

Knowing ourselves **DOING BETTER**



**A TOOL FOR
ORGANISATIONAL
SELF-ASSESSMENT
(TOSA)**

Building Competence and Credibility of
Civil Society Organisations in Tanzania

Knowing Ourselves DOING BETTER

A TOOL FOR ORGANISATIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT (TOSA)

Building Competence and Credibility of Civil Society Organisations in Tanzania

Published by:
NGO Resource Centre
A Project of the Aga Khan Foundation
P.O Box 4128, Zanzibar
Tel. +255-24-2230696
Email: admin@ngorc.or.tz

© NGO Resource Centre and Tanzania Association of NGOs 2008

This publication may be reproduced for developmental purposes provided that the material is distributed free of charge and Aga Khan Foundation (NGO Resource Centre) and TANGO are acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the official views of the NGO Resource Centre, His Highness the Aga Khan, Aga Khan Development Network, nor the Tanzania Association of NGOs.



AKDN
AGA KHAN DEVELOPMENT NETWORK
www.akdn.org

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Acronyms and Abbreviations</i>	<i>iii</i>
1. Introduction	1
2. Why Conduct Organisational Self Assessment?	2
3. Aspects to be Assessed	3
4. How to use TOSA	7
5. Reporting and Feedback to Stakeholders	10
6. Tool for Organisational Self Assessment	11

Acknowledgements

This tool is a product of wide consultations and discussions with many organisations and individuals in the civil society sector in Tanzania who have been part of a broader national initiative seeking to promote the image and competence of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in Tanzania.

A National Reference Group established at the onset of this work offered guidance peer review and ensured that the outcome reflected the realities within Tanzania. This team was comprised of Aga Khan Foundation, Vivian Kazi of the Economic and Social Research Foundation, Deogratius Mlay of the Foundation for Civil Society, Fidelis Chale of Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP), Djax Biria of TRACE Organisational Development (OD) Facilitation Centre, Mary Mwingira from the Tanzania Association of NGOs, Hassan Khamis of the Association of NGOs in Zanzibar, Khalfan Khalfan of Umoja wa Watu Wenye Ulemavu Zanzibar. The two departments concerned with NGO Coordination in Tanzania were represented by Marcellus Katemba, the Director for NGO Coordination in Mainland Tanzania and Mwinyiusi Hassan, the Director of Good Governance in Zanzibar. We salute your commitment and dedication.

Special thanks go to the many NGOs and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) that offered to use this tool during the pre-testing phase. Their feedback and support was useful in enriching the final outcome. We also acknowledge the commitment and support of the entire project team from NGO Resource Centre (NGORC) and Tanzania Association of NGOs led by Achim Chiaji, the NGORC Project Director. Without their dedication, critique and consistent peer review, the quality of this output may not have been assured.

We also wish to thank Japheth Makongo who facilitated the entire discussions and prepared the first draft of this tool. Our gratitude goes to Ogango K'omolo of MediaNet Limited who edited and reviewed the content of the tool before its publication.

We are grateful to the Civil Society Programme of the Aga Khan Development Network for providing the financial resources to facilitate the studies and subsequent publication of this tool.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
FBO	Faith Based Organisation
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
N/A	Not Applicable
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NGORC	NGO Resource Centre
OCAT	Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool
OD	Organisational Development
PROSE	Participatory Result-Oriented Self-Evaluation
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TANGO	Tanzania Association of Non Governmental Organisations
TGNP	Tanzania Gender Networking Programme
TOSA	Tool for Organisational Self Assessment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

1. Introduction

Initiatives to build organisational capacity of CSOs often concentrate on the details of administrative management, giving limited attention to good practice in such areas as partnership working, constituency building, participation, joint planning with stakeholders, mediation, encouraging pluralism, and peace building. The demands of meeting external donor funding and reporting requirements often reinforces a mechanistic approach to capacity building rather than looking at issues surrounding building relationships and partnership working.

Clearly, CSOs need to develop transparent and accountable management systems and to promote core values like participation, learning from evaluation and knowledge sharing. CSOs can only gain increased support inside Tanzania if they explain clearly the value of their work to citizens and the government – not just external donors.

