Capacity Building Project – Final Report

MARCH 2016

Prepared by: Dr. Atta Ceesay (SUNY-Buffalo State College) & Dr. Ellen Szarleta (Indiana University Northwest)
Contents

Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 2
Summary of Capacity Building Project Deliverables ............................................................................... 4
Capacity Building Program Components and Completed Action Steps .................................................. 5
  Step One: Foundations of East Chicago capacity building assessment ............................................. 5
  Step Two: Nonprofit capacity building assessment ........................................................................... 9
  Step Three: Group training/facilitation on key capacity issues ......................................................... 16
    Step Four: Peer networks based on needs of community and organizations ............................... 20
Process Summary ....................................................................................................................................... 21
Final Evaluation Survey ............................................................................................................................ 22
Next Steps: Measuring Performance ....................................................................................................... 24
Appendix 1: FEC Board and Staff Input ................................................................................................. 26
Appendix 2: Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire .................................................................................. 38
Appendix 3: Author Biographies ........................................................................................................... 41
Introduction

In 2013, the Foundations of East Chicago (FEC), through a strategic realignment, implemented a process to explore the issues of long-term sustainability of its grantees. As stated, the foundation’s mission is “to strengthen and improve the quality of life in East Chicago through strategic grant making, providing leadership, and serving as a community resource” (FEC, 2016). The main tenets of the strategic realignment focused on health, education and public safety. The Foundation engaged in multiple conversations with key stakeholders to determine how best to address the main tenets. It became apparent to the foundation that grantees required support in four areas in order to sustainably implement programs supportive of the FEC mission. These areas are:

- Capacity Building
- Program Measurement and Reporting
- Public Relations
- Technology

The East Chicago Foundation capacity building and reporting and measurement challenges and opportunities are the focus of this report by the Indiana University Northwest Center for Urban and Regional Excellence. The project team initially was contracted to help the Foundations of East Chicago achieve its program goals by:

- Determining where the nonprofits are in the data collection, data assessment, analysis software use, report development and report presentation stages
- Evaluating the capacity/potential of the organization’s staff, board, facilities, programs/services

Capacity Assessment: Phase I

The Indiana University Northwest team would take on this part of the assessment, by examining the organizational capacity and lifecycle stages of the chosen providers. Through the use of The Core Capacity Assessment Tool (CCAT), an electronic survey was
administered to the participating organizations. This tool allowed providers to select and report their views on leadership, technology, organizational learning, and management. Participants received a summary of the results that contained an assessment of their strengths and challenges based on their answers. The individual organization reports also contained recommendations for improvement in each of the areas assessed – leadership, technology, organizational learning, and management. Although the tool was not established to rank organizations according to their overall capacity score, it was able to suggest, based on their responses, infrastructure areas of strength and areas of challenge. Three sessions were held with providers to distribute the results of their surveys, discuss the purpose of the exercise, and explain the results and how to process the information. This was an important opportunity for providers to begin to examine, based on a self-assessment, the sustainability of their organization.

Capacity Building: Phase II

In March 2015, the Indiana University Northwest team signed an agreement with FEC to take the next step in building a sustainable nonprofit community. In this next phase of the project steps were taken to increase the efficiency and effectiveness not only of the nonprofit organizations grantees but also the Foundations of East Chicago. The foundation also conducted an environmental scan of its operations. The information collected from the capacity assessment stage (Capacity Assessment: Phase I) was used to inform this phase of the study.

The objectives of the Capacity Building Project (Phase II) were to:

- Work with FEC to inventory the types of capacity building support already provided to nonprofits and to identify the most effective way for FEC to develop its capacity building capability;
- Work directly with the nonprofit organizations identified in the previous study to build a peer support network;
- And develop and deliver group and/or individualized training that is specific to the needs of the organizations and the community.
To accomplish the project objectives, the team:

- Worked closely with FEC and the relevant stakeholders
- Utilized several different methods of building collaborative relationships between the nonprofit organizations including community of practice methods. To do this we use the results of the CCAT survey and an assessment of community needs to come up with a framework for the network
- Used best practices to deliver high quality knowledge to the nonprofits in the areas most needed so they are able to advance to the next lifecycle stage.

Dr. Atta Ceesay and Dr. Ellen Szarleta, lead investigators, completed this phase of the project and Elizabeth LaDuke and Mary Jarrett graduate assistants provided invaluable assistance.

The aim of this section of the report is to provide an overview of the project’s activities and results. Lesson learned will be presented along with recommendations for the future.

**Summary of Capacity Building Project Deliverables**

- The Foundation of East Chicago’s board and staff members completed a Core Capacity Assessment Tool.
- The project team conducted an analysis of lifecycle stages and individual organization capacity of the selected grantees. 21 out of 26 completed the survey.
- A capacity building training plan was developed from the assessment.
- Five training sessions covered various aspects of operational skills.
- The 21 agencies that completed the initial assessment attended the training sessions.
- Peer-to-Peer networking sessions were facilitated by the project team.
- A nonprofit resource directory was developed by the project team and circulated to all the participating agencies.
- 3 resource tools (reference books) were given to the participants upon completion of the training.
Capacity Building Program Components and Completed Action Steps

STEP ONE: FOUNDATIONS OF EAST CHICAGO CAPACITY BUILDING ASSESSMENT

Foundations of East Chicago provides a strong basis for nonprofit sustainability in the community. To enhance the ability of nonprofits funded by FEC to sustain their operations and services, the project team worked with FEC to identify the types of capacity building support already provided and to identify for FEC what is the most effective way to expand its capacity building capability. The project team participated in meetings with other consultants, FEC staff, and management to discuss current initiatives and to identify needs.

The project team organized the administration of the Foundation Core Capacity Assessment Tool (FCCAT)™ for FEC staff and board members. The FCCAT was administered to FEC during the month of July, 2015. The assessment looks at four key capacities: 1. Leadership Capacity; 2. Adaptive Capacity; 3. Management Capacity; and 4. Technical Capacity.

