An Evaluation of the Omaha Community Foundation's Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative – Cohort 3

Catherine Humphries Brown and Angela M. Eikenberry
University of Nebraska at Omaha

June 2013

Contents

Executive Summary

This report provides information to help the Omaha Community Foundation assess its Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative (NCBI). The questions that guided this evaluation were:

1. What has been the impact of the NCBI?
2. How could the process for managing and administering the NCBI be improved?

The NCBI has been funded by the Omaha Community Foundation since early 2010[1] and is one of several programs available in the Omaha area designed to strengthen the nonprofit community. The NCBI is perhaps distinct from these in that it offers participants greater opportunities for self-reflection and a more confidential environment. These opportunities and environment may foster different types of relationships among participants. In addition, the NCBI is designed to focus not only on leaders, but also the organization as a whole—as evidenced by the grant funding for organizational development and the focus on strategic planning. Lastly, there is no cost to participants.

The NCBI is perceived to have had a positive impact on the people and organizations that participated. Although each organization is unique and the Initiative was tailored slightly differently to each, participants said that the Initiative had a positive impact on both their organization and their own professional development. Additionally, in surveys, executive directors of participating organizations reported increased organizational capacity in 31 out of 40—or 77.5 percent—of areas assessed. Additionally, participants in the 2012-2013 NCBI more often reported positive changes in organizational capacity when compared to other, similar organizations in the Omaha-Council Bluffs area. More details on these interview and survey findings are included in the text that follows.

The recommendations for the Omaha Community Foundation that emerged based on the findings and a review of best practices in nonprofit capacity building are:

1. Continue to use mechanisms that were successful in enabling the translation of ideas into practice (for example, the focus on strategic planning and the content and structure of the monthly meetings for participants).
2. Consider replacing or altering the SVP version of the McKinsey assessment with a more accessible organizational assessment tool.
3. Consider other programmatic changes suggested by participants. These include addressing ethics more fully among the roundtable topics, updating some materials, explaining how this program differs from others, making roundtable materials available electronically, posting NCBI evaluations to the Omaha Community Foundation's website, and publicizing organizations' participation in the NCBI.

---

[1] As of the writing of this evaluation report, three groups—or cohorts—of nonprofit organizations have participated in the Initiative. This evaluation report focuses on the 2012-13 cohort of organizations, which was the third such group to participate in the Initiative. The report also incorporates data from previous cohorts.

Program History and Design

Beginning in March 2012, The Omaha Community Foundation's Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative (NCBI) engaged a new cohort of ten nonprofit organizations in a 13-month long, multi-component program with the goal of helping these organizations develop or improve the infrastructure needed to better fulfill their respective missions. Of the applicants who met the basic eligibility criteria,[2] the following were selected for the 2012-13 cohort:

- Heart Ministry Center
- Heartland Equine Therapeutic Riding Academy (HETRA)
- Kent Bellows Foundation
- Latino Center of the Midlands
- Literacy Center
- Omaha Healthy Kids Alliance
- Phoenix Academy
- Ronald McDonald House Charities
- Urban League of Nebraska
- Youth Emergency Services[3]

This 2012-13 cohort represented the third group of organizations to participate in the NCBI. (For a list of the nonprofit organizations that comprised the 2010 and 2011 cohorts, see Appendix A.) The Omaha Community Foundation used the knowledge gained through its 2010 and 2011 NCBIs to refine this year's program. For example, rather than meeting separately from executive directors, as they had in the prior year, board leaders met jointly with executive directors. This change was a response to feedback from participants in the previous cohort and was intended to facilitate better connections between the two groups. More attention was also paid to enable participants to more quickly translate ideas into practice during the cohort year. Lastly, the program design was revised to place less emphasis on the use of consultant-supported projects, which had been an element of the program in prior years but met with mixed success.

The NCBI is one of several programs available in the Omaha area designed to strengthen the nonprofit community. Compared, at a general level, to these, the NCBI is perhaps distinct in that it offers participants greater opportunities for self-reflection and a more confidential environment. Such opportunities and this environment may foster different types of relationships among participants. In addition, the NCBI is designed to focus not only on leaders, but also the organization as a whole—as evidenced by the grant funding for organizational development and the focus on strategic planning. The inclusion of board members is perhaps also unique.

---

[2] Basic eligibility criteria for nonprofits applying for inclusion in the 2012-13 cohort were: 501(c)(3) status; at least two full time equivalent staff; an annual budget over $300,000; founded at least 5 years ago; and a history of sound financial position as indicated in audit or budget information. Additionally, applicants were asked to provide a written response to several questions.

[3] Youth Emergency Services did not complete the full year of the Omaha Community Foundation's 2012-13 Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative.

As in 2010 and 2011, the Initiative was largely organized and facilitated by a project director on contract with the Omaha Community Foundation and consisted of an approximately year-long effort centered on organizational capacity and leadership development.

The **organizational capacity building** component consisted of:

1. The online completion of an organizational capacity assessment tailored to nonprofit organizations (the Social Venture Partners version of the McKinsey Organizational Capacity Assessment) by board members, the executive director/CEO, and selected staff; followed by discussion during a board meeting of the findings with the project director.
2. Assistance, if needed, in developing or refining a strategic plan for the organization.
3. A grant of $5,000 through the Fund for Omaha.

The **leadership development component** targeted both executive directors/CEOs and board leaders (board chairs and vice chairs). This leadership development component consisted of half-day monthly roundtables. Executive directors/CEOs attended these meetings each month over the course of the year. Board leaders attended these meetings four times over the course of the year, alongside the executive directors/CEOs. These meetings included discussions and dissemination of tools related to: nonprofit leadership, the development of organizational narratives, team building, strategic planning, board development (roles and responsibilities, board reporting, recruitment, agendas, financial reporting, board self-assessment), dashboards/key indicators, and performance evaluation for the executive directors/CEOs.

Methodology

Data for this year's evaluation of the NCBI were gathered using interviews and surveys.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with the current cohort of executive directors/CEOs and board leaders were conducted during March-April 2013. In total, 15 interviews were conducted (9 executive directors/CEOs and 6 board leaders).[4] All nine executive directors were interviewed in person. Three of the six board leaders were interviewed in person. Three were interviewed by phone.

These interviews were used to gather information about each individual's experience with the Initiative over the course of the year, the impact of the Initiative, and how the Initiative could be improved. All interviews were recorded and notes were taken during the course of the interviews. Following Rubin and Rubin (2005), transcriptions of these notes were used to

---

[4] The executive director and the board leader of the organization in the 2012-13 cohort that did not complete the full year were excluded from the interviews. In addition, three of the nine board leaders were not interviewed, either because 1) they did not respond to initial as well as follow-up email and voicemail requests for interviews or, 2) they did respond to subsequent, follow up email and voicemail requests for interviews but, after multiple exchanges of messages, a time could not be found for an interview and/or stopped returning calls.

develop records of analysis that showed how various interviewees responded to each category of question. Once responses were summarized, they were reviewed in order to identify common overarching themes, as well as micro-level variation within these themes. Survey and documentary evidence was also used to corroborate and elaborate on these themes.

Surveys

Pre- and post-test survey data were used to evaluate the Initiative. Both surveys asked for basic respondent information as well as information relating to the organization's current capacity in terms of mission, program design, information technology, financial management, fund development, board leadership, and marketing and communications. These later questions were taken from the Social Venture Partners version of the McKinsey Assessment. The full set of questions for both the pre-test survey and the post-test survey is included in Appendix B.

A pre-test (or "baseline") survey was provided online in April 2012 to the two following groups:

1. Executive directors/CEOs of nonprofit organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list and have not participated in the NCBI, and
2. Executive directors/CEOs of nonprofit organizations participating in the 2012-13 NCBI and alumni of the NCBI (i.e. organizations that were part of either the first or second cohort for the NCBI).

The response rate for the first group (i.e. nonprofit organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list that have not participated in the NCBI) was 48 percent. In other words, the survey was completed by 131 of the 273 local nonprofit organizations that received the survey. The response rate for the second group (i.e. organizations participating in the 2012-13 NCBI) was 100 percent.

A post-test (or "follow-up") survey was provided online in April 2013 to the following groups:

1. Executive directors/CEOs of nonprofit organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list that: a) stated in the pre-test survey that they were willing to share their names and the names of their organization, and b) were comparable to organizations in the 2012-13 NCBI cohort in terms of budget size and organizational age (i.e. year formed),[5] as well as described their field of work as one that was the same as at least one of the organizations in the 2012-13 NCBI cohort, and
2. Executive directors/CEOs of nonprofit organizations participating in the 2012-13 NCBI.

The response rate for the first group was 60 percent. In other words, the survey was fully completed by 6 of the 10 local nonprofit organizations that received the survey. The response rate for the second group (i.e. organizations participating in the 2012-13 NCBI) was 78 percent. In other words, 7 out of the 9 organizations completed the survey.

---

[5] The literature on nonprofit capacity building points to budget size and organizational age as two factors that are related to the amount of change nonprofit organizations report, when these nonprofit organizations take part in capacity building programs (Abt Associates, 2010a; Abt Associates, 2010b).

Taken together, data from these surveys was used to investigate the extent to which nonprofit organizations that participated in the Initiative perceived changes relating to their organizational performance and capacity over the course of the year, as compared to organizations that did not take part in the Initiative. Results of these surveys are discussed in the sections that follow and in Appendix C.

There are several limitations that should be noted in interpreting the results of these surveys. First, as with any pre-test/post-test design (as opposed to a post-test only design) there is a validity threat posed by the act of testing. In other words, nonprofit organizations that are not participating in the NBCI, but take the pre-test, may benefit by the act of taking this test and possible resulting increased awareness of organizational strengths and weaknesses. Second, this approach does not provide information about the likelihood and extent to which reported changes would have occurred within these organizations even in the absence of the NCBI. In other words, any observed changes may or may not be directly attributable to the Initiative. As Abt Associates (2010, p. 2)—who also used a before/after method in their evaluation of a federally-funded nonprofit capacity building program— note, observed changes may be due to a range of factors other than the capacity building program itself. Third, because of the small sample size, tests of statistical significance are not appropriate and results are not generalizable to a larger population. Fourth, both the original McKinsey assessment tool and the SVP version derived from it are designed as tool for nonprofit managers to understand and track their own organization's capacity (Guthrie & Preston, 2005; McKinsey, 2001). In other words, they are meant to be used as self-assessment tools rather than tools to measure change over time. Nonetheless, such a survey instrument can provide some indication of whether or not organizations in the cohort have improved capacity in the areas of focus addressed by the NCBI.