In response to this challenge, the NGO Resource Centre in Zanzibar facilitated a process of self reflection among CSOs that has led to the development of a basic tool for assessing their capacities and performance overtime. This followed wider consultation with Civil Society Organizations in which they attempted to identify the key attributes and standards of a well functioning CSO. These inputs were reviewed in various technical forums to pick out agreeable parameters for assessing the capacity of CSOs. Simple indicators were then developed to explain the meaning implied by each of the agreed standards. The indicators have now been clarified and guidelines developed on how organisations could use them to assess their performance with less reliance on external support. The indicators and the guidelines constitute the Tool for Organisational Self Assessment (TOSA).

TOSA incorporates core elements of other capacity assessment tools that CSOs in Tanzania consider relevant in measuring their performance. It is expected that this tool will go a long way in enriching the current discussions on how to strengthen the capacities of Civil Society Organisations in Tanzania.

2. Why Conduct Organisational Self Assessment?

The Tool for Organisational Self Assessment (TOSA) is designed to serve as a guide for CSOs that wish to assess the way they operate.

TOSA provides a CSO with an “organisational health check” - it highlights areas for development and improvement and can help a CSO develop training packages for staff. TOSA compliments other measures of organisational capacity such as audit reports or feedback from Monitoring and Evaluation reports. It should not be treated as a stand alone tool.

3. Aspects to be Assessed

The Foundation of the CSO

a) The Foundation of the CSO

- **The Mission** of the CSO sets out why the CSO exists and what it wants to do and why. It is important that the CSO and stakeholders (members, leaders, staff etc) agree with the mission.
- **The Membership** describes the groups of stakeholders and partners who have agreed to work with the CSO to pursue its mission. Partners and stakeholders should be clearly listed in the Appendix to the CSO’s strategy.
- **The Organisational Structure** (The Board, Trustees, Executive or Steering Committee) provides direction and advice to the overall management of the CSO. The Board, Trustees and Committees also oversee progress towards achieving the CSO’s mission. Key characteristics of an effective governing body include its representative composition and its ability to guide the implementation of the overall policies of the CSO.
- **Legal Status** shows whether the CSO’s existence is in line with the legal requirements of the country. Typically, CSO’s need to be registered and some may need to obtain “charitable status.” The legal status of the CSO contributes greatly to its credibility, respect and acceptance as a genuine organisation. Lack of formal registration is often associated with poor management practice.

- **Cross-cutting Themes** refers to key issues affecting development, these include Gender, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights and the environment.

- **Sustainability** is vital to the existence of the CSO. Sustainability is about the way a CSO is able to continue its work after a project has been completed and funding regimes have changed. To be sustainable means not being dependent for funding on external donors only.

b) Management of the CSO is about the way in which a CSO coordinates its administration, operational, human resource and financial systems to implement its activities. The key task for management is to translate policy goals into action, monitor progress and equip, motivate and train staff to carry out their duties.

Management of the CSO

- **Organisational Structure** outlines functions and levels of accountability and communication channels and the roles and responsibilities of various people in the organisation. A well defined organisational structure demonstrates how organisational skills and abilities help the CSO attain its goals.

- **Policies and Procedures** are guidelines to help leaders, staff or members to work within CSO's mission and legal framework. Policies and procedures define the organisational culture/behaviour, guide business practice, safeguard the values of the organisation and protect the rights of employees, volunteers and stakeholders. Policies and procedures relate to financial management, resource management, administration, human resource development, gender equality and the environment.