**Leadership Capacity** focuses on the ability of all organizational leaders to create and sustain the vision, inspire, model, prioritize, make decisions, provide direction and innovate, all in an effort to achieve organizational mission.

**Adaptive Capacity** measures an organization’s ability to monitor, assess, respond to, and create internal and external changes.

**Management Capacity** marks the organization’s ability to ensure the effective and efficient use of organizational resources.

**Technical Capacity** assesses the organization’s ability to implement all of the key organizational and programmatic functions.

The tool also looks at the organizational culture. Organizational culture consists of a foundation’s ability to empower grantees, its belief in grantees, and its capacity for re-energizing, and unifying. This aspect marks the environment and context in which the four aforementioned capacities operate.
Results

15 participants comprising all board members and management staff completed the survey. Assessment of each core capacity and its sub-capacities is based on a 300 point scale. A score of 230 or greater is considered to be showing strong capabilities; a score of 190 to 229 is satisfactory, and a score below 190 indicates potentially challenging capabilities. FEC’s overall capacity scores demonstrate a strong capability in leadership, management, and technical (244, 231, and 245). The foundation scored satisfactory in adaptive and organizational culture (scores of 229 and 226 respectively). While the foundation’s assessment depicts an exemplary operation, an in-depth analysis of the different components identify some potential challenges and areas of improvement. Here, we will provide a summary of the results but see Appendix 1 for an aggregate compilation of the survey responses of all 15 participants.

Leadership capacity measurements include advocacy; board leadership and strategy; internal and external leader influence; leader vision and strategy; and supporting diversity, equity and/or inclusion. The foundation’s capabilities in this area lie in its ability to formulate a clear vision which not only outlines the trajectory that the foundation wants to take, but incorporates how the organization relates to its larger environment. The foundation also has policies and programs in place in support of diversity, equity, and/or inclusion. Some potential challenging areas within leadership capacity speak to the foundation’s lack of or minimal involvement in community decisions; involving staff in the decision making process; board pool consideration; and un-willingness to get rid of programs that are not working.

Sub-capacity scores in adaptive capacity ranged from 209 to 245 with the highest performing aspects speaking to the foundation’s ability to create networks through connections with potential partners to discuss or solve problems and to develop and implement a strategic plan. Environmental learning seems to take place occasionally, leaving room for the potential to learn and adapt to some industry best practices. This shows that the foundation could potentially benefit from a more streamlined program evaluation process.
Management capacity scores range from 212 to 246. Internal communications and problem solving are areas that both the board and staff agreed to be on point. Communication is open, clear and constructive feedback exchanges occur often. All participants felt that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, along with the required knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOCs). While job descriptions are well outlined, the staff lacks benchmarks for performance assessment. Grant making process and grant strategy were two areas where participants would like to see more work done. Key themes included the foundation’s inability to effectively manage the budget for long-term sustainability, and the lack of mission alignment with grant making strategies.

The foundation’s technical capacity scores of 231 to 257 all fell within the strong category. This section of the evaluation assesses the organization’s ability to implement all of the key organizational and programmatic functions. The results show that the foundation does have adequate infrastructure and technological capacities for operational efficiency. The board and staff seem to have a good handle on the mission, governance, and policy directives of the organization. One area of improvement lies in the foundation’s ability to provide external communications that are consistent with the organization’s mission and vision. The internal grant making process currently serves its purpose of a smooth grant administration but the foundation is not linking its grantees to other potential funders.

The overall organizational culture score of 226 (satisfactory), which is a separate measure, demonstrates a notable handle of the environment and context in which the core capacities of leadership, adaptive, management, and technical operates. Specifically, this area of the assessment looked at:

**Empowering** promotes proactivity, learning, and a belief in the value and ability of staff and clients. The foundation score of 242 (strong) speaks to the organization’s ability to promote an environment of learning and belief in the value and abilities of its staff and grantees.

The board and staff **belief in grantees** ability to succeed score of 214 shows a potential gap in communication and capacity.
The ability to **re-energize** the work environment by supporting staff reflection on the work at hand, socialization, and interaction, seems to be an area of potential improvement for the foundation. While the foundation has enacted policies and programs in support of diversity, equity and inclusion, its needs to ensure that they are implemented properly so that no one group or individual is getting preferential treatment over others.

FEC’s overall capacity scores of 229 to 245 show a satisfactory to a strong capability in leadership, adaptive, management, technical, and organizational culture. These results, as discussed above, show that the overall operation of the foundation is commendable but a few recommended changes can make the operation exemplary.

**Recommendations**

Recommended leadership, programmatic and operational changes includes:

- The foundation should seek to build stronger community relationship by getting involved and participating in community decision making.
- Increase board training and seek to diversify future board membership based on value added skills.
- Empower and involve staff in brainstorming and programmatic changes within the organization.
- Improve its program evaluation tool to effectively weed out programs that are not meeting the goals of the organization.
- Take into account research and industry best practices in their programmatic and decision making processes.
- Re-vamp its current program evaluation and monitoring system to allow for meaningful learning and acting.
- Re-evaluate and redesign the grant making strategy and process
- Ensure that its external communication message and use of social media is consistent with the mission and vision of the organization.
- Foster a work environment where all employees feel equally treated.

The FCCAT exercise allowed the foundation’s board and staff to evaluate its leadership, adaptive, management, and technical capacities. Furthermore, it also assessed the overall
organizational cultural environment in which these capacities operate. It helps the foundation identify internal and external strengths and weaknesses and offers some recommended changes.

STEP TWO: NONPROFIT CAPACITY BUILDING ASSESSMENT

In 2014, 26 grantees of FEC were selected to participate in capacity building assessment. Drawing upon theories on Capacity Building, four lifecycle stages were identified for the study: 1. Impact Expansion; 2. Infrastructure Development; 3. Core Program Development; and 4. Stagnation.

