



Knoxville Leadership Foundation Center for Communities

*Building non-profit capacity through the
Strengthening Communities Fund*

An assessment of progress

DECEMBER 2011

Knoxville Leadership Foundation Center for Communities

*Building non-profit capacity through the
Strengthening Communities Fund*

An assessment of progress

December 2011

Prepared by: Thalia Cooper, Jessica Meyerson, and Greg Owen

Wilder Research
451 Lexington Parkway North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104
651-280-2700
www.wilderresearch.org

Contents

Summary	1
Background	6
Introduction	7
Goals of the project	9
Process for recruiting and selection of organizations	9
Study methods	11
Baseline organizational assessment	11
Follow-up interviews with representatives of participating organizations	11
Program records and planning documents	12
Characteristics of participating organizations	13
Number of organizations and types of services provided	13
Organizational assets and resources at baseline	14
Types of training, technical assistance and financial support provided	15
Group trainings	15
Sub-award grants	16
Project outcomes	17
Capacity-building support	17
Changes in service delivery capacity	20
Implementing improved evaluation efforts	22
Implementing work with partners	23
Implementing improved management efforts	25
Fund-raising support	27
Participant satisfaction ratings	29
Satisfaction with specific trainings and technical assistance	29
Grantees' overall satisfaction with the project and project staff	31
Appendix	39
Grantee capacity-building goals	40
Baseline organizational profile 2010	43
Follow-up interview	48

Figures

1. Number and percentage of participating organizations completing year-end survey	12
2. Organizational resources at baseline (annual budgets).....	14
3. Organizational assets at baseline (staff and volunteers)	14
4. Total hours of training and technical assistance provided to organizations	16
5. Total dollars awarded to participating organizations.....	16
6. Number of organizations specifying capacity-building assistance goals, number and percent reporting that they received assistance, and met or exceeded their goal	18
7. New clients served at follow-up	20
8. Changes in staffing from baseline to follow-up.....	21
9. Changes in volunteers and board members from baseline to follow-up.....	21
10. Changes in programs or services at follow-up.....	22
11. Changes in evaluation at follow-up	23
12. Partnerships for economic recovery (baseline to follow-up).....	24
13. Number and percentage of organizations reporting improvements in management and leadership skills (N=19)	26
14. Change in annual budget among participating organizations at follow-up (N=18).....	27
15. Satisfaction with services provided by the Knoxville Leadership Foundation.....	32

Acknowledgments

The authors of this report would like to thank the staff of the Knoxville Leadership Foundation for their contributions toward the evaluation of the Strengthening Communities Fund Project.

We would also like to thank the following directors and project managers for their help with obtaining baseline data, information needed to contact project participants, and descriptive information needed to prepare and complete this report.

Courtney Holbert
Chris Martin
Dan Myers
Stanley Taylor

Thank you to the following Wilder Research staff who provided their assistance with the project:

Mark Anton
Jennifer Bohlke
Marilyn Conrad
Louann Graham
Ryan McArdle
Ronald Mortenson

Summary

The Strengthening Communities Fund is a federal initiative of the Office of Community Services in the Administration for Children and Families. It was created to support capacity-building efforts among faith-based and community-based organizations and designed to address the economic recovery needs of communities throughout the U.S.

The Knoxville Leadership Foundation received a Strengthening Communities Fund award in the amount of \$1,000,000 to provide capacity-building assistance and related services to local faith- and community-based organizations to help them address and build capacity, strengthen infrastructure, and address economic recovery needs in their communities. Wilder Research in St. Paul, Minnesota was awarded the contract to conduct an external evaluation of the Foundation's success in building capacity among participating organizations.

To carry out this capacity building work, the Knoxville Leadership Foundation recruited small to midsized community-based and faith-based organizations (annual budgets under \$500,000) to apply for funding and technical assistance. Twenty organizations participated in the initiative over two years and received a wide range of capacity building assistance including training workshops, technical support, one-on-one coaching and mentoring, peer support and financial awards. Foundation staff conducted baseline organizational assessments and worked with each participating organization to develop capacity building plans in at least three of the following five areas: *leadership development, organizational development, program development, collaboration and community engagement, and evaluation of effectiveness*. Once plans were completed and agreed upon, leaders of each organization worked with a Leadership Foundation staff member and consultant to develop a customized and step-by-step strategy for achieving the specified goals.

In addition to the unique goals adopted by participating organizations, all nonprofits receiving financial awards were expected to expand the number of people served, improve evaluation efforts, implement one or more management improvements, enter into at least one collaborative activity with another organization, and secure new funding. The overall performance targets for this initiative as well as the results achieved are shown below.

Achievement of organization-specific capacity building goals

Performance target 1: At least 75 percent of all participating organizations will meet or exceed their capacity building goals by the end of year 2.

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- 72 percent of all organizations met or exceeded their primary capacity building goal
- 77 percent of all organizations met or exceeded their secondary capacity building goal
- 69 percent of all organizations met or exceeded their tertiary capacity building goal

Building service capacity

Performance target 2: The number of people served by participating organizations will increase by 5 percent

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- The total number of individuals served increased by 28.7 percent (N= 12,530)
- Eight full-time staff positions were added
- Four part-time staff positions were eliminated
- 1,851 additional volunteers were added

Improving evaluation efforts

Performance target 3: At least 75 percent of all participating organizations will improve their evaluation efforts

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- 90 percent were able to count clients and track service
- 84 percent were collecting consumer satisfaction feedback
- 74 percent were using methods to determine client benefit/outcomes

Partnering with others

Performance target 4: At least 25 percent of all participating organizations will implement at least one collaborative activity

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- 84 percent established new relationships with other organizations doing similar work
- 32 percent were involved in partnerships to get people ready for employment
- 26 percent were involved in partnerships to help create, retain, or maintain jobs
- 16 percent were involved in partnerships to provide access to state and federal benefits

Strengthening management practices

Performance target 5: At least 50 percent of participating organizations will implement management improvements

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- 100 percent developed a better understanding of their organizations strengths and weaknesses
- 95 percent implemented improvements in organizational management
- 84 percent strengthened their board to make programs more accountable to the community
- 79 percent developed skills to better manage service programs

Securing new funding

Performance target 6: At least 50 percent of participating organizations will secure new funding

Results: Across all grantee organizations at follow-up:

- 60 percent of grantee organizations increased their budgets by an average of approximately \$29,000
- 25 percent of grantee organizations decreased their budgets by an average of approximately \$21,000

- There was a net gain in the size of annual operating budgets across all grantee organizations of approximately \$244,000
- 80 percent of new funding came from private sources and 12% came from public sources

Conclusions

The evaluation results presented here show that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation served as a successful intermediary, providing effective capacity building assistance to 19 nonprofits in the greater Knoxville area. Using baseline organizational assessments as the framework for developing capacity building plans, the Knoxville Leadership Foundation was able to deliver an effective combination of services grounded in strong and trusting relationships as well as candid, and sometimes challenging, advice. Feedback from grantees regarding the assistance they received was overwhelmingly positive and is consistent with the strong results seen in each of the performance outcome measures.

Leaders of grantee organizations reported that they were most helped by the one-on-one support from Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff and their ability to provide consultation and mentorship as needed. It is also clear from the open-ended comments that grantees were able to accept and respond to suggestions of consultants and Leadership Foundation staff, in part because they trusted the people who were giving advice.