- **Management Capabilities** are the ability of the management team to oversee the implementation of activities and attainment of goals. It is about clear decision making, coordinating and controlling the use of inputs (finance, human resource and the environment) and the building of a strong motivated team of staff or members. Management capabilities in any organisation need to be developed and enhanced continually.

c) Human Resources are about the people required to implement the CSO's strategy. The capacity of the CSO to deliver is very much dependent of how it has been able to develop the following human resource attributes:

Human Resources

- **Staffing** looks at the needs of the CSO in terms of the abilities and skills that the staff need to deliver the CSO's strategy – it is linked to training and skills development. CSOs need to have clear procedures for recruiting staff, allocating duties and training within the context of an Equal Opportunities policy. Most CSOs rely on volunteers i.e people who work on various activities of the CSO without payment.
- **Volunteers** can be grouped into three categories. This include individuals (CSO members, leaders or beneficiaries) who have decided to contribute to some of the CSO's work without any form of payment. The second is people undertaking short term tasks in the CSO as academic/professional interns at their own cost. The third is people who may be attached to one of the CSO programs from other organisations such as International NGOs, Research Institutions, or government departments.

With regard to the first category of volunteers, it is important that the CSO has procedures in place for their recruitment, policies outlining their roles, how their training requirements will be met, and procedures regarding reimbursement of expenses related to volunteer activities.

- **Human Resource Management** is about the ways the CSO coordinates its people resources to undertake activities to achieve its goals. The aim is to ensure that there are procedures to manage the contribution and accountability of each staff member, develop cross team working and have ways to resolve conflicts in the organisation.
- **Human Resource Development Plan** shows how the CSO will develop the professional skills of its leaders, staff and members. A Human Resource Development Plan should identify key skills gaps of the CSO at all levels and outline how these gaps will be filled.

Financial Management

d) Financial Management is important to the integrity and credibility of all organisations. It is about how the CSO is able to access and safeguard financial resources. The following are key features of good CSO financial management:

- **Sources of Funds** is about how the CSO proposes to raise the money for its activities. CSOs need to outline how they will access resources (both internal and external) and how they will build the confidence of donors.

- **Budgeting** shows how a CSO will allocate its resources (financial/material) for the implementation of its activities. In this process a detailed analysis of costings should be done for all the CSOs activities – this should involve stakeholders and key relevant staff.
- **Financial Accounting** defines how the finances of the CSOs are managed, monitored and protected. It is, essentially, a process of record keeping and internal auditing.
- **Financial Reporting** is about providing information to Board Members, Management, stakeholders and partners to show how funds were used in accordance with financial regulations. The financial report should also provide recommendations for appropriate management interventions where this is necessary.

e) Program Development and Management is about taking the broad goals of the CSO and developing programs and projects to realise those goals. Once programs and projects have been developed they need to be monitored and evaluated to see if they are meeting the goals of the CSO.

Program Development and Management

- **Strategic Planning** is about developing the program objectives of the CSO and outlining activities to attain the CSO's goals. A well defined strategic plan demonstrates the capacity of the CSO to link activities with the objectives/goals and its mission. A strategic plan should use baseline data to form benchmarks of indicators. Participation of stakeholders and partners is essential in the creation of the strategic plan.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation (MandE)** is about reviewing activities against the strategic plan. The main purpose of monitoring is to find out whether the CSO is on track to meet its objectives. An evaluation is a learning process for the CSO and aims to identify the impact that objectives have had and, if necessary, make changes to improve future results. Stakeholders should be involved in both monitoring and evaluation processes.
- **Documentation** is about collecting, recording and disseminating results, lessons and experiences to the stakeholders and wider public. This can be done via Annual Reports, press releases and radio and TV broadcasts. Dissemination can also occur through dialogue, presentations, and events.

Infrastructure and Logistics

f) Infrastructure and Logistics is about the basic facilities a CSO needs to undertake its day to day work. These include working space such as offices, stores, communication systems (phones and e-mail), transport and electricity. These should be obtained efficiently, openly and at the best prices.

External/ Public Relations

g) External/Public Relations is the way in which the CSO is seen by the larger community it serves. Successes need to be highlighted to show the benefits of partnership working and encourage other CSOs in their endeavours. CSOs should give consideration to writing a Public Relations Strategy. This Strategy should cover the undernoted:

- **The Community (Public)** is the recipient of CSO services. It is therefore important to communicate with them effectively on how CSO activities are directly addressing their concerns and needs.
- **The Government** includes local government (Village Council, Ward Council, and District Council) and Central Government and its institutions (Judiciary, Ministries, Departments and Agencies). It is important to communicate effectively with these bodies on the success of jointly funded projects and the benefits of partnership working.
- **Donors/Funding Agencies** are development partners with the potential or willingness to support the CSOs through funding and other means of assistance. CSOs need to work closely with the donor organisations to highlight the benefits of partnership, knowledge sharing and accountability.
- **The Media** plays an important role in promoting the work and credibility of CSOs. CSOs should develop an approach to working with the media as a partner in highlighting various issues regarding activities of CSOs and more so how partnership between CSOs, government and donors can transform a community. Positive coverage by the media would encourage other CSOs and local communities in their endeavours.

