CSO ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY

ZANZIBAR, TANZANIA

FINAL REPORT

Submitted by:
Andrew Gilboy
Felipe Tejeda
Associates for Global Change

To:
David Simpson
Institute for International Education
Washington, D.C.

For:
U.S. Agency for International Development
Tanzania

February 2018
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

I. Background
   A. HICD Assessment of 15 Zanzibari CSOs
   B. Profile of the 13 CSOs selected
   C. General observations

II. The 5-Phase Program
   A. Description
   B. Design Features
   C. Level of Participation

III. Participant Evaluations

IV. Summary of Results Achieved

V. Recommendations
   A. For the group of 13 CSOs
   B. For a new group of CSOs working in education and/or health
   C. For CSOs already on USAID-funded activities

VI. Annexes
   A. List of CSOs
   B. Overview of 5-Phase Program
   C. ESRF Evaluations of Phases 1, 3, 5
   D. Scope of Work for the Program
INTRODUCTION

Undertaking a 5-phase 4-month long capacity building program in Zanzibar for 13 Civil Society Organizations requires collaborative mixed teams of local and international specialists, clear roles and responsibilities for each phase, proactive communications, and above all, flexibility and sensitivity to local practices and realities. The team that AGC and ESRF assembled was of high quality and all had a strong commitment, paving the way for an excellent program that achieved its major objectives – on time and within budget.

The facilitators/authors of this report thank this superb team listed below for their efforts, good will and technical expertise:

**Coaches:** The first three were Zanzibaris and the fourth was a Kenyan. They served as local and long-distance coaches, visiting and working with a number of the CSOs at their work place or via Internet or social media links.

- Ishaq Shariff, Zanzibar
- Mohammed K. Mohammed, Zanzibar
- Ali Said Salim, Zanzibar
- Kirogo Mwangi, Kenya

**ESRF Senior Staff:** the first two staff members helped assure continuity and maintain contact with the CSOs throughout the 4 months, and the third offered invaluable advice on business development practices.

- Margaret Kasembe, Dar es Salaam
- Goreth Kashasha, Dar es Salaam
- Patrick Kihenzile, Dar es Salaam

**IIE Home Office Staff:** Support from headquarters was critical to the success of the program. IIE’s professional staff drafted the Scope of Work that was realistic and provided continuous budget and financial support.

- Susan Fickling, Washington, D.C.
- Lindsay Hillenberg, Washington, D.C.

The following report was compiled in January and February 2018 by Andrew Gilboy and Felipe Tejeda, Certified Performance Technologists (CPT), at Associates for Global Change (AGC).
I. BACKGROUND

The idea to assist a selection of emerging and established Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Zanzibar originated in USAID/Tanzania’s Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG) Office which wanted to reach out more directly with Zanzibari groups working in the areas of youth and women empowerment. The office decided to begin with an assessment of a group of 15 CSOs that had been pre-selected by the Mission based on exploratory trips to the island. That assessment, completed in April of 2017, provided the essential foundation upon which a 5-phased 4-month program of organizational strengthening was designed and delivered.

The performance assessment of 15 CSOs and the subsequent 5-phase training program for 13 of them, were commissioned as part of USAID/Tanzania’s Participant Training Program (PTP) managed by the Institute of International Education (IIE). Associates for Global Change (AGC), a US-based sub-contractor to IIE under the PTP, implemented both activities using USAID’s principles and approaches found in its Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD) framework. The two AGC organizational specialists who undertook the assessment (Andrew Gilboy and Felipe Tejeda), have extensive experience with NGO capacity development and carry the Certified Performance Technologist (CPT) designation from the International Society for Performance Improvement.

Local arrangements and support came from the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), a Tanzanian organizational partner with IIE on PTP, by the assignment of two senior staff (Margaret Kasembe and Goreth Kashasha) to the Zanzibar assessment. They helped ensure local continuity and that schedules were set prior to the arrival of the AGC team; recruited and funded a local team of three senior Zanzibari facilitators; and provided invaluable advice throughout both assessment and workshop activities in Zanzibar.

This Final Report describes the main features of the organizational performance improvement program that stretched over 4 months, indicates what results were obtained, and recommends follow-up support to respond to anticipated challenges the CSOs will encounter embarking on instituting major changes in their strategic planning, program management and business development systems. (Readers who wish to consult the initial HICD Assessment completed in April 2017, can request a copy from USAID/Tanzania.)

A. The HICD Assessment of 15 Zanzibari CSOs

The objective of the HICD assessment was to define measurable performance gaps and other challenges of the pre-selected CSOs. The purpose of the assessment was to establish what should be optimal performance, to identify actual performance, and ultimately identify the gaps between the two. The assessment then recommended solutions to address these gaps. The assessment is the first step in the capacity-building process and is a key component of the entire performance improvement system. The process can be seen in the following graphic:
The assessment guided the facilitators to group the CSOs into two categories, each with three ratings:

Current Performance: Low – Medium – High

Potential Performance: Low – Medium – High

Of the total of 15 CSOs interviewed, USAID indicated that 13 should be invited to the in-depth organizational performance improvement program beginning in September, 2017. The final list of the selected CSOs is included in the Annex with their participants.

The principal value of conducting the Zanzibar assessment, prior to designing solutions to address the identified gaps, was to identify the principal areas that required corrective interventions. Performance solutions involved training targeting specific areas, coaching, sector-specific or topical technical assistance, and access to resources. Based on the findings, AGC identified local consultants as facilitators and together they designed the programs that revolved around specific themes or “improvement areas.” Every effort was made to avoid generic “solutions” and to ensure that all interventions were context-appropriate. The assessment guided the way.

B. Profile of the 13 CSOs selected

The USAID Mission in Tanzania selected 15 CSOs in Zanzibar, two of which were located in Pemba, for assessment by the team. While all the CSOs addressed the cornerstone of USAID’s strategic plan (youth and women empowerment), the list included a wide range of CSO types and levels of development. This section presents the profile of the group and describes the current performance, which was the first step in the process of conducting an HICD assessment.
Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total exceeds fifteen since some CSOs work across sectors, for example, women in the media, or legal assistance to youth. The age of the CSOs ranged from new (since 2011) to a few formed in the 1990s.

Performance Ratings

The rationale behind the ratings was based on three levels of observed performance:

- **Low performance.** The CSO has not managed in the past, or is not currently managing, activities currently that affect positively its target audience or contributes to its stated mandate or goal.

- **Medium performance.** The CSO has on occasion produced outputs that addressed its mandate thereby showing a capacity to perform that may or may not, be present today. Often the mediocre performance was explained by a lack of funding or by funding terminated (in which case the assessment team would attempt to determine if the funding was ended due to poor performance or for other external reasons). In some cases the organization lacked the know-how to identify funding opportunities.

- **High performance.** The CSO is currently managing activities that directly relate to its mandate and can be shown using MEL techniques to produce results. Here the team would assess whether the high performance revealed organizational strength or reflected an unusual circumstance (e.g., a one-time large contribution, an exceptionally committed and strong leader, a personal contact in a funding organization).

In terms of location and governance, 2 were based in Pemba and 13 in Unguja. Some were managed by women. All had variations of Boards of Directors, a local requirement to be registered as a CSO/NGO. Some had "active" boards involved in decision-making while others had inactive boards that may or may not meet as required.

Although financial resources, capacity and performance varied widely, no CSO could claim an endowment or a permanent source of future funding (such as an irrevocable trust), and only two owned their headquarters. Long-term financial and real assets are important indications of long-term viability. Only five (16%) of the 15 CSOs had reliable donor support to finance their activities as planned while the remainder either had no support (and no activities) or had some activities with little or irregular donor support.
Types of CSOs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Association</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Membership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The size and employment levels of the CSOs varied widely as well, from a few unpaid volunteer staff with no permanent office, to a large high-performing CSO with 28 full-time employees paid regular salaries with workers' benefits. Most fell in between, with “full-time” staff with positions and responsibilities, who functioned without regular pay, to those that had paid administrative staff with volunteer leadership.