Findings – Impact

For the 2012-13 cohort, participants reported that, overall, they had made progress and implemented needed changes at the organizational level. This is a slight change from prior years, in which participants felt that the Initiative had a positive impact on their organizations, but it was too soon to assess this impact fully. The majority of the executive directors interviewed spoke positively about the role that developing and implementing a strategic plan had played for their organization (and none spoke negatively about this). Additionally, executive directors also described impacts related to other aspects of the NCBI, beyond the grant and/or the strategic plan/strategic planning process, including growth from the use of grant funds, increased board accountability, improved performance measures, improved succession planning, and personal and professional development.

An emphasis on strategic planning was helpful

The majority of the executive directors spoke positively about the role that developing and implementing a strategic plan had played for their organization over the course of the 2012-2013 Initiative. For example, one executive director that took part in a process to revise their organization's strategic plan described the new plan as including "necessary" items for the

organization, as well as enabling the organization's staff and board to reach a point where they can be more strategic and visionary. Another said their organization's revised strategic plan was helpful to the board president in holding board members more accountable. A third said it was a great investment. A fourth executive director said they could see the strategic plan driving the work of the staff and board, and this is what should be happening. A fifth said that tracking the organization's progress against items in their revised strategic plan was helpful to the board in showing progress. In at least some cases, executive directors noted that the plans they developed focused on important but perhaps not strategic items, which by the end of the year were either overcome by events and no longer relevant or completed. In total, seven of the nine executive directors had positive comments about the emphasis on strategic planning for their organization. In addition, one had not yet conducted their strategic planning process (but planned to in the coming months). One other had no comments either positive or negative.

Grant funds supported strategic planning for most organizations, but were leveraged elsewhere too

Five of the nine organizations devoted at least some portion of the $5,000 grant funding associated with the Initiative to a strategic planning process facilitated by the project director (one also plans to have a strategic plan facilitated by a volunteer). The remaining three already had a strategic plan in place, and so were not required to use their grant funds to support the development of a strategic plan. These three, as well as those that held a balance after development of the plan, were able to leverage their funds to in other ways. Perhaps most notable in terms of the use of funds to increase organizational capacity is the Heartland Equine Therapeutic Riding Academy (HETRA). This organization used grant funds to increase the number of certified instructors from 11 to 15, which increased the number of certified instructors by more than one third. More details on how organizations spent the grant is provided in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Use of Grant Funds by 2012-13 Cohort	
Organization	*Use of Funds*
Heart Ministry Center	Development of a strategic plan; financial audit
Heartland Equine Therapeutic Riding Academy (HETRA)	Increase number of certified instructors from 11 to 15
Kent Bellows Foundation	Development of a strategic plan; development of a fundraising plan
Latino Center of the Midlands	Development of a strategic plan
Literacy Center	Development of a strategic plan; environmental scan; impact measures
Omaha Healthy Kids Alliance	Development of a strategic plan; conference attendance
Phoenix Academy	Development of a strategic plan
Ronald McDonald House Charities	
Urban League of Nebraska	Website development; publication of annual report

Other organizational-level impacts were reported as well

Executive directors also described impacts related to other aspects of the NCBI, beyond the grant and the strategic plan/the strategic planning process. Specifically, executive directors noted the following changes.

- Board feels like they have more accountability to themselves and each other, and/or feels more energized (2)
- Developed performance measures for programs and other aspects of the organization (2)
- Organization is more organized (e.g. has a more developed committee structure) and moving in a positive direction, in a general sense (2)
- Implemented and/or are better prepared in the areas of succession planning (2)
- The executive director and board have solidified an already strong relationship (1)
- More developed volunteer program (1)
- Critically analyzed the infrastructure and made infrastructure changes (1)
- Now have board meetings in which the board sets the agenda, and have learned ways to structure board meetings such that valuable time is not wasted and the focus is on the future, not the past (1)

Board members also described changes, though noted that it is difficult to distinguish the effects of the Initiative from other work happening within their organizations.
- More processes in place around management issues such as evaluation (1)
- Much more active board (1)
- Improved board composition (1)
- Have learned ways to structure board meetings such that the focus is on substance (1)
- Improved office morale (1)
- More efficient delivery of services (1)
- The establishment of committees (1)

In all these cases, it should be remembered, as one executive director pointed out, that the connection between the organization's participation in the NCBI and these impact may not be direct. Moreover, as another executive director noted, the process of capacity building is different for each organization. Additionally, comments from executive directors reflect that the process of change can be difficult; for example, four of the nine executive directors felt like, to varying extents, their board was not accepting the responsibility for the organization that they should. In some cases, board attrition occurred.

Monthly roundtable meetings offered professional and personal development

Executive directors also reported that the NCBI had a positive impact on their professional development. All executive directors attributed at least some part of this impact to the monthly roundtable meetings solely for executive directors. Among the types of impact executive directors reported were:

- The opportunity to connect with others and/or develop new relationships (4)
- The feeling that they had a support system that could also help them develop creative solutions to problems (3)
- Learning from listening to how others had solved problems (2)
- Feeling more comfortable, confident, and/or able to express concerns in their executive director role (2)
- Learning from feedback provided by the group (1)
- A heightened awareness of potential problems that nonprofit organizations might face, and greater attention to avoiding such problems (1)
- Seeing examples to which to aspire (1)
- Developing a greater understanding of nonprofit management as a discipline (1)
- The opportunity to speak in a safe environment (1)
- Feelings of greater ability to affect change (1)
- Feeling the ability to help others in the group (1)

Board members reported that, for themselves, there was:
- Learning from listening to how others had solved problems or approached issues, in general (3)
- Understanding better how nonprofits work, different types of boards; "giving voice to procedures and formal processes (3)

Survey findings support and reinforce interview findings about organizational-level impact

In surveys, executive directors of participating organizations reported increased organizational capacity in 31 out of 40—or 77.5 percent—of areas assessed. Around board leadership in particular, executive directors of participating organizations reported increased organizational capacity in 7 out of 7—or 100 percent—of areas assessed. Both overall and all but one of the seven subset areas of organizational capacity that were assessed on these surveys, participants in the 2012-2013 NCBI more often reported positive changes in organizational capacity when compared to other, similar organizations in the Omaha-Council Bluffs area. [6] The following summarizes the frequency with which executive directors of participating organizations reported positive changes in organizational capacity, as well as how their responses compared to those of similar organizations in the Omaha-Council Bluffs area.

---

[6] The one subset area in which 2012-2013 cohort organizations reported fewer positive changes than other, similar organizations was marketing, communications, and external relations. This subset area was included in the survey because it had been a focus for organizations in Cohorts 1 and 2. It was not, however, a focus for Cohort 3, which may account for the feeling by participants that fewer changes occurred in this area.

Table 2: Perception of Changes in Organizational Capacity Between April 2012 and April 2013, NCBI Participants and Control Group

Subset area of organizational capacity	Number of items in subset area	Number of Items on which Positive Change was Reported*	
		NBCI	Control
Mission and Planning	16	69%	60%
Program Design and Evaluation	5	60%	20%
Information Technology	1	100%	0%
Financial Management	2	100%	0%
Fund Development	3	100%	33%
Board Leadership	7	100%	43%
Marketing, Communications, and External Relations	6	67%	83%
Total/overall	40	78%	45%

*In other words, the average change reported was greater than zero.

One aspect that should be noted in interpreting these results is that the organizations in the control group, on average, had reported slightly higher levels (less than a quarter of a point). Thus, it may be that the differences found reflect a "ceiling effect," which has been reported in other evaluations of nonprofit capacity building. In other words, at baseline, some organizations have higher reported capacity than others. The ones with lower reported levels, then, have greater room for change and improvement (Abt Associates, 2010b). That said, in the NCBI case, the difference between the two groups is very small (less than a quarter of a point). Moreover, the organizations in the control group were intentionally matched so as to be of similar ages and development, and so reduce problems that might stem from comparing a very established/mature organization to a relative new one.

Findings – Process

In terms of the components of the Initiative, which included an organizational assessment (the Social Venture Partners version of the McKinsey assessment) and monthly roundtable meetings, participants offered their observations and feedback. In terms of the SVP version of the McKinsey assessment, about half of the executive directors had a somewhat negative response. Among their concerns were the absence of versions in languages other than English and the abstract nature of the questions. All participants also described the monthly meeting that included both executive directors and board leaders as making sense, but in some ways difficult. Participants also volunteered what they thought worked particularly well about the process, and what areas could be improved.

Participants had a somewhat negative response to the organizational capacity assessment tool

Executive directors' responses to the McKinsey assessment were somewhat negative on the whole. One executive director had no comment on the assessment. Three were neutral to positive about it, saying, for example, that it was a helpful, comprehensive tool that helped the organization to identify priorities. One of these three thought it helped bring to light information not previously known, but another said it validated an already existing awareness of organizational issues. The remaining five executive directors, however, raised concerns about the assessment. Part of the reason executive directors may have raised these concerns in interviews may have been that interviews were being conducted around the same time as the post-test survey was fielded, so bringing to mind the tool and reminding interviewees of the time needed to complete the survey. Among the concerns were that it was too long and that the questions were posed too abstractly or confusingly, which made it seem overwhelming and/or may have compromised the validity of the data resulting from the assessment (i.e. respondents were not clear what they were being asked, so the resulting data may not have been a useful reflection of their perceptions). There is also a need to use a tool that is available in languages other than English to ensure all who are asked to take the assessment are able to do so. One executive director suggested a tool be found that was less wordy, and another suggested that rather than an assessment, a more general set of thought questions be used to begin a conversation about the organization's strengths and weaknesses.