One of the unexpected benefits seen in this initiative was the growth in the number of volunteers providing services to grantee agencies. Whether or not this was a specific intention of this capacity building initiative, such a substantial increase in the number of individuals willing to support the mission of these organizations through voluntary service will likely yield substantial payoffs for the organizations themselves and the clients they serve.

It is also clear from follow-up interviews that grantees will have additional capacity building work to do in the future. In particular, grantees report that they are interested in both strengthening their funding as well as building their repertoire of fundraising strategies. Given the time period of this grant and the significant economic downturn that was experienced throughout the United States, it's not surprising that this would remain an ongoing focus for these relatively small nonprofit organizations. Obviously, any additional support that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation can provide toward this end, either directly or in collaboration with others, will be welcomed by grantees.

Improvements in board development, outcome evaluation, and marketing were evident in many of the interviews, but are still regarded by many grantees as works in progress. Nonetheless, it also appears that the vast majority have experienced successful starts on the path toward stronger boards and better evaluations as a result of the assistance they have received to date. Given the depth of good feeling expressed in these interviews, it seems likely that the lessons gained from the training, coaching and mentoring portion of this initiative will stay with these organizations' leaders for the duration of their tenure and potentially passed on through example to those who succeed them.

Overall, the Knoxville Leadership Foundation's diligence in attending to and supporting the goals of the area nonprofits that participated in this initiative can be clearly seen in the following comment:

They were so beneficial to us. I have had a capital grant before to help us internally. But we didn't have the instruction. The Knoxville Leadership Foundation gave us personal attention, evaluated our agency, identified our weaknesses; gave us consultants to help us with our deficiencies. The one-on-one mentoring and instruction was invaluable.

As any consultant, coach or mentor knows, you cannot buy this kind of respect and appreciation, you can only earn it. This evaluation shows that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation has indeed, earned it.

Background

The Strengthening Communities Fund (SCF) is a federal initiative of the Office of Community Services in the Administration for Children and Families. It was created to support capacity-building efforts among faith-based and community-based organizations and designed to address the economic recovery needs of communities throughout the U.S. The focus of this grant was to assist nonprofit organizations in making contributions to all levels of government, and to ensure that information and services described in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 was made available to disadvantaged and underserved populations.

The program made one-time awards up to one million dollars to a variety of experienced lead intermediary organizations nationwide to provide smaller local non-profit agencies with capacity building training, technical assistance, and financial assistance. The grant period ran for twenty months from February 2010 through September 2011.

The Knoxville Leadership Foundation (KLF) sought and received grant funds from the Administration for Children and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The grant was used to support the work of faith-based and community-based nonprofits in the Metropolitan Knoxville area which included a total of nine counties; all of which have unemployment or poverty rates higher than state or national rates. Their efforts involved the granting of sub-awards, the provision of leadership and management training, on-going support through relationships developed with other sub-awardees, technical assistance and individualized coaching.

This report was prepared by Wilder Research at the request of Knoxville Leadership Foundation. The purpose of the report is to assess the value of the capacity building assistance delivered through the initiative and to describe the outcomes achieved by participating non-profits.

Introduction

In October 2009, Knoxville Leadership Foundation received a Strengthening Communities Fund award in the amount of \$1,000,000 from the Administration for Children and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The purpose of the project was to provide capacity-building assistance and related services to local faith- and community-based organizations to help them address and build capacity, strengthen infrastructure, and address economic recovery needs in their communities. The specific economic recovery goals include helping low-income individuals gain and retain employment, earn higher wages, get better jobs, and gain better access to federal and state tax benefits and credits.

Local organizations working with low-income populations, and addressing the economic recovery needs of their communities, especially those with relationships with providers of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), were encouraged to apply.

The Knoxville Leadership Foundation served as an intermediary organization to provide a range of capacity-building support including technical assistance, community training, and disbursement of financial awards for two years. In their efforts to help build the capacity of selected organizations, KLF focused on five key priority areas identified for the project: *leadership development; organizational development; program development; collaboration and community engagement; and evaluation of effectiveness.*

The key program elements used to approach this capacity-building project were:

- **A baseline organizational assessment.** This tool was used to collect current information about the capacity of the organization at the onset of the project. It was used to identify specific capacity-building needs that could be addressed during the project.
- **Capacity building plans.** These plans were developed according to the capacity-building needs identified at baseline. Participants were required to select one or more goals for their organization from at least three of the five key priority areas. Each organization was then expected to work toward their specified goals for the duration of the initiative.
- **Community workshops or trainings.** Workshops or trainings offered monthly were categorized into two tiers to accommodate the diverse backgrounds of participating organizations.

Tier One trainings were open to all nonprofit organizations including those that did not receive funding through this initiative. These large group trainings emphasized a

skill building approach for individuals, groups or emerging organizations in the developmental stages of their work.

Tier Two trainings provided intensive small group training and technical assistance for more advanced organizations that had been selected to receive funding and participate in all aspects of the initiative. All trainings focused on the five key priority areas of the project and were led by national and local consultants with expertise in each of the five capacity building areas described above.

- **Individualized technical assistance.** Specialized one-on-one coaching was provided by staff and consultants according to the unique capacity-building plans of each organization. This level of technical assistance occurred mostly at the site of the participating agency.
- **Sub-awards.** Funds were awarded to those selected organizations that chose to apply for financial assistance. One competitive cycle to apply for funds occurred with two separate disbursements in the first and second year of the project. These funds were intended to assist with the capacity-building efforts of each organization as identified through baseline assessments.
- **Organizational Assessments.** Thorough assessments of the entire organization were conducted using this tool to rate the five priority areas according to sub-categories within each.
- **Site visits** Site visits were made after the application process was complete to verify the information applicants provided in their Organizational Assessments. This activity provided an opportunity for participating organizations to review and revise plans as needed and to finalize capacity building plans and activities.

Between February 2010 and September 2011, twenty organizations were selected to participate and received training, technical assistance and sub-award dollars from the intermediary organization. The total amount of sub-awards made to selected organizations was \$600,000.

Over the course of the project electronic surveys were administered to representatives in each grantee organization quarterly beginning in August 2010, and ending in November 2011. The purpose of this survey was to collect routine performance data from the participating organizations to learn about their capacity-building progress at specific stages in the project. The information gathered was used by staff of the Knoxville Leadership Foundation to prepare federal reports required by their award.

This report examines the progress made by grantees in the achievement of their capacity-building goals.

Goals of the project

The goals for the Strengthening Communities Fund project were to strengthen the capacity of local faith- and community-based nonprofit organizations focusing on the five key priority areas of organizational development, leadership development, program development, collaboration and community engagement, and evaluation of effectiveness.

According to the proposal submitted to the Strengthening Communities Fund, Knoxville Leadership Foundation identified specific outcomes for their work during the project.

These outcomes focused on helping participating organizations to:

- Meet or exceed their capacity-building goals
- Expand the number of people they serve
- Implement improved evaluation efforts
- Implement management improvements
- Implement at least one joint activity with a collaborator
- Secure new public or private funding

The Knoxville Leadership Foundation assisted participating agencies in achieving their goals by connecting them to necessary resources by way of workshops, financial support, peer learning, and individualized coaching.