As for the methods used to induce change, all but two (87%) were actively engaged in advocacy of some form. All conducted workshops and delivered training, some produced videos for television, a few used social media aggressively, several used radio effectively, several produced documents of various sizes and kinds distributed in hard and soft copy, and a few provided professional opportunities for selected beneficiaries.

C. General Observations

An assessment methodology produces a “photo” of the current performance of an organization. As described above, the assessment uncovered three levels of current performance: low, medium and high. This categorization simply provides information on an organization's present output and to some extent, its capacity. Capacity does not equal performance; that is, an organization can have a finance department, a procurement specialist and an HR manual, and have poor performance.

The USAID Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) measures the existence of these functions, not the organizational performance occurring. Furthermore, the OCA is completed by the organization itself whereas a performance assessment is driven by an external performance technologist working closely with the institution. Observing current performance is a richer indication of an organization’s capacity to, for example, increase performance, adjust to a changing external environment or become active in a new sector.

The Zanzibar assessment team of international and local consultants concluded that the CSOs had . . .

- limited knowledge of USAID development objectives and little experience interacting with USAID;
- developed few partnerships with other CSOs among those selected;
- a strong culture of volunteerism. Staff with resources shared whatever they had with unpaid staff when income was limited, a factor the facilitators had not observed often in other countries.
• widespread recognition of the constraints encountered due to the political environment and the uncertainty that produced for the organization.

The assessment team identified the following functional areas upon which the 5-phase “improvement” program could be designed:

• **Business development/resource mobilization.** All of the CSOs needed assistance to varying degrees. Few had any notion of the bidding process to be selected for a grant or contract.

• **Advocacy.** Even the high performing CSOs among the 15 needed to improve their approach to advocacy, a concern shared by all of the CSOs.

• **Financial management.** Although the needs differed considerably among the CSOs, some common issues applied to all, such as the importance of indirect rates in financial management, or developing reasonable budgets for proposals. Only two CSOs had an active Chart of Accounts.

• **Membership management.** For the Membership CSOs, the ability to deliver relevant services to members was limited or uneven. Few CSOs were aware of best practices in constituent or membership management.

• **Strategic planning** was ignored or misunderstood by all but a few. Some believed the plan should be done solely by an outside consultant, if funding is available.

• **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL).** Several of the higher-performing CSOs had strong or improving MEL system. An organization’s MEL system has to be both activity-focused (primarily for donors/clients) and organizational (inwardly focused), so that the CSO tracks its performance toward achieving the strategic goals and targets. Most, however, had little understanding of the importance of MEL.

• **Board of Directors.** Although a wide variety of CSO Boards exist, only a few played an active role in assisting the CSO in reaching its objectives or even less, in ensuring its survivability.

The Final Assessment provides details on these findings.

**II. The 5-Phase Program**

*Objective:* By the end of the Program, each CSO will be equipped with the knowledge, skills and tools needed to achieve ...

- increased performance in their focus areas;
- greater impact on their target beneficiaries; and
- improved prospects for growth and/or sustainability.
A. Description

Drawing on the assessment findings, the facilitators designed a program comprising five phases, of which three (Phases 1, 3 and 5) included on-site in-depth workshops on five of the seven areas cited in the assessment (and listed above). Phases 2 and 4 (and a period following the final phase) were devoted to coaching to help ensure that the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired in the on-site workshops, could be applied by the CSOs.

Five of the “improvement areas” above were compressed into four and two (membership management and advocacy) were postponed for future consideration. Board of Directors training joined Strategic Planning, and Business Development/Resource Mobilization replaced the more widely used Fund Raising term. The designers considered that these four topical areas found in all non-profit organizations were critical to fueling CSO growth, organizational performance and stability.

The 5-phase program was presented to the CSOs as shown below:

- Phase 1: Orientation and Overview of 4 Workshop Topics
  (September 12-15, 2017)
- Phase 2: Coaching
  (September 25 – October 29)
- Phase 3: Business Development, Strategic Planning/Boards & MEL
  (October 30 – November 8, 2017)
- Phase 4: Coaching
  (November 9 – December 3, 2017)
- Phase 5: Financial Management & Program Evaluation
  (December 4 – 8, 2017)

The underlying concept reiterated throughout the program is illustrated in the graphic below:
Even though the workshops were presented in separate 2-day sessions each, making improvements in any one organizational area would profoundly affect the others. Participants learned that their organizations were comprised of complex systems, even if their CSO were small. The assessment team sought systemic changes that would build capacity, enhance their chances for growth and success, and increase performance, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The parallel to the human body was another leit-motif reiterated throughout the program: an open sore on the leg could lead to fever, headaches and weight loss. A change in one part or system effects change in the others.

**Phase 1** set the stage for the subsequent training by devoting a half-day to introduce each subject so the CSOs could plan their schedules well ahead of the proposed date. The first phase also aimed to get input from the group as to their agreement that the subjects were timely and relevant, and to build anticipation and excitement about attending the rigorous sessions. Lastly, the facilitators needed to establish trust with the group and establish a learning dynamic to ensure full participation and a culture of knowledge-sharing throughout the time together.

In **Phase 2**, a Zanzibari consultant assisted each CSO to plan for the upcoming workshops, select the appropriate staff to attend and to take stock of each CSO’s performance level for each topical workshop. The CSOs were tasked with creating a Preparation Plan so that they could take maximum advantage of the Phase 3 program of three 2-day intensive workshops. The facilitators selected a well-known coach, who had been on the assessment team, and also had been in a leadership position in one of the 13 CSOs attending the program, to assist each CSO in completing an internal inquiry as to its current performance in each of the topical areas.

**Phase 3** opened with a review of the Preparation Plans each CSO had developed. The aim of the plans was to ensure that participants in **Phase 1** informed staff of the program’s objectives and
selected appropriate staff to attend the different workshops. It also served to motivate the CSOs to participate fully in Phase 3.

After sharing the CSO plans, participants attended three of the four topical area workshops, devoting two days to each one. Local Zanzibari experts teamed with the international facilitators in presenting each subject, with the exception of Business Development where no local expert could be identified.

- **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL).** The facilitators identified a highly-experienced MEL employee of one of the CSOs who, with the support of his supervisors, became an official “coach” for Phases 3, 4 and 5 with regards to MEL. To supplement this critical area for CSO development, a highly-respected MEL expert from Nairobi fluent in Swahili and English came to Zanzibar to spend time with the group and to mentor the younger Zanzibari MEL coach. Both experts then served as coaches for Phase 4.

- **Business Development/Resource Mobilization.** The nascent level of understanding of this important area in Zanzibar explained that no Zanzibari expert could be identified with whom the expatriate facilitators could co-train. A principal theme in this session was to nudge the group away from the current approach whereby CSOs requested “help” from well-meaning donors to support their CSO in its charitable work.

Instead, CSOs learned that they had valuable technical expertise and local knowledge that can be marketed to “clients” that need the CSOs, whether international donors, local government entities or private businesses. The CSOs needed to transform their relationship with potential funders from the “hands-out” approach, to one where they were marketing their technical services.

Participants learned how a business development unit functions, the critical role it plays in securing a stable future for the CSO, and the ways it can identify and seek out funding opportunities that meet its strategic objectives. An ESRF official (Patrick Kihenzile) experienced in developing proposals for donors and clients, shared how ESRF has grown from a small, government-funded NGO to a solid entity with diversified funding and 25 full-time employees, providing essential services to donors and government. Participants saw from the inside how business development functions, to the extent of discussing the organization’s “win rate,” that is the percentage of proposals submitted that were successful. This was all new knowledge for the participants and once again, supported the paradigm change from a mindset of “help us” to “let us help you reach our shared objectives” (to improve the lives of Zanzibari women, promote press freedoms, etc.).

- **Strategic Planning and Role of Boards.** A Zanzibari attorney well known to the group made sure that the Zanzibari context drove the learning. The level of understanding of the importance of Strategic Planning for CSO growth and stability was minimal, while the notion that Board members have an active role to play, particularly in business
development, was nonexistent. Participants learned how strategic planning, organizational MEL, business development, and financial management were essential components of a stable and performing organization.