Of the board members who offered input on the McKinsey assessment, their responses were less negative than those of the executive directors. This may be because some of those organizations whose executive directors were most concerned about the usefulness of the assessment were among those able to be interviewed. It may also be that board members were more positive in their feelings about the tool than executive directors because board leaders, unlike executive directors, were only asked to complete the survey once (at the outset of the NCBI). Of the board members that commented on the assessment, one said they mostly did not remember but it seemed like busywork. Another said that such assessments, in general, were not to their liking but it was good to see the results on paper and validate strengths and challenges they as an organization already knew they had.

Joint meetings were helpful, and participants offered suggestions to further improve

Interviewees—both board leaders and executive directors, when asked to comment on the roundtables in which both board leaders and executive directors attended, felt that while the idea of having both groups together made sense and was helpful at a general level. All board leaders interviewed had positive comments on these, noting, for example, that they were valuable, helped facilitate connections between themselves and with the executive director, and had good content.

Eight of the nine executive directors (the other did not comment either positively or negatively) felt these joint meetings had value or were otherwise helpful. As one executive director said, it was good to know what was said to whom. Executive directors and board leaders both made

suggestions to further improve these meetings, and address challenges they observed as part of these meetings. Several of these challenges were related to group dynamics, and stemmed from having one group that met more frequently than the other and/or having two groups that had interrelated, but distinct relationships to the organization and the organization's mission, and perhaps different levels or types of investment in the organization. Interviewees acknowledged that these challenges were perhaps intrinsic to the endeavor and could not be fully addressed through changes in the program design, and all felt the meetings were helpful.

Executive director suggestions:

- Provide board leaders a time to meet as a group without executive directors, while keeping the joint meetings as well—either replacing some of the joint meetings with just board leader meetings or splitting the time of one meeting into a part where only board leaders would meet together (2)
- Find a way to involve the whole board (2)
- Have the project consultant and board president meet and discuss expectations at the outset of the NCBI (1)
- Ask participants in the joint meetings to submit issues anonymously for discussion to the project consultant (1)
- Have a mid-year check in with the project consultant, involving both the executive director and the board (1)

Board leader suggestions:

- Ensure transparency by sharing the syllabus used by executive directors with board leaders directly, and rely less on executive directors as a conduit for sharing information between the project director and board leaders (1)
- Have representatives from three organizations (approximately) that participated in the Initiative in the past talk about what they gained from the Initiative (1)
- Reconsider inclusion of or revise design of elevator speech exercise to better meet learning objectives (1)
- Ensure that cultural diversity is recognized and valued within the group (1)
- Tailor the program more to participating organizations' lifecycle stage, perhaps by having the large group break into smaller working groups according to their lifecycle stage (1)
- Provide more opportunities for board members' skill development, perhaps through an online component in addition to the in-person joint meetings (1)[7]

---

[7] Three other board leaders, when asked specifically for their response to this suggestion, gave mixed and only moderately supportive responses. One thought they might be of some benefit, especially if used as preparation for the joint meetings—though was skeptical as to whether board leaders would use such opportunities (the chances of their using it might be increased if such modules were short and to the point). Another thought that other, additional avenues for skill development for the board would not be as successful as the joint meetings, and people would not participate as actively—maybe 30 percent would participate. However, online training might be a way to involve more board members than are able to attend the joint meetings. Another board leader was very skeptical of online training, suggesting that is would not lead to the sort of interaction they found valuable about the joint meetings—although it might be helpful for some with different learning styles.

- Provide board leaders a time to meet as a group without executive directors, while keeping the joint meetings as well— perhaps replace one or two of the joint meetings later in the year as board leaders only meetings (1)

Additional Feedback

Executive directors also volunteered what they thought worked particularly well about the process, and included some general suggestions for improvement. In addition to the roundtable meetings, which are discussed above and received positive feedback, other aspects that worked well were:

- Choice of topics, tools, and assigned readings—as well as the opportunity to apply tools (5)
- Quality of facilitator (6)
- Mix of organizations (2)
- Physical space and room set up (1)
- Use of outside facilitator and evaluators (1)
- Meeting structure, to include time for executive directors and board leaders to interact (2)

Suggestions for changes were to:

- Consider more fully including ethics as a topic (1)
- Consider updating some materials, although as is it made a good conversation starting point (1)
- Explain how this program differs from others (1)
- Make materials available electronically though a centralized file sharing system (1)
- Post NCBI evaluation reports to the Omaha Community Foundation website (1)
- Publicize organizations' participation in the NCBI (1)

Summary and Conclusion – 2012-13 Cohort Findings As Compared to Prior Years

In comparison to previous years' evaluations, this evaluation suggests that changes to the design of the Initiative have helped participants more quickly translate ideas into practice, while maintaining the Initiative's perhaps unique ability to offer participants an environment where they can speak candidly about their challenges and successes. What are perhaps some of the most important changes to the program's design are listed and discussed below. Taken together, these three changes may have addressed what seemed to be a consistent finding across both the 2010 and 2011 cohorts—namely, that participants felt that the NCBI had had a positive impact but it was too early to assess changes. While capacity building is often an ongoing process, findings from this year's 2012-13 evaluation suggest that the changes listed above have generally enabled a quicker translation of ideas into practice for participants than experienced in prior years.

1) **The use of more structured, content-oriented monthly roundtable meetings**. In the first year of the Initiative, the evaluation found that all executive directors who participated in the CEO Roundtables (i.e. the monthly meetings) found these roundtables to be helpful in terms of

opportunities for peer learning in a confidential environment. The evaluation also recommended, based on the survey and interview feedback gathered from participants, that the Omaha Community Foundation and/or the project director consider adding additional structure to these meetings, such as a reading list or syllabus with material that built on itself over the course of the NCBI. In the second year of the Initiative, more structure was added and evaluation findings suggested this was an effective change, with executive directors/CEOs sharing positive feedback that included descriptions of these as characterized by good topic choices, rich dialogue, and good facilitation (and five executive directors in the 2011 cohort offered other suggestions to develop a pre-assembled package of materials to provide to executive directors at the start of the year, move the "management problems" section of the discussion to earlier in the sessions, and include the meeting dates in the application materials). Although the 2012-13 cohort had suggestions as well, many traced the impact of the Initiative on their personal and professional development to these meetings.

2) **An increasing focus on strategic planning, to include the requirement that grant funds support the development of a plan if one is not already in place and the elimination of consultant sponsored projects which, for the 2010 and 2011 cohorts, were offered in addition to the monthly meetings and organizational assessments**. Strategic planning has always been, at least to some extent, a focus of the NCBI. According to evaluation data, one of the organizations in the 2010 cohort used their consultant (a different person than the project director) to develop a strategic plan, although the majority in 2010 focused—in varying ways—on fundraising (i.e. one developed case statements, another worked to develop a fundraising plan, a third collected data and developed a proposal for additional staff, and a fourth worked to develop a general organizational consensus about what broad changes in their fundraising strategy were most appropriate). In the 2011 cohort, strategic planning was emphasized more greatly by project directors, but the extent to which organizations in the cohort made progress in developing their strategic plans was unclear and many did not spend the grant funds to support strategic planning. Based on 2010 and 2011 evaluation data, the recommendation was then made to consider limiting the consultant-supported projects. For the 2012-2013 cohort, consultant-supported projects were eliminated from the NCBI, participants were asked to spend the grant funds on the development of a strategic plan if one was not in place already, and the strategic planning processes were—in all but one case—facilitated by the project director rather than an outside consultant. This seems to have provided a mechanism for engaging the whole organization, as well as resulted in less consultant-related frustration for participants and clearer outcomes.

3) **An evolving focus on board capacity and leadership**. One of the recommendations from the evaluation of the first year of the program was to consider adding additional mechanisms to address board capacity and board leadership. The recommendation stemmed from the observation that executive directors and board presidents from six of the ten nonprofits interviewed at the outset mentioned board development at a potential area for improvement; however, none of the nonprofits focused on this as part of their organizational capacity building effort and the majority of board presidents interviewed at the conclusion of the 2010 Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative said they would like to be more involved in the Initiative. One option discussed during second round interviews with board presidents and executive directors

was the creation of a Board President Roundtable. Individuals were generally supportive of this option, and felt it could be a source of information about what a board member's role is in a nonprofit as well as a place to discuss challenges they and/or their organizations are facing. In the second year of the program, quarterly meetings for board directors were added and interviews from this year showed that seven of the eight 2011 board presidents had positive comments about the board leadership workshops (although the eighth's comments were not negative, they were more neutral). Additionally, a common theme from both executive directors and board leaders in 2011 was the need for some type of joint meeting between the executive directors/CEOs and the board leadership, and the evaluation included in its programmatic recommendations that some or all of the CEO roundtables and board development workshops be held as combined meetings—a practice adopted and incorporated in the program for the 2012-13 cohort. This change was generally seen by participants as helpful.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and summary presented above, three recommendations are offered below.

Recommendation 1: Continue to use mechanisms that were successful in enabling the translation of ideas into practice (for example, the focus on strategic planning and the content and structure of the monthly meetings for participants).

As elaborated on in the summary and conclusion section above, 1) the use of more structured, content-oriented monthly roundtable meetings, 2) a focus on strategic planning, to include the requirement that grant funds support the development of a plan if one is not already in place, and 3) a focus on board capacity and leadership seem to have helped ensure that participants are able to translate ideas into practice within the timeframe of the Initiative, which was also slightly longer for the 2012-13 cohort than it was for prior cohorts. The text of this report also lists suggestions made by interviewees as to how both the executive director and the joint executive director and board roundtable meetings might be improved. No suggestions in regard to the focus on strategic planning were made.

Recommendation 2: Consider replacing or altering the Social Venture Partners version of the McKinsey assessment and ensuring that whatever tool used is accessible.

Some type of organizational assessment tool has been used at the outset of the NCBI for each of the cohorts, and the literature suggests that some sort of assessment is a useful starting point in foundation-funded nonprofit capacity building programs (Backer, Bleeg, & Groves, 2010; Blumenthal, 2003). However, participants in the NCBI have consistently had some level of negative feedback on the assessment tool used. For the 2010 cohort, the full McKinsey assessment was used. NCBI participants commented both positively and negatively on the tool; among the concerns were its length. In a response to these concerns, for the 2011 cohort, a different tool was used—specifically, a version of the McKinsey assessment constructed by Social Venture Partners that additional questions on fundraising, communications, and board issues; reorganizes the original McKinsey Grid Assessment questions into a more intuitive taxonomy based on ten skill areas; and adds a method for nonprofits to prioritize their capacity

building goals (Guthrie et al., 2005). For the 2012-13 cohort, the Social Ventures Partners version was again used. NCBI participants completed the full assessment at the beginning of the program year, then completed a shortened version at the end of the year that excluded questions that did not seem aligned with the activities of the NCBI, thus shortening the length of time the survey was expected to take.

