The newsletter of INTRAC
International NGO Training and Research Centre
No. 49 September 2011
ontrac

viewpoint

NGO funding and private philanthropy


© Erik Cleves Kristensen, 2006

Discussions with project beneficiaries, Togo.

Foundations and new private donors are now significant players in the development arena – not just in terms of the funds they provide but also their influence on approaches to development and the way that official aid agencies operate and think. Their increasing importance was reflected in July 2011 when the UK Parliament's International Development Committee established the Inquiry into Private Foundations to assess their role and influence, levels of accountability and their relationship with official donors.

Among the reasons given for establishing this government inquiry is that philanthropic funds and foundations are now major contributors to aid funding. They estimate that total private philanthropy worldwide now accounts for roughly the same as 'programmable aid' from official donors at around US$60 billion annually. Studies at the Brookings Institute in Washington DC have also highlighted the growth and diversity of private philanthropy, and the influence and success of new, innovative ways of harnessing private giving.[1] Clearly NGOs must not underestimate the potential power and impact of innovative online fund-channelling sites such as Global Giving, Guidestar, GivingWell, GivingWhatWeCan; or social-investment channelling sites like Kiva or Energy in Common.

NGOs need to understand the dynamics of this influence and how to engage with foundations – particularly the new breed of major private donors that have emerged over the last twenty years who give considerable funds to development projects and NGOs. This issue of ONTRAC explores some aspects of private donors' work in development.

Diversity and scale

Firstly, NGOs need to understand the diversity and scale of private philanthropy,

[1] Fengler.W and Kharas.H, *Delivering Aid Differently: Lessons from the Field*; Brookings Institute Press, Washington, 2010.

Contents

viewpoint

In this issue:

This issue of ONTRAC explores issues around private donors' work in development. Foundations and new private donors are now significant actors in development – in terms of both the funds they provide and also their influence on approaches to development and the way that official aid agencies operate and think.

Following a viewpoint by John Hailey, four subsequent articles present differing experiences and arguments around the issue.

Connell Foley looks at Concern Worldwide's engagement with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, discussing how Concern found the foundations' approach, emphasising evidence and innovation, refreshing and challenging.

One area in which this is evident is monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Two articles in this issue – by Blain Teketel and Suman Sureshbabu - explore different foundations' approaches to M&E. These articles show them wrestling with similar questions to NGOs – a desire for in-depth evidence on what works, while prioritising a realistic and flexible relationship with partners.

Finally, the article by Susanne Kirk Christensen, a former field director of a major European INGO, explores how NGOs and CSOs need to appreciate the potential costs of working with private donors.

and what this means when developing a fundraising strategy or developing relationships with the very different types of private donor. These include major family foundations which fund significant development work, like the US-based Gates and Moore foundations, the London-based Gatsby Foundation or the Children's Investment Fund Foundation, or the Mumbai-based Tata Foundation; as well as corporate-based foundations like the Google Foundation or Deutsche Bank's CSR Fund.

There are also many small and specialist foundations that not only give project funding, but also provide alternative and in-kind support - for example, the medical supplies provided in conjunction with the London-based Morgan Foundation. Or those foundations which sponsor awards and prizes, such as the 'Stars Foundations Impact Awards' which are awarded to innovative NGOs and CSOs working with disadvantaged children.

The scale of giving from these private foundations and donors is hard to gauge accurately but we know it is significant and growing. Recent data suggests that there are over 160,000 grant-giving foundations in the US and Europe alone. Evidence suggests that funding for international development makes up at least 20 per cent of the total funds of those foundations that fund overseas development projects.[2] This is estimated at over US$10 billion per annum - much of which goes directly to projects and programmes run by NGOs and CSOs. In other words, this is a considerable resource that NGOs and CSOs can tap into.

Direct action, impact and innovation

There is also a growing body of evidence that the new generation of foundations and private philanthropists are more action-orientated, problem-focused and results-based than traditional donors. Much private aid appears to be focused on frontline projects that have direct impact at a community level, rather than supporting complex cross-cutting development agendas or meeting government targets (e.g. National Development Strategies or the MDGs). Private donors are more targeted with their giving, and commonly focus on development challenges of special or personal interest. They value creativity and innovation. Generally they seem less concerned with issues that official donors care about – for example, supporting good governance or enhancing security, or trying to ensure a balance of between agricultural, educational and health funding.[3] The article by Connell Foley about Concern Worldwide's engagement with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, discusses how Concern found the foundations' approach, emphasising evidence and innovation, refreshing and challenging.