Within a company life-cycle, the Impact Expansion stage expresses the organization’s ability to lead, manage, discover, adapt, and fund activities that are embedded in both its mission and vision. Throughout the Impact Expansion stage the focus is on the changes that occur within the community in which the organization operates.

The stage of Infrastructure Development marks an organization’s ability to primarily lead, manage, explore, adapt, and fund the operation and infrastructure to take the core program to scale.

Within an organization’s lifecycle, Core Program Development phase represents the organization’s ability to lead, manage, explore, adapt, and fund its own core programs.

Within each lifecycle, organizations must focus on four core areas of capacity: Adaptive Capacity, Leadership, Management, and Technology.

Adaptive Capacity refers to an organization’s ability to monitor, assess, respond to, and create external and internal changes. Leadership capacity refers to the organization’s leader’s ability to create and sustain the vision, inspire, model, prioritize, make decisions, provide directions, and innovate, all in an effort to achieve the organizational mission. Management capacity refers to the organization’s ability to ensure the effective and efficient use of organizational resources. Technology capacity is the organization’s ability to implement all of the key organizational and programmatic functions.
Results

Among the 26 non-profit organizations selected by the FEC for the study, 21 completed the survey. Table 1 summarizes the lifecycle overall scores for the 21 organizations that completed the survey. The order of the organizations is based on their stages of development within their lifecycle, color-coded as in the original CCAT reports provided to the FEC for each organization that completed the survey.

The lifecycle of an organization begins with the Core Program Development Stage. It continues with the Infrastructure Development and it culminates into the Impact Expansion Stage. The impact expansion stage often leads to changes that allow the organization to survive in a continuously evolving environment. In some cases, organizations that fail to expand and change, succumb to the external changes of the environment facing what is identified as a stagnation stage. A glance at the survey results suggests that, among the 21 organizations that completed the study, 4 are now facing the impact expansion stage (see Table 1 color coded brown). Eight are still in the infrastructure development stage; and, the remaining 9 (43.0% of the total respondents) are still in the Core Program Development Stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Core Program Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure Development</th>
<th>Impact Expansion</th>
<th>Did NOT Complete Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bethany Retreat House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We Care from the Heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communities In Schools of Lake County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indiana Parenting Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>East Chicago Carnegie Performing Arts Center, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Holistic Community Coalition NFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>East Chicago Urban Enterprise Association Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Food Bank of Northwest Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mission of Jesus Christ Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana Federation Interfaith Organizations, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Salvation Army East Chicago Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s Carmelite Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Healthy East Chicago, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Chicago Education Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Croatian Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. Stanislaus Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I Too Sing America Organization of NWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teens in Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club of Northwest Indiana, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Workforce Development Services, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Faith Temple Church of God in Christ, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sociedad Civica y Cultural La Reforma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Xel-Ha Escuela de Danza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Community Fellowship Outreach Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Achievement of Chicago/Northwest Indiana area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

Impact Expansion Nonprofit Organizations: Based on the responses to the survey, the organizations that are in the Impact Expansion stage are doing well in Core Program and Infrastructure Development showing that they have a solid base upon which to build further activities and expand the mission and vision of the organization. Their programs seem to be well linked to the mission and vision and these organizations have systems in place that allow them to operate smoothly. The following recommendations apply to all the organizations that are currently in the Impact Expansion stage: We encourage these organizations to consider their Impact Expansion including broadening the organization’s approach to achieving impact expansion beyond its core programs. This may include strategic alliances, partnerships, policy/advocacy work or further outreach in the community.

Infrastructure Development Nonprofits: For those organizations that are currently in the Infrastructure Development stage: we recommend a focus on Impact Expansion, including aspects of capacity building that address broadening the organization’s approach to achieving impact expansion beyond the organization’s core programs. This may include strategic alliances, partnerships, policy/advocacy work or further outreach in the community. It is important to note, however, that the development of an organization’s effectiveness is an additive process, so a continued focus on more effective and efficient Infrastructure and Core Program Development will always be important to consider throughout the organization’s lifecycle.

Core Development Nonprofit: For those organizations that are still in the Core development stage we recommend that the Leaders/administrators consider the organization’s Core Program Development. Close alignment between their programs and mission/vision – and clarity within the organization as to how they relate – are critical to the foundation of each organization’s effectiveness. If the organization is just starting out, leaders/administrators may want to think more about how to clearly articulate the mission and vision and apply it to developing their programs. For those established organization, we believe it is best to go back and ensure that there is a strong connection
between the organization’s programs and its mission/vision in order to build the capacity or the organization. The prioritized set of recommendations that we provide to each organization represent some of the strategies for enhancing their core program development, based on the results of their organization’s capacity assessment participation and our research on which areas are most critical for organizations at their stage of capacity building.

While we were able to provide overarching recommendations to the nonprofit organizations based on their lifecycle stages, the project team conducted a micro analysis of the four areas of capacity to gain more depth into the capacity issues facing the organizations. Regardless of lifecycle stage some common themes shared by all organizations emerged. **Table 2** depicts such themes.
Table 2: Micro analysis of CCAT Core Capacity Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCAT Core Areas of Capacity</th>
<th>Shared Capacity Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational Resource Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve financial sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding stream diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Resource Adaptability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scale back programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hire more staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce organization’s reliance on a single leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program staffing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff alignment/restructuring/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross training, retention and volunteer management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Financial management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fundraising/grant capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff financial skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supporting staff resources needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Carefully constructed job descriptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well-defined roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Employee motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing relevant benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employee development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outreach, advocacy and marketing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff skill development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legal expertise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fundraising/grant capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facility management</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the organizations along with FEC staff members were invited to a meeting to go over the survey results and brainstorm on what the organizations might need moving forward. The meeting was held at the foundation’s facility on May 12, 2014. The general discussion of goals and concerns centered on the following issues:

- Workshop is encouraging organizations to evaluate their internal strengths and challenges – might be beneficial for them to conduct SWOT analysis
- Promoting thinking differently
- Collaboration is vital – leads to growth
- Difference between partnership and collaboration
- Organizations have goal of advancing fundraising
- Need to create and maintain authentic connections
- Request for knowledge of services that all organizations provide - and the depth of those services
- Sustainability through connections
- Reference manual/user guide – include contact information for all organizations
- Request for knowledge of other organizations’ missions
- Concern of time requirement – takes time to build relationships and develop trust – many organizations have only one (or small) staff and cannot dedicate the time
- Size of organization can lead to different problems – not same issues for all organizations
- Sustainability not equal to fundraising
- Becoming better organization is more important than fundraising
- Networking opportunities are key – cannot operate as islands – must eliminate silos
- Change and developing partnerships does not lead to loss (loss of control, standing, etc.)
- Trust is paramount
- Educate others on what organizations can and cannot do – challenges, restrictions, etc.