Concerns about the assessment tool used in the 2012-13 cohort fall into two categories: one dealing with the content and length of the tool, and the other dealing with its accessibility in terms of language. Regardless, this report recommends that whatever tool is used be available in English, Spanish, and other languages as appropriate. Literature and internet searches suggest that a version of the McKinsey assessment in languages other than English may be unavailable, meaning the tool would need to be translated. In terms of the content and length, one possibility is to further reduce the number of questions on the tool to only those with a direct link to the activities associated with the NCBI. For example, questions were included this year about information technology and marketing, which could be excluded.

Lastly, McKinsey and Company states they are currently in the process of revising the assessment and updating it from the version that has been used over the past ten years. They state that the revised assessment tool will be available in 2013 (McKinsey and Company, 2013). It may be that the revised version of the tool addresses some of the concerns raised by NCBI participants.

Recommendation 3: Consider other programmatic changes suggested by participants.

There were several other suggestions for programmatic changes noted above. These should be taken into consideration when planning and implementing future years of the Initiative:

General suggestions:

- Consider more fully including ethics as a topic (1)
- Consider updating some materials, although as is it made a good conversation starting point (1)
- Explain how this program differs from others (1)
- Make materials available electronically (1)
- Post NCBI evaluation reports to the Omaha Community Foundation website (1)
- Publicize organizations' participation in the NCBI (1)

Suggestions relating to joint executive director and board leader meetings:

- Provide board leaders a time to meet as a group without executive directors, while keeping the joint meetings as well—either replacing some of the joint meetings with just board leader meetings or splitting the time of one meeting into a part where only board leaders would meet together (2)
- Find a way to involve the whole board (2)

- Have the project consultant and board president meet and discuss expectations at the outset of the NCBI (1)
- Ask participants in the joint meetings to submit issues anonymously for discussion to the project consultant (1)
- Have a mid-year check in with the project consultant, involving both the executive director and the board (1)
- Ensure transparency by sharing the syllabus used by executive directors with board leaders directly, and relying less on executive directors as a conduit for sharing information between the project director and board leaders (1)
- Have representatives from three organizations (approximately) that participated in the Initiative in the past talk about what they gained from the Initiative (1)
- Reconsider inclusion of or revise design of elevator speech exercise to better meet learning objectives (1)
- Ensure that cultural diversity is recognized and valued within the group (1)
- Tailor the program more to participating organizations' lifecycle stage, perhaps by having the large group break into smaller working groups according to their lifecycle stage (1)
- Provide more opportunities for board members' skill development, perhaps through an online component in addition to the in-person joint meetings (1)[8]
- Provide board leaders a time to meet as a group without executive directors, while keeping the joint meetings as well— perhaps replacing one or two of the joint meetings later in the year a board leaders only meeting (1)

---

[8] Three other board leaders, when asked specifically for their response to this suggestion, gave mixed and only moderately supportive responses. One thought they might be of some benefit, especially if used as preparation for the joint meetings—though was skeptical as to whether board leaders would use such opportunities (the chances of their using it might be increased if such modules were short and to the point). Another thought that other, additional avenues for skill development for the board would not be as successful as the joint meetings, and people would not participate as actively—maybe 30 percent would participate. However, online training might be a way to involve more board members than are able to attend the joint meetings. Another board leader was very skeptical of online training, suggesting that is would not lead to the sort of interaction they found valuable about the joint meetings— although it might be helpful for some with different learning styles.

References

Abt Associates. (2010a). Improving capacity among nonprofits—Impact study of the Compassion Capital Fund Demonstration Program. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/other_resrch/ccf/reports/ccf_impact_study/ccf_impact_rprt_final.pdf

Abt Associates. (2010b). Assessing Changes in Nonprofit Capacity— Outcome study of the Compassion Capital Fund Demonstration Program. http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/other_resrch/ccf/reports/assessing_technical/outcome_study_rpt_final.pdf

Backer, T., Bleeg, J. E., & Groves, K. (2013). Evaluating foundation-supported capacity building. Encino, CA: Human Interaction Research Institute. Retrieved from http://www.humaninteract.org/publications.htm

Guthrie, K., & Preston, A. (2005, March). *Building capacity while assessing it: Three foundations' experiences using the McKinsey capacity assessment grid*. Blueprint Evaluation Series. Seattle: Blueprint Research & Design.

McKinsey and Company. (2001). Effective capacity building in nonprofit organizations. Retrieved from http://www.vppartners.org/sites/default/files/reports/full_rpt.pdf

McKinsey and Company. (2013). Organizational capacity assessment tool. Retrieved from http://mckinseyonsociety.com/mckinsey-organizational-capacity-assessment-tool/

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

TCC Group. (2011). Strengthening organizations to mobilize Californians: Lessons learned from a major initiative to build the capacity of civic engagement nonprofits. Retrieved from http://www.tccgrp.com/pdfs/Strengthening_Organizations-Lessons_Learned.pdf

Appendix A: 2010 and 2011 Cohort Organizations

The table below shows the nonprofit organizations that comprised the 2010 and 2011 cohorts for the Omaha Community Foundation's Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative. During the first year of the project (i.e. 2010), The Omaha Community Foundation chose these local organizations based on a desire to work with a diverse group of organizations in terms of agency age, service area, population served, and geographic area. During the second year of the project (i.e. 2011), there was a call for applications, these were reviewed by a committee, and organizations were selected from the applicant group.

Table 1: Nonprofit Organizations Previously Selected to Participate in the Omaha Community Foundation's Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiatives	
2010	- The Bemis Center for Contemporary Arts - Charles Drew Health Center - Family Housing Advisory Services - Habitat for Humanity – Council Bluffs - Kids Can! Community Center - Latino Center of the Midlands - Love's Jazz and Arts Center - Neighborhood Center* - NeighborWorks Omaha* - Youth Emergency Services (YES)
2011	- Concord Mediation Center (formerly The Concord Center) - Council Bluffs Community Education Foundation - Council Bluffs Community Health Clinic - Eastern Nebraska Community Action Program (ENCAP) - Inclusive Communities - InCOMMON Community Development - Legal Aid of Nebraska - Literacy Center** - Together, Inc. of Metro Omaha - Youth Care and Beyond
*Did not complete the full year of the Omaha Community Foundation's 2010 Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative ** Due to leadership changes, the Literacy Center only participated in the earlier portions of the Initiative.	

Appendix B: Survey Questions[9]

Introductory Text (Pre-Test)

We appreciate your time to complete the following survey.

We are asking the CEO/Executive Directors of nonprofit organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list to take this survey. To maintain the integrity of the research sample, please do not forward this survey to other organizations.

The purpose of the survey is to help the Omaha Community Foundation better understand the impact of current economic conditions on local nonprofit organizations and their capacity.

The survey should take about 20-30 minutes of your time to complete. Your responses are voluntary and will be confidential; all responses will be compiled together and analyzed by researchers at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

At the end of the survey, you will be asked if you are willing to share your name and the name of your organization. By providing this information, you will be entered into a drawing for one of two $1,000 grant awards offered by the Omaha Community Foundation. If you would prefer not to be eligible for an award, please skip this question. In addition, some organizations will be asked to complete the survey a year from now to gauge changes over time.

If you have any questions or run into any problems taking the survey, please contact Dr. Angela Eikenberry at 402-415-5310 (cell) or aeikenberry@unomaha.edu.

Thank you!

Introductory Text (Post-Test)

We appreciate your time to complete the following survey.

This survey is being sent to the CEO/Executive Directors of nonprofit organizations who completed a similar survey in May 2012 and were willing to share their names the names of their organization. All survey recipients were also listed on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list. To maintain the integrity of the research sample, please do not forward this survey to other organizations.

---

[9] This is the text of the pre-test survey sent to executive directors/CEOs of nonprofit organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list that were not members of the 2012-2013 cohort. Organizations that were part of the 2012-13 NCBI answered the same questions, but as part of two separate surveys. The first asked executive directors, as well as all staff and all board members of organizations that were part of the 2012-2013 cohort, to complete the SVP version of the McKinsey assessment (here, questions 18-57). The second asked only executive directors of organizations that were part of the 2012-2013 cohort to complete the questions relating to demographics and economic climate (here, questions 1-17).

The purpose of the survey is to help the Omaha Community Foundation to assess changes since the last survey and to evaluate its Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative. For more information about the Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative, please go to: http://omahafoundation.org/improving-our-community/initiative/.

The survey should take about 10-15 minutes of your time to complete. Your responses are voluntary and will be confidential. All responses will be compiled together and analyzed by researchers at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

At the end of the survey, you will be asked if you are willing to share your name and the name of your organization again. By providing this information, you will be entered into a drawing for one $1,000 grant awards offered by the Omaha Community Foundation. If you would prefer not to be eligible for an award, please skip this question.

If you have any questions or run into any problems taking the survey, please contact Dr. Angela Eikenberry at 402-415-5310 (cell) or aeikenberry@unomaha.edu.

Thank you!