This preference for direct action, impact and innovation is something that NGOs and CSOs can build on. They have a track record of engaging directly with local communities and adopting a practical, hands-on approach to development. NGOs and CSOs are responsive to local needs, and willing to work in different and innovative ways. This comes at time when official donors increasingly emphasise uniformity, harmonisation and greater coordination (e.g. DAC policies) and are geared-up to meeting globally-set common objectives (e.g. the MDGs).

Clearly, when compared with the strategies of official donors, or the way that government departments operate, NGOs have a closer fit with the aspirations and activities of many of the new private donors. One area in which this is evident is monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Two articles in this issue explore different foundations' approaches to M&E, which show them wrestling with similar questions to NGOs – a desire for in-depth evidence on what works, while prioritising a realistic and flexible relationship with partners.

A health warning

Despite the obvious fit between NGOs and private donors, and the potential financial benefits, there needs to be a 'health warning' when working with some of the new generation of private foundations and philanthropists – particularly those whose wealth has been derived from recent business success. While they can be the source of significant funding, NGO staff need to develop the skills to deal with them – particularly their reliance on business-like solutions and language (e.g. franchising), their use of commercial assessment criteria (e.g. rate of return on investment), or the organisational consequences of their preference to invest in innovative projects or promoting new partnerships and joint-ventures.

As the article by a former field director of a major European INGO explores, NGOs and CSOs need to appreciate the potential costs of working with such private donors. They need to invest time and energy in building relationships, implementing new planning processes or evaluation systems, and developing organisational capacities to handle new partnerships. But above all NGOs need to develop the competencies and confidence needed to manage relations with this new generation of private donors.

Conclusion

The reality is that NGOs and private donors both need each other, in that they provide complementary skills and resources. While NGOs need to learn how to work with private philanthropy, so new private donors also need to understand NGOs and learn how to work with different types of civil society organisation. NGOs can clearly benefit from working with private philanthropy but they must do so in a way that does not jeopardise their values and identity, and both NGOs and private donors must ensure that they proactively learn from each other.

John Hailey
Development consultant, and Visiting Professor, Cass Business School, City University, London
john.hailey@hope-hailey.com

---

2 Transforming Development, GPPi Research Paper no.10
3 Kharas.H and Desai.R, 'Do Philanthropic Citizens Behave Like Government', Wolfensohn Centre Working Paper 12, Washington, 2009.

Concern's engagement with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation on innovation

In a single day in February 2010, I attended two meetings that seemed to represent the past and future of development work. In the morning, I met with a number of Irish NGOs to discuss collaboration on a particular issue. In the afternoon, a new private foundation came to visit Concern to explore possible collaboration. The morning meeting ran in an expected manner: there was something cosy about it, accepting, inward-facing, seeking to protect NGO space, traditional. The meeting with the foundation was very challenging. We suggested some areas of possible collaboration and the response was: 'there is no evidence for that being effective'. The foundation had analysed the published evidence for interventions in its area of focus and it was seeking to see where it could add significant value to what already existed. It was hard-nosed, analytical, evidence-focused, questioning, probing. This has mirrored Concern's experience with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

In November 2008, Concern Worldwide received a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to identify and test innovations in maternal, newborn and child health in three countries. 'Innovations for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health' was based on a number of premises. The first was that successful interventions had been identified but what was missing was evidence of successful scale-up or delivery of these interventions. The second was that innovations can come from anywhere, and there were many people whose ideas had never been sought, such as service-users, students or front-line health workers.

In Malawi, Sierra Leone and Orissa state in India, Concern collaborated with Ministries of Health and UNICEF to research major implementation barriers and then set up various mechanisms to solicit ideas on how to break these barriers. Through national competitions, outreach to specific target groups, and repeated engagement with marginalised communities, over 13,000 ideas on how to solve the key problems were identified through diverse channels, such as suggestion boxes, email, post, and event-based submissions. Unfortunately, the hope that we might unearth potentially ground-breaking ideas was not realised, although it was clear that many of the ideas were new to the particular country or health community. Overall, the results were disappointing, even if the process had generated excitement globally and among the public and health communities in the three countries.