Phase 4 concentrated on on-site support to each CSO in applying what they acquired during the Phase 3 topical workshops. The selected coaches devoted valuable time between Phases 3 and 5 meeting with the CSOs and supporting the changes they were learning or undertaking. Each CSO developed a presentation to share with the group at the opening of Phase 5 identifying changes they had made in their CSOs and the challenges they faced.

Phase 5 included the final topical workshop on Financial Management (FM), which occupied two full days of the Phase 5 program, and a final day for CSO presentations, evaluation and Action Planning.

- **Financial Management.** The FM workshop was led by a well-known Zanzibari financial expert with 20 years of experience assisting NGOs in establishing their financial systems. Participants learned using case studies, simulations and exercises so that they could move quickly to make changes in their CSOs. The Zanzibari trainer demonstrated various software tools that were accessible and affordable for the CSOs. He also offered his assistance, as did all the coaches, to the CSOs in future months in introducing new FM systems and methods.

The last day of Phase 5 was set aside for Action Planning, participant evaluation, CSO comments on the training program and distribution of certificates to the CSOs. It opened with a dynamic session of presentations by each CSO in the presence of a USAID/Tanzania representative. Participants detailed the changes made in their CSOs during the previous four months and the results already obtained based on the first four phases they completed.

Each CSO signing a *Commitment to Change* document was a major commitment from the beginning of the 5-phase program. CSOs reviewed their learnings over the previous months and selected two actions they pledged to introduce into their organizations over the next 6 months: *We the undersigned have selected the following priority changes to introduce into our CSO over the next 6 months.* The facilitators then collected these pledges that would serve as the basis for follow-up assistance from coaches and others.

**B. Design Features**

Some aspects of the Program that increased the likelihood of achieving the program’s objectives, were:

- Regular contact maintained by various team members through all phases with every CSO – including Pemba-based ones, helped assure continuity and interest
Phased approach with regular coaching supported workplace integration of learnings from workshops

Flexible training approach allowed for real-time changes – no off-the-shelf elements were used

At least 2 staff from each CSO participated in each topical workshop according to topic and position, resulting in multiple staff from most CSOs attended the training

The 4 workshop topics were evidence-driven and based on needs drawn from the assessment

Attendance in all phases was high – ranging from 80 to 100 percent of CSOs

4 external coaches (3 of whom were Zanzibari) worked with CSOs between phases

All coaches were Swahili speakers increasing the potential impact of the topical training

Coaches also served as lead or co-trainers in every workshop

At the beginning of each Phase, participants could share their experiences and challenges implementing what they had learned from the previous workshops. After each topical workshop, facilitators assembled all handouts and PowerPoints to distribute to participants with the help of ESRF, so that every participant had access to all the resources used, plus additional ones the facilitators selected. In this way every participant received by email or by USB memory stick, everything they needed to follow up with their Action Plan, including tools and job aides. The handouts for all the phases are too long to include in the Annex to this report but can be obtained from USAID/Tanzania’s DRG office.

C. Level of Participation

Most of the 13 Zanzibari CSOs actively participated throughout the 4-month program. Each CSO carefully selected the appropriate personnel or volunteer to attend according to the topic being addressed. In this way, financial personnel attended the last workshop on Financial Management, and staff devoted to MEL attended that session. Some small CSOs tended to send their principals since they had no designated staff handling the responsibilities of the topical workshops.

Below are some indications of the seriousness by which the CSOs greeted the entire program.

A Pemba-based CSO self-financed a coach’s follow-up assistance

One Pemba-based CSO paid for airfare and per diem for a 3rd participant to attend

CSOs formed strong relationships during the program, an impact that has led to the establishment of a Community of Practice via social media

One CSO pledged to provide excess office space to another CSO
On the final day of the program, the CSOs presented hard evidence which they shared with colleagues of the institutional changes they were carrying out.

12 CSOs signed a formal commitment to institute 2 organizational improvements in the first 6 months of 2018.

One CSO is allowing its M&E expert to provide assistance to 2 other CSOs setting up their M&E systems.

ESRF maintained attendance records for all CSOs for all sessions. These also demonstrated the commitment the CSO leadership and staff had to the program.

III. Participant Evaluations

Evaluations were conducted by ESRF at the conclusion of each of the three Phases involving common events or workshop (1, 3, 5), and these are included in the Annexes. In all three of the evaluations, participants responded to questions covering topics such as the quality and relevance of the information received, appropriateness of the venue and time available for the subject areas. In a scale of 1 to 5, in all but one area (time available), responses regarding the topical workshops ranged from 4.1 to just under 5.0 indicating an unusually high participant satisfaction rating. Regarding the time factor, responses were 3.7 on a scale of 5 showing that most of the participants were comfortable with the time allotted. Coaching received somewhat lower ratings which nonetheless remained above 3.0.

Below are some of the comments found in the evaluations, from both participants and the ESRF observers:

---

**AGC used a good approach to select the final topics based on the niche and findings from the participants, thus being able to capture and address the relevant critical gaps identified during the assessments. AGC also allowed participants to selected topics on which to focus on in each of the four major capacity building areas given in Phase 3.**

**The deep involvement of participants at every level in the conducted Phases so far has enlisted the participants’ engaged in the discussions, so that during Phase 3, the participants were able to articulate skill gaps facing their organizations, and openly acknowledged that the training was useful in providing more insight for skills strengthening especially with regard to the management and sustainability of their work in the communities as CSOs.** From ESRF Evaluation Report, Phase 3

---

**Participant comments regarding the time available:**

- Monitoring, Evaluation Learning need more than two days to be taught so the time is not enough, data analysis should be trained in deep because many organization have a problem in it.
The overall training is very useful to my organization but also to me personally. However there is a need to have more time especially on the issue of Proposals writing and strategic plan.

Participant ratings regarding relevance of training to participants’ work:

Participants indicate high scores (above 4.6/5) on the relevance of the training to their work situation. They show much satisfaction in the knowledge they have gained in Strategic Planning, MEL, and Financial Management. These are the main areas that relate to the experienced gaps in all CSOs in Zanzibar. (ESRF Phase 5 Final Evaluation)

Participant ratings on coaching:

Although the coaching aspect received scores ranging from 3 to 4 showing overall satisfaction, participant comments indicated that coaching could have been of a higher quality. The Phase 2 coaching raised some questions which were addressed in Phase 3 (with a view toward improving Phase 4 coaching), so that evaluations of Phase 4 coaching were significantly higher. Although the quality of the coaches was excellent, managing remotely their work and technical delivery was challenging. The facilitators acquired experience in managing coaching in a 5-phased activity that will lead to improvements on future training programs of this type.

IV. Summary of Results Achieved

Results are not typically recorded prior to the end of a short training program designed to address performance gaps in an organization. In the case of the Zanzibar program, with a span of 4 months, and the support of coaches, the participating CSOs made impressive changes in their organizations based on progressively acquiring knowledge and skills. Some of these are listed below.

- Many revised or initiated their Strategic Plans
- One CSO revised its former Vision statement from 2 pages to 1 sentence (based on learnings from the workshop on Strategic Planning)
- Only 2 CSOs understood organizational MEL (as compared to project-level M&E) at the beginning; at the end, all CSOs could demonstrate the importance of organizational M&E and Learning.
- All CSOs recognized the limitations of a project-based focus and were moving toward the organizational mentality
- Few CSOs had a Chart of Accounts (COA); at the end, all CSOs had learned how to create a COA and intended to do so.
The program built the capacity of a cadre of professional Zanzibaris to carry on work and provide assistance to local CSOs in the future.

One CSO is allowing its M&E expert to provide assistance to 2 other CSOs in setting up their M&E systems.

All post-workshop evaluations reported high satisfaction levels.

CSOs formed strong relationships during the program, an impact that has led to the establishment of a Community of Practice via social media.

Some of the bullets above are recopied from the list showing a high level of participation since they illustrate both strong interest in the program as well as results obtained.