A separate meeting with the board their perspective, thoughts and goals mainly centered on these key issues.

**Leadership/management**

- Mobilize organizations through advocacy at city and state
- How can FEC provide help needed to be an effective collaborator
- How can FEC help each provider work successfully with FEC’s mission?
- Refer to (or look at) the experience of providers and their services and successes in meeting community’s needs
Sustainability/long-term viability

- Organization needs to be able to build long-term support
- Think outside the box
- How will the plan make the community better over time

Impact

- Impact that is measureable
- Clear goals for impact
- Meaningful request or project that addresses the mission
- How is project or organization impacting the community
- Best practices – history of successful projects (per organization)
- Investment that makes long-term impact
- True investment in the growth of community and its residents
- Not interested in Band-Aids or quick fixes – but rather changes in the way the populace thinks and/or does things
- How are lives being improved

Funding/grant management

- Current track record of grant fidelity
- Demonstrate how organization has successfully used funds previously
- Fundraising tools that build organization’s capacity/sustainability

Advocacy/community relations/marketing/collaboration

- Improve community perception
- Is the organization meeting objectives
- What makes organization effective

It is from this conversation with the foundation board, staff, nonprofit organization and our micro analysis of the CCAT survey results that the project team derived some group training and facilitation on key capacity issues as outlined in step three below.

STEP THREE: GROUP TRAINING/FACILITATION ON KEY CAPACITY ISSUES

After it was determined what leadership skills are needed to enhance nonprofit performance, the team developed and delivered workshops on key capacity issues. The group training began with an orientation and training session on the value of creating a peer network. All nonprofits that completed the CCAT evaluation in phase one were invited to participate in training sessions. On this date the nonprofits organizations were informed that capacity building training sessions would be held in the areas of
organizational culture, leadership, operational management, adaptive capacity, and sustainability. The organizations were also introduced to the concepts of knowledge sharing and peer networks. They were encouraged to think of all participating nonprofits as peer resources to support future capacity building efforts.

Four capacity training sessions were held in June 2015 and two in February 2016. The topics covered were chosen after careful review of the CCAT results. The topics were chosen to meet the core needs of the FEC nonprofits and to build the nonprofit peer network. The final sessions were developed to integrate all the different aspects of the previous four sessions. Table 3 outlines the schedule of sessions along with a brief description of each session.
### Table 3: Capacity Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Training Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Who Attends?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Introduction to the capacity building process; assessment of nonprofit organizational culture</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Sustainability</td>
<td>Training on staff/board leadership best practices</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Staffing &amp; Staff Resources</td>
<td>Training focused on staff alignment, cross training and skill development</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 17, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sustainability &amp; Adaptability</td>
<td>Training on change, managing change and creating/maintaining sustainable organizations</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmarks of a Sustainable Nonprofit</td>
<td>Training on strategic tools to achieve sustainability</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>February 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming Highly Impactful</td>
<td>Discussion on what is takes to be impactful</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>February 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all sessions, the nonprofit organizations used the results of the previously administered CCAT as a reference point for developing their plans for improving capacity. All participants began with a review of their organizational culture. Then the participants developed strategies for advancing improvements in the critical areas of leadership sustainability, management of staff and resources, resource sustainability and adaptability. The nonprofits used the information provided in the capacity building training sessions to guide the development of their strategies.

At the end of the fourth training session held on June 24, 2015, all the participants were asked to write a memo to FEC outlining the top two or three priorities that will be addressed as a result of the capacity building training and CCAT assessment. The organizations were asked to reflect on the following three questions:
• What do you think is the most important change your organization has to go through to remain sustainable?

Create clearer criteria and measurement tools to use to determine the effectiveness of the organization’s programs.

Culture: Communication on the operational and organizational level. We have to make sure that all groups/departments understand and can articulate the mission within the context of the work that is being performed. So important since everyone is involved in the communities in which we work, at various levels.

That everyone has the same information at the same time, so the messaging can be clear and everyone is able to perform in the same direction.

• How are you going to create the capacity to adapt to change?

Often times we do what we do because we have been doing it for years. The assumption is made that the program/service is useful to the Enterprise Zone residents and businesses. Enhanced better defined measurement tools and criteria for programs will yield more meaningful assessment information; which will allow for development of programs and services that are better suited for residents and better assist businesses.

During the past several months, actions have moved us into a period of change. We will establish a strategic team that will work collectively and/or individually to brainstorm ways in which our communication system is solid and therefore help to foster the desired culture of the organization. We need the right people, at the right time, in the right place.

Increasing our board engagement is critical if we are to move forward. Increasing meeting attendance and everyone’s understanding of our goals is important to get things done.

Strengthening working relationships between board members would help reinforce our efforts by having everyone feel accountable to each other and more likely to follow-through with tasks.

• How are you going to embed this process in your day to day operations?

Create annual timelines so that programs aren’t just ongoing. This will establish baseline numbers and also allow one period to be to be measured against another.

Over time collected data can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program or service and the organization can adapt as necessary.
Create tracking mechanisms so that the organization can assess long term success.

Annually revisit the mission of the organization to ensure the programs and services are remaining true to the mission.

Instill in leadership the need to adhere to the criteria in carrying out programs.