Cyclist on a road in Vietnam

© Olof Sandkull. SIDA, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, 2005

On the basis of Concern's internal reflections, engagement with the Foundation and an external mid-term review, Concern decided to completely rethink its approach and is currently using a number of processes to try to generate innovation, based on learning about principles of innovation: diverse perspectives, iterative processes rather than being too linear, action and incubation on an ongoing basis.

Why work with a foundation on innovation?

Concern recognises that improvements in health come from investments in strengthening health systems as well as from innovations. The former is at the heart of development and requires commitment and long-term capacity building, the latter is viewed as a luxury by many. However, Concern applied for this funding because it was recognised that if we were to find a breakthrough in implementation or delivery of known solutions, it would have a much wider impact than Concern's direct programmes and could be worth many years of capacity building.

Lessons learnt

This has been and continues to be a provocative and interesting initiative which has stirred debate within Concern. The standard debates about initiatives like this are that: they are 'top-down'; they undermine government ownership of interventions; they are high-profile and destabilise the arduous, bread-and-butter work to ultimately deliver services. These debates were resolved internally and Concern understood the additional value of this initiative.

However, we decided to manage this programme in a non-traditional way and this caused disruption within the organisation. We did not clearly plan or think through many of the implications of changing our management processes, which caused a lot of unnecessary tension. Indeed, a management consultant informed us that private foundations often underestimate the management demands of such initiatives and such tensions and difficulties are not uncommon.

Advantages of working with a foundation

Concern has found several things very positive in its engagement with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, such as:

- The focus on evidence and what is missing in the evidence base.
- Their added value is clear – innovation, innovation, innovation! Concern has to be accountable for public funds and balance responsible use of funds with trying new things. Funding for innovation is rare and most welcome.
- The Foundation hires top level staff with strong experience and excellent

academic qualifications. While the Foundation has emerged from the private sector and brings a somewhat hard-nosed business approach to its work, it is striking that their staff fully understand the complex realities on the ground. Our discussions have been realistic and meaningful while being ambitious in terms of delivering real, practical and measurable change.

- The Foundation is solution-driven. They want Concern to put proposals and solutions on the table and they also are happy to suggest ways forward.
- Nurturing and facilitating collaboration is a big strength. The Foundation has connected Concern and our partners with others. They have a vast array of contacts across a range of work areas and disciplines and proactively promote such links for learning from others.
- Obviously, the Foundation is a big global brand that brings influence. It has been very useful to leverage this influence to bring support to this initiative. While the nature of the initiative itself has excited people, the backing of the Foundation has also helped bring unusual and diverse actors to the table.

Conclusion

Working with large private foundations has its challenges and a NGO needs to constantly refer back to its own values and strategic goals and be careful not to be driven by large funding. But Concern's experience has been very positive, with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation challenging us to be much more evidence-focused, more creative and agile, more open to diverse perspectives and more rigorous in measurement of results.

Connell Foley
Director of Strategy, Advocacy and Learning, Concern Worldwide
connell.foley@concern.net

Beyond the fear: a foundation perspective o[n] evaluation

As a member of programme staff working for a private foundation, I come across varying views about the purpose of monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The different understandings and expectations of the M&E contribute towards the dynamics of how partner organisations relate to a donor; in this case a private foundation. This article seeks to explore why some organisations funded by Oak Foundation's East Africa Child Abuse Program find M&E a daunting and demanding process and how we seek to tackle this jointly. Our partners include local NGOs of varying sizes and INGOs.

A comment made by a staff member of a partner organisation epitomises one view of the M&E process. He said 'The M&E officer is responsible for collecting all the data about the positive changes and preparing the nice looking graphs that go on our annual report. My role is to implement the activities'. In this instance, the task of M&E was clearly relegated to a 'specialist' officer, and functioned with little input and dialogue with the programme staff. Other organisations see M&E as a critical review of successes and failures, which could then negatively influence future funding. However, many others recognise the importance of M&E to assess if the desired changes are actually taking place, but often lack the capacity in terms of staff, time and resources to undertake rigorous M&E processes geared towards influencing practice.

In the East African Child Abuse Program of the Oak Foundation, we try to take a realistic and flexible M&E approach with partners. In the grant making process I often start initial discussions with potential partners by establishing a common understanding on key concepts within the project cycle: the viability of a project idea, project goals, how progress is measured and whether the project will be able to measure its intended results. Overall, these discussions give us a shared understanding of objectives, outputs, outcomes and the purpose of M&E.