Survey Questions

Respondent Information

1. Your role in the organization
   - CEO/Executive Director
   - Other (Please specify)
2. Which sector best describes your organization's work? (please check all that apply)
   - Aging
   - Arts & Culture
   - Community & Economic Development
   - Education
   - Environment
   - Health & Human Services
   - Human & Race Relations
   - Religion
   - Other (please describe)
3. Where are your organization's main offices? [allow more than one answer]
   - Omaha
   - Council Bluffs
   - Other (please specify)
4. In what year was your organization formed?
5. Please indicate the approximate number of individuals currently affiliated with your organization for each area.
   - Full-time paid employees

- Part-time paid employees
- Volunteers
- Board members

6. What was your organization's operating budget in its most recently completed fiscal year?
   - Less than $250,000
   - $250,000 - $499,000
   - $500,000-$999,000
   - $1 million - $5 million
   - More than $5 million

7. To what extent are the following currently presenting challenges for your organization?

1 = Not a challenge   2 = Minor Challenge   3 = Major Challenge   N/A

   - Attracting new members/clients/participants
   - Covering employee payroll, benefits and/or insurance costs
   - Duplication of services with other organizations
   - Marketing our services/programs
   - Meeting needs/interests of current members/clients/participants
   - Obtaining funding
   - Recruiting donors
   - Recruiting board members
   - Training current board members
   - Recruiting qualified staff
   - Recruiting qualified, reliable volunteers
   - Strategic planning
   - Evaluation
   - Other (please describe)

8. How have the following items changed compared to the state of your organization a year ago?

1 = Decreased   2 = Unchanged   3 = Increased   4 = Don't know

   - Demand for services/programs
   - Number of clients served/members participated
   - Number of staff members
   - Number of volunteers
   - Total assets
   - Total expenses
   - Total liabilities
   - Total revenue

9. Which of the following best describes your organization's outlook for the next three years?

- Our services/offerings will remain unchanged.
- We will cancel all of our programming and close our operations.
- We will evaluate and reconfigure our current offerings.
- We will expand services in key areas of need and/or identified areas for growth.
- We will reduce services/offerings.

10. Which statement best describes your organization's current financial health?
- We are financially healthy and not currently vulnerable
- We have been financially healthy to date but may be vulnerable in the future
- We are experiencing chronic financial problems but expect to survive
- We will be closing our doors if the economy does not improve soon

11. Is your organization currently undertaking a capital campaign?
- Yes
- No
- We have postponed our plans to launch a capital campaign

12. How interested would your organization be in any of the following?

1 = Not interested   2 = Possibly interested   3 = Very interested   4 = Already doing this

- Building an endowment
- Using volunteers more effectively
- Merging operations with another nonprofit organization
- Receiving technical assistance and support for planned giving services
- Undertaking collaborative fundraising efforts
- Utilizing shared back office services with another nonprofit(s)
- Utilizing shared space with another nonprofit(s)

13. Specifically because of the economy, did your organization do any of the following? (please check all that apply)
- Borrow money
- Collaborate with other nonprofits
- Cut nonessential expenses
- Cut training or professional development
- Delay payment of bills
- Delay payment of payroll
- Eliminate programs
- Increase fundraising activities
- Lay off staff
- Turn away clients
- Use prior-year cash reserves
- Other (please describe)

14. If your organization has experienced any cash flow problems in the past 12 months, what was the primary cause of the difficulties?
- A prior year deficit
- Decline in return on investments

- Delays in government payments
- Donors not fulfilling pledges
- Normal business cycles
- Unmet fundraising goals
- Other (please describe)
- Not applicable/Did not experience any cash flow problems in the past 12 months

15. If your organization borrowed money in the past 12 months, what was the primary reason?
- For an emergency
- For an equipment or building purchase
- For facility construction / renovation
- To be able to make payroll / benefits payments
- To stabilize cash flow
- To start a new program
- Other (please describe)
- Not applicable/Did not borrow money in the past 12 months

16. In the last year, have you, as ED/CEO, your staff, or board members participated in any nonprofit capacity building programs (to include training, leadership development, and/or funding for capacity building)
- Yes (please describe source and type)
  No

17. The section that follows is a version of the McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid. Have you previously taken the McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid or a modified version of it?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know

For each area below, please select the text that best describes your organization's current status or performance.

Mission, Vision, Strategy, and Planning
18. Mission
- No written mission or limited expression of the organization's reason for existence; lacks clarity or specificity; either held by very few in the organization or rarely referred to.
- Some expression of organization's reason for existence that reflects its values and purpose, but may lack clarity; held by only a few; lacks broad agreement or rarely referred to.
- Clear expression of organization's reason for existence which reflects its values and purpose; held by many within organization and often referred to.
- Clear expression of organization's reason for existence which describes an enduring reality that reflects its values and purpose; broadly held within organization and frequently referred to.

19. Clarity of Vision
- Little shared understanding of what organization aspires to become or achieve beyond the stated mission.
- Somewhat clear or specific understanding of what organization aspires to become or achieve; lacks specificity or clarity; held by only a few; or "on the wall," but rarely used to direct actions or set priorities.
- Clear and specific understanding of what organization aspires to become or achieve; held by many within the organization and often used to direct actions and set priorities.
- Clear, specific, and compelling understanding of what organization aspires to become or achieve; broadly held within organization and consistently used to direct actions and set priorities.

20. Boldness of Vision
- No clear vision articulated.
- Vision exists but falls short of reflecting an inspiring view of the future and being demanding yet achievable.
- Vision is distinctive along only one of following two attributes: reflects an inspiring view of future; demanding yet achievable.
- Vision reflects an inspiring view of future and is demanding but achievable.

21. Overarching Goals
- Vision (if it exists) not explicitly translated into small set of concrete goals, though there may be general (but inconsistent and imprecise) knowledge within organization of overarching goals and what it aims to achieve.

- Vision translated into a concrete set of goals; goals lack at least two of following four attributes: clarity, boldness, associated metrics, or time frame for measuring attainment; goals known by only a few, or only occasionally used to direct actions or set priorities.
- Vision translated into small set of concrete goals, but goals lack at most two of following four attributes: clarity, boldness, associated metrics, or time frame for measuring attainment; goals are known by many within organization and often used by them to direct actions and set priorities.
- Vision translated into clear, bold set of (up to three) goals that organization aims to achieve, specified by concrete objectives to measure success for each criterion, and by well-defined time frames for attaining goals; goals are broadly known within organization and consistently used to direct actions and set priorities.

22. Overall Strategy
- Strategy is either nonexistent, unclear, or incoherent (large set of scattered initiatives); strategy has no influence over day-to-day behavior.
- Strategy exists but is either not clearly linked to mission, vision, and overarching goals, or lacks coherence, or is not easily actionable; strategy is not broadly known and has limited influence over day-to-day behavior.

- Coherent strategy has been developed and is linked to mission and vision but is not fully ready to be acted upon; strategy is mostly known and day-to-day behavior is partly driven by it.
- Organization has clear, coherent medium- to long-term strategy that is both actionable and linked to overall mission, vision, and overarching goals; strategy is broadly known and consistently helps drive day-to-day behavior at all levels of organization.

23. Strategic Planning
- Limited ability and tendency to develop strategic plan, either internally or via external assistance; if strategic plan exists, it is not used.
- Some ability and tendency to develop high-level strategic plan either internally or via external assistance; strategic plan roughly directs management decisions.
- Ability and tendency to develop and refine concrete, realistic strategic plan; some internal expertise in strategic planning or access to relevant external assistance; strategic planning carried out on a near-regular basis; strategic plan used to guide management decisions.
- Ability to develop and refine concrete, realistic and detailed strategic plan; critical mass of internal expertise in strategic planning, or efficient use of external, sustainable, highly qualified resources; strategic planning exercise carried out regularly; strategic plan used extensively to guide management decisions.

24. Planning Systems
- Planning happens on an ad hoc basis only and is not supported by systematically collected data.
- Planning done regularly and uses some systematically collected data.
- Regular planning complemented by ad hoc planning when needed; some data collected and used systematically to support planning effort and improve it.
- Regular planning complemented by ad hoc planning when needed; clear, formal systems for data collection in all relevant areas; data used systematically to support planning effort and improve it.

25. Goals/Performance Targets
- Targets are non-existent or few; targets are vague, or confusing, or either too easy or impossible to achieve; not clearly linked to aspirations and strategy, and may change from year to year; targets largely unknown or ignored by staff.
- Realistic targets exist in some key areas, and are mostly aligned with aspirations and strategy; may lack aggressiveness, or be short-term, lack milestones, or mostly focused on "inputs" (things to do right), or often renegotiated; staff may or may not know and adopt targets.
- Quantified aggressive targets in most areas; linked to aspirations and strategy; mainly focused on "outputs/outcomes" (results of doing things right) with some "inputs"; typically multiyear targets, though may lack milestones; targets are known and adopted by most staff who usually use them to broadly guide work.
- Limited set of quantified, genuinely demanding performance targets in all areas; targets are tightly linked to aspirations and strategy, output/outcome-focused (i.e., results of doing things right, as opposed to inputs, things to do right), have annual

milestones, and are long-term nature; staff consistently adopts targets and works diligently achieve them.

26. Operational Planning
   - Organization runs operations purely on day-to-day basis with no short- or longer-term planning activities; no experience in operational planning.
   - Some ability and tendency to develop high-level operational plan either internally or via external assistance; operational plan loosely or not linked to strategic planning activities and used roughly to guide operations.
   - Ability and tendency to develop and refine concrete, realistic operational plan; some internal expertise in operational planning or access to relevant external assistance; operational planning carried out on a near-regular basis; operational plan linked to strategic planning activities and used to guide operations.
   - Organization develops and refines concrete, realistic, and detailed operational plan; has critical mass of internal expertise in operational planning, or efficiently uses external, sustainable, highly qualified resources; operational planning exercise carried out regularly; operational plan tightly linked to strategic planning activities and systematically used to direct operations.