When applicable; site visits should include all segments of leadership.

Annually evaluate programs to ensure organization is being fiscally responsible in allocating funds to the program or service.

Create and conduct a pre & post survey with our stakeholders

Brainstorm ways in which we can successfully measure our results within the parameters of a specific timeline. Then finally share the results with our stakeholders and implementation results.

We need to bring on more board members so we can lighten the load on current members. We also need to make expectations clear upon bringing on new board members

By having a set onboarding process and staying loyal to it, creating an orientation meeting for new members, and holding a staff retreat to help build relationships within our group.

The answers above will give FEC an idea of what the organization’s see as the most important changes they have to make to remain sustainable and how they are going to create the capacity to adapt to change.

To complement the aforementioned training sessions, the project team introduced and facilitated the process of building peer networks amongst the nonprofits to further engage them in a collective learning, sharing and collective impact effort.

STEP FOUR: PEER NETWORKS BASED ON NEEDS OF COMMUNITY AND ORGANIZATIONS

The results of the CCAT survey administered to the 26 nonprofits in the first phase of the project provided critical information for designing the peer network. Using the CCAT results, the project team was able to identify and group the nonprofits according to their stage of development and their strengths and challenges. This information served as the basis for designing the peer support network. Once the framework was created, we used the results to help design the training sessions. For instance, in a training session on leadership capacity building we placed the nonprofit organizations with strong leadership capacity in a mentoring position. Through shared stories and experiences the nonprofit
organizations learned best practices from one another and built relationships based on trust that will later serve as a valuable peer resource.

While not part of the original proposed work, the project team determined that a Peer Network Resource Guide would be beneficial to the participating nonprofits. The team prepared a resource that will provide critical information including contact information and mission statements. The nonprofits can use this guide to maintain contact with their peers. Table 4 outlines the peer-to-peer training schedule.

Table 4: Peer-to-Peer Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Who Attends?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Reinforce concepts delivered in leadership training session; guide peer-to-peer discussions on governance</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Volunteer Management</td>
<td>Reinforce concepts discussed in management training session; facilitate peer-to-peer discussions on best practices</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 17, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning</td>
<td>Reinforce concepts discussed on organizational sustainability including funding presentation, discussion and financial sustainability</td>
<td>All nonprofits</td>
<td>June 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process Summary

Throughout the project we:

- Worked closely with FEC and the relevant stakeholders
- Utilized several different methods of building collaborative relationships between the nonprofit organizations including community of practice methods
- Used best practices to deliver high quality knowledge to nonprofits in the areas most needed so they are able to advance to the next lifecycle stage if a decision is made to do so
- We bring all organizations in a particular lifecycle stage together to discuss how best to increase their capacity by sharing ideas and/or resources. In the end, the
nonprofit organizations would have a way to share their expectations and learn best practices from one another lead by the project team.

Final Evaluation Survey

At the February 18, 2016 project wrap-up and training meeting, 12 participating nonprofits completed a 21-question survey based on the topics and conversations we had during the capacity building training. On Likert scale of 0 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the nonprofits were asked questions regarding the structure and delivery of the training program. The graph below shows the responses to the questions.
The participants also provided feedback on four open-ended questions.

**How would you improve this workshop?**

- Provide better information before the workshop.
- Clarify the workshop objectives.
- Increase the content covered in the workshop.
- Make the workshop more difficult.
- Shorten the time for the workshop.
- Make workshop activities more stimulating.
- Add more video to the workshop.
- Speed up the pace of the workshop.

**What other improvements would you recommend for these workshops?**

- Monthly workshops provide CEU’s at end of the session.
- Be clear about who is to attend.
- Provide more resources to take back to the organization.
- More stats.
- Build in more interaction between participants.
- Don’t believe the right people for our organization are in the room.
- There were a number of PowerPoint presentations. I would have loved to have a copy.
- Begin at stated time, not 1.2 hour later.
- Give organization the freedom to attend topics of help to this particular organization. It is a terrible waste of our very precious time to be ‘mandated’ to attend components that are not relevant.
- Some of the material was too repetitive and some too basic.
- Begin on time.
- I learned a lot. Used what I learned to improve many aspects of our NPO.
- Perhaps splitting up non-profits by size. As a larger organization, some of the things discussed are not in my control, and therefore were not relevant.

**What is the least valuable about these workshops?**

- As is typical many of the organizations differ in significant ways and it is hard to generalize particularly as if relates to boards.
- Most of the content does and apply to our organization and yet we were ‘mandated’ to attend.
- Both benefits and values valuable.
- Only those topics that did not apply to my role within my organization, such as strategic planning, leadership and governance. Those are important for smaller non-profits though, so I understand the need to cover them.
What is the most valuable about these workshops?

- Knowing the organization in the community.
- Realization on what elements constitute a healthy organization and how to be better for the organization and self.
- Making connections that have been overlooked and under-utilized. Also it made me go back and clean up some unresolved issues.
- Becoming more familiar with other organizations and the people running them.
- The comments of the participants.
- For me board engagement their importance, and how to get them actively engaged in a natural way.
- To hear different perspectives.
- Networking, board management information, funding, diversification, information, the resource guide and books provided. Sitting down with Denise Dillard for a 1 on 1.

Next Steps: Measuring Performance

The Foundations of East Chicago capacity building challenges and opportunities have been the focus of this project. The main purpose was to assist the FEC in its effort to assess its grantee in order to improve the foundation’s grant making capacity and resource allocation. The team administered the Core Capacity Assessment Tool (CCAT), a 146-question online survey that measures a nonprofit organization’s effectiveness in relation to four core capacities—leadership, adaptability, management, and technical capacities—as well as organizational culture to the 26 selected nonprofits. The tool helps organizations identify their lifecycle stage and provides a real-time findings report, a prioritized capacity-building plan.