Other experiences have confirmed the importance for us of an M&E approach that seeks to honestly reflect how organisations work together in practice. In 2009, a group of child-focused organisations in Uganda came together to implement a project which aimed to provide a range of coordinated services for abused children in Kampala. It started as a one-year pilot with the possibility of extending over multiple years depending on its outcome. During discussions, the project team emphasised that they wanted the M&E to assess the extent to which the four organisations were able to work together and realign their different organisational systems for the effective delivery of coordinated services to abused children. A consultant was attached to the project, focused on meeting with the staff to assess the strengths, weaknesses and the complementarities in the way the different organisations operate and approach the project. There were regular feedback sessions to the directors and programme team, followed by recommendations. One project staff member later described this as a 'painful but useful' process that made each organisation open its system to the scrutiny of its peers and respond to sensitive issues without being threatened. For the Oak Foundation, this process helped us better understand the dynamics among the different organisations and their systems, and gave us key recommendations for the design of the next phase of the project.

Private donors, like other donors, must try to break the 'us and them mentality' that often characterises the relationship between donor and recipient organisations. The key principle of equal partnership guides my discussions with partner organisations. An equal relationship between donor and grantee paves the way for an open and honest dialogue on the purpose of M&E within the project cycle. This dialogue aims to shift the focus on M&E from an external donor-imposed process to a process that is useful for both the donor and grantee to critically evaluate what works and doesn't work, and adjust practice accordingly. We try to work on a relationship that seeks to explore joint learning which includes learning from and with each other.

on monitoring and

Practitioners often need space, time and resources to examine the impact of their work and adjust their practices in response. Donors need to go beyond demanding accountability for the way each dollar has been spent to developing a relationship that promotes mutual learning. This requires a genuine commitment from both donor and grantee for a type of M&E that will allow performance to be assessed beyond the level of outputs and for changes to be made both at the programme and organisational level in response to the findings of the M&E process. It also requires funding organisations to create an atmosphere of trust that encourages dialogue on the M&E process, which triggers reflection, interest and commitment to improve performance and learning within and across organisations, teams and beneficiaries.

Within the Child Abuse Program, the Oak Foundation does not advocate for a single 'blue print' for M&E. However, over the years, we have come to emphasise the need for partner organisations to have a system for monitoring the impact of their work, whether positive or negative. There is an increasing consensus among partners and donors in the region on the need to build evidence on what works, for whom and in what context in order to influence policy and practice.

Regardless of our working context, or whether we are private donors or INGOs, we all have the responsibility to ensure that financial and human resources have been effective in bringing about desired social changes. This will require relationships built on trust and dialogue between donors and recipients. In the Child Abuse Program of the Oak Foundation, we are striving to find ways of doing M&E based on principles of partnership and accountability.

Blain Teketel
Programme Associate
Child Abuse Programme, East Africa
Oak Foundation
blain.teketel@oakfnd.org

Working with private donors in the field: An INGO country director perspective

Western INGOs have, as one of our moral obligations, to constantly increase funding for our work in developing countries in order to improve and enhance our impact and reach for the poor and marginalised people of the world. It is therefore a welcome development that private donors are increasingly interested in supporting INGOs in development work. These new types of collaborations are however not without problems and may risk changing the quality and focus of our work.

During my four years as Country Director for a European NGO in an African country, I had several experiences of collaboration with private donors and foundations, which led me to some reflections which this article discusses.

In some cases, private donors can give tight deadlines and demand a level of detail that is hard for INGOs and their partners to work with. A major foundation gave such a tight deadline that our country programme had just five days to put together a comprehensive project proposal for a five-year project. The foundation required a very detailed budget. Obviously it is not possible to make a detailed budget without outlining activities in detail too. The result was a project developed entirely 'at the desk' without consulting any stakeholders or doing any kind of situation assessment.

The foundation insisted that the project should be implemented with a number of local NGO partners. This is how my organisation always implements projects, but the timing was so tight that none of our existing partners could participate in writing the proposal. The selection of one partner was done through a phone call, asking if they would like to take part in this project – we gave them one day to decide!

Another feature witnessed in private donors coming from the corporate sector, is that they tend to have a 'we can fix it' approach to development and poverty reduction. This can err towards technical projects focusing on mosquito nets, water pumps, vaccines and so forth – all of which are valuable, but cannot be a stand-alone approach in the development process. The risk is that we increasingly take on this approach if it is preferred by the donor, and leave out our own approaches developed through INGO experiences and learning. This can lead to more service delivery and less focus on advocacy: less focus on rights and more focus on needs.