Process for recruiting and selection of organizations

In March 2010, Knoxville Leadership Foundation began outreach to faith- and community-based organizations regarding the Strengthening Communities Fund grant opportunity. The Foundation invited organizations to apply by using their extensive mailing list to recruit grassroots agencies that varied in size, faith affiliation, and level of business experience. Agencies such as the Chamber of Commerce, United Way, and the Nonprofit Center were included on the list which helped broaden their recruitment efforts. The Foundation also solicited applications through other local agencies including those that provide Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, as well as the Department of Human Services in each local county. These agencies informed other smaller agencies of the Strengthening Communities grant opportunities.

Following these recruitment efforts, two informational meetings were held in the Knoxville community to introduce the grant and the application process to interested agencies.

Part of the application process required all interested agencies to submit a brief agency profile and a description of their capacity-building needs. Within that profile, they were to include their current involvement in improving economic recovery needs in the communities they serve.

Eligibility for participation in the project required organizations to:

- Be small to mid-sized faith- and community-based nonprofits, partnerships and ministries located in the greater Knoxville nine-county area
- Be organizations that serve at-risk and low-income communities
- Have operating budgets under \$500,000
- Have staff, volunteers and board of directors committed to ongoing capacity-building activities
- Propose capacity-building activities that could increase sustainability and improve effectiveness
- Implement or improve programs that could directly address economic recovery issues
- Have at least one substantial secular social service program that would benefit from financial assistance

Applicant organizations were not required to have 501(c) 3 status or to have a fiscal agent to receive funding for the project.

A review committee comprised of Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff and board, including community representatives used a screening and scoring system to determine which organizations met the eligibility requirements for financial assistance.

Announcements were made to selected participants in March 2010. For organizations interested in financial assistance, two separate competitive application processes were made available during the project.

Study methods

The evaluation was designed by Wilder Research in consultation with staff from the Knoxville Leadership Foundation and examines changes that occurred within grantee organizations over the course of the grant period.

The primary data sources for this report are:

- Baseline organizational assessments
- Follow-up interviews with project participants
- Program documents provided by Knoxville Leadership Foundation

Baseline organizational assessment

Representatives of each organization completed a Baseline Organizational Profile as part of the grant application process. This tool collected background data about each organization including information about the number of staff and volunteers, characteristics of populations served, annual budget, revenue sources, existing services or programming including those that address economic recovery issues, existing partnerships, current use of evaluation methods, and a description of capacity-building goals they intended to work on during the project.

Representatives received coaching on how to complete Baseline Profile at the public informational meetings. Additionally, KLF staff made site visits to applicants to review and confirm all information. When complete all Baseline Profiles were forwarded to Wilder Research for analysis and reporting.

A copy of the Baseline Organizational Profile can be found in the Appendix.

Follow-up interviews with representatives of participating organizations

In September 2011, representatives of participating organizations were asked to complete telephone follow-up interviews conducted by trained interviewers from Wilder Research. The purpose of the interview was to learn about the kinds of progress or improvements participants made during their experience with the project. Questions focused on any changes that may have occurred in their organizations over the grant period, including any work that focused on creating jobs or promoting new business growth, the development and diversification of funding, current budgets, size and scope of programs, current

numbers served, current partnerships, work encouraged by or knowledge gained from experience with the project, current evaluation methods, progress made on goals at project onset, and responses to services provided by Leadership staff and consultants.

Additional questions were asked about overall project benefits, other assistance that might be helpful in the future, and what might have been done differently to improve capacity-building outcomes.

Twenty organizations completed baseline assessments at the onset of the project and 19 fully participated in the project. Figure 1 shows the breakdown.

1. Number and percentage of participating organizations completing year-end survey

	Total
Organizations completing baselines	20
Number completing follow-up surveys	19
Response rate at follow-up	95%

A copy of the telephone follow-up interview can be located in the Appendix.

Program records and planning documents

Project records were provided by Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff for the review of Wilder Research staff. The following is a list of records used for parts of this report:

- Proposal documents
- Technical assistance and training information/schedules
- Participant lists and records for the project
- Project timelines

Characteristics of participating organizations

Number of organizations and types of services provided

Twenty organizations were originally selected to participate in the project. However, two withdrew because of changes in senior leadership staff. One organization was later replaced and the new organization was able to fully participate in the project.

All of the twenty organizations provided information at baseline and only one organization could not be reached for follow-up at the end of the project.

Participating organizations classified themselves as faith-based or community-based nonprofits, and typically provided services to more than one of the nine counties identified for this project. Organizations provided services to at least one of the following populations:

- At-risk youth and adults
- Unemployment and welfare-to-work
- Homelessness
- Elderly care
- Prisoner re-entry
- Children of prisoners
- Chemically dependent persons
- New immigrants

One organization focused on overall community safety without having a focus on a specific population group.

Organizational assets and resources at baseline

One of the eligibility requirements for project participation was that organizations had budgets of less than \$500,000. All twenty organizations reported having met the budget requirement. At baseline, organizations were asked what their annual budgets were for 2010. The combined budget amounts of all participating organizations totaled \$2,448,349. The maximum budget amount was \$403,000, the minimum amount was \$5,025 and the average budget size was \$122,417. See Figure 2 for total budget amounts.

2. Organizational resources at baseline (annual budgets)

	Total (N=20)
Average organizational budget at baseline	\$122,417
Maximum organizational budget	\$403,000
Minimum organizational budget	\$5,025
Combined budget for all organizations	\$2,448,349

Another important non-profit resource is staff and volunteers. Participants were asked to report the number of paid full- and part-time staff at baseline. On average organizations employed two full-time and two part-time employees. Volunteers were more numerous. Organizations reported an average of 108 volunteers serving at baseline. The average number of board members serving participating organizations was 12. Figure 3 summarizes this information for all staff and volunteers at baseline.

3. Organizational assets at baseline (staff and volunteers)

Staff/volunteers	Total (N=18)
Total number of paid full-time staff	27
Average paid full-time staff	1.5
Total number paid part-time staff	34
Average paid part-time staff	1.8
Total number of volunteers (excluding board members)	1,944
Average number of volunteers (excluding board members)	108
Total number of board members	215
Average number of board members	11.9

**Three organizations did not provide staff and volunteer data*

Types of training, technical assistance and financial support provided

Knoxville Leadership Foundation offered a comprehensive nonprofit training program to all participants as part of their capacity-building experience. Organizations were required to commit to the following activities for the duration of the project:

Group trainings

During an 18-month period from April 2010 to September 2011, two required large and small group trainings were offered to participants. In addition, optional trainings were offered between January 2010 and August 2011. During the initiative, an overall total of 58 trainings including 36 large and small groups, and 22 optional trainings were offered to participants. Large and small group trainings were one and one half hours long, while optional trainings ranged from one hour to six hours in duration. A total of 54 hours was conducted for large and small trainings, and a total of 43 hours for optional sessions. See Figure 4.