The results helped the project team and the FEC make several determinations: (i) determine the life cycle stage of the organizations, (ii) identify capacity gaps and (iii) the make recommendations on the capacity areas to be addressed. Furthermore, the data helped the project team evaluate and make strategic recommendations in the areas of institutional and programmatic capacity. Capacity building training and peer-to-peer networking was provided to the different organizations.
At this junction, the nonprofits will benefit from strategic objective development, program planning and management, leading to the implementation of key performance measures that are outcome oriented. This will give them the ability to compare their deliverables to a set of key performance indicators or set of benchmarks overtime.
Appendix 1: FEC Board and Staff Input

Leadership Capacity

Advocacy:

- developing endowment plan
- We can do more in regards to promoting our core focus areas. As the Foundation continues to define what we will concentrate our funding on, we need to identify more organizations and/or movements that are aligned with these areas. Once these are identified, we can look for ways we can become more involved with them. To this point, we have not gone out of our way to associate ourselves with agencies and/or causes that reflect our core values outside of just awarding them funding. This is an area ripe for improvement

Board Leadership:

- Rethinking and adapting to change
- Updating policies and procedures and goals since the birth of Foundations of East Chicago 18 years ago, FEC has followed the "Governance and Best Practices" models of the "Council on Foundations" which is comprised of numerous Foundations and entrepreneurs worldwide.
- Using these models and the knowledge of community leaders from all professional backgrounds, FEC created a mission statement and a strategic plan for sustainability.
- The Board can do more to learn about the work the staff does and have a better understanding of what they do. This will assist them in making governance decisions that more align with what is occurring on a day-to-day basis. This will also enable them to speak in more authoritative tones regarding the work of the Foundation and make informative decisions about the future of the organization.
- All the necessary information for effective governance". Learn our policies and continued discussion on them for more effectiveness. "All the necessary information all the time."
External Leaders Influence:

- people talk to us; we are on the streets of EC
- Need: establish better communication with community leaders taking into consideration their main intentions
- FEC identifies (external) leaders of the E.C. community and where appropriate, seeks collaboration and attempts to partner with them to better the city and its resident
- Board and staff members (internal leaders) are very visible in the community and are encouraged to engage with young and old for idea
- We need to do more in regards to interacting with stakeholder associations in the region. We need to develop stronger relationships with them so they know more about us and what we do. This way, they will be able to speak up in public and private forums in which the Foundations are being spoken about or should be brought into the conversation even if no one directly associated with the Foundations is present. This will increase our visibility and strengthen our brand.
- Establishing better communication with community leaders taking into consideration their main intentions

Internal Leader Influence:

- We can do a better job in allowing the natural leadership qualities of our staff to be utilized in regards to activities of the Foundation. Therefore, it will not fall only on one or two individuals to be the leader and public representation of the Foundation.

Leader Vision and Strategy:

- The vision and direction that the Board has for the Foundation does not at all times appear to be in complete harmony with the Staff and Grant committee. While they may not be opposite of each other, there needs to be more opportunities for the Board to communicate its overall vision for the Foundation to the staff and committee members and vice versa.
- While the Board’s vision is the final word, having input from staff and committee's will help strengthen the overall Foundation strategies.
Leadership Sustainability: budgeted monies for board/staff attendance at seminars or CE;

• Need: make stronger efforts to cultivate staff members and other candidates about leadership transitions.
• There could be more done regarding encouraging more staff and board members to attend learning opportunities (Conferences, webinars, seminars etc.) This is where the true learning regarding the field of philanthropy occurs. As people learn more about this field, they will be more inclined to take on leadership roles within the Foundation and in areas they normally would not work in.
• Make stronger efforts to cultivate staff members and other "candidates" about leadership transitions.

Support Diversity:

• grant committee is diverse group of individuals; retired, extensive background in workforce and community; board staff and grant committee are diverse
• The Grant Committee needs to bring more diverse voices on the committee. Need younger individuals who currently work in the education and health fields. There is also a need for more professionals on the committee. There is a danger for too many like-minded individuals to become the majority of decision makers. Cultivating and encouraging more individuals with different thoughts and viewpoints will help the Foundations make better informed decisions for all.
Adaptive Capacity Scores

Creating Networks

• As we continue to develop a database demonstrating the needs of our grantees, I believe the opportunity to increase our score in this category will increase. As we learn more about the needs of our grantees, we will then be able to reach out to organizations and individuals who are experts in these areas. We will then be able to connect not only our grantees, but Board members, Committee members and staff to these resources as well. As this process continues, we as staff and Board members need to look for opportunities to network with individuals and organizations that we feel would be of current or future benefit to our grantees.

Decision-Making Tools

• The development of a grant application rubric would greatly increase our ability to improve in this area. By having a rubric to evaluate the strength of applications, the grant committee would have a uniform tool to use to score applications. This will assist the committee in making funding decisions based more on the overall merit of the application and not their personal feelings about the authors of the grant. This rubric should also be made available to the grantees prior to their completing the application. By knowing what the Foundation will value within the application, they hopefully will write better proposals.

Environmental Learning

• We need to continue taking advantage of the information that is made available to us through the various funding networks and associations we are a part of. The field is constantly releasing new information about best practices regarding how to do philanthropy. We need to pay more attention to these resources and integrate them into our practices. This also occurs by attending more conferences and webinars.

• Need to make best efforts learning about what is going on in our community programs, agencies, community strategies.
Innovation and Experimentation

- I believe as we work on improving the other areas within this section, we will naturally become more comfortable with being more innovative and open to taking more risks with the way we currently invest in grantees. The thing to keep in mind is we must be more mindful of what the potential risks are with non-traditional program investment strategies and conduct due-diligence in ensuring we don’t end up doing more harm than good by not thinking things though. We also must educate the community that we can do more to be helpful than just fund programs.

Program Evaluation

- We are beginning to take steps to correct this area of weakness. As we begin to become more focused on the types of outcomes we want to see from our grantees, we will be able to develop the appropriate evaluation tools and measurement systems for our needs. This will come from improving the way we conduct site visits and restructuring our interim and exit reports so they better reflect the type of information we need to evaluate our giving decisions.
- Attention to the quality of evaluations.