Building Coalitions and Networks

h) Building Coalitions and Networks looks at how the CSO establishes working relationships with other organisations pursuing similar goals (NGOs, advocacy networks or coalitions, advocacy movements, faith groups or professional associations). The extent to which the CSO engages in coalition or wider network issues will demonstrate its professionalism, integrity, and credibility.

4. How to Use TOSA

4.1 Background Information

Background Information

TOSA is a product of broad discussions among CSOs about standards of measuring their performance. It does not cover all aspects of a CSO's work and the tool needs to be adapted to suit the focus of a particular CSO. For example, if the main focus of the CSO is on service delivery in HIV/AIDS area, it may consider adapting the tool to suit that area of work. It is, however, important to note that the tool must always cover all the three levels of the organisational activity: Institutional, Systems, and Individuals.

a) It is important to ensure that leaders, staff and members of the CSO are familiar with the tool, and where necessary given an opportunity to make adjustments to suit their own organisational requirements and circumstances. A staff member (with knowledge of TOSA) should lead the assessment process working with an external facilitator. These two people will be responsible for the preparation, facilitation and drafting of the report(s).

b) While the TOSA is designed to provide a realistic picture of the organisation's strengths and weaknesses, it should not be relied upon as the only tool for examining a CSO's capacity. TOSA, however, highlights specific gaps which require attention – e.g. staff training, or the need to create internal procedures.

c) While TOSA uses the standard Organisational Development (OD) variables, some of the contents have been borrowed from other Participatory Capacity Assessment Tools such as the Participatory Result-Oriented Self-Evaluation (PROSE) developed by UNDP and the Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) developed by Pact Zimbabwe.

Managing the Self Assessment Discussion

4.2 Managing the Self Assessment Discussion

Establishing of the Assessment Team: The composition of people participating in the self-assessment should be as inclusive as possible.

The more people participating in the assessment the better the chances of getting a fair and balanced picture. Participants in the assessment exercise should be drawn from the following groups:

- The Board/Executive Committee/Board of Trustees
- Management team
- Staff members at all levels (program and administration)
- Members of the CSO (you will need to establish criteria for selection of a representation sample)

The Assessment Process; The facilitators are advised to meet with leaders and staff or members of the CSO to explain the purpose of using TOSA. The briefing will help staff/members of the CSO to:

- Understand the key concepts and definitions used in the tool.
- Understand how TOSA works. Appreciate the importance of the exercise for organisational development.

Step 1: Establish Work Groups

Divide the participants into smaller groups (in cases where the group comprises 10 or more people participating in the assessment).

- Ask each group to select one person to lead the discussion and another one to record the findings
- Ensure the groups have a mix of participants from all levels of the CSO (Board, Executive Committee, management, junior staff and members)
- In some cases respondents may propose how they want the groups to be formed

Step 2: Explain the Tool

Give a copy of TOSA to each of the members participating in the assessment exercise. The tool must be in a language that is well understood by all participants (a Kiswahili translation is provided). Explain how the scoring or rating of the categories is to be done. The rating is on a scale of 1-5, where 1 is considered the lowest and 5 the highest.

Category	Score					
	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Step 3: Group/Individual Scoring

Ask the group leaders to read aloud the statements in each of the categories. This is helpful to ensure the members have understood the statements, but more importantly in cases where some respondents are unable to read and write. Once all the statements under each category have been read, participants will be left on their own to give a rating (score) to each of the statement. The rating is done by putting a circle around the number which the participant feels would provide a fair description of the situation in the organisation.