Training topics were organized according to the five key priority areas as follows:

- **Collaboration and community engagement.** Community needs assessments; enhancing or forming collaboration processes; creating or updating community marketing materials; presentations to the community; strategic partnerships
- **Leadership development.** Board, staff and volunteer development; succession planning
- **Program development.** Technology upgrades; new program development; program improvement or expansion
- **Evaluation of effectiveness.** Program evaluation – record keeping systems, outcome measurement and tracking, logic models
- **Organizational development.** Staff development and management, strategic planning, fiscal management and accounting, revenue development, donor management, marketing plan;

KLF partnered with local and national consultants to conduct the trainings.

Individualized technical assistance. Specialized one-on-one coaching was provided to participants that received funding and whose capacity plans focused on economic

recovery issues in their communities. All coaching was conducted by Knoxville Leadership staff and hired consultants during the project. Twenty organizations received a minimum of one hour of service during the 18 month project period for a total of 360 hours. An additional 1.8 hours was provided to each organization for an overall one-on-one coaching total of 649. Consultants met with the leadership staff of participating organizations based on availability, consultant fees, and the number of priority areas addressed during each project year. See Figure 4.

4. Total hours of training and technical assistance provided to organizations

(N=20)	Hours
Group trainings (large, small and optional)	97
One-on-one technical assistance	649
Total hours provided	1,784

Sub-award grants

Nineteen of the 20 organizations received training, technical assistance and sub-award dollars as part of their participation in the project. One organization chose not to apply for financial assistance. Sub-award dollars were intended to help improve the services and programs of each organization. Examples of how sub-awards could be used included:

- Consultant fees
- New personnel whose activities focused on organizational development
- Technology improvements

The sub-awards disbursed to selected organizations totaled \$600,000. See Figure 5.

5. Total dollars awarded to participating organizations

	Total (N=19)
Sub-award amount	\$600,000
Minimum award	\$7,059
Maximum award	\$50,000
Average award amount	\$31,578

** One organization did not apply for financial assistance*

Project outcomes

Capacity-building support

Project goal 1: 75 percent of participating organizations will meet or exceed their capacity-building goals

At baseline, 20 representatives of organizations identified specific capacity-building goals from any three of the five priority areas of organizational development, leadership development, evaluation of effectiveness, program development, and collaboration and community engagement. Ninety percent of the representatives identified a total of three goals, while the remaining ten percent had identified just two goals for their project work. The goals participants selected in each priority area were: *marketing strategies, strategic planning, fund expansion, board development, human resources, recruiting and retaining volunteers, volunteer management processes, program evaluation, program operation, program expansion, community engagement, collaboration, and building organizational infrastructure.*

A comprehensive list of the capacity-building goals of participating organizations can be found in the Appendix.

Progress made toward addressing participants capacity-building needs was measured by the percentage of organizations that reported at follow-up that work on their identified goals had been achieved. By follow-up, 19 participating representatives were first asked whether or not they received the help they expected on their goals. Ninety-five percent of reporting organizations said they received assistance on goal one; 95 percent received assistance on goal two; and 75 percent received assistance on goal 3.

Secondly, they were asked to rate their progress made on each goal. Respondents reported progress by rating their goal accomplishment as “exceeded,” “met,” “partially met,” or “not met.” Seventy-two percent of organizations met or exceeded goal one; 77 percent met or exceeded expectations for goal two; and 69 percent met or exceeded expectations for goal 3. See Figure 6 for a breakdown.

6. Number of organizations specifying capacity-building assistance goals, number and percent reporting that they received assistance, and met or exceeded their goal

Goal	Organizations specifying this goal at baseline	Organizations reporting receiving needed assistance		Organizations meeting or exceeding goal at follow-up	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Goal 1	20	18	95%	13	72%
Goal 2	20	18	95%	14	77%
Goal 3	18	14	75%	9	69%

In addition to information on goal attainment, participating organizations were asked how their capacity-building efforts had impacted their programs or organizations during the initiative. Sixteen agencies answered this question and responses were coded within focus areas. More than one response was provided by each organization. The following four areas were mentioned most often:

- Improved organization’s structure or function (9)
- Strengthened organizational leadership (8)
- Improved evaluation or service training (4)
- Enhanced collaboration or community engagement (2)

Respondents were also asked to identify goals that were only partially met or not met as part of their capacity building efforts. The most common unmet goal area was related to fund development or sustainability (N=4). This was followed by board development (N=3) and marketing or brand development work (N=2). Goal areas identified as partially met or not met by a single respondent each included creating a new program, finishing a strategic plan, or agreeing on final outcome measures. In general, however, comments related to specific capacity building goals were highly positive, as illustrated below.

Organizational Development

Strategic Planning

They helped us have a plan for our organization. We have the strategic planning they helped us set up. They helped us be on track, making sure we were following the dates we were planning to have them. We were on the right track, getting the advice from their consultant, making sure we were doing the right thing.

We developed a one-year, three-year, five-year strategic plan.

Board Development

We had goals, but re-did the bylaws. They took me off the board and made me executive director. We have board position descriptions - that is required. We have developed how to do orientation for new board members. We are learning how to recruit; finding people that will fill specific needs we have and bringing expertise we need that will help us.

Emphasis was on board development through a consultant, allowing us to develop a board implementation plan, which allowed us to focus on board roles and responsibilities that further built board capacity and strength for sustainability.

Leadership Development

It has enabled me and others in the organization to observe, report, take action, and communicate better than ever. That has resulted in stronger output in just about everything we do.

Leadership staff helped me see that as we grow I am going to have to refine my role maybe by stepping out of some of the responsibilities I have had. I am going to have to hire more staff so that I can step more into the true executive director kind of work that will be needed

Our leadership has become stronger. Working on the different development plans, we put names as to who was responsible for what. It was quite a responsibility.

Evaluation of Effectiveness

Evaluation of effectiveness has seen a big improvement. We have created several ways of measuring what we are doing. That has been a big, positive change encouraged by KLF.

We have good evaluation methods in place.

We came up with measurement tools.

Collaboration and Community Engagement

We have had success with collaborations with churches. They are controlled by MOUs compared to handshaking before.

Our building is being used by other groups. In collaboration, there have been lots of opportunities for us to work with other groups. The Leadership staff has really encouraged that.

We needed to raise the organization’s capacity to help the families we serve. We have been able to do that through the use of student interns through the local college. We have been able to hire one of them as a part-time social worker.

Capacity-building assistance was made available to grantees through multiple sources including the staff and consultants serving Knoxville Leadership Foundation, as well as a custom designed training program delivered by local partner organizations, and outcome measurement workshops offered by Wilder Research.

Changes in service delivery capacity

Project goal 2: To increase the number of people served by participating organizations by 5%

Reliable information on the number of participants served at baseline and follow-up was available for 17 of the 20 participating organizations. Specifically, respondents were asked how many individuals they had served in the year just before they became involved with the Strengthening Communities grant, and how many people they had served during any 12-month period of the project between 2010 and 2011. Results show that a total number of 56,193 individuals were served. The average number served was 3,305. The total number served increased from baseline to follow-up by 12,530 or 28.7%, far exceeding the initial project goal. The figure below shows the number served during each time period.

7. New clients served at follow-up

Clients served	Total (N=17)
Number of clients served the year before project	43,663
Number of clients served during the project	56,193
Net increase in number of clients	12,530
Minimum number of clients served	16
Maximum number of clients served	28,350
Average number of clients served per organization	3,305
Median number of clients served	150

An important factor in the capacity of an organization to serve individuals is the availability of staff and volunteers to carry out the work. Representatives of participating organizations were asked to report baseline and follow-up numbers for their paid full and part-time staff, volunteers and board members.