Seeking new opportunities for funding should never jeopardise the quality of our work

In a concrete case, we were contacted by a private donor, who wanted to provide funding for the construction of a rural primary school. This is a common and a fairly easy project to accommodate, but must be done in cooperation with government education authorities. In this case the donor wanted to go further and began asking for a substantial amount of information about local communities in the area. We did our best to explain how a local community functions. Based on our information, the donor decided he would like to support an entire community to become 'developed'.

We tried to explain that it is not possible – even with a very large budget – to 'fix' a community in isolation from contextual forces. Many factors, which are not controlled by the community, need to change. For instance, inadequate food in a community requires substantial structural, educational and agricultural changes – all of which will involve government structures and policy change. Even without the government, expertise in all the necessary technical areas would involve intensive collaboration with a number of INGOs. In the end the donor gave up this project, and we had spent a substantial amount of time on providing information which then led to nothing.

Technical solutions create visibility. Bed nets and water pumps are obviously much more tangible than an anticorruption campaign; much easier to visit and indeed much easier to show on a website. Some private donors may expect a high level of engagement with the project during implementation, including visits to the project site.

A high level of involvement in the field, which on one hand should be appreciated, may also become quite demanding for a country programme. Visits to remote project sites are time and resource consuming. If such visits from a donor are not coordinated with regular monitoring visits they will be an extra burden. I have experienced a donor insisting on updated photos from a project site, which was almost two days drive away from the country office. In one case, such demands were combined with the donor, a private association made up of corporate-sector members, insisting on not supporting administrative costs such as staff salaries, transport and communication, which are always in reality part of project implementation.

As INGOs engaged in development work we must maintain that we have expertise to bring to the table, and that the principles and approaches to our work are developed based on a long history of experiences. Seeking new opportunities for funding should never jeopardise the quality of our work.

We must however appreciate that private donors are taking on a responsibility for the poorest. It is therefore important that we engage in a dialogue with private donors and do so, not in a donor-recipient relationship, but as equal organisations. For such a dialogue to succeed we need to step up our ability to prove impact, to document lessons learnt (good and bad), and to speak a language which can be understood outside our own world. In that regard, cooperating with private donors may be a healthy and needed new kind of relationship. It can take INGOs out of the intimate sphere between traditional donors and INGOs – a 'comfort zone' which may seldom challenge how we 'do development'.

Susanne Kirk Christensen
Former Country Director in a major Danish INGO
SKC@redbarnet.dk

Learning, monitoring and evaluation: a perspective from the Rockefeller Foundation

© Amir Jina, 2009

A woman in Bangladesh

The Rockefeller Foundation was founded in 1913 with the mission to support the wellbeing of mankind. The Foundation's specific mandate is to promote equitable growth and to strengthen the resilience of poor and vulnerable populations.

The Foundation is currently organised around time-bound initiatives (usually five to seven years in length) that focus on areas such as urbanisation, climate change, health systems, agriculture, impact investing and transportation. Most of its work focuses on Africa and Asia, with a smaller domestic programme in the United States. We work with a wide diversity of grantees and partners, from small NGOs to larger regional organisations, to the UN agencies, multilateral agencies and country governments (see www.rockfound.org).

Using flexible approaches to evaluation, and providing space for learning is important to the Foundation. This article explores why the Foundation focuses on learning, monitoring and evaluation, and the approach and strategies we have put in place.

Why do we focus on learning, monitoring and evaluation?

The Foundation views monitoring, evaluation and learning as a fundamental element of effective and sustainable development.

The evaluation team works with Foundation initiative staff and grantees to demonstrate how evaluation, effectiveness and empowerment go hand-in-hand. Some of our grantees have had experiences in the past where they felt that evaluation focused only on upward accountability to boards and donors with little attention to the views and needs of beneficiaries on the ground. In some instances they felt that evaluators were seen as outsiders extracting and passing judgment on what worked and what did not, and subsequently heavily influencing future planning and funding decisions. In those instances, we work with them to ensure that their perspectives and questions are a central part of evaluation processes.

As a Foundation we recognise that we must balance upward accountability to our boards and senior leaders with strengthening the internal capacity of grantees to learn from their own work and contribute to broader learning in their field. We believe that this institutional capacity building is crucial for downward accountability and that grantees are best placed to learn from their own work, track their own progress and plan their own future action. This process needs to be one of respect for multiple perspectives and recognition that there are several levels of accountability and learning that monitoring and evaluation must serve.