Step 4: Category Scores

The recorder will then ask each respondent to announce the scores awarded by all participants for each statement in order to get the average scores for the group. The average is the total sum of the participant's scores awarded divided by the total number of respondents in the group. Statements with N/A rating do not count on the average score.

For example, if the group had seven participants, the average score of one of the categories (say staffing) will be

$$3+3+4+2+1+4+1=18/7=2.6$$

The average should be rounded to only one decimal point

Step 5: Discuss the Final Awards

The average scores (using TOSA) will only provide a quantitative assessment of the status for each category. It is therefore advised to ask the group to provide brief written comments for each category especially the one either scoring the lowest or highest score.

- Encourage participants to say why they gave the scores they did and what could be done to improve the scores.
- Ask participants to comment on the appropriateness and applicability of the tool, and where needed provide recommendations for improvement in the future.

Space is also provided to record how decisions as to scores were arrived at. It may well be, for example, that administrative staff gave a low score to certain activities but management gave a high score. It is useful to capture such organisational perspectives.

Developing an Action Plan

4.3 Developing an Action Plan

The summarized scores for each indicator and capacity area indicates the key constraints and challenges that an organisation will need to address in order to improve their performance and effectiveness.

The facilitator needs to guide participants to identify these key areas of weakness, what action needs to be taken and by whom, and how the progress will be monitored and reported to stakeholders. The table below covers these elements;

Action Plan

Indicators	Weakness identified	Action Needed to address weakness	By Whom (Responsible Person)	By When Now/ Soon/ Later	Resources required

At the end of each section this table should be filled in as much as possible. However, it is recommended that these responses are analysed and discussed in a plenary session to ensure the buy in and support from everyone in addressing jointly identified areas of weakness.

5. Reporting and Feedback to Stakeholders

The facilitators will then work out the averages of all categories and make a summary of the assessment.

Prepare the summaries of findings from the assessment (both quantitative based on TOSA and qualitative based on the narrative). Give the reports to relevant people in the organisation (board

executive committee chairpersons, management).

Organise a feedback session and present the summary of findings to participants. In the feedback session the results are shared and agreed on with the participants and actions for tackling agreed challenges.

Edit the final report based on the comments from the feedback session.

6. The Tool for Organisational Self Assessment (TOSA)

TOSA has been developed to help CSOs examine how they are performing against a range of key measures – institutional, systems and individual.

6.1 Organisational Information and profile

Organisational Information and Profile

The facilitator should take sufficient time to discuss and document the historical background of the organisation, major changes it has gone through over the years, its current situation and major achievements. This should form part of the final assessment report and will help the facilitators to plan the discussion in a better way.

Identification

Name of CSO:

Address:

Date of Assessment:

Facilitators:

Internal Lead Facilitator:

External Facilitator:

Interpretation of Assessment Scores

6.2 Interpretation of Assessment Scores

The table below summarises the meaning that could be derived from each of the scores to be awarded during the assessment.

Raw Scores	Interpretation
N/A	N/A (Not Applicable) is where what is being assessed is not relevant to the CSO.
1	The CSO is functioning at a very basic level. What has been assessed requires urgent attention to ensure the long term survival and credibility of the organistaion.
2	The CSO is improving and developing some capacity. It needs, however, more attention in specific areas to reach a higher standard and also to maintain high performance.
3	The CSO is functioning adequately, but it still needs improvement on certain aspects.
4	The CSO is functioning well, but there is no guarantee that good performance could be sustained in a long time. Improvement need to be made to sustain performance.
5	The CSO is fully functioning and is at a high level of maturity. This can be sustained over along period of time. Effort must be made to maintain performance at this level.