27. Use and Development of Organizational Processes
   - Limited set of processes (e.g., decision making, planning, reviews) for ensuring effective functioning of the organization; use of processes is variable, or processes are seen as ad hoc requirements ("paperwork exercises"); no monitoring or assessment of processes
   - Basic set of processes in core areas for ensuring efficient functioning of organization; processes known, used, and truly accepted by only portion of staff; limited monitoring and assessment of processes, with few improvements made in consequence
   - Solid, well-designed set of processes in place in core areas to ensure smooth, effective functioning of organization; processes known and accepted by many, often used and contribute to increased impact; occasional monitoring and assessment of processes, with some improvements made
   - Robust, lean, and well-designed set of processes (e.g., decision making, planning, reviews) in place in all areas to ensure effective and efficient functioning of organization; processes are widely known, used and accepted, and are key to ensuring full impact of organization; continual monitoring and assessment of processes, and systematic improvement made

28. Decision Making Framework
   - Decisions made largely on an ad hoc basis by one person and/or whomever is accessible; highly informal
   - Appropriate decision makers known; decision making process fairly well established and process is generally followed, but often breaks down and becomes informal
   - Clear, largely formal lines/systems for decision making but decisions are not always appropriately implemented or followed; dissemination of decisions generally good but could be improved
   - Clear, formal lines/systems for decision making that involve as broad participation as practical and appropriate along with dissemination/interpretation of decision

29. Monitoring of Landscape
- Minimal knowledge and understanding of other players and alternative models in program area
- Basic knowledge of players and alternative models in program area but limited ability to adapt behavior based on acquired understanding
- Solid knowledge of players and alternative models in program area; good ability to adapt behavior based on acquired understanding, but only occasionally carried out
- Extensive knowledge of players and alternative models in program area; refined ability and systematic tendency to adapt behavior based on understanding

30. Knowledge Management
- No formal systems to capture and document internal knowledge
- Systems exist in a few areas but either not user-friendly or not comprehensive enough to have an impact; systems known by only a few people, or only occasionally used
- Well-designed, user-friendly systems in some areas; not fully comprehensive; systems are known by many people within the organization and often used
- Well-designed, user-friendly, comprehensive systems to capture, document, and disseminate knowledge internally in all relevant areas; all staff is aware of systems, knowledgeable in their use, and make frequent use of them

31. Interfunctional Coordination
- Different programs and organizational units function in silos; little or dysfunctional coordination between them
- Interactions between different programs and organizational units are generally good, though coordination issues do exist; some pooling of resources
- All programs and units function together effectively with sharing of information and resources; few coordination issues
- Constant and seamless integration between different programs and organizational units with few coordination issues; relationships are dictated by organizational needs (rather than hierarchy or politics)

32. Shared Beliefs and Values
- No common set of basic beliefs and values exists within the organization
- Common set of basic beliefs exists in some groups within the organization, but is not shared broadly; values may be only partially aligned with organizational purpose or only rarely harnessed to produce impact
- Common set of basic beliefs held by many people within the organization; helps provide members a sense of identity; beliefs are aligned with organizational purpose and occasionally harnessed to produce impact
- Common set of basic beliefs and values (e.g., social, religious) exists and is widely shared within the organization; provides members sense of identity and clear direction for behavior; beliefs embodied by leader but nevertheless timeless and stable across leadership changes; beliefs clearly support overall purpose of the organization and are consistently harnessed to produce impact

33. Shared References and Practices

- No major common set of practices and references exists within the organization (such as traditions, rituals, unwritten rules, stories, heroes or role models, symbols, language, dress)
- Common set of references and practices exists in some groups within the organization, but are not shared broadly; may be only partially aligned with organizational purpose or only rarely harnessed to produce impact
- Common set of references and practices exists, and are adopted by many people within the organization; references and practices are aligned with organizational purpose and occasionally harnessed to drive towards impact
- Common set of references and practices exist within the organization, which may include: traditions, rituals, unwritten rules, stories, heroes or role models, symbols, language, dress; are truly shared and adopted by all members of the organization; actively designed and used to clearly support overall purpose of the organization and to drive performance

Program Design and Evaluation

34. Performance Measurement
- Very limited measurement and tracking of performance; all or most evaluation based on anecdotal evidence; organization collects some data on program activities and outputs (e.g., number of children served) but has no social impact measurement (measurement of social outcomes, e.g., drop-out rate lowered).
- Performance partially measured and progress partially tracked; organization regularly collects solid data on program activities and outputs (e.g., number of children served) but lacks data-driven, externally validated social impact measurement.
- Performance measured and progress tracked in multiple ways, several times a year, considering social, financial, and organizational impact of program and activities; multiplicity of performance indicators; social impact measured, but control group longitudinal (i.e., long-term) or third-party nature of evaluation is missing.
- Well-developed comprehensive, integrated system (e.g., balanced scorecard) used for measuring organization's performance and progress on continual basis, including social, financial, and organizational impact of program and activities; small number of clear, measurable, and meaningful key performance indicators; social impact measured based on longitudinal studies with control groups, and performed or supervised by third-party experts.

35. Performance Analysis and Program Adjustments
- Few external performance comparisons made; internal performance data rarely used to improve program and organization.
- Some efforts made to benchmark activities and outcomes against outside world; internal performance data used occasionally to improve organization.
- Effective internal and external benchmarking occurs but driven largely by top management and/or confined to selected areas; learning distributed throughout organization, and often used to make adjustments and improvements.
- Comprehensive internal and external benchmarking part of the culture and used by staff in target-setting and daily operations; high awareness of how all activities rate against internal and external best-in-class benchmarks; systematic practice of making adjustments and improvements on basis of benchmarking.

36. Program Relevance and Integration
   - Core programs and services vaguely defined and lack clear alignment with mission and goals; programs seem scattered and largely unrelated to each other
   - Most programs and services well defined and can be solidly linked with mission and goals; program offerings may be somewhat scattered and not fully integrated into clear strategy
   - Core programs and services well defined and aligned with mission and goals; program offerings fit together well as part of clear strategy
   - All programs and services well defined and fully aligned with mission and goals; program offering are clearly linked to one another and to overall strategy; synergies across programs are captured
37. Program Growth and Replication
   - No assessment of possibility of scaling up existing programs; limited ability to scale up or replicate existing programs.
   - Limited assessment of possibility of scaling up existing programs and, even when judged appropriate, little or limited action taken; some ability either to scale up or replicate existing programs.
   - Occasional assessment of possibility of scaling up existing programs and when judged appropriate, action occasionally taken; able to scale up or replicate existing programs.
   - Frequent assessment of possibility of scaling up existing programs and when judged appropriate, action always taken; efficiently and effectively able to grow existing programs to meet needs of potential service recipients in local area or other geographies.
38. New Program Development
   - No assessment of gaps in ability of current program to meet recipient needs; limited ability to create new programs; new programs created largely in response to funding availability.
   - Limited assessment of gaps in ability of existing program to meet recipient needs, with little or limited action taken; some ability to modify existing programs and create new programs.
   - Occasional assessment of gaps in ability of existing program to meet recipient needs, with some adjustments made; demonstrated ability to modify and fine-tune existing programs and create new programs.
   - Continual assessment of gaps in ability of existing programs to meet recipient needs and adjustment always made; ability and tendency to efficiently and effectively create new, truly innovative programs to the needs of potential service recipients in local area or other geographies; continuous pipeline of new ideas.

Information Technology
39. Databases & Management Reporting Systems
   - No systems for tracking clients, staff volunteers, program outcomes and financial information
   - Electronic databases and management reporting systems exist only in few areas; systems perform only basic features, are awkward to use or are used only occasionally by staff

- Electronic database and management reporting systems exist in most areas for tracking clients, staff, volunteers, program outcomes and financial information; commonly used and help increase information sharing and efficiency
- Sophisticated, comprehensive electronic database and management reporting systems exist for tracking clients, staff, volunteers, program outcomes and financial information; widely used and essential in increasing information sharing and efficiency

Financial Management

40. Financial Position

- Cash available to pay bills on time, but not to support an operating reserve; assets not clearly designated as restricted or unrestricted
- Cash available for timely payment of all obligations; board has not designated an operating reserve, but periodic surpluses could begin to support a reserve; minimal attention paid to the designation of unrestricted vs. restricted funds
- Cash flow sufficient to meet obligations and take advantage of investment opportunities; board has established or is developing an operating reserve of at least three months of expenses; balance of restricted and unrestricted assets is justified
- Cash available to meet all obligations and investment needs; board designated operating reserve appropriate to budget size of at least six months of expenses; most assets are in unrestricted accounts and good justifications exist for those that are restricted

41. Financial Planning & Analysis

- No or limited financial planning; limited board oversight of financial performance; no or little cash flow monitoring or tracking of program unit costs; trend analysis not utilized as a planning method; financial planning capacity could be improved with more training
- Limited financial plans with ad hoc updates; board reviews financial information at least quarterly; cash flow projections prepared periodically and used for planning; some trend analysis is conducted and some, but not all joint/indirect costs allocated to individual programs; training on financial and accounting topics is made available to staff and board members
- Solid financial plans, regularly updated; board reviews financial information at each meeting; cash flow projections regularly updated and monitored closely; trends including year-end revenue and expense projections are monitored to assist in making sound management decisions; program unit costs monitored through documentation of staff time and other joint expenses; board and staff encouraged to pursue financial training
- Very solid financial plans, continuously updated; financial performance indicators clearly identified and monitored by the board at least monthly; cash flow routinely monitored and reviewed in conjunction with other financial statements; current year and multi-year trend data collected, actively monitored, and used for ongoing planning purposes; cost center data accurately tracked, analyzed, and incorporated into financial plans; board and staff financial training is prioritized and fully funded

Fund Development
  42. Funding Stability
- Organization highly dependent on a few funding sources, largely of the same type (e.g., government, foundations, individuals, special events); no or narrow individual donor base; little or no funding stability from year to year
- Organization has access to multiple types of funding (e.g., government, foundations, corporations, individuals, special events) but only a few funders in each type, or has many funders within only one or two types; little attention paid to growing the individual donor base; funding base still relatively unstable
- Good diversity of funding sources with solid base of funders in most categories (e.g., government, foundations, corporations, individuals, special events); some activities to hedge against market instabilities (e.g., building of endowment and/or developing revenue-generating activities); more attention paid to individual donor base development
- Highly diversified funding across multiple source types; maintenance and growth of a large and active individual donor base; insulated from market instabilities through fully developed endowment and/or sustainable revenue-generating activities; other nonprofits emulate organization's fundraising strategies

  43. Fundraising Infrastructure
- Donor information is retained but is insufficiently tracked to be useful for organizational decision making; donors are thanked inconsistently; grant reporting requires laborious process of gathering information from multiple sources
- Donor information is retained and managed sufficiently to track donor histories and produce basic reports showing funding trends, but system is not well documented; donor acknowledgements are prompt and meet federal, local, and state requirements; ad hoc management of prospective donor information; donor management system is insufficiently integrated with accounting and other internal systems to facilitate information gathering for grant and other reports
- Well developed donor management system provides adequate information for most fund development needs, such as appropriate donor acknowledgement and accurate donor histories; some ability to track prospects, segment donor population, and analyze appeals results; system has flexibility to create new reports as needed for organizational decision making; some efforts to integrate donor management system with accounting and other internal systems to facilitate information gathering and reporting
- Well documented and secure donor management system has tools to accurately track prospective donors and donor history, thank donors appropriately, fully segment donor population for targeted appeals, and analyze appeals results; system produces reports needed to integrate fund development with budgeting, decision making, and organizational goals, and interfaces well with accounting and other internal systems; documented procedures facilitate the generation of information needed for grant and other reports