At the initiative level, we support large portfolios of grants rather than one-off projects because we believe the value of a linked set of grants is greater than individual one-off projects. We utilise our learning, monitoring and evaluation function to understand whether we are making a difference across a body of work and to plan future grant-making.

We work with grantees to develop a shared vision of success for the whole Initiative, and to identify appropriate ways of monitoring and measuring progress and change from the context of the grantee. For example, we convene prospective and current grantees to discuss their perspective on solutions. This informs the way we shape our initiatives and the results we expect. We also engage a monitoring and evaluation grantee who works as a 'critical friend' to the Initiative staff and grantees to track the progress and convene learning dialogues.

Results-based monitoring, learning and evaluation: What do we do?

Learning from the pitfalls and benefits of the past decade of results-based management systems, we have instituted a flexible result orientation in the Foundation's work to help us better think about what success could look like and how we would know if it happened. We scope out a longer term vision of success, a set of intended outcomes around which grant-making takes place. The vision and outcomes remain a common 'anchor' for the life of the Initiative with adjustments made in grant-making on an annual basis to reflect realities on the ground.

This orientation helps us put together a more coherent approach to addressing short and longer term social change while allowing for flexibility to innovate, experiment and adapt along the way. Specifically we:

- **support the generation and use of high quality evaluative knowledge** about the performance and work of the Foundation at global, regional and grantee level. This includes a strong focus on knowledge about what works, under what circumstances, by whom, how and why.
- **strengthen skills and capacity of Foundation staff, grantees and partners in results oriented monitoring, evaluation and learning** in order to make performance improvements in their work and to be accountable to their constituents.
- **strengthen the fields of philanthropy, evaluation and development** by supporting global and regional communities of grantees to advance innovative and progressive evaluation approaches, methods, and tools.

Our focus is equally on conducting a regular cycle of evaluations for our longer term initiatives – mid-term, end of initiative as well as ongoing monitoring and learning including experimenting with innovative real time ways of learning with partner organisations. A few examples of the Foundation's support for innovation and improved capacity include:

- a community of practice in evaluating climate change resilience and adaptation in South East Asia (Grantee: PACT SEA Change)
- innovative approaches to monitoring, learning and evaluation that are useful for networks of the urban poor (Grantee: Slum Dwellers International – SDI, Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), Institute for Policy Alternatives (IPA)
- the use of stories and narrative in monitoring and evaluation (Grantee: Global Giving)
- a 'go-to' hub called *Better Evaluation* for advice on matching evaluation methods and approaches with different development challenges such as evaluating networks, climate change, policy influence, etc.

How do we do it?

Our evaluation team works closely with our initiative staff to build capacity and skills to innovate on approaches. The elements of this process are:

- **A common results and M&E language.** We work with our partners to define standards for results - impact, outcomes, outputs - and nurture the discipline to understand and use the terms to be more precise about what we mean by impact and sustainable change - for whom, where, how much.
- **A shared understanding of results we seek to achieve.** We are committed to developing this understanding with grantees and partners. This is not a trivial undertaking – it takes time, but pays off in extending and amplifying the reach and influence of our collective work.
- **Shared responsibility.** We recognise that learning, monitoring and evaluation must exist beyond the evaluation team and individual grantees and thus we focus on sharing responsibility and committing resources and time to build capacity among individuals, teams, grantees and the senior leadership of the Foundation.
- **Practical tools and agreed measures.** We work to create practical tools and agreed measures which suit the complexity of the types of work we engage in to help plan, manage, monitor, evaluate and report on progress towards achieving results.

Conclusion

The overall aim of our learning, monitoring and evaluation function is to support organisational effectiveness to achieve development outcomes and impact. We come to this work with the understanding that development is complex and requires a range of partners and a healthy respect for multiple perspectives on problems, solutions, results and strategies. We subscribe strongly to the value that the evaluation process has to be owned by all stakeholders and needs to include bottom-up as well as top-down approaches. With these values in place we are continuing to work with our partners to experiment and test new methods and approaches to learning, monitoring and evaluation that work in complex situations.

Suman Sureshbabu
Associate at the Rockefeller Foundation, working for the Foundation Initiative team.
SSureshbabu@rockfound.org

With input from Nancy MacPherson, Managing Director, Evaluation, Rockefeller Foundation.

