			

Catholic Relief Services--IDF							
Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 3: Human Resources (cont.)							
Staff Development	No conscious human resource development strategy or practice.	General direction provided for staff.	Staff development needs assessment and action plan exists.	Professional development considered as part of job performance.			
	Little coaching, counseling, or training provided.	Some coaching, counseling, and even training provided.	Staff receive coaching, counseling, and training.	Intra-office mentoring and guidance considered part of the job. Staff receive coaching, counseling, and training.			
	Little or no formal recognition of employee performance.	Performance recognized informally, but no formal mechanism exists.	Formal performance appraisal system established, but skill development not included in appraisals.	Employees participate in objective setting and know what is expected of them. Skills development is included in performance appraisals.			
Organizational Diversity	Organization has little consciousness of importance of, or interest in, diversity.	Consciousness and interest increased, but still no policy regarding diversity.	Organization expresses commitment to diversifying staff via formal policy.	Active recruitment of women and people from traditionally disadvantaged groups as board members and staff.			
	Staff is under-represented by women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.	Some women and traditionally disadvantaged groups are on staff.	Significant representation of women and traditionally disadvantaged groups among staff.	Composition of staff adequately represents women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.			
	Board is under-represent by women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.	Some women and traditionally disadvantaged groups on board.	Significant representation of women and traditionally disadvantaged groups on board.	Composition of board adequately represents women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.			

Catholic Relief Services--IDF							
Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 4: Financial Resources							
Financial Management	Financial records are incomplete and difficult to understand. Organization often needs to be prodded to produce reports.	Financial reports are produced, and are somewhat more clear, but still incomplete. They are somewhat timely.	Financial reports are clear and complete, even as portfolio becomes more complex. Reports are usually on time.	Reports and data systems can quickly provide a sense of financial health. Reports are always timely and trusted.			
	Budgets are not used as management tools.	Budgets are developed for project activities, but are often over or under-spent by more than 20%.	Total expenditure is usually within 20% of budget, but actual activities often diverge from budget predictions.	Budgets are an integral part of project management and are adjusted as project implementation warrants.			
	No clear procedures exist for handling payables and receivables.	Financial controls exist, but lack a systematic office procedure. Bookkeeper is not a trained accountant.	Improved financial control systems. Trained accountant is in charge of books.	Excellent cash controls for payables and receivables, and established budget procedures.			
	Audits are not performed.	External audits are only rarely performed.	External audits are performed frequently, but not on a regular schedule.	External audits are performed with regular and appropriate frequency.			
	Project funds are not separated.	Project funds are separated, but some temporary cross-project financing may occur.	Standard procedure is to avoid cross-project financing and most funds are separated.	All project funds are separated and adequate controls exist to avoid cross-project financing.			
Financial Security	Financing comes from only one source.	Financing comes from multiple sources, but 90% or more is from one source.	No single source of funding provides more than 60% of total.	No single source provides more than 25% of funding.			
	Local fundraising (including in-kind assistance) for operational income is untried or unsuccessful.	Up to 5% of unrestricted operating expenses are from fees and indirect costs charged by the organization, earned interest, revenues, trust funds, unrestricted gifts, and membership fees.	30% of unrestricted operating expenses are from such fees charged by the organization.	50% of unrestricted operating expenses are from such fees charged by the organization. Some funds for capital or project expenditures also raised locally.			
Financial Solvency	Project funding is insufficient to meet project management goals.	Funding is available to cover short-term project costs.	Funding is available for short-term costs and a medium-term funding strategy exists.	All projects have long-term funding plans and current funds are adequate to meet management plan needs.			

Catholic Relief Services--IDF							
Resources	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: precise wording should be adapted to each project)						
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Sustainability=4	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final

CATEGORY 5: External Resources								
Recognition	General	Organization little known outside the range of its direct collaborators.	Organization is known among technical peers, but does little to promote its activities or broader issues to public and key decision-makers.	Organization has limited contact with key decision-makers and has limited lines of communication with the public.	Organization and its work are well known to public and policy-makers. Able to engage decision-makers in dialogue on policy. Has a loyal constituency and commands respect outside that constituency.			
	Community	Work is centered in capital, or is based on top-down structure.	Work is focused on the field and organization is viewed as an ally of communities.	Community input is solicited for key decisions. Organization and efforts viewed as a service provided to communities.	Community input integrated into most management considerations. Organization viewed as a community resource.			
	Government	Viewed from an 'us' versus 'them' perspective. Tension is frequent between government and the organization.	Relations are friendly. Collaboration occasionally occurs on specific tasks and projects.	Collaboration is frequent, usually on an informal level. Relations are friendly, but too narrowly focused on a few institutions or individuals.	Formal mechanisms exist for collaboration and are often used. Relations are a full partnership.			
	NGOs	Organization does not have experience working with NGOs. Not known or trusted by the NGO community.	Organization increasingly known and trusted by the NGO community, but little experience with collaboration.	Organization works with international and/or local NGOs and participates in NGO networks, but has not played a leadership role in promoting NGO coalitions and projects.	Organization plays a leadership role in promoting NGO coalitions or projects, supports other NGOs, and can help resolve inter-NGO or NGO-gov't conflicts.			