  44. Fund Development Planning and Evaluation
- No or few systems in place for long-term planning, revenue diversification, outlining and managing to target goals, or evaluating fund development efforts; fund

development strategy not well articulated and over reliant on funds from limited sources; fundraising more reactive than strategic

- Recognize need to develop systems for long-term planning, revenue diversification, outlining and managing to target goals, and evaluation of fund development program; fund development strategy includes several activities, but is not well connected to long-term strategic plan and budget projections; fundraising activities more opportunistic than strategic
- Some systems in place for long-term planning, revenue diversification, outlining and managing to target goals, and evaluating costs of fundraising activities; fund development strategy includes multiple activities and is loosely connected to long-term strategic plan and budget projections; fund development strategy more proactive than reactive
- Well developed and documented systems for long-term planning, revenue diversification, outlining and managing to target goals; costs and effectiveness of fund development strategies are evaluated; multi-pronged fund development strategy is proactive and integrated into budget projections and long-term strategic plan, but organization can react quickly to changes in the funding environment

Board Leadership

45. Core Financial and Legal Responsibilities of the Board
- Board does not carry out and/or lacks clear understanding of basic legal and fiduciary responsibilities (including establishing and following by-laws; complying with federal, state, and local financial reporting requirements and tax payments; hiring and supervising the CEO/ED); little input on budgeting; financial oversight delegated to treasurer
- Board carries out and understands basic legal and fiduciary responsibilities (including establishing and following by-laws; complying with federal, state, and local financial reporting requirements and tax payments; hiring and supervising the CEO/ED); beyond basic requirements, board is involved in budget preparation and reviews financial statements regularly; CEO/ED performance reviews conducted periodically
- Board carries out and clearly understands basic legal and fiduciary responsibilities (including establishing and following by-laws; complying with federal, state, and local financial reporting requirements and tax payments; hiring and supervising the CEO/ED); beyond basic requirements, board is involved in financial planning, reviews financial statements at every meeting, and co-defines and monitors CEO/ED's performance targets
- Board's role extends far beyond basic legal and fiduciary responsibilities; in addition, board is actively involved in preparing and reviewing multi-year financial plans, reviews financial statements at least monthly, defines and monitors CEO/ED performance targets, reviews salary for appropriateness, and is attentive to CEO/ED's professional development

46. Board Strategic Direction
- Overall lack of understanding of and/or disagreement over organization's mission/vision; no formal process for reviewing mission/vision, strategic planning, or monitoring program performance against mission

- General agreement on mission, but vision may not be formalized; infrequent discussion of mission/vision or program performance against mission; little active involvement in mission/vision review or strategic planning beyond approving periodic staff-driven plans
- Board members share common understanding of mission/vision, which they frequently refer to during strategic discussions; formal process for board's active involvement in reviewing mission/vision, strategic planning, and setting goals to monitor program performance against mission
- Complete buy-in on mission/vision, which drive major strategic discussions; well documented process to facilitate board's regular review of mission/vision, active involvement in strategic planning, and cooperation with staff on setting goals to monitor program performance against mission

47. Board/Staff Balance of Leadership
- Board provides little direction, support, or accountability to staff leadership; no clear process for developing or selecting board leadership; board not fully informed about major organizational matters; too narrowly engaged or prone to micro-management; disagreement about appropriate level of board engagement; low level of understanding of leadership roles and responsibilities; little participation in reputation building
- Board provides some direction, support, and accountability to staff leadership and is informed about most organizational matters; informal process of developing and selecting board leadership; board input on most major decisions is sought and valued; occasional disagreement on the distinction between board-level and staff-level decisions; members understand most leadership roles and responsibilities, including the need for participation in reputation building activities
- Board provides direction, support, and accountability to staff leadership and is informed about all major matters; its input is actively sought and valued; process in place for selecting effective board leaders; some cultivation of future leaders; full participant in major decisions with clear understanding of distinction between board and staff decisions; clearly understands leadership roles and responsibilities and strives for a balance of engagement with staff leadership; members are effective ambassadors for the organization
- Board provides strong direction, support, and accountability to staff leadership through clear goals and policies; acts as a strategic resource; process in place to identify, develop, and select effective board leaders; communication between board and staff leadership reflects mutual respect, awareness of appropriate roles and responsibilities, shared commitment, and valuing of collective wisdom; board actively supports CEO/ED's leadership development and proactively engages in outreach to build organization's reputation

48. Board Participation in Fund Development
- Members do not recognize fundraising as one of the board's responsibilities and have little understanding of organization's resource needs; no goals or plans for board-driven fundraising activities exist; board members donate minimally to the organization

- Members accept that the board has some fundraising responsibilities, but concerns exist regarding ability of board to be successful in this area; some understanding of organization's resource needs; several members have made significant financial gifts to the organization; board fundraising activities not yet underway
- Many members embrace fundraising as one of the board's core roles and responsibilities and feel ownership of the organization's resource needs; core group of board members consistently donates at appropriate levels; realistic and appropriate board fundraising goals and plans exist; fundraising activities are underway
- Majority of members embrace fundraising as a core board role and responsibility; each board member makes a regular donation to the organization that is personally significant; realistic and appropriate fundraising goals and plans are in place; board feels strong ownership for goals, is actively fundraising, and has achieved measurable progress towards goals

49. Board Composition and Commitment
- Limited diversity of fields of practice and expertise; drawn from a narrow spectrum of constituencies (nonprofit, academia, corporate, government, etc.); not reflective of the community served; little or no relevant experience; limited capacity to donate financially; low commitment to organization's success, vision and mission
- Some diversity in fields of practice and expertise including some of the skills and experience needed by the organization; membership represents a few different constituencies (nonprofit, academia, corporate, government, etc.); some representation of community served; moderate capacity to donate financially; moderate commitment to organization's success, vision, and mission
- Good diversity in fields of practice and expertise including most of the skills and experience needed by the organization; membership represents most constituencies (nonprofit, academia, corporate, government, etc.); make-up generally reflects organization's stakeholders and community; good capacity to donate financially or connect to other donors; solid commitment to organization's success, vision, and mission
- Broad variety of fields of practice and expertise drawn from all relevant constituencies (nonprofit, academia, corporate, government, etc.); make-up closely reflects organization's stakeholders and community, includes functional and program content-related expertise, and high-profile names; proven track record of investing financially in the organization; outstanding commitment to organization's success, mission, and vision

50. Board Development and Self Evaluation
- Ad hoc process for recruiting and nominating new members; little or no attention to board composition; no official orientation or training for new board members; no policy on member tenure; little or no on-going training and skill development; board does not set goals for itself; little or no board discussion of its own performance; lack of assessment of individual directors results in retention of low performing members
- Committee to recruit new members meets occasionally; some attention paid to board composition, but no formal assessment is done; informal new member orientation; loosely followed policy on member tenure; some on-going training and skill development; informal board self evaluation on some objectives, but no formal

structure for setting goals and evaluating performance against them; informal assessment of individual directors may result in retention of low performing members

- Development committee meets regularly to assess board composition and identify and recruit new members to fill specific gaps in needed skills or attributes; orientation held for new board members; well understood policy on member tenure; board conducts on-going training and skill development; regular performance evaluations against board-established goals in some areas (e.g., fundraising), but results not well utilized to formulate plans for improvement; board assesses individual director performance at the time of re-nomination
- Development committee meets year-round; annual assessment of board composition results in targeted recruiting of new members with specific skills and attributes; formal process for new member orientation; written policy on member tenure; high level of commitment to ongoing training and skill development; formal process for performance evaluation against goals set by the board; results used to make improvements; formal process for evaluation of individual directors; no collective tolerance for low performing members

51. Board Infrastructure
- Board either too small or too large for organization's needs; lack of communication about and/or incomplete understanding of board member roles and responsibilities; meetings infrequent, called at the last minute and/or poorly attended; meetings not always well-planned or productive; inconsistent use of agendas and minutes; some meetings start and/or end late; little or no use of sub-committees
- Board working to find the number of members that best meets organization's needs; board member roles and responsibilities generally understood, but not written; attendance generally good at regular, purposeful meetings; established calendar of meetings publicized but not necessarily adhered to; agendas prepared and minutes recorded for most meetings; most meetings start and end on time; occasional meetings of ad hoc subcommittees support work of the full board
- Board size appropriate for organization's needs; written board member job descriptions; attendance is consistently good at regular, purposeful, well-planned meetings; meeting calendar set and publicized in advance; agendas prepared and minutes recorded for every meeting; meetings generally start and end on time; committee system in place with generally understood division of roles and responsibilities between full board and subcommittees; regular committee meetings support work of the full board
- Appropriately sized board holds regular, productive meetings following agendas agreed upon by board chair and CEO/ED; yearly meeting calendar set and distributed in advance; meeting agendas and materials sent in advance; all meetings start and end on time; consistent attendance highly valued; decisions recorded in official meeting minutes; members sign written contract detailing roles and responsibilities; formal committee structure clearly designates board-level vs. committee-level decisions; written descriptions of committee roles and responsibilities; focused committees result in more efficient board meetings

Marketing, Communications, and External Relations
52. Communications and Outreach Effectiveness

- Organization does not have marketing materials; or materials that it has are outdated; organization is strictly internally-focused and does little to no outreach to stakeholders; any materials that exist are unprofessional in their presentation
- Organization has a loose collection of materials it uses for marketing; documents are generic and not updated to reflect new programs and organizational results; materials have a minimal degree of professionalism or consistent look and feel
- Organization has a packet of marketing materials that it uses on a consistent basis; information contained in the materials is up to date and reflects new programs, activities and outcomes; materials are reasonably professional in presentation and aligned with established standards for font, color, logo placement, etc.
- Organization has a packet of marketing materials that it uses consistently and is easy to update on a regular basis; materials are extremely professional in appearance and appeal to a variety of stakeholders; materials adhere to clear "branding" standards for font, color, logo placement, etc.