Strategic Planning

- The process to improve this will take place later this month with the Board’s strategic planning retreat. The key from this development will be how closely we align our daily operations to the guidelines developed through the new plan

Management Capacity Scores

Grantmaking Process

- Improvement is needed of current grant procedures and policies which should include the revamping of grant applications/evaluation process.
- Apply better skills reviewing grant applications as we should pay more attention to need and merit.

Grantmaking Strategy

- FEC’s Pillars are too broad; discussion is needed to narrow focus and determine what area(s) FEC wants to make greater impact and how or what path to take to ensure our grantees understand our goals and objectives.
• FEC has begun the process of capacity building through shared learning activities with a select group of grantees.
• This process should be expanded to include other nonprofits. The Social Media Training workshop was successful with over 40 local providers attending. FEC should continue as a convener, organizing meetings and events where similar learning opportunities are offered, providing funds and free/low cost training to boost the abilities of the grantee’s capacity and the opportunity to share information. It’s not all about Programs and General Operating funding, but just as important providing training opportunities to our grantees to better understand FEC’s new direction in funding.

Internal Communications

• When employees become more specialized and focused, they often lose sight of the big picture. That’s when having effective internal communication becomes vital. As we moved into the Transition Phase, the Interim Executive Director has emphasized the importance of weekly/biweekly staff meetings. This has proven successful and provided employees an excellent platform to exchange ideas, information and questions. This also empowers staff to seek answers from their peers, strengthen connections among each other and transfer knowledge.

• It would be of benefit that all staff get involved (to some degree) in the grantmaking process and in attending site visits. So scholarship or admin division can understand the site visit process and get an understanding of what some of the grants are all about. Same with Grant department learning about the scholarship application and selection processes. Allowing staff to participate boosts their self-confidence, making their work experience better and opens the door to better interactions with current and future grantees. This improves staff knowledge, participation and the opportunity to provide input from a different perspective. It’s about learning together and identifying ways to work better and smarter.

Managing Staff Performance

• There is a need to finalize the staff processes manual, and encourage cross-training among staff, so if someone leaves or is off someone can fill in until the individual returns to work or position is filled. Continue to encourage staff training, workshops, webinars, etc., not only within their comfort zone, but in other areas of nonprofit processes.

Problem Solving
• HR conflicts are usually resolved by the executive director who has an open door policy. It is also important to engage the Board President in the HR problem-solving process.

Technical Capacity Part 1

Evaluation Skills

Before we can make improvements on our current evaluation skills - staff, committee members and the Executive Board first need to be trained on the evaluation process. However, the first step is having precise and well defined pillars along with creating a shared vision.

Once this has been determined asking the right questions is key in the evaluation process. The following questions are just a few examples to aid us in improving our evaluation skills.

• What is the evidence that this type of project can be effective?
• Do proposed grant activities mesh with logic/theory supported by past evidence?
• Is this the most efficient way of achieving goals, or is there a better alternative?
• Is this the best use of foundation money?
• Are there alternative uses of resources that would yield greater benefits?
• What have we learned what works?

External Communication Skills

• Providing educational Webinars on FEC’s website, forward promotional materials form grantees to SMDG, place the list of current grants on the front page of FEC’s website, distribute newsletter to the community, provide specific directions to our clients on how to send a Press Release to our local newspapers, and continue to develop a Provider Directory.

Facilities

• FEC’s conference rooms and Healthy East Chicago’s classrooms one and two appear to have ample space, equipment and amenities to provide a conducive learning environment

Facility Management Skills

• Assign only one FEC staff to schedule all external meetings with outside organizations. This will eliminate duplication and RSVP’s will be given to just one person

Grantmaking Adaptability
• Our past flexibility may be looked at as a hindrance due to the fact we were open to new opportunities but we lacked specific direction.
Technical Capacity – Part 2

Grantmaking Budget Skills

- In regards to managing our Grantmaking budget from a Foundation standpoint, we are improving. As we continue to educate the Grant Committee they are not obligated to award every dollar allocated per grant round, we lessen the chances that we will go over budget. In addition, as we eliminate special, out of cycle, line item grants, we will be able to stay within a set budget. One additional area we need to continue to work on is forcing the Scholarship committee to stay within budget and not overspend. One way to assist in this area is to do a better job in forecasting the number of potential scholarship applicants at the beginning of each year and allocate the proper amount of funds to cover the need.

Grantmaking Skills

- We will continue to improve in this area as staff goes about learning additional best practices from the field and we incorporate those practices within our day to day grant making process

Knowledge of Nonprofit Organization Effectiveness

- As we learn more about the non-monetary needs of our grantees, we will be able to create more assistance programs to address this issue. The key will be our willingness to provide these services and encourage our grantees to take advantage of them

Legal Skills

- Staff and Board members need to become more educated in basic nonprofit legal methodologies and terminologies so we can make educated evaluations of legal situations that do not call for engaging our legal team. We should also look to bring on more individuals both on the Board and staff level who have legal backgrounds to improve our expertise in this area.

Mission-Related Investing Skills

- We can charge our Investment committee to engage our money managers to look for and suggest opportunities that we could invest in companies that align with our Grantmaking focus. This could be especially useful with companies that are local or have an impact on our community.
- Check on adaptability and flexibility when granting monies.
Technology

- We need to continue to encourage our Board members and grant committee members to take advantage of all the various forms of technical communication available. We should eventually become a paperless organization in all aspects of Grantmaking and grant evaluation. This will be assisted with upgrading our grant management software (MicroEdge).

Technology Skills

- We need to continue looking for training opportunities for Board and Staff to be as knowledgeable about how to maximize the operational capabilities of the technology we utilize in the office. Similar to when we participated in the office-wide Gifts training and the social media classes.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is the behavior of humans within an organization and the meaning that people attach to those behaviors. Culture includes the organization’s vision, values, norms, systems, symbols, language, assumptions, beliefs, and habits.