INTRAC training

For more information on these courses, to apply online, and to read details of all our training courses for 2011-12, visit **www.intrac.org/pages/en/training.html**

Advanced Monitoring and Evaluation

10-14 October 2011, 28 November - 2 December 2011 and 20-24 February 2012 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

This popular course explores M&E in greater depth. It builds on each individual's understanding and skills of how to develop sustainable and cost effective monitoring and evaluation processes and practices within their own projects, programmes and organisations. It is also relevant for those trying to improve current M&E processes, or supporting partners to develop and implement effective M&E. The focus is on ensuring M&E contributes towards improving organisational learning and accountability.

Supporting Southern Advocacy

19-21 October 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £550 non-residential/£700 residential

This course is designed to help Southern and Northern NGOs support effective southern advocacy e.g. linking local, national, regional and international advocacy. It will cover different approaches to capacity building for southern advocacy. It will explore methods to identify issues and solutions and review approaches to achieving policy change in different contexts. The course will reflect on the causes and solutions to common problems such as how to integrate advocacy into programme work. There will also be space to assess advocacy strategies and consider effective methods for monitoring and evaluating advocacy.

Mastering Wicked Problems – Alan Fowler Master Seminars

20-21 October 2011 Location: National Council of Voluntary Organisations, London
Fee: £195 per day, or £350 for both days

Successful NGOs overcome critical issues and dilemmas for the whole organisation that have multiple, interdependent causes. Potential solutions are many, but they are seldom obvious or amenable to assured implementation. Yet, effective leadership and management find ways to surmount such problems and motivationally communicate a way forward. This capability is vital for maintaining social value and durability. This series of half-day seminars will concentrate on four areas where NGOs are confronted by problems calling for far-reaching, strategic responses. Offering challenging food for thought, the sessions will combine reflection and collective experience with dialogue and insights from recent innovations and publications. .

Monitoring and Evaluation

31 October – 4 November 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

M&E is an essential component of international NGOs, NGOs and CSOs striving to continually improve their work and have greater accountability. This course develops individual's understanding of what M&E entails, why it is so vital, and, crucially, how to do it well and in a participatory way. The course ensures that those who are new to M&E have a thorough understanding of M&E concepts and have built up the practical skills and the confidence needed to do M&E effectively. Participants will learn to use a range of M&E tools and activities that will help them improve accountability, learning and effectiveness of projects and programmes.

Advanced Organisational Development

14-18 November 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

Development organisations are facing a range of challenges which require an in-depth understanding of organisational development and change. This course will use participant-driven case studies to explore several major organisational challenges. Participants will examine the nature of the challenge and the contribution that organisational development models and tools can make to understanding, planning and managing complex organisational change. Participants will have the opportunity to expand their personal toolbox, deepen their conceptual understanding and ground their knowledge through the exploration of real-life practice.

Project Cycle Management

16-20 January 2012 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £550 non-residential/£700 residential

This new course has been designed to equip project managers with the necessary understanding and skills to manage all five stages of the project management cycle – defining, planning, organising, managing and finishing projects. It builds up a clear body of theory, understanding and skills for each stage, so that by the end of the course participants have a clear competence across all stages of the cycle.

To receive a printed copy of our open training brochure or to enquire about tailor-made training, contact us at **training@intrac.org** or call **01865 263040**.

ontrac **ISSN 1476-1327**

ONTRAC is the newsletter of INTRAC (the International NGO Training and Research Centre). It is published three times a year. The contents of the newsletter may be freely reproduced and translated, providing the source is acknowledged. INTRAC wishes to thank the NGO Research Programme members for funding ONTRAC: Concern Worldwide, Cordaid, DanChurchAid, Oxfam Novib, Save the Children Denmark, Save the Children Sweden, ICCO, and Trócaire.

To receive a printed copy of ONTRAC, please contact info@intrac.org indicating whether you wish to receive a copy in English or Russian. ONTRAC can also be downloaded at www.intrac.org/pages/en/ontrac.html, where translated versions in Arabic, French, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish, and previous issues, are also available.

INTRAC
Oxbridge Court, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES
T: +44 (0)1865 201851
F: +44 (0)1865 201852
E: info@intrac.org • www.intrac.org

INTRAC is a limited company No. 2663796 and a registered charity No. 1016676