V. Recommendations

As this report suggests, the 5-phase, 4-month capacity strengthening program for 13 CSOs in Zanzibar achieved its objectives. In a short time, participants acquired new knowledge that they had begun to apply at their workplaces and that were producing positive changes. With time and additional carefully-targeted support, this group of CSOs will transform themselves into stronger, effective and stable organizations. The low performers identified in the assessment will move up the ratings ladder to medium, the medium performers to high, and the already high performers to a new category: super performers. Not all will change, but the 5-phase program gave all access to the resources and knowledge they needed to begin the process.

The graphic below illustrates the importance of follow-on for any training program. The left circle represents the typical way training is employed to effect change and transfer knowledge: 85 percent of the effort is on the training event itself, 10 percent on pre-training planning, and 5 percent on follow-up to ensure that the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired during training are applied in the workplace. Whereas, research shows when these allocations are altered so that roughly one-quarter of the effort is spent in planning and one-quarter on the training itself, and half is devoted to support after the training event, significantly more results are achieved. Yet decision-makers continue to believe that the training event itself is the principal determinant of training effectiveness.
There is no question that the 5-phase approach to strengthen the Zanzibari CSOs transferred critical knowledge and skills to participants. And due to factors discussed in this report, the CSOs began making changes in their systems within the 4-month time frame. The challenge now is to sustain those changes through follow-up support, so that the CSOs get on a solid footing toward stability, quality performance and growth. Some important recommendations are:

A For the group of 13 CSOs

- For MEL and Financial Management. Support the 2 Zanzibari coaches to provide on-site technical assistance in these two topical areas. The 2-day workshops held for each topic during the program provided an adequate foundation and ready-made tools for each CSO to begin implementing changes immediately. The CSOs made a good start working with the two excellent topical coaches in MEL and FM. These initiatives should be supported so that any CSO requesting assistance can access it in 2018. Both MEL and FM require software, trained staff or volunteers to operate and maintain these new systems, and local TA. Software costs are minimal in that so much readily available freeware. It is recommended that the two coaches be financed through ESRF, with remote coaching oversight from PTP. For MEL, the Nairobi-based MEL expert who provided invaluable assistance in Phase 3 and 4 both in Zanzibar and from Nairobi, should be engaged to continue his work with the Zanzibari MEL coach. They have already created a Community of Practice for MEL that would be supportive of any follow-on work.

- For Business Development/Resource Mobilization and Strategic Planning/ Board of Directors. The two-day dive into these technical areas provided a foundation on which the CSOs could build. But each topic requires more time to delve into the technical aspects to enable most
of the CSOs to make more than an initial change. For example, because more workshop focus was placed on Strategic Planning and less on Board of Directors, participants left with primarily a theoretical grasp of the role of their Boards. A logical next step is to organize training specifically for CSO Board members, which participants voiced as a strong need. A 2-day Board of Directors training could be designed and delivered for two Board members from each CSO, plus their CEOs, to develop, with the Board members, best practices for NGO Boards: roles and responsibilities, Boards and governance, ethics and conflict of interest policies, Board-CEO relationships, fundraising roles of Boards, etc. At the moment, the CEO Boards are far from meeting international standards.

For Business Development and Resource Mobilization, participants had little notion of either concept, except in the most general manner. Recognizing that a major take-away from the 5-phase program was participant recognition that their CSOs must “sell” their technical capability and knowledge to “clients” who in turn need Zanzibari organizations to implement activities, a follow-up training employing simulations and case studies is needed that focuses on developing marketing strategies, tools and materials; bid/no-bid decision making; tracking systems for new business opportunities; forging strategic bidding partnerships; and proposal writing skills. In particular, proposal writing training could be designed whereby CSO staff were tasked with creating proposals for sample contracts or grants, developing proposal budgets, presenting CVs and corporate qualifications and presenting them to other CSOs and facilitators. Technical teams would simulate reviewing the proposals, grading them and selecting the winners.

Whereas the on-site work in MEL and FM can be provided by existing coaches, with oversight from facilitators, the second training and coaching would be designed and implemented by international specialists co-training with Zanzibari coaches.

B. For a new group of CSOs working in education and/or health

In light of the achievements of the 5-Phase program, a similar phased program can be offered to a second group of CSOs working in two sectors not implicated in the first program: education and health. The CSOs selected could be those with no USAID or USG funding, either directly or indirectly. Or, USAID could prefer to work with those CSOs in these two sectors that have had some involvement, either directly or through an implementing partner in Zanzibar, with a USG agency. The program could be similar to the 5-Phase program or modified to fit the context and need.

C. For CSOs already on USAID-funded activities

Some Zanzibar CSOs are already receiving technical assistance from US implementing agencies through regional or central projects. One of these (Strengthening Civil Society Globally – SCS Global) currently works with selected Zanzibari CSOs building their technical capacity in journalism and communication. In contrast, the 5-phase program just completed aims to build organizational strength and stability so that the CSO's technical output can flourish and be
effective. A modified *capacity building / performance improvement* activity could be designed and delivered to this group, drawing on successful examples from the first group of 13 as models to emulate.

There are other follow-on ideas that can be tailored to meet USAID’s CDCS objectives, in particular so that Zanzibar Civil Society Organizations become active and effective players in Zanzibar's future.
ANNEXES

A. List of CSOs
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANGOZA</td>
<td>Association of NGOs in Zanzibar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYD</td>
<td>Center for Youth Dialog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYSED</td>
<td>Institute for Youth Socio Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT</td>
<td>Media Council of Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>Pemba Press Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRO</td>
<td>Pemba Relief Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMWA</td>
<td>Tanzania Media Women’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAFAYCO</td>
<td>Zanzibar Fighting Against Youth Challenges Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAFELA</td>
<td>Zanzibar Female Lawyers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZLSC</td>
<td>Zanzibar Legal Services Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANIC</td>
<td>Zanzibar Interfaith Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIRPP</td>
<td>Zanzibar Institute of Research and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZYF</td>
<td>Zanzibar Youth Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Overview of 5-Phase Program

Organizational Performance Improvement for Zanzibari CSOs

Hilton Double Tree Conference Center
Stone Town, Zanzibar

Program Summary by Phase

A program sponsored by:
USAID/Tanzania
Participant Training Program
Contract # AID-621-TO-14-00001

Implemented by:
Institute of International Education
Washington, D.C.

Training Designed and Facilitated by:
Associates for Global Change
October 2017
Organizational Performance Improvement for Zanzibari CSOs

OBJECTIVES OF THE 5-PHASE PROGRAM

By the end of the Program, each CSO will be equipped with the knowledge, skills and tools needed to achieve ...

❖ increased performance in their focus areas;

❖ greater impact on their target beneficiaries; and

❖ improved prospects for growth and/or sustainability.
Review of Program by Phase
September – December 2017

PHASE 1: Orientation and Program Presentation
4 Days: September 12 – 15, 2017

- Building the CSO “performance team”
- Distinguishing between organizational functions and positions
- Validating the assessment findings
- Learning about the selected four performance Topical Areas:
  - Business Development and Resource Mobilization
  - Strategic Planning and Role of the Board of Directors
  - Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
  - Financial Management
- Planning for follow-up (Action Plan) and coaching

PHASE 2: Coaching
One Month: September 17 – late October, 2017

Objective: CSOs supported by access to a resource person ("coach") to help prepare the way to apply the knowledge and skills to be acquired from the topical workshops to improve performance.

Activities
- Assist CSOs in implementing their Action Plans
- Support the CSOs in creating an environment for performance improvement
- Gather information on current performance in each topical area

PHASE 3: Topical Workshops
7 days: October 30 – November 7, 2017

Objective: CSOs with knowledge, skills and tools able to introduce changes in their CSOs in the topical areas listed below:

- Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors
- Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
Activities

- 1-day update on Action Plan implementation
- 2-day Training module in each of the 3 topical areas
- Training facilitated by a technical specialist in each field
- Action Plan revised

PHASE 4: Coaching
One Month: Nov 8 – December 3, 2017

Objective: CSOs with access to subject-matter experts to help them introduce changes in their organization that will result in performance improvements in the areas they identify as the most needed.