The figures below shows that eighteen of 20 organizations reported changes made in the number of staff, volunteers and board members over this time period. There was a net increase of eight paid full-time staff and a net decrease of four part-time staff.

8. Changes in staffing from baseline to follow-up

Paid staff	Total (N=18)
Number of paid full-time staff at baseline	27
Number of paid full-time staff at follow-up	35
Number of increased paid full-time staff	8
Average paid full-time staff per organization at follow-up	1.9
Number of paid part-time staff at baseline	34
Number of paid part-time staff at follow-up	30
Number of increased paid part-time staff	-
Average paid part-time staff per organization at follow-up	1.6

Volunteers, whether they provide direct service to an agency's clients or serve as members of a board, represent an important resource for participating organizations. Since baseline, regular volunteers increased by a total of 1,851 for an overall follow-up total of 3,795. Organizations on average had a total of more than 200 volunteers at follow-up compared to an average of just over 100 at baseline. The number of board members increased slightly over this time, but the increase in these numbers was far less dramatic as shown in the figure below.

9. Changes in volunteers and board members from baseline to follow-up

Volunteers/board members	(N=18)
Number of volunteers at baseline	1,944
Average number of volunteers per organization at baseline	108
Number of volunteers at follow-up	3,795
Number of increased volunteers	1,851
Average number of volunteers per organization	210.8
Number of board members at baseline	215
Number of board members at follow-up	220
Number of increased board members	5
Average number of board members per organization	12.2

Program expansion

Representatives from each organization were asked at baseline to identify services or programs currently offered or planned. Just over half (53%) offered between four and seven distinct services, and 47 percent offered two or three.

The same participants were asked at follow-up if the size and/or scope of programs or services had increased, decreased or stayed the same over the course of the project. Of the 19 respondents, 16 (84%) reported growth in programs or services. Figure 10 below summarizes these results.

10. Changes in programs or services at follow-up

Program growth	Number	Percent
Number of organizations reporting an increase in services or programs	16	84%
Number of organizations reporting no change in services or programs	2	11%
Number of organizations reporting a decrease in services or programs	1	5%
Total	19	100%

Implementing improved evaluation efforts

Project goal 3: 75 percent of participating organizations will improve their evaluation efforts

At baseline and follow-up, participants were asked about any systematic methods or tools they were using to help them evaluate their program or service operations. This could include strategies to count their clients, keep track of services, collecting satisfaction information from clients, and assess whether or not clients had benefitted from program services. Most of the organizations (17) said they had methods in place at baseline for just counting who they serve, and held steady with those methods by the end of the project. From baseline to follow-up, there was a significant increase in the percentage of organizations (50% through 60% at baseline vs. 74% through 90% at follow-up) that had methods in place in one or more of the evaluation categories.

The figure below illustrates how participants answered at both time periods.

11. Changes in evaluation at follow-up

	N=20		N=19	
	Number at baseline	Percent baseline	Number at follow-up	Percent at follow-up
Organizations using methods to count who they serve	17	85%	17	90%
Organizations using methods to count and track amount of service	11	55%	17	90%
Organizations using methods to collect satisfaction information	12	60%	16	84%
Organizations using methods to determine client benefit	10	50%	14	74%

**One organization since baseline dropped out of the project.*

The figure shows that the most common changes occurred in the development of strategies to track service delivery and gather consumer feedback.

Implementing work with partners

Project goal 4: 25 percent of participating organizations will implement at least one collaborative activity

Collaboration or partnering has been an important goal for the Strengthening Communities Fund project. Participating organizations have been encouraged to engage in activities with similar organizations within the project, as well as external networks. Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff created opportunities for grantees to make those connections through trainings, work with consultants, and cohort meetings.

At project onset, most participating organizations had established some type of partnership with other agencies to achieve their goals. In fact, nineteen out of twenty (95%) participating organizations said they did have at least one relationship of this kind. The participating agencies had already established partnerships with community organizations, churches or religious institutions, other Strengthening Communities grantees, foundations, schools, colleges, or city departments or divisions.

However, a unique component of this initiative was to strengthen or build capacity to address economic issues within their communities in partnership with others. At baseline, participants were asked if they were currently involved with partners in efforts to create jobs

or encourage new business growth in their communities. A significantly smaller percentage of respondents (35%) said that they were involved in this capacity. Figure 12 below shows changes from baseline to follow-up in these types of strategic alliances.

12. Partnerships for economic recovery (baseline to follow-up)

Partnerships for economic recovery	Baseline Number	Baseline Percent	Follow-up Number	Follow-up Percent
Partnerships to create or retain jobs	3	15%	5	26%
Partnerships to get people job ready	7	35%	6	32%
Partnerships to help people get or keep a job	4	20%	5	26%
Partnerships to provide access to state and federal benefits	2	10%	5	16%

As shown, the greatest change occurred in the development of partnerships to access state and federal benefits.

Additionally, participants were asked whether or not their involvement with the Strengthening Communities initiative helped them to establish relationships with other organizations doing similar work. There were 84% who responded favorably that their involvement with the initiative was helpful. The most common examples (75%) reflected networking through the project cohort meetings, direct connections made between agencies by the Leadership Foundation, and strategies for learning how to work together.

The following comments are illustrative:

- We also are becoming familiar with other groups doing similar things. Whether we partner with them or not, we are able to ask them how they are doing certain things, which also helps us. KLF is also asking us to partner with other groups doing similar plans, like our work with youth.
- They have given us a place to meet these other people. We didn't know each other existed. There are tons of people doing good work that just don't get the write ups like other organizations.
- We have established relationships during the times we have worked with the foundation, not necessarily through this grant. However, we have partnerships with grantees in this project.
- We currently partner with other organizations in the project to further our work. We make referrals.

There is an organization similar in their after school and sports activities. KLF staff had worked with them before and set up introductions for me to be able to talk with them about their work and about how we could work together.

[We worked] directly with KLF organizations within the cohort. We became more aware of looking for partners.

We have been [working] together monthly for a year, so we have learned what other services are out there in the community and have been able to refer people back and forth for services

There are organizations similar to ours. We go to those organizations to get help and see how they went about it.

We are working with a domestic violence shelter, and have developed networking strategies to stay in touch.

Helped enhance our existing relationships. Primarily staying connected and build bridges mostly through the work of the directors. Raising money.

Implementing improved management efforts

Project goal 5: 50 percent of participating organizations will implement management improvements

At follow-up, participants were asked whether or not their involvement in the Strengthening Communities initiative helped them to better manage their organizations and/or programs.

All of the participants reported that they had developed a better understanding of their organizations strengths and weaknesses. Of those participants who reported favorably about their involvement, 95% said it helped them to implement improvements in organizational management, and 79% reported developing better management skills for their programs. Eighty-four percent of organizations said they received help establishing relationships with agencies doing similar work, and strengthening their board to make their programs more accountable to the community.

The following figure shows the number and percentage of respondents reporting improvements in specific management related activities.