Our grantees are stuck in their organizational ways. As their source of funding it is up to us to ensure they are successful through training (capacity building, social media, etc.) Providing continued capacity building opportunities for staff and grantees is important. FEC believes in their grantees and wants them to succeed therefore providing them with the necessary training and devaluation tools is vital. We want our grantees to be able to better the community but FEC realizes there are changes that need to be made which is why the trainings were implemented. If a grantee’s program is well structured and implemented correctly this instills a belief in the grantee from the point of view of FEC staff.

Belief in Grantees

- FEC believes in the community it serves. As staff, we need to be more involved and learn as much as we can about our grantees and the services they provide. We don’t only want to provide funding for these grantees but we want to provide a level of comfort as well. We want them to understand that they can come to FEC staff before and when a problem arises. Grantees need to know every member of FEC staff so that they feel comfortable addressing concerns so that we may offer support or direction.
- To this point, we have been funding organizations more for who is associated with them rather than what they do. This has caused the staff to not have the greatest trust that the organizations will be able accomplish what they stated they will do.
They also damage their relationship with staff when they do not follow through with providing the proper reporting as requested. As we take more steps to improve the operational capacity of our grantees, and become more selective in who we fund, this relationship will improve.

Empowering

- Because of the management style of our previous Executive Director, our Program Staff (even though very capable and knowledgeable) appeared confused at times on what was expected from the board. We succeeded in making corrections in-house before issues were irreparable
- The staff needs to be aware of all events (meetings, site visits, etc.) that the grantees are having in case the staff would like to attend. Attending the events will help staff learn more about the grantees and what they do or are planning to do. Site visits offer an opportunity for staff to engage with grantees and perhaps provide valuable input on possible partnerships/networking opportunities that may favorably impact the grantees program and the community it serves. We would like to see all of our grantees succeed FEC is a team and our goal is to work together to better the community. We can only do so if we are aware of what is going on in the community. The more we know about our community the more we can help one another. I believe FEC works well as a Team and by empowering one another we will become even better. We should always have room to grow and learn and expand our expectations.
- While we provide funding to organizations, they need more than just dollars from us. They need the assistance and guidance from our professional staff to help them as they mature as organizations. We need to provide more training for organizations so they will become better equipped to operate. We can also develop more opportunities with our social media consultants to find was to highlight and celebrate the accomplishments of our grantees even if we did not directly fund it.

Re-energizing

- FEC staff appears to be more focused and mission oriented rather than disconnected with each other.
- FEC now has in place an Interim Director who clearly understands the community and has the skills to re-energize and empower the staff
- We need to be more encouraging to staff members to find learning and self-improvement opportunities to participate in that makes them better professionally and personally. By providing opportunities for staff to take part in these programs, they will become more engaged employees.
Unifying

- This process is improving, but there needs to be a corporate culture and environment that encourages open two way dialogue between the Board and Staff and between staff direct reports and their supervisors. This has improved over the years, but there still needs to be strong messaging from the leadership that this form of communication is not only encouraged but is expected and there will be no negative repercussions directed to the individual.
Appendix 2: Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

Please complete the following questions to assist us in completing this study. The questions should be answered by one individual per organization. Your organization’s identity should NOT be placed anywhere on this form.

1. Is your organization a 501(c) (3)?
   Yes  or  No

2. If you answered yes to Question One, how many years have you been a 501(c) (3)?
   _______

3. Does your organization have a paid Executive Director?
   Yes  or  No

4. How many paid staff does your organization employ?
   _______

5. How many volunteer staff does your organization use to conduct everyday activities? ______

6. How long have you been affiliated with the organization in the capacity of a paid employee or unpaid volunteer? ______years  ______months

7. How many of the 5 (four) training sessions did you attend (including this one)? ______

Please circle your response to the questions listed on the next page.

Rate aspects of the workshop on a 1 to 5 Scale:

1 = "Strongly disagree," or the lowest, most negative impression

3 = "Neither agree nor disagree," or an adequate impression

5 = "strongly agree," or the highest, most positive impression

Choose N/A if the item is not appropriate or not applicable to this workshop. Your feedback is sincerely appreciated. Thank you.
WORKSHOP CONTENT (Please circle your response to each item.)

1=strongly disagree  2=Disagree  3=neither agree nor disagree  4=Agree  5=strongly agree
N/A=Not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I was well informed about the objectives of the workshops
2. This workshop lived up to my expectations.
3. The content is relevant to my organization.

WORKSHOP DESIGN (Please circle your response to each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The workshop objectives were clear to me.
5. The workshop activities stimulated my learning.
6. The workshop activities encouraged interaction with fellow participants
7. The activities in this workshop gave me sufficient practice and feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The time allotted for each workshop was too long.
9. The time allotted for each workshop was too short.
10. The day/time of each workshop was convenient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The difficulty level of this workshop was appropriate.
12. The pace of this workshop was appropriate.

WORKSHOP INSTRUCTORS (Please circle your response to each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The instructors were well prepared.
14. The instructors were helpful.

WORKSHOP RESULTS (Please circle your response to each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I accomplished the objectives of this workshop.
16. I will be able to use what I learned in this workshop.
17. The workshop was a good way for me to learn how to increase the capacity of our organization to serve the community
18. How would you improve this workshop? (Check all that apply.)

___Provide better information before the workshop
___Clarify the workshop objectives
___Reduce the content covered in the workshop.
___Increase the content covered in the workshop.
___Update the content covered in the workshop.
___Improve the instructional methods
___Make workshop activities more stimulating
___Improve workshop organization
___Make the workshop less difficult
___Make the workshop more difficult
___Slow down the pace of the workshop
___Speed up the pace of the workshop
___Allot more time for the workshop
___Shorten the time for the workshop
___Improve the tests used in the workshop.
___Add more video to the workshop

19. What other improvements would you recommend for these workshops?

20. What is least valuable about these workshops?

21. What is most valuable about these workshops?
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