Activities

- Assist CSOs in implementing their Action Plans
- Provide guidance on overcoming challenges of introducing new ideas for the three topical areas
- Provide technical knowledge of how to adapt each topical area to the CSO’s context

There will be one coach for each topical area with experience working in non-profit or small organizations.

PHASE 5: Topical Workshop: Financial Management
Action Plan and Program Evaluation
3 days: December 4 – 7, 2017

Objective: CSOs with knowledge, skills and tools able to introduce changes in their CSOs in the topical area of Financial Management.

Activities

- ½ -day update on Action Plan implementation from previous month
- 1 ½ -day Training in Financial Management
- Training facilitated by a technical specialist in Financial Management
- 1 day in-depth program evaluation and forward planning.
C. ESRF Evaluations of Phases 1, 3, 5
PHASE 1
ZANZIBAR CSO TRAINING PROGRAMS
PHASE ONE: ORIENTATION WORKSHOP
HILTON DOUBLE TREE CONFERENCE CENTER IN STONE TOWN, ZANZIBAR.
SEPTEMBER 12 – 15, 2017,

Group Photo: AGC, PTP, and ZNZ CSOs Participants September, 2017

Report Submitted by:
Margaret K. Kasembe
Project Director
USAID PTP Tanzania

September, 2017
A. BACKGROUND

Based on the findings from the organizational assessment which was conducted last April (2017) on Zanzibar and Pemba CSOs, AGC has designed a series of activities as intervention solutions in order to assist these organizations improve performance and build capacities.

Starting with Phase One, AGC conducted a four days Orientation and Overview workshop, on Organizational Performance Improvement for the CSOs. The workshop took place from September 12 – 15, 2017, at Hilton Double Tree Conference Center in Stone Town, Zanzibar.

The Orientation workshop was able to focus on areas for improvement: that is, common areas which have been found to prevail in most CSOs, namely: Business Development and Resource Mobilization; Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors; Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning; and CSOs Financial Management.

The last session on the fourth day was devoted to Action Planning development. The CSOs will implement these action plans under coaching for one month. The presentations of these action plans will be done at the Phase 3 Workshop.

B. EVALUATION

The following is a brief analysis of the participants’ responses on the PTP Evaluation Tool. The rating was between (1) as the lowest and (5) as the highest.

NB: However, due to the absence of the Project Director, this evaluation does not include PTP technical observations.

Fig 1: Delivery and Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Participants’ Evaluation Tool Sept 2017-09-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The given scores are indicating that the participants were highly satisfied with the Content and Delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2: Relevance of Training to the Participants' Work Situation
The responses on this variable also indicate high participants’ scores. The low score indicated in the graph was probably based on the fact that the CSOs did not receive feedback on the April Assessment. In the absence of the feedback, the participants could not easily relate the training to the assessment.

**Fig 3: Organization and Logistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Participants’ Evaluation Tool Sept 2017-09-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The responses on this variable also indicate high participants’ scores. The low score indicated in the graph was probably based on the fact that the CSOs did not receive feedback on the April Assessment. In the absence of the feedback, the participants could not easily relate the training to the assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**
In the given tool, the participants were given opportunity to give open comments on any area of the training program. The following comments were given by the participants either as general or specific comments.

1. **General Comments**

1. I would suggest to have the trainer who will have enough time to visit each participated CSO and help to overcome the challenges that faces the CSOs and increase the CSO performance rather than meeting in groups like that.
2. Coaching Session should be conducted as in house training and greater effort should be made to ask for each CSO to select their particular area of improvement.
3. It was a wonderful training and I got a lot of knowledge which I didn't have before and hope to get another chance to improve my knowledge. Keep on working and helping our CSOs.
4. This training has been very helpful and eye opening to me. Now I and my colleagues can improve the performance of our NGO and we hope to use very well the knowledge we gained in this training to bring more impact (positive) to our NGO and beneficiaries.
5. Individual report or need assessment is important for better planning of the future interventions.
6. In every department of institution it is better to have the specific person attend; e.g MEL – M&E Staff concerned.

2. **Specific Comments for the Trainers**

1. Provide link to reference materials
   - Provide more related similar experiences from CSOs world wide
   - Provide more training (knowledge on Governance/Management for CSO)
   - Provide more challenging case study scenarios for group visit
2. The use of live case studies as training materials should be provided before training
3. More of guided group work
4. I suggest on the coming phase you need to be careful in selecting coaches, as an important person and must be with appropriate knowledge and commitments to deliver desirable objectives.
ANNEX 1

CSO ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

A. DATE: 12TH TO 15TH SEPTEMBER, 2017

B. VENUE: DOUBLE TREE ZANZIBAR

C. 

D. PARTICIPANTS’ EVALUATION FORM

E. This evaluation form is intended to help the ESRF/IIE improve its performance in the delivery of Trainings in future. Please give your sincere opinion. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME.

F. Please assign the score against each of the inquiries using the given score ranges 1-5 below.

G. (1= Poor, 2= Average, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, and 5= Excellent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Area of Inquiry</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The quality of training delivery and training materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rating on presenters’ knowledge and experience on the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rating on the appropriateness of knowledge and skills on your needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did the training meet your expectations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to Your Work Situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did the identified gaps during the assessment in April relate to the training you have received?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What is the relevance of training on Business Development and Resource Mobilization for your institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rate the relevance of training on Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors to your institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advantage of the session on Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Relevance of the training in Financial Management for your institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Has the Action Plan implementation been tailored to your work situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Organization and other Logistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adequacy of Days allocated for the training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quality of the venue and equipment(s) used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Training coordination and administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for pre-training preparations (e.g. information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Overall quality of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments and/or Suggestions for Improvement:

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
PHASE 3

EVALUATION ON ZANZIBAR CSO TRAINING PROGRAMS ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

PHASE THREE: TOPICAL WORKSHOP

HILTON DOUBLE TREE CONFERENCE CENTER IN STONE TOWN, ZANZIBAR.


Prepared for IIE by:
Margaret K. Kasembe
USAID PTP Tanzania
Economic and Social Research Foundation
P. O. Box 31226
Dar es Salaam
Tel:
Email: mkasembe.esrf.or.tz
Introduction

The Associates for Global Change (AGC) continued to implement the goal of equipping the selected 13 Zanzibar CSOs, with the knowledge, skills and tools needed to achieve increased performance in their focus areas: namely; greater impact on their target beneficiaries; and improved prospects for growth and/or sustainability. By the end of the Program, each CSO was equipped with the knowledge, skills and tools needed to achieve the named focused areas.

Phase 3 was conducted on three (3) Topical Workshops from October 30 – November 7, 2017. The main Facilitators Andrew Gilboy and Felipe Tejeda, from Associates for Global Change, Ishaq Shariff, Phase 2 Coach & Consultant in the area of Strategic Planning, and Kirogo Mwangi, Specialist and Consultant in the area of Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, Patrick Kihenzile from ESRF staff (Department of Commissioned Studies) also participated in the Business Development topical area, by sharing the experience of ESRF as an NGO. The knowledge sharing discussion was well received as it was able to touch base with most concerns in the area of Business Management within the ZNZ CSOs.

PTP was able to distribute Evaluation Questionnaires at the end of Phase 3 training. The main intention was to determine how well the focus areas were received by the participants. These areas included: Content and Delivery of the subject areas; Relevance to the Work Situation; plus the participants views on the Training Organization and Logistics. Scores range was (1= Poor, 2= Average, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, and 5= Excellent).

Content and Delivery

Under Content and Delivery, participants were able to indicate how well the 3 topical areas were facilitated and gave scores according to the given questionnaire scale.

1. Business Development

Business Development and Resource Mobilization had been identified as an area of concern in most of the CSOs in Zanzibar and Pemba. The Facilitators were able to give presentations on ideal situations regarding on the importance of business Development and its value-added function in any CSO of whatever size. ESRF was used as a model, and the presenter was able to demonstrate the link to the organization’s Strategic Plan and Sustainability. Resource mobilization through fund raising or proposal writing and bidding as individual or partnerships were also discussed at length and were well appreciated by the participants.