13. Number and percentage of organizations reporting improvements in management and leadership skills (N=19)

Reported improvements	Number	Percent
Developed better understanding of organizations strengths and weaknesses	19	100%
Implemented improvements in organizational management	18	95%
Strengthened board to make programs more accountable to community	16	84%
Established relationships with other organizations doing similar work	16	84%
Developed skills to better manage human service programs	15	79%

Respondents were asked for examples of how their involvement with the project had helped them to implement improvements in organizational management which was the goal for the project. As shown below, the majority of comments focused on leadership and governance issues:

It has built my confidence by validating the things I do well, and has helped me identify gaps I need to look at and areas of weakness that I need to strengthen.

The person who has been our office manager became our volunteer coordinator, which has freed me to be out in the community, do fundraising, and letting more people know about our organization. My job description has changed, so instead of running the program, I am more involved in fundraising and community outreach. The person who has moved into running the more day-to-day stuff is ideal. We have also redesigned our training to make it easier for people to volunteer, with some of the training now being online, making it easier for people. With this increased flexibility in our training, it is going to help us get more volunteers.

One of my greatest challenges has been to re-train and equip my other staff members within this new position and being able to take them to leadership training and development classes. There has been good discussion of best practices.

Changing positions and functions had allowed me to serve as a board member and to do the networking in the community that I need to do.

Through board development. That is the last help we are getting. They have the board training and are following up with a progress report with what to do to improve, and how to have some goals there. That is in progress now.

We defined our board roles.

Fund-raising support

Project goal 6: 50% of participating organizations will secure new funding

An important goal of the Strengthening Communities Fund is to expose organizations to opportunities that will help them secure new funding. The Knoxville Leadership Foundation did this in a variety of ways including discussions during training, one-on-one coaching, as well as through the arrangement of introductions with individuals representing potential new funding sources.

Organization's budgets

At baseline, participating organizations were asked to describe current sources of financial support and to report on the size of their annual budgets prior to participation in the Strengthening Communities Fund initiative. Organizations ranged widely in size and scope, with the smallest organization having an annual budget of just over \$5000 and the largest organization having an annual budget just over \$400,000. The average (mean) budget size across all organizations at baseline was \$122,400.

At follow-up, 12 of the original 20 organizations had increased their annual budgets by an average of \$29,104. Five of the organizations had seen a decrease in their annual budgets by an average amount of \$21,060. One organization reported no change in annual budget size, one had no data available to report, and one organization had discontinued participation.

Figure 14 provides a summary of this information for all participating organizations.

14. Change in annual budget among participating organizations at follow-up (N=18)

Direction of budget change	Total number of organizations	Average amount of change	Total amount of change
Increase	12	\$29,104	\$349,250
Decrease	5	\$21,060	\$105,300
No change	1	-	-
Unknown	2	-	-
Total net change			\$243,950

The results show that 60% of the original 20 organizations served through the initiative increased the size of their annual budget from baseline to follow-up, exceeding the goal of the initiative. The total net change represents a roughly 10% average increase in annual budgets based on the average size of annual budgets reported at baseline. Further,

it is worth noting that this is a somewhat conservative estimate because it is calculated based on all organizations that began the initiative rather than only those that completed the full range of capacity building services.

Budget sources

Information from baseline interviews shows that participating organizations received financial support from a wide variety of sources including corporate gifts, foundation gifts, donations from religious organizations, government grants and contracts, earned income, in-kind donations, self-sponsored fundraising initiatives, as well as other miscellaneous forms of support.

At follow-up, for the 12 organizations whose annual budgets reflected an increase; 88% came from private sources and 12% came from public sources. For those whose annual budgets reflected a decrease, 56% was lost from private sources and 44% was lost from public sources.

In total, when source could be identified, \$128,345 of new money was secured from private sources and only \$13,000 was procured from public sources. This finding may reflect some of the general economic difficulties faced by state and county funding sources during this grant cycle.

Type and level of assistance provided

At follow-up, representatives were asked if they had received help to strengthen or diversify their funding. All participants reported receiving this type of help. The most commonly mentioned area focused on expanding an organizations' base of financial resources through fund development.

Other areas include:

- Creating a fund development plan (26%)
- Learning how to identify and approach donors (21%)
- How to conduct fundraising events (16%)
- Group trainings (16%)
- Grant writing (11%)

Participant satisfaction ratings

Satisfaction with specific trainings and technical assistance

Participants were asked to rate the overall value of the training they received as part of their capacity-building assistance. Of the 19 representatives who answered, 16 (84%) said that the trainings helped them to address specific needs and caused them to make changes or strengthen their organizations. The remaining three representatives felt that either the trainings were generally useful and informative but did not result in specific organizational changes, or they did not find them helpful.

Just over half (58%) of respondents preferred one-on-one coaching, compared to 42 percent who preferred group trainings. The following comment is illustrative:

I liked the one-on-one because you could ask questions specific to your organization. In the group classes, it was more general. On the whole, the topics discussed throughout the year have been informative and helpful, whether your organization is large or small.

When asked to recall which trainings they valued most, work on collaborations and partnerships, as well as training related to evaluation and marketing were most valued as shown below.

Most valued training topics

- Collaborations/partnerships (6)
- Outcome evaluation (5)
- Marketing strategies (4)
- Leadership development (3)
- Board development (3)

The following comments are illustrative:

Collaborations

Collaborations. That is what we do. Our focus is collaborations, referrals and networks; so anything we could learn to do that better was gold.

The collaboration piece. We broke up into different groups and had to talk about what we would implement if they came to our place, and why. EX: Within our group, we had a senior citizen center, and we chose them, what we would do with their families, and how we would address their fears with horses. It was really helpful getting us to see how you can learn to think outside the box and still remain focused on your mission.

Evaluation of effectiveness

The logic model was very helpful in helping us identify outcomes. I think the logic model helped me to quantify things. With the help line, it was hard to quantify what we were doing. We knew we were being helpful, but it helped us develop goals to show that.

I think the training on evaluation and gathering of outcomes, and how you can make use of your outputs and outcomes in improving your programs, operations, and fundraising. It was the most enlightening to me as a leader. I always viewed our mission as the benefit being self-evident, but I learned it is one thing to say “This is what we do. Please support us.” But it is much more to say, “This is what we do and what it does for others. Please support us.”

A lot of their training is on measurable outcomes, which has been very helpful. People here have been ready to move in that direction. That even in things like fundraising, it is important to be able to show measurable progress.

Board development

One was on the different types of boards and how they operate; what is healthy, what is not healthy. We have moved recently from being a working board to a governing board. I was looking at how we were doing things and what is healthy and unhealthy, and what I can do to help that.

The ones on board members and what makes an effective board. Also, how to choose good board members. We have learned so much about things we didn't even know we needed to learn about.

Leadership development

The leadership training, in general, empowered me to feel we didn't have all the right people in the right places that we needed.

Leadership development. - The panel discussions about time management and leadership skills.

Managing your priorities. Personal coaching for those who need it – work-life balance to become more productive.

Marketing

A couple trainings centered around marketing and different methods of doing it. Learning how to implement those methods was really helpful for me.

The two consultants were very successful in the marketing world, and they gave good pointers.

The marketing training – The visuals and examples.

Program development

Program development. It is the foundation of what we do, and helps make sure we are doing the right thing for our clients. It helps us make sure we have the right programs, doing it right, and serving it right.