	Category	Rating levels					Average
1.0	GOVERNANCE						
1.1	The foundations of the CSO						
a	Our CSO is guided by well articulated vision, mission and goals.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The vision, mission of our CSO is well articulated and clearly understood by all stakeholders.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The operations of our CSO are guided by a clear set of “value systems” and working norms.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The value systems are well articulated in various documents and everyone can read them.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	We have an identity (trade mark) which makes our CSO to stand out among other actors.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.</p>							
1.2	Constituency / Membership						
a.	Our CSO has a clearly defined constituency or membership.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The membership of our CSO is clearly articulated in the constitution.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Members in our CSO practice their rights to hold the management team accountable for performance.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The members exercise their rights, obligations and responsibilities as defined by the constitution.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

	Category	Rating levels					Average
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .							
1.3	Governing Bodies						
a.	Our CSO has a governing body (the Board or Executive Committee) that has been elected in accordance to agreed procedures.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Our governing bodies demonstrate ability to provide overall leadership to the CSO's operations.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Our governing bodies carry out strategic functions including formulation and review of policies, strategies and systems.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The composition of the governing bodies takes into consideration the representation of gender, disability and other groups of stakeholders.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	The governing bodies understand their roles and responsibilities/limits and this complies with the constitution and the laws governing the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Our CSO has a clear organisational structure outlining the different roles and responsibilities of staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
g.	The Chairperson of the Board or Executive Committee is the spokesperson of the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .							

	Category	Rating levels					Average
1.4	Legal Status						
a.	Our CSO is constituted and registered in accordance with the legal requirements.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Our constitution is easily accessible to all members and other stakeholders.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The constitution of the CSO is reviewed/amended to accommodate major developments.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The implementation of activities in our CSO complies with legal requirements.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Our CSO is legally situated at a known address (with a clearly legible sign board).	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .</p>							
1.5	Crosscutting Issues (Environment, HIV/AIDS, Gender etc)						
a.	Our CSO has developed policies and strategies to address the needs of different groups of its members, staff and beneficiaries.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	International and National protocols, laws and polices on human rights issues, environmental concerns and HIV/AIDS are well articulated in our programs.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Crosscutting issues are well mainstreamed in all programs and activities of our CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
d.	Our CSO takes into consideration the national policies and laws governing environmental, gender and HIV/AIDS issues in the country.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .

1.6	Sustainability							
a.	Our CSO has adequate resources for the implementation of programs and activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Our programs are derived from the needs of our members and the local community.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	We have established clear guidelines to assist leaders and staff of CSO to reach realistic negotiations with various donors.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Our CSO has established relationships and co-operates with locally based partners as a way to reduce over dependency on external donors.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .

2.0	MANAGEMENT							
2.1	Organizational Structure							
a.	We have a functional organisational structure which clarifies the main functions of the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	The organisational structure of our CSO is clearly understood by the staff, members, Board of Directors/executive committee.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
c.	The structure clearly defines lines of communication, accountability and delegation of authority in the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .								
2.2	Policies and Procedures							
a.	Our CSO has clearly documented administrative policies and guidelines to guide the implementation of activities and the organisational behaviour.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Policies and guidelines are known by all members and staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Systems and procedures are regularly updated to accommodate changes/developments.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Staff take an active part in decision making at different levels in the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.								
2.3	Management Capability							
a.	The management facilitates integration, coordination and building team work.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	The management team has the expertise, skills and knowledge to guide the growth of our CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	The management team is effective in dealing with unforeseen crises and conflict.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
d.	The management complies with procedures which encourage staff participation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	The management communicates decisions timely and in a transparent manner.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
f.	Staff members in our CSO are knowledgeable of the poverty-environment linkages in the country.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

3.0	Program Management							
3.1	Strategic Planning							
a.	Our planning process is realistic and based on the mission and goals of the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Our plans are based on well researched baseline information (data).	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Our CSO disaggregates its data/information to show status of gender, disability, vulnerability etc.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Key stakeholders are involved in the development of strategic plans at various stages.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Our planning and budgeting processes are linked in order to ensure that we operate within our capacity and budget limits.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
f.	Our strategic program recognises social and economic changes which are likely to bring adverse effects to the community.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