Raw Scores--IDF

Capacity Category 1: Oversight and Vision (G9-G14)	6 indicators	x4 pts=24 pts max raw	10	0	0
Capacity Category 2: Management Resources (G21-G39)	12 indicators	x4 pts=48 pts max raw	12	0	0
Capacity Category 3: Human Resources (G43-G57)	8 indicators	x4 pts=32 pts max raw	0	0	0
Capacity Category 4: Financial Resources (G65-G72)	8 indicators	x4 pts=32 pts max raw	0	0	0
Capacity Category 5: External Resources (G80-G83)	4 indicators	x4 pts=16 pts max raw	0	0	0

Adjusted Scores--IDF

Capacity Category 1: Oversight and Vision (Max 20 pts)	To adjust: (capacity 1 raw score x 20) divided by (6 indicators x 4 pts max score)	8.33333	0	0	0
Capacity Category 2: Management Resources (Max 20 pts)	To adjust: (capacity 2 raw score x 20) divided by (12 indicators x 4 pts max score)	5	0	0	0
Capacity Category 3: Human Resources (Max 20 pts)	To adjust: (capacity 3 raw score x 20) divided by (8 indicators x 4 pts max score)	0	0	0	0
Capacity Category 4: Financial Resources (Max 20 pts)	To adjust: (capacity 4 raw score x 20) divided by (8 indicators x 4 pts max score)	0	0	0	0
Capacity Category 5: External Resources (Max 20 pts)	To adjust: (capacity 5 raw score x 20) divided by (4 indicators x 4 pts max score)	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Total Score: IDF (Max 100 pts)	Sum of all 5 categories adjusted scores	13.3333	0	0	0

2.2. Data Entry Form: CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist

Note: Sample Scores Inserted

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: Precise wording should be adapted to the project)					
	Very Limited Capacity = 1	Basic Capacity = 2	High Level of Capacity = 3	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
CATEGORY 1: Strategy						
Does the organization have a strategy?	No strategy.	A strategy, but not necessarily clear.	Clear strategy with priorities.	1	3	4
Does the strategy express commitment to food security and alleviating human suffering?	No commitment to food security.	Food security is mentioned, but not explicitly.	Strategy focused upon food security and the alleviation of human suffering.	1	3	4
Funding: Is the organization dependent upon a few funding sources or is it relatively diversified?	Highly dependent on only a few funders.	Multiple types of funding.	Highly diversified funding.	1	3	4
CATEGORY 2: Organizational Skills						
Performance: Does the organization have M&E systems for project performance?	Limited M&E system, organization collects data on activities and outputs but not on impact indicators	M&E system in place, collects data, but not necessarily impact indicators	Strong M&E system in place; collects data on activities, outputs and impact	1	3	4
Does the organization have systems to develop project proposals or strategies?	Limited ability to develop strategic plan or project proposal.	Ability to develop strategic plan and project proposals, but outside assistance needed.	Ability to develop a strategic plan and project proposal without assistance.	1	3	4
Does the organization effectively build relationships with a variety of parties?	Limited use of partnerships or partner relations.	Early stages of building relationships with other organizations.	Built and maintained effective partnerships that are anchored in stable, mutually beneficial collaborative partnerships.	1	3	4
Local community presence and involvement	Organization's presence not recognized by the community or not regarded as positive.	Organization's presence recognized and generally regarded as positive.	Organization well recognized and perceived as engaged and highly responsive to community needs.	1	3	4
Fundraising	Generally weak fundraising skills and lack of expertise.	Main fundraising needs covered by internal capacities and external support.	Fundraising covered by internal skills and expertise	1	3	4

CRS Checklist						
Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage (Note: Precise wording should be adapted to the specific project)					
	Start-up=1	Development=2	Expansion/Consolidation=3	Baseline	Mid-term	Final
CATEGORY 3: Human Resources						
Staffing levels	Many positions are unfilled.	Positions are filled but there are turnover and vacancy problems.	Positions are filled; no turnover or vacancy problems.	1	3	4
Staffing experience	Staff drawn from narrow range of experience/interests; staff only have experience in one area.	Staff have variety of backgrounds, experiences and capabilities; staff have experience in several areas.	Staff have very diverse backgrounds and bring a broad range of skills.	1	3	4
CATEGORY 4: Systems and Infrastructure						
Knowledge Management	No formal system to capture and document knowledge.	Systems exist, but are not user friendly or comprehensive enough.	Systems are well designed, user-friendly, and document and disseminate internal knowledge.	1	3	4
Physical assets (vehicles, computers, etc.)	Has building, but only one vehicle that is used by many staff; typewriters.	Has sufficient vehicles, but not well managed; computers and printers, but need upgrading.	Has good system for managing and maintaining vehicles; new computers.	1	3	4
Financial support	Ledgers for financial records.	Computerized finance system, but not accurate reports.	Well managed finances.	1	3	4

CRS Organizational Capacity Checklist

Capacity Category 1: Strategy (10-12) for F,G, and H	3 indicators	3	9	12
Capacity Category 2: Organizational Skills (16-20) for F,G,H	5 indicators	5	15	20
Capacity Category 3: Human Resources (27-28) for F,G,H	2 indicators	2	6	8
Capacity Category 4: Systems and Infrastructure (32-34) for F,G,H	3 indicators	3	9	12
Total Raw Scores		13	39	52

Total Adjusted Scores (so each capacity category weighted so that the maximum score is 25 points)

Capacity Category 1:	Raw score total x 25 divided by total possible	6.25	18.75	25
Capacity Category 2:	Raw score total x 25 divided by total possible	6.25	18.75	25
Capacity Category 3:	Raw score total x 25 divided by total possible	6.25	18.75	25
Capacity Category 4:	Raw score total x 25 divided by total possible	6.25	18.75	25
Total Adjusted Scores (so each capacity category weighted so that the maximum score is 25 points)		25	75	100