Grantees' overall satisfaction with the project and project staff

When asked whether or not working with the Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff, trainers, and consultants had helped improve their programs or organizations, 100 percent of reporting organizations said “yes” it had, and a majority (84%) reported that the help mainly came from a combination of consultant work, trainings, and Leadership Foundation staff.

Nineteen organizations provided comments about how working with Leadership Foundation staff, trainers, and consultants helped them make improvements. Responses were coded in categories. The categories most frequently mentioned were governance and leadership, organizational development, programs, and staffing. Specific areas most often mentioned as helpful include:

- Defining the roles and responsibilities of the board
- Evaluating the whole organization
- Getting better organized to address goals through strategic planning
- Increasing capacity to provide more services
- Hiring staff

Overall, participants were highly satisfied with the services they received from the project and staff. One hundred percent of participants felt they received useful suggestions and recommendations; 100 percent felt staff were knowledgeable and skilled; 100 percent

found it easy to contact staff, 100 percent felt staff helped them use strengths to make progress toward goals; and 100 percent received services that met their expectations.

See Figure 15 below.

15. Satisfaction with services provided by the Knoxville Leadership Foundation

	Number agreeing or strongly agreeing	Mean rating	Percent
Staff at the Leadership Foundation have given me useful suggestions and recommendations.	19	3.74	100%
Staff were sensitive to cultural issues.	18	3.28	95%
Staff were knowledgeable and skilled.	19	3.84	100%
It was easy to contact staff when I needed to.	19	3.89	100%
Staff helped our organization to use its strengths to make progress on goals.	19	3.37	100%
Overall, the services I received met my expectations.	19	3.68	100%

**Means are calculated on a four point scale where 4= Strongly Agree, 3= Agree, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree*

In addition to the scaled satisfaction items, respondents from participating organizations were given an opportunity to provide additional comments on the work of the Knoxville Leadership Foundation through their Center for Communities. The following comments reflect the range of opinions expressed by organizational leaders.

Just to sum it up, I would say what I said when speaking to a group of folks – without their education, support and accountability, we wouldn't have come as far as we have. There is no reason, as young as we are, that we should be doing as good as we are. We owe that to the Center for Communities, for sure.

It has made a lasting difference to be more efficient and to get more out of what we've got. Each time has enlightened us and made us more aware of what we are doing. We can always improve. They have helped us improve.

I think we were the first non-profit Hispanic organization that KLF had. Thank you for the opportunity. It was a lot of help individually, and as a part of a group. We really appreciate that.

If it had not been for KLF we would not be where we are. They helped us put things in place to help us grow as an organization which took us to the next level.

To let you know how valuable KLF is and the high regard I hold them in. We are being looked at for a national grant. I have called Stanley to find out how much it would cost to write KLF in as a consultant. I want to write them in as a consultant on anything we get funding for in the future. They are good at holding your feet to the fire, to sustain for the people in your ministry.

KLF has a lot of good people, but the face of this is Stanley Taylor. He has been a great ally and great partner in helping us on our mission. I commend his work to you. The grant has been well stewarded.

I am very thankful for what they are doing and for seeking us out to participate. KLF staff is really great.

This is an excellent way to make sure non-profit organizations, particularly faith-based organizations, have the opportunity to grow through having the resources available to them. I particularly appreciate our being held responsible for our budgets, our expenses. Could they do everything perfectly? Of course not. But if I had the opportunity to do this again, I would be in.

I have really gotten so much out of CFC. My prayer is that they will be there for others, what I call "the newbies." It's an awesome organization.

What helped participating organizations the most

At follow-up organizations were asked the question, "When you think about your work with the Knoxville Leadership Foundation, what has helped your organization the most?"

Nineteen organizations provided comments about the most beneficial aspects of their experience. All responses were coded and the results are presented below.

Most helpful aspects of services

- One-on-one support/relationship from Leadership staff (47%)
- Availability of Leadership staff to consult or advise at any time (21%)
- The mentorship support from consultants/staff (21%)
- Knowledge and experience with boards and non-profits (11%)
- Meeting with others in the cohort (11%)
- The grant overall (sub-award, technical assistance, training) (11%)

One thing is clear in both coded responses and the open-ended comments shown below; that is, the personal and attentive support that grantees experienced over the course of the project was a key ingredient in grantee's ability to make the most out of the training and technical assistance they received.

The relationships with the leadership of the foundation.

Probably a combination of the one-on-one consulting time with Stanley and our fund development consultant, Christina Shands. Stanley is so good with cutting to the chase. He doesn't let me beat around the bush, just getting to the meat of what I need to address. And Christina is not only good as a consultant in advising, but also in giving specific tools to help us apply things and be more accountable, helping us come up with some accountability tools for that.

Stanley. His support and being available. He is very open and approachable.

The monthly meeting, when we go to KLF and meet with everybody. Then you can hear how others are going through the same things, or that they have gone through them and gotten through them. They have good presentations every month. Ideas on how things can be fixed or accomplished, because everybody had different ideas on how to do something. You might have 4 people up front who have experienced the problem, each telling how they dealt with it in different ways.

The mentoring. When things are uncomfortable to do, they are able to provide you with constructive things to do. When issues came up that were difficult, as in board development, my mentor provided significant support, with corrective criticism and suggestions. Not only did he provide structure, but also the freedom for me to do what I needed to do with the suggestions.

Other than the financial aspect or the sub-award, we greatly appreciate the staff.

Overall, it helped us. The program was holistic. The consultants went into depth. There was something to take away from each component. There was not one thing more than the other.

Their knowledge and experience with boards and non-profits has encouraged us to think better and positively. We are trying to change the culture of our board and they have helped.

The one-on-one consultation with the Leadership staff. It felt more like mentoring with a leadership quality.

The wisdom taught us. KLF has helped us at no cost to us. We could call, and we did, and we could get help at any time.

Stanley Taylor was our personal consultant and we met monthly – Phenomenal. He helped us understand collaboration as a team. He helped me to be the Director I need to be with the board.

Kinds of help organizations would find most useful in the future

Each respondent was asked to think about the kind of help their organization might need in the next 12 to 24 months following the Strengthening Communities grant. Nineteen organizations provided comments, and those responses were coded in categories. The categories most frequently mentioned were: resource development, leadership and governance, and program assessment. The most specific needs mentioned within those categories are:

- Expanding funding or fundraising
- Board development
- Evaluation of programs

The following comments are illustrative:

I think it would all come down to expanding our funding, because our greatest needs are going to be getting additional staff and maybe having a facility of our own to be able to expand in.

Get more funding, Fundraising. We would like to get more money to help us expand our programs and have one more staff, hopefully.

We need more expert help with grant writing.

Evaluation of the programs and events that we do provide within the community, to be able to measure the outcome more effectively.

Being able to articulate the outcomes we are seeing.

My immediate focus is on evaluating all our programs. What is uppermost in my mind to address or work on is, “What does data mean.” We will need a consultant to help us with that.

Board development – We are moving slowly towards the direction of a culture change and trying to get leadership in step as well. We need to do some prodding.

More board development – we are continuing to define roles, but it still feels incomplete to me.

What might organizations do differently with similar support in the future

At follow-up, participating organizations were asked what they would do differently if they had a similar opportunity in the future. A sizeable portion, one-quarter of respondents,

said they would not do anything different. For those who considered the potential value of a difference in approach or strategy, the following comments are illustrative.