	Category	Rating levels					Average
3.2	Monitoring and Evaluation						
a.	The CSO has an effective system for tracking, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of its program.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Regular reviews are conducted to enable staff and members to reflect on the outcomes resulting from the implementation of activities and its implication to the overall goals of the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The heads of departments/units provide close mentoring support to staff and members.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Staff/members have been trained in skills for monitoring and evaluation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	There are simple and user-friendly standard tools for monitoring the performance of activity at all levels of the CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .							
3.3	Documentation						
a.	Progress reports (quarterly/annual) are prepared and shared with all key stakeholders through various communication channels.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	CSO has developed or adapted user-friendly tools for documentation of outcomes and lessons.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Documented outcomes and lessons are translated in simple language and presented into user-friendly formats for different users.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
d.	Members/staff have the habit of reading CSO reports and provide timely feedback.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	The CSO has set aside time and facilities to enable its members/staff to reflect on lessons.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

4.0	HUMAN RESOURCES							
4.1	Staffing							
a.	Our CSO has employed adequate staff in accordance with the needs.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Our CSO has a recruitment and employment policy.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Policies are followed in recruitment and deployment of staff at all levels.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Staff have been allocated responsibilities in accordance to the qualifications and experiences.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	The CSO uses its staff/members as a source of ideas to inspire new innovations and increase the momentum for improvement.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

4.2	Volunteers							
a.	Our CSO uses volunteers in the implementation of some of its activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Some leaders/members of our CSO work as volunteers.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
c.	The recruitment policy has clauses which define and guide the work of volunteers.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Volunteers are nominated based on the need of the CSO and their qualifications.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Locally based volunteers are adequately remunerated by the CSO for their contribution to program implementation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

4.3	Human Resource Development Plan							
a.	The CSO has a human resources development policy and plan.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Staff capacity building in the CSO is well articulated and understood by staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Job appraisals and staff performance is part of the Human Resource Development Plan and are conducted every year.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Staff are adequately remunerated according to their qualifications and performance.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Promotions within the CSO are based on established procedures and staff performance.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

	Category	Rating levels					Average
4.4	Human Resource Management						
a.	Our CSO has recruited experienced and competent staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Our CSO is attractive and competitive in the labour market.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Staff employment is guided by formal contracts in line with labour laws, taxes, insurance etc.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Our CSO has procedures for enhancing accountability and work discipline among its staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	The CSO has an incentives and motivation packages for staff based on performance.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
f.	The CSO has a clear grievance and conflict resolution procedure.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .

5.0	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT						
5.1	Sources of Funds						
a.	Our CSO has a reliable funding base to ensure the availability of adequate financial resources for program implementation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	We have a fundraising strategy for generating resources from both internal (locally generated) and external sources.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Our CSO has developed credibility for attracting funding opportunities from diversified sources including the private sector.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
d.	Our CSO has a strategy for enhanced financial sustainability through alternatives other than direct funding from donors.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Our CSO has managed to access materials and financial resources from the government (local or central) budget to implement some of our activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
f.	Members of our CSO contribute resources to the program activities through various means.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

5.2	Budgeting							
a.	Stakeholders are involved in budget preparation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Our annual budgets and projections are based on the identified priorities, goals, and targets.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Staff/members have received basic training in budgeting matters.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	The management uses lessons learned from previous budget rounds.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Stakeholders are given enough time to consider the budget.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

5.3	Accounting							
a.	Our CSO has developed accounting procedures and systems which comply with accounting standards.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
b.	Our financial system is user-friendly and transparent to staff and stakeholders.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	There are proper books of accounts duly filled on daily basis as required.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	The financial control system is known to all relevant staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	The finance department has a system undertaking timely internal audit and quality assurance practices.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
f.	External auditing of our CSO is conducted on an annual basis by a recognised auditing firm.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
g.	The management takes appropriate measures against people found violating financial regulations.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

5.4	Financial Reporting							
a.	Relevant financial reports are produced according to the approved policies and procedures of our CSO.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	The financial reports are developed and shared with the relevant governing bodies.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	Financial reports are regularly sent to relevant stakeholders for decisions and actions.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Financial reports are prepared in a simple way to enable a larger group of stakeholders to understand.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
e.	The management provides feedback, advice and takes action to address issues uncovered during the audit process.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .

6.0	Infrastructure and Logistics							
6.1	Infrastructure							
a.	Our CSO has a convenient and adequate working space (offices, workshop, storage etc) to help program implementation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	The infrastructure is conveniently designed and user-friendly to accommodate the needs of users such as children, women, and people with disabilities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	The infrastructure/equipment are secured and insured for protection against accidents and other unforeseen disasters.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Staff/members have the requisite knowledge and experience to use and maintain the relevant infrastructure and equipment.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Appropriate sanitary facilities such as toilets, wash rooms are in place.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

	Category	Rating levels					Average
6.2	Equipments and Materials						
a.	Our office has adequate working facilities and furniture.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The CSO is adequately equipped with reliable transport facilities (vehicles, bicycles, boats, motorcycles etc).	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Our CSO has set up an effective communication system (faxes, telephones, computers, e mail etc) suitable to our working environment.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Our CSO uses modern Information and Communication Technology (ICT) such as websites and internet services.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Staff/members have been trained in the use of ICT facilities and technology.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

6.3	Stock Control and Procurement						
a.	The CSO has a fixed assets register which is regularly updated.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The CSO uses approved procurement procedures for its assets and services.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The procurement procedures are transparent and effectively used by staff.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The procedures for disposal of assets are known and used by all staff/members .	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores .

	Category	Rating levels					Average
7.0	EXTERNAL/PUBLIC RELATIONS						
7.1	The Community (Public)						
a.	Our CSO is known by the surrounding communities as potential development partner.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The public (community) has a positive image of our CSO and acknowledges the contribution of the services we provide.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Our CSO interacts well with the surrounding communities and we are regularly invited/involved in various development functions.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The CSO regularly considers how it relates with the communities and how stakeholders rate the CSOs performance.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Our CSO has good track record/reputation which acts as a trade mark to distinguish us from others.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
f.	The surrounding communities and the public at large support our activities and are willing to defend them.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.</p>							
7.2	The Government						
a.	Our CSO is recognised and accepted by relevant government departments and agencies.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The staff/members of the CSO understand the government structures and policies.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

	Category	Rating levels					Average	
c.	Our CSO cooperates with various departments to influence changes on policy issues.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	Our CSO can easily access data and information on policies, plans, and budgets etc from government departments.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
e.	Our CSO uses data and information from the government for informing the public and influencing changes in policy.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
f.	Our CSO shares its reports and other information with relevant government agencies in the constituency.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
g.	Government departments want to work with the CSO and strategic and operational levels.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

7.3	The Donors							
a.	The CSO has established a good working relationship with funding agencies locally and internationally.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
b.	Donors perceive our CSO positively and have established long-term working relationship with us.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
c.	The relationship with donors goes beyond funding alone and is at a more strategic level.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
d.	The relationship with donors is built on the basis of transparency and mutual trust.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	

	Category	Rating levels					Average
Notes: Highlight-any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.							
7.4	The Media						
a.	Our CSO has established a close working relationship with various media to highlight its work.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Our CSO uses media to promote its identity and activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The information the CSO gives the media on its activities is seen as reliable.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Our CSO cooperates with media to access and disseminate information regarding policy and other development issues.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Staff/members have received basic training on how to use media for policy advocacy work.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Our CSO has an adequate budget to work with the media.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Our CSO respects the freedom of the press and we do not restrict information to the media even when we are being criticised.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.							

	Category	Rating levels					Average
8.0	BUILDING COALITION AND NETWORKS						
8.1	Membership to Network/Coalitions						
a.	Our CSO is a member of various networks advancing goals which are similar to our vision and mission.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Our CSO participates effectively in building strong coalitions and networks.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	We have adequate resources in our budget to facilitate advocacy and network activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

8.2	Engagement in Policy Advocacy						
a.	Our CSO has identified specific policy issues for its advocacy initiatives.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Members of our CSO are involved in the selection and prioritisation of the advocacy agenda.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Our CSO has established clear procedures to guide leaders, members and staff to participate in advocacy processes.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
d.	We often conduct reviews of our advocacy work and process.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Our CSO uses lessons from previous advocacy work to help its current activities.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Notes: Highlight any key issues that shows contradicting views especially where big differences are recorded in individual scores.