The given figure below indicates responses from participants on how well the content on Business Development facilitation was received. Participants acknowledge that the facilitators had good Knowledge and Experience of the subject area (4.47/5). The training delivery and training materials used scored (4.14/5). The participants indicate that the training was well received as it was able to meet their expectations by (4.16/5).

Fig 1: Responses on Content and Delivery of Business Development
Strategic Planning and Role of Board Of Directors in implementing the organizations Vision, Mission, Objectives, were greatly emphasized. Using sample models, the Facilitators were able to highlight the formulation of these key messages in the CSO. Comparison of Planning Models & Approaches in Managing the Planning Process were used in order to demonstrate how the SP should be integrated and aligned to the Monitoring Progress. In all the processes the Role of the Board of Directors and Types of Boards in promoting the image of the CSO were highlighted. Case Studies, Role Plays and Exercises were extensively used in order to promote understanding.

**Fig 2: Responses on Content and Delivery of Strategic Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training delivery and Training Materials</th>
<th>Knowledge Experience</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Phase 3 Participants Responses

The main Facilitator, who was also the Coach of the Phase 2, regarding the CSOs' implementation of their Action Plan was able to touch on key areas found during the coaching process. By the end of the session on Strategic Planning, the participants indicated much satisfaction: Facilitator’s knowledge and Experience scored (4.6/5); Training and Delivery scored (4.5/5) and Expectations were met by (4.3/5)

3. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

The Facilitator for MONITORING, EVALUATION & LEARNING (MEL) was hired from Kenya. For the participants benefit, they were introduced to MEL: definitions, differences, role, value-added Project-level MEL vs. Organizational-level MEL. Facilitator also emphasized on Data Management and Analysis
as major inputs/Outputs in the monitoring and evaluation process. The impact of MEL was demonstrated as a major link to Strategic Plan, and Business Development.

**Fig 3: Responses to Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses on MEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training delivery and Training Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Phase 3 Participants Responses**

Being an area which is on much demand, the CSOs indicate high expectations in acquiring this knowledge on MEL (4.9/5). Scores on knowledge and experience of the facilitator were (4.65/5) and training and delivery received (4.45/5). In short, one is able to conclude that the MEL topic was successfully presented.

**Relevance to the Work Situation**

The given questions in the questionnaire were intended to gauge how much the training was related to the participants work situations especially in the light of the assessment that was conducted by AGC in April, 2017. The responses were able to indicate much satisfaction by the participants that the training actually had been successfully tailored to match the needs and gaps that were found in the various CSOs.

The figure 4 below is indicating very high scores on all the topical areas.

1. *How well did the organizational performance gaps identified for your CSO during the assessment in April relate to the training programs you received?*

On how well the training related to the April Assessment; the scores are indicating that the Strategic Planning (4.3/5) were highest followed by MEL (4.2/5) and Business Development scored (4.1/5). The scores are high and quite close to each other. This is clear evidence that the facilitators in all the given topics were able to touch base on the gaps and needs found during the assessment.

2. *Relevance of training in Business Development/Strategic Planning/MEL*

Regarding the relevance of the training in each topic, the scores in the figure below are indicating high relevance in all the three areas of training. Highest scores are in MEL (4.6/5); whereas Business Development and Strategic Planning both received equal scores (4.4). With regard to achieving a match of the needs and gaps vs the facilitation, the response indicate that the match was highest in the Strategic Plan topic (4.3/5) followed by MEL (4.2/5) and Business Development (4.2/5)

**Fig 4: Responses on how training links to Work Situation**
The responses for both questions in Fig 4, indicate high levels of matching that was achieved by AGC with regard to the designed training vs the needs and gaps identified during the assessment in April 2017.

**Training Organization and Logistics**

As usual, PTP asks participants to this question with the intention to assess the appropriateness of the workshop training: the adequacy of the time allocated for the training, quality of the venue, training coordination, and quality of overall program. The given responses usually help PTP to improve on the organization and logistics for future training activities.

The given scores in figure 5 below are indicating that the participants were most satisfied with the Quality of Venue (4.6/5); followed by Training Coordination and Administration (4.5/5) and Overall Quality of Program (4.5/5). Time allocated for Pre-training Preparations was scored a bit lower (4.3/5) while Adequacy of time allocated for the training was scored lowest (3.7/5)

**Fig 5: Responses on Training Organization and Logistics**
AGC used a good approach to select the final topics based on the niche and findings from the participants, thus being able to capture and address the relevant critical gaps identified during the assessments. AGC also allowed participants to select topics on which to focus on in each of the four major capacity-building areas given in Phase 3.

The deep involvement of participants at every level in the conducted Phases so far has enlisted the participants' engagement in the discussions, so that during Phase 3, the participants were able to articulate skill gaps facing their organizations, and openly acknowledged that the training was useful in providing more insight for skills strengthening especially with regard to the management and sustainability of their work in the communities as CSOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Organization and Logistics</th>
<th>Adequacy of time allocated for the Workshop</th>
<th>Quality of the venue and equipment (s) used</th>
<th>Training coordination and administration</th>
<th>Adequacy of time allocated for pre-training preparations (e.g., information)</th>
<th>Overall quality of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for the Workshop</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Phase 3 Participants Responses

PTP Views

PTP also observed that the training materials for Phase 3 were submitted at the end of the training. PTP policy requires that Training providers submit training materials prior to the
commencing of a training event. Having readily prepared training materials prior to the training helps PTP and USAID to see the content and how the training has been planned. Even if some changes occur during the training, but the presence of already designed training material helps to indicate the way the intervention had been changed.

During Phase 3 of the ZNZ training, the absence of training materials as a road map to what was being taught, was a major drawback. Distributing materials to the participants at the end of the training is commendable but caters only for participants future reference purposes.

======================
ANNEX 1

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS

Box 1: Comments on Delivery and Materials

- The contents of materials have been provided for each CSO in the flash disk after the training. However as individual participants they can see the materials at the CSO’s office.

- The training sessions were very great because, the trainers talked less and gave the room to the CSOs to discuss. This allowed people to be very active and readily shared the knowledge and experience through stories of real example with CSOs. This was a very great thing.

- A part from the presentation and material provided we still needed more examples of case studies or sample of project succeeded.

- Monitoring, Evaluation Learning (MEL) should use actual or hypothetical example.

Box 2: Time line not adequate

- The training is very important for the development of our CSOs but the time is too short to impart the necessary knowledge. I recommend if this training is conducted with staying in hotel (retreat) if the time is a concern.

- Monitoring, Evaluation Learning need more than two days to be taught so the time is not enough, data analysis should be trained in deep because many organization have a problem in it.

- The overall training is very useful to my organization but also to me personally. However there is a need to have more time especially on the issue of Proposals writing and strategic plan.

Box 3: Commendations

- Firstly I would like to congratulate the Government and USAID for this program because many CSOs will want to apply and work on training which will bring changes. Most of the CSO haven't strategic planning and MEL. But through this training; it will improve CSO a lot. Secondly the training will contribute to the participants’ capacities to build permanent skills for the organization.

- I will take this opportunity to thank the facilitators a lot especially Mr. Andrew and Felippe for their effort but specifically for their participatory approach during the trainings which I attended and I highly recommend them to continue with other trainings. Also I will be indebted if I not mentioned our chief coordinator from ESRF for the effort and friendship during all the trainings which I attended.
Box 4: Suggestion for Way forward

- All the workshops that I attended are very beneficial to our organization as for sustainability of one organization. The ESRF team should have to plan for other courses to train us.
  1) Activism and working in a coalition
  2) Advocacy skills
  3) NGO Managements and leadership skills
  4) Exposures and field trips to other NGOS outside Zanzibar.
  5) Human Resources Management in details.
- All CSOs to conduct more in-house couching that will enable to deliver and share more knowledge expertise for more members
- Exchange visits between CSOs
- The training was very constructive and we hope it will help our organization very much. This should not end here. USAID should think of testing competencies by funding these CSOs they have trained.
H. **DATE:** 30th OCTOBER TO 7th NOVEMBER, 2017

I. **VENUE:** DOUBLE TREE, ZANZIBAR. PARTICIPANTS’ EVALUATION FORM

J. This evaluation form will be used to help ESRF, AGC and IIE improve our own performance in the delivery of training programs and coaching in the future, and to help you identify where you might need to continue to develop your skills. Please give us your sincere opinion. **DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME.** Please assign the score against each of the inquiries using the given score ranges of 1-5 below. Please use NA to indicate if the question is not applicable or you don’t know.