53. Communications Strategy
- Organization does not have any sort of communications plan or articulated communications strategy in place; key messages are not defined or articulated; stakeholders are not identified; information messages about the organization are inconsistent
- Organization does not have any sort of communications plan or articulated communications strategy in place, but key messages are defined and stakeholders are identified; communications to stakeholders are fairly inconsistent
- Organization has a communications plan and strategy in place; key messages are defined and stakeholders are identified; communications to stakeholders are generally consistent and coordinated
- Organization has a communications plan and strategy and updates it on a frequent basis; knows not only who its stakeholders are, but what they value; customizes communications to each of those stakeholders; communications always carry a consistent and powerful message

54. Public Relations and Marketing
- Organization makes no or limited use of PR/marketing; general lack of PR/marketing skills and expertise (either internal or accessible external or expertise).
- Organization takes opportunities to engage in PR/marketing as they arise; some PR/marketing skills and experience within staff or via external assistance.
- Organization considers PR/marketing to be useful, and actively seeks opportunities to engage in these activities; critical mass of internal expertise and experience in PR/marketing or access to relevant external assistance.
- Organization fully aware of power of PR/marketing activities, and continually and actively engages in them; broad pool of nonprofit PR/marketing expertise and experience within organization or efficient use made of external, sustainable, highly qualified resources.

55. Presence and Involvement in Local Community
- Organization's presence either not recognized or generally not regarded as positive; few members of local community (e.g., academics, other nonprofit leaders) constructively involved in the organization

- Organization's presence somewhat recognized, and generally regarded as positive within the community; some members of larger community constructively engaged with organization
- Organization reasonably well-known within community, and perceived as open and responsive to community needs; members of larger community (including a few prominent ones) constructively involved in organization
- Organization widely known within larger community, and perceived as actively engaged with and extremely responsive to it; many members of the larger community (including many prominent members) actively and constructively involved in organization (e.g., board, fund-raising)

56. Development and Nurturing of Partnerships and Alliances
- Limited use of partnerships and alliances with public sector, nonprofit, or for profit entities.
- Early stages of building relationships and collaborating with other for-profit, nonprofit, or public sector entities.
- Effectively built and leveraged some key relationships with few types of relevant parties (for-profit, public, and nonprofit sector entities); some relations may be precarious or not fully "win-win."
- Built, leveraged, and maintained strong, high-impact, relationships with variety of relevant parties (local, state, and federal government entities as well as for-profit, other nonprofit, arid community agencies); relationships deeply anchored in stable, long-term, mutually beneficial collaboration.

57. Influence on Policy Making
- Organization does not have ability or is unaware of possibilities for influencing policy-making; never called in on substantive policy discussions.
- Organization is aware of its possibilities in influencing policy-making; some readiness and skill to participate in policy discussion, but rarely invited to substantive policy discussions.
- Organization is fully aware of its possibilities in influencing policy-making and is one of several organizations active in policy-discussions on state or national level.
- Organization pro-actively and reactively influences policy-making, in a highly effective manner, on state and national levels; always ready for and often called on to participate in substantive policy discussion and at times initiates discussions.

58. Are you willing to share your name and the name of your organization? In agreeing to share this information, you will be eligible for one of two cash awards being offered by the Omaha Community Foundation. Each award is worth $1,000. Winners will be selected at random from the pool of eligible organizations.
- Yes (Please provide your name and the name of your organization)
- No

59. Would you like us to send you a pdf of your survey responses for your records? Your responses will not be shared with the Omaha Community Foundation or any other party.
- Yes (Please provide email address if not provided above already)
- No

Appendix C: Survey Results

The table below shows the results of the pre-test (or "baseline") and the post-test (or "follow-up") surveys. As discussed in the text of this evaluation report, the baseline survey was provided online in April 2012. The follow-up survey was provided online in April 2013, a year later. The results below show executive directors' responses to a set of questions asking them to assess their organization's capacity—on a scale of one to four— around the areas of mission and planning , program design and evaluation, information technology, financial management, fund development, board leadership, and marketing, communications and external relations. The scale used is as follows:

1 = Clear need for capacity
2 = Basic level of capacity
3 = Moderate level of capacity
4 = High level of capacity

The table below also compares the survey results between two groups—organizations that participated in the 2012-2013 NCBI and organizations on the Omaha Community Foundation's grant programs list that a) stated in the pre-test survey that they were willing to share their names and the names of their organization, and b) were comparable to organizations in the 2012-13 NCBI cohort in terms of budget size and organizational age (i.e. year formed), as well as described their field of work as one that was the same as at least one of the organizations in the 2012-13 NCBI cohort.

As discussed in the methodology of this evaluation report, while there several limitations that should be noted in interpreting the results of these surveys (including the inability to generalize these results to a larger population), these results suggest that executive directors of organizations that participated in the 2012-2013 NCBI felt that their organizational capacity had increased more so than comparable organizations that did not take part in the Initiative.

Table 1: Comparison of Survey Data, NCBI Participants and Control Group						
	NCBI Participants' Average			Control Group Average		
	Start	End	Change	Start	End	Change
Mission and Planning						
Mission	3.44	3.43	-0.02	3.83	3.666667	-0.17
Clarity of Vision	2.33	2.57	0.24	3.33	3.50	0.17
Boldness of Vision	2.63	3.14	0.52	3.50	3.83	0.33
Overarching Goals	2.22	2.29	0.06	3.67	3.50	-0.17
Overall Strategy	2.67	2.71	0.05	3.33	3.50	0.17
Strategic Planning	2.22	2.86	0.63	3.67	3.50	-0.17
Planning Systems	2.44	2.43	-0.02	3.00	3.17	0.17
Goals/Performance Targets	2.67	2.67	0.00	3.17	3.17	0.00

Operational Planning	2.33	2.71	0.38	3.00	3.17	0.17
Use and Development of Organizational Processes	2.56	2.57	0.02	3.00	3.17	0.17
Decision Making Framework	2.78	2.86	0.08	3.50	2.83	-0.67
Monitoring of Landscape	3.33	3.14	-0.19	3.67	3.33	-0.33
Knowledge Management	2.56	2.86	0.30	3.17	3.00	-0.17
Interfunctional Coordination	3.00	2.86	-0.14	2.83	3.00	0.17
Shared Beliefs and Values	3.44	3.43	-0.02	3.67	3.50	-0.17
Shared References and Practices	3.22	3.29	0.06	3.17	3.33	0.17
Positive Change	11 out of 16 items (69%)			8 out of 16 items (50%)		
Negative Change	5 out of 16 items (31%)			8 out of 16 items (50%)		
Program Design and Evaluation						
Performance Measurement	2.11	2.71	0.60	3.00	3.00	0.00
Performance Analysis and Program Adjustments	2.38	2.86	0.48	2.83	3.17	0.33
Program Relevance and Integration	3.33	2.86	-0.48	3.67	3.33	-0.33
Program Growth and Replication	3.11	3.00	-0.11	3.60	3.50	-0.10
New Program Development	2.89	3.29	0.40	3.33	3.33	0.00
Positive Change	3 out of 5 items (60%)			1 out of 5 items (20%)		
Negative or No Change	2 out of 5 items (40%)			4 out of 5 items (80%)		
Information Technology						
Databases and Management Reporting Systems	3.00	3.29	0.29	3.17	3.17	0.00
Positive Change	1out of 1 item (100%)			0 out of 1 item (0)%		
Negative or No Change	0 out of 1 item (0%)			1 out of 1 item (100%)		
Financial Management						
Financial Position	2.56	3.00	0.44	3.17	3.00	-0.17
Financial Planning and Analysis	2.22	2.57	0.35	3.17	3.00	-0.17
Positive Change	2 out of 2 items (100%)			0 out of 2 items (0%)		
Negative or No Change	0 out of 2 items (0%)			2 out of 2 items (100%)		
Fund Development						
Funding Stability	2.56	2.57	0.02	2.83	3.00	0.17
Fundraising Infrastructure	2.67	2.86	0.19	2.67	2.67	0.00
Fund Development Planning and Evaluation	2.22	2.57	0.78	3.17	2.83	-0.33
Positive Change	3 out of 3 items (100%)			1 out of 3 items (33%)		
Negative or No Change	0 out of 3 items (0%)			2 out of 3 items (67%)		
Board Leadership						
Core Financial and Legal Responsibilities of the Board	2.33	3.00	0.67	3.33	3.33	0.00

Board Strategic Direction	2.44	2.86	0.41	3.00	3.33	0.33
Board/Staff Balance of Leadership	2.56	3.00	0.44	3.17	3.17	0.00
Board Participation in Fund Development	2.67	2.71	0.05	2.83	3.00	0.17
Board Composition and Commitment	2.78	2.86	0.08	2.83	2.83	0.00
Board Development and Self Evaluation	2.22	2.57	0.35	2.83	2.67	-0.17
Board Infrastructure	3.00	3.14	0.14	3.17	3.33	0.17
Positive Change	7 out of 7 items (100%)			3 out of 7 items (43%)		
Negative or No Change	0 out of 7 items (0%)			4 out of 7 items (57%)		
Marketing, Communications, and External Relations						
Communications and Outreach Effectiveness	2.78	2.86	0.08	3.17	3.50	0.33
Communications Strategy	2.13	2.57	0.45	3.00	3.17	0.17
Public Relations and Marketing	2.33	2.57	0.24	3.33	3.33	0.00
Presence and Involvement of Local Community	2.67	2.71	0.05	3.00	3.33	0.33
Development and Nurturing of Partnerships and Alliances	3.22	3.14	-0.08	3.17	3.50	0.33
Influence on Policy Making	2.63	2.17	-0.46	2.33	2.83	0.50
Positive Change	4 out of 6 items (67%)			5 out of 6 items (83%)		
Negative or No Change	2 out of 6 items (33%)			1 out of 6 items (17%)		
Overall Change						
Positive Change	31 out of 40 items (78%)			18 out of 40 items (45%)		
Negative or No Change	9 out of 40 items (23%)			22 out of 40 items (55%)		