K. **Score** (1= Poor, 2= Average, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, 5= Excellent and NA = Not Applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Area of Inquiry</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery and training materials in Business Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery and training materials in Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery and training materials in MEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Please rate the trainers’ knowledge and experience in Business Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Please rate the trainers’ knowledge and experience in Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Please rate the trainers’ knowledge and experience in MEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Did the Business Development training meet your expectations? If not, comment below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Did the Strategic Planning training meet your expectations? If not, comment below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Did the MEL training meet your expectations? If not, comment below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>How well did the organizational performance gaps identified for your CSO during the assessment in April relate to the training programs you received?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rate the relevance of training in Business Development for the needs of your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rate the relevance of training in Strategic Planning for the needs of your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rate the relevance of training in MEL for the needs of your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quality of the venue, room comfort, and equipment used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Training coordination and administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for pre-training preparations (e.g. information on venue, on schedule, travel arrangements, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Overall quality of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give us additional comments and/or suggestions for improvement. We ask you to be as specific as possible, and refer to each technical topical training when relevant. Please use the back side of the form if you need more space.
PHASE 5

REPORT ON

FINAL EVALUATION ON ZANZIBAR CSOs TRAINING PROGRAMS ON STRENGTHENING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

PHASE FIVE: TOPICAL WORKSHOP ON FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
HILTON DOUBLE TREE CONFERENCE CENTER IN STONE TOWN, ZANZIBAR.
December 6, 2017.
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**Introduction**

The final training session gave the opportunity to review the whole training process from Phase 1-5. All the resource persons for the training and the coaching process were available for further elaboration. The participants who attended were the executive personnel in each CSO. Also in attendance were Mr. Jonathan Young and Mr. Lopa, as two representatives from the Program Office of the USAID Mission.

**Training Activity**

AGC guided the review of all the training phases by going through the five phases and then allowing the participants to discuss around the subject areas. Using the skills and knowledge gained, the participants were able to relate these to their work situations and identified what could be introduced in their respective organizations. In a plenary session each CSO was given the opportunity to present their action plans. During these sessions, the CSOs were able to isolate distinctly what their main achievements were in the action plans against what was still their main challenges. Furthermore, each Action Plan was reviewed with assistance from the coaches ready for further coaching which started immediately after the training.

In their group work, participants were given the opportunity to share and exchange experiences. Furthermore, the coaches for Phase 2 and Phase 4 were able to elaborate more on general challenges which continue to face the CSOs in Zanzibar.

**Evaluation**

PTP distributed Evaluation Questionnaires at the end of Final Day training. The main intention was to determine what the participants had learned from the training and coaching in the 5 Phases. Using the skills and knowledge, what changes had they managed to introduce in their organizations? Any principal achievements so far? What challenges are they facing? What are their views on the Content and delivery of Phases 1,3,and 5? What about the coaching sessions in Phases 2 and 4? How relevant was the training to their work situations? What are the participants views on the Training Organization and Logistics? What were the participants views on the Overall Training Program?

Scores range was (1= Poor, 2= Average, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, and 5= Excellent).

**Content and Delivery of the training Sessions in Phase 1,3,and 5 (See fig 1)**

In the evaluation tool, the participants were to respond to the quality of the trainer’s knowledge and training materials in each phase. For Phase 1, the participants indicated a score of 4.17/5. For Phase 3 and 5, the score was 4.38/5 for each.

**PTP Views**

We observed that there was more satisfaction in the content and delivery of Phase 3 and 5. The use of local resource persons could have enhanced the participants more understanding.

'Fig 1: Participants' rating of Content and Delivery
Source: Participant Ratings on Evaluation of Overall Program

Assessment on the Coaching Sessions (See Fig 2)

Responses from the participants on the coaching against the implementation are indicating that Coacher's knowledge and experience against the CSO's ability in implementing the designed action plans in Phase 2 had low scores (3.75/5 and 3.9/5) respectively. However, Phase 4 coaching and action plan implementation, scored higher (4.17/5 and 4.13/5) respectively.

This is clear indication that after the Orientation in Phase 1, the participants had less knowledge on the implementation of action plans in Phase 2. However, after Phase 3 topical workshops, the participants gained much skills and knowledge to be able to implement better the action plans in Phase 4 than they did in Phase 2.

PTP Views

Looking at the scores; those in Phase 4 are very high probably because the participants achieved more understanding through the topical workshop in Phase 3. Coaching in Phase 4 plus it action plan implementation were an immediate follow-on of the training in the 3 topical areas in Phase 3. Therefore Knowledge in Business Management, Strategic and MEL brought much more understanding on the action plans implementation in Phase 4.

Given the above scenario, PTP is of the view that participants continued to gain more knowledge and skills as the phases progressed. During Phase 2 coaching and action plan, the participants had less gained knowledge as compared to experiences during Phase 4 plus its action plan implementation.

Fig 2: Responses Assessment on the Coaching Sessions
Relevance of Training to your Work Situation (see table below)

Participants indicate high scores (above 4.6/5) on the relevance of the training to their work situation. They show much satisfaction in the knowledge they have gained in Strategic Planning, MEL, and Financial Management. These are the main areas that relate to the experienced gaps in all CSOs in Zanzibar.

Therefore the high scores given in the table below is enough evidence that the training was very relevant to each CSO's work situation.

Table 1: Relevance of Training to your Work Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship of the topical areas to the needs of your CSO?</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness and relevance of Strategic Planning training to role of the Board of Directors</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness and relevance of training in Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning to your CSO</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate the usefulness and relevance of training in Financial Management to your CSO</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Participant Ratings on Evaluation of Overall Program
PTP Views

The scores in this area are indicating that the participants gained the skills and knowledge that is going to be used most effectively in strengthening each CSO’s capacity. In other word, the overall objective of strengthening the capacities of CSOs’ capacities in Zanzibar and Pemba was achieved through the designed interventions.

Overall quality of the Program (4.2)

The score on overall program (4.2/5) gives evidence that the intended goal: **Improve Organizational Performance, Build Capacity and Achieve Sustainability in Zanzibar CSOs** was achieved.

PTP Views

Much satisfaction is indicated in responses given by the participants in all the areas under evaluation (1. Content and Delivery; 2. Coaching Assessment; 3. Relevance to the Work Situation; 4. Overall Quality of the Program).

Other participant responses from the given Additional Comments (in Annex 1) indicate a few areas which needed to be addressed. In the area of **Content and Delivery** suggestions such as the Use of live case studies or Using more guided group work were suggested by the participants.

In the area of **Training and Logistics** suggestions such as Coaching to be conducted as in-house training or Training should be conducted by residential for better participant concentration were suggested in the comments.

In the area of **Time Frame** suggestions such as Provision of training materials prior to commencement of training or Allocating a full day for each topic during topical training were suggested by the participants.

In the area of **Commendations**, the participants were very appreciative with statements such as The training was very fruitful it has opened our eyes or …a wonderful training and we got a lot of knowledge… were given as complements.

In the area of **Way Forward**, the participants have promised … to use the knowledge and skills to improve the performance of our NGO…or suggested … training conducted to ZNZ CSO should also open that opportunities for other CSOs in Zanzibar ….

In conclusion, PTP is of the view that AGC has successfully implemented the designed interventions in the 5 Phases.
ANNEX 1

General Comments from Final Evaluation Session

Table 1: Comments on Content and Delivery of Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Content and Delivery of Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. I would suggest to have the trainer who will have enough time to visit each participated CSO and help to overcome the challenges that face the CSOs and increase the CSO performance rather than meeting in groups like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide link to reference materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Using more of guided group work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Time Frame AND Training Organization and Logistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Organization and Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The coaching aspect is a very important. Session to be conducted as in house training greater effort should be made to ask for each CSO to select their particular area of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Topical areas and training should be conducted in a residential environment where participants spend all days of training without being destructed by other activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The training materials should be provided before training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I prefer it could be each topic to take one full day instead of combining two topics as introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Given Commendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The training was very fruitful it has opened our eyes in that there is still a lot for our organization to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was a wonderful training and we got a lot of knowledge which I didn’t have before and hope to get another chance to improve my knowledge. Keep on working and helping our CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Way Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I and my colleagues will use the knowledge and skills to improve the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of our NGO and we hope to use very well the knowledge we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gained in this training to bring more impact (positive) to our NGO and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The training conducted to ZNZ CSO should also open that opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for other CSOs in Zanzibar from USAID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The orientation training has great impact in the future advantages in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I suggest on the coming phase you need to be careful in selecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaches, as an important person and must be with appropriate knowledge and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitments to deliver desirable objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Individual report on need assessment is important for better planning of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2

VARIOUS SESSION PHOTOS

Photo No 1

Participants during presentation on Strategic Planning

Photo No 2

Participants working during the Final Session
Participants during the final session

Representative from USAID Program Office attended this final session
ANNEX 3

CSO ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT: OVERALL EVALUATION

M. DATE: Dec 6th, 2017
N. VENUE: DOUBLE TREE, ZANZIBAR. PARTICIPANTS’ EVALUATION FORM
O. This evaluation form will be used to help ESRF, AGC and IIE improve our own performance in the delivery of training and coaching programs in the future, and to help you identify where you might need to continue to develop your skills. Please give us your sincere opinion. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME. Please assign the score against each of the inquiries using the given score ranges of 1-5 below.
Q. 1= Poor, 2= Average, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, 5= Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Area of Inquiry</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery, the trainers’ knowledge and experience and training materials in Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery, the trainers’ knowledge and experience and training materials in Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Please rate the quality of training delivery the trainers’ knowledge and experience, and training materials in Phase 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Please rate the coacher’s knowledge and experience in Phase 2 Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rate your CSOs ability in implementing the designed Action Plan of Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Please rate the coacher’s knowledge and experience in Phase 4 Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rate your CSOs ability in implementing the designed Action Plan of Phase 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>How well did the training you received in the topical areas relate to the needs of your CSO?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Rate the usefulness and relevance of training in Business Development and Resource Mobilization to your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Rate the usefulness and relevance of training in Strategic Planning and Role of the Board of Directors to your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rate the usefulness and relevance of training in Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning to your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rate the usefulness and relevance of training in Financial Management to your CSO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Quality of the venue, room comfort, and equipment used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Training coordination and administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Adequacy of time allocated for pre-training preparations (e.g. information on venue, on schedule, travel arrangements, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Overall quality of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was the most striking lesson learnt from the training/encounter with other CSOs? Use the back side of the form if you need more space.
Attachment A: Scope of Work
Zanzibar CSO Capacity Building Program

Background
Through its Tanzania Participant Training Program (PTP), USAID/Tanzania has contracted IIE to contribute to the Mission’s vision of building the capacity of Tanzanian institutions within certain priority sectors, including the empowerment of women and youth. In April 2017, AGC, through PTP, conducted performance assessments of 15 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) focused on youth development and women’s empowerment in Zanzibar to identify performance gaps and root causes of the gaps, and recommend solutions based on interviews and on-site observation of each CSO. Based on the recommendations produced from the assessment, a combination of follow-on capacity development trainings and coaching were identified with the aim to improve institutional performance in 13 of the CSOs which were identified as having medium to high capacity to benefit from further capacity development assistance. The follow on trainings and coaching will focus on the four most frequently found performance gaps from the assessment: Business Development, Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors, Monitoring & Evaluation, and Financial Management.

Activity Overview
The follow-on capacity development support will occur in five phases:
1. Orientation Workshop
2. Coaching #1
3. Topical Workshops on 1) Business Development and Fundraising, 2) Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors, and 3) Monitoring, Evaluation, & Learning
4. Coaching #2
5. Topical Workshops on 1) Financial Management, 2) Program Evaluation, and 3) Next Steps

Two participants from each of the 13 CSOs will attend the workshops and participate in the coaching. AGC will use the results of April 2017 HICD assessment to design, implement, oversee, and evaluate the follow-on activities, including recruitment of local and sub-regional experts for the topical workshops, provide terms of reference to ESRF to help them recruit local experts for the topical workshops, and oversight of coaches that will be chosen from the high performing CSOs to provide support during the action plan implementation stage in between the workshops.

AGC will work with the CSOs to create Action Plans during the workshops for implementation in their organizations. Action Plan progress will be monitored over the follow-on capacity development support period by the coaches. PTP staff from the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) in Tanzania will accompany the AGC performance specialist during the workshops to organize logistics, coordinate with the CSOs, and ensure adherence to local context. AGC and ESRF will work together to identify local coaches and prepare trainings for the CSOs in phases where the organizations will implement what they have learned in the time between each meeting.

Specific Tasks
1. Review assessment and gather information regarding the needs of the CSOs in Zanzibar and how to best design the workshops, phases 1 – 5.
2. Conduct Phase 1 of project: Early September 2017. This will be a 4-day orientation workshop to address the principal “gaps” identified in assessments. The 13 CSOs will discuss ways to address these gaps, and lay the groundwork for follow-up coaching and subsequent topical workshops.
CSO’s to create action plans after this workshop to identify additional skills needed in order to address performance gaps.

3. Identify follow-up coaching and local trainers/coaches needed for topical workshops based on the results of the orientation, taken from key staff of some of the four high-performing CSOs.

4. Conduct Phase 2 of project: Late September-Mid October 2017. Local Trainers and coaches will spend the next month coaching the organizations and assisting them in applying their action plans and information given in orientation workshop.

5. Identify, with ESRF, a group of “lead trainers/coaches” (fluent in Kiswahili) with expertise in the topical areas will be recruited locally in Zanzibar, and/or regionally in Tanzania and Kenya, to serve as external resources and trainers in the topical workshops.

6. Conduct Phase 3 of project: Mid-Late October-Early November 2017. Topical Workshops will be held over a month-long period and will be topic-specific and gauged to the level of the CSOs. They will begin with one-day review for participants to share their experience in applying orientation knowledge in real time. Three (3) additional workshops will be provided in the following two (2) days to address the following themes: Business Development and Fundraising, Strategic Planning and Role of Board of Directors, and Monitoring, Evaluating and Learning (MEL).

7. Conduct Phase 4 of project: Mid-Late November 2017. Sub-regional training experts will use next month to set up CSO-specific coaching plans to continue coaching them on Business Development, Strategic Planning, and MEL once three (3) topical workshops have been completed.

8. Conduct Phase 5 of project: Late November-Early December 2017. Two (2)-day workshops to address Financial Management and Program Evaluation and next steps, an evaluation of the capacity development program and a discussion of next steps.

9. Develop a final report to report on the result of the capacity development workshops and coaching, and present recommendations to USAID for follow up.

Deliverables

1. Brief reports to be submitted after Phase I: Orientation Workshops, Phase 3: Topical Workshops, and Phase 5: Financial Management, Program Evaluation, and Next Steps. Reports will include workshop agendas, participant handouts, attendee lists, participant evaluations, challenges encountered, and successes achieved.

2. A cumulative report after the last Phase of the training program, Phase 5, reporting on the results of all the Phases and workshops and presenting follow up recommendations to USAID

Location of Work

AGC is based in the United States and Mr. Gilboy and Mr. Tejeda will conduct work under this Task Order in the United States and Tanzania. International travel to Zanzibar (Unguja and Pemba) and Dar es Salam, Tanzania is required.

Technical Direction

Technical direction will be rendered by IIE’s Director of Participant Training, Ms. Susan Fickling, and IIE’s Program Officer, Ms. Lidia Awad. The deliverables should be sent in electronic format to Ms. Lidia Awad (lawad@iie.org) for tracking and administrative follow up.

Performance under this SOW shall be subject to the technical direction of the above named IIE employee(s). Only those individuals named in the SOW may issue technical directions.