Leadership involvement

I would try to be more large thinking instead of small. I had difficulty spending large amounts [of grant] in small increments.

I didn't realize how much this was about the funding. I thought it would compromise what we do. It would have been good to evaluate our organization based on that in the beginning. Our participation may have kept someone else from getting funding.

I would probably more quickly implement some of the recommendations that were given by KLF and the consultants. You get bogged down in day-to-day challenges and fires and don't implement things as quickly as you might. I would implement things more quickly, if given another chance.

It seems like we were so busy working on the plans, that it is now getting to the point where we will be implementing them. We had that money to spend, and we spent time redesigning the website. You might do more of the planning aspects first, then find out what money we had available and do things in the two pieces. We were kind of doing everything all at the same time. Maybe we could spread it out over a longer period of time.

Focus from the very beginning. We had never received anything like this before, and our heads were in the clouds. Focus more quickly, understanding the gift we have been given, in order to better serve the people we serve.

Program development

We would go into a new area to do the same work. We have increased our capacity; we have grown.

Organizational Development

I would have the capacity to get that database. I would have the funding to hire one, perhaps two more persons. I would also have the funding to expand the job creation/job training program.

Evaluation of effectiveness

With funding in the future, what we would use it for would be for our record keeping. That is how we know the people who have come to an event; to be able to do that more effectively. Then [we would need] to get the money for training in accounts payable.

Conclusions

The evaluation results presented here show that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation served as a successful intermediary, providing effective capacity building assistance to 19 nonprofits in the greater Knoxville area. Using baseline organizational assessments as the framework for developing capacity building plans, the Knoxville Leadership Foundation was able to deliver an effective combination of services grounded in strong and trusting relationships as well as candid, and sometimes challenging, advice. Feedback from grantees regarding the assistance they received was overwhelmingly positive and is consistent with the strong results seen in each of the performance outcome measures.

Leaders of grantee organizations reported that they were most helped by the one-on-one support from Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff and their ability to provide consultation and mentorship as needed. It is also clear from the open-ended comments that grantees were able to accept and respond to suggestions of consultants and Leadership Foundation staff, in part because they trusted the people who were giving advice.

One of the unexpected benefits seen in this initiative was the growth in the number of volunteers providing services to grantee agencies. Whether or not this was a specific intention of this capacity building initiative, such a substantial increase in the number of individuals willing to support the mission of these organizations through voluntary service will likely yield substantial payoffs for the organizations themselves and the clients they serve.

It is also clear from follow-up interviews that grantees will have additional capacity building work to do in the future. In particular, grantees report that they are interested in both strengthening their funding as well as building their repertoire of fundraising strategies. This is consistent with study data that show that fund development was the most common area in which goals were unmet or only partially met. Given the time period of this grant and the significant economic downturn that was experienced throughout the United States, is not surprising that this would remain an ongoing focus for these relatively small nonprofit organizations. Obviously, any additional support that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation can provide toward this end, either directly or in collaboration with others, will be welcomed by grantees.

Improvements in board development, outcome evaluation, and marketing were evident in many of the interviews, but are still regarded by many grantees as works in progress. Nonetheless, it also appears that the vast majority have experienced successful starts on the path toward stronger boards and better evaluations as a result of the assistance they have received to date. Given the depth of good feeling expressed in these interviews, it seems likely that the lessons gained from the training, coaching and mentoring portion of

this initiative will stay with these organizations' leaders for the duration of their tenure and potentially passed on through example to those who succeed them.

Overall, the Knoxville Leadership Foundation's diligence in attending to and supporting the goals of the area nonprofits that participated in this initiative can be clearly seen in the following comment:

They were so beneficial to us. I have had a capital grant before to help us internally. But we didn't have the instruction. The Knoxville Leadership Foundation gave us personal attention, evaluated our agency, identified our weaknesses; gave us consultants to help us with our deficiencies. The one-on-one mentoring and instruction was invaluable.

As any consultant, coach or mentor knows, you cannot buy this kind of respect and appreciation, you can only earn it. This evaluation shows that the Knoxville Leadership Foundation has indeed, earned it.

Appendix

Grantee capacity-building goals

Baseline organizational profile 2010

Follow-up interview 2011

Grantee capacity-building goals

- 1.) Marketing - developing a brand
- 2.) Tools for outcome measurement
- 3.) Diversification of funding sources

- 1.) Strategic planning
- 2.) Board development
- 3.) Sustainability

- 1.) Program development - community engagement
- 2.) Funding
- 3.) Marketing

- 1.) To increase funding to further stabilize the organization
- 2.) To increase community awareness through improved marketing
- 3.) To increase volunteer mobilization

- 1.) Build strong infrastructure. This includes an active board.
- 2.) Build capacity by fundraising efforts. Build sustainability by competent paid staff and volunteers.
- 3.) Implement a database system that precisely tracks performance measure, outcomes, and agency collaborations.

- 1.) To increase our volunteer base. With the icarol web-based software, we can operate from multiple locations for the convenience of the volunteers.
- 2.) We want to increase our hours of operation from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. to 24 hours.
- 3.) Currently our donor base is mostly Anderson County. We want to increase our donations from individuals, churches, corporations, etc., in other counties, particularly Knoxville, which now consists of 60% of all calls.

- 1.) Re-starting our Pathways to Parenting Program
- 2.) Providing mentoring homes (families and single women) for new moms and their babies.
- 3.) Growing our Board into a working Board with additional members from all areas of work and life.

- 1.) Board development
- 2.) Volunteer training and mobilization
- 3.) Fundraising

- 1.) To increase board development, develop a board governance plan and implement a monitoring system for the board to ensure sustainability.
 - 2.) Increase outreach to another geographical area after appropriate measures have been taken to justify need.
 - 3.) Increase program effectiveness through more efficient use of consultants in the areas of IT and fundraising, along with increased abilities to focus on specific areas of need and growth with designated staff.
-
- 1.) Develop a strong marketing campaign to make our presence in the community more visible.
 - 2.) Develop a fund development plan including an annual giving campaign and partnerships with businesses and corporations.
 - 3.) Develop a comprehensive evaluation tool that will allow us to gather statistics and numbers to prove our successes.
-
- 1.) To strengthen our fund development and accountability structure.
 - 2.) Board development
 - 3.) Program development - we need help structuring our programs.
-
- 1.) Program development - to have more structured programs
 - 2.) Strategic planning - to have a strong foundation to continue community building.
 - 3.) Board development - to create an active board
-
- 1.) Create an evaluation plan that is consistent with a sustaining organization.
 - 2.) Create a board governance and development plan that is consistent with a sustaining organization.
-
- 1.) Strengthen volunteer management process.
 - 2.) Improve marketing both for services and for events/Support opportunities.
-
- 1.) To further enhance the leadership skills of the Board by identifying and attracting committed members.
 - 2.) To develop a written volunteer program that attracts and retains volunteers.
 - 3.) To identify and write down all funding sources then identify gaps.
-
- 1.) Human resource
 - 2.) Program development
 - 3.) North Ridge Crossing Single Mother's Meal Assistance Program
-
- 1.) Increased financial structure
 - 2.) Program development
 - 3.) Partnerships

- 1.) Create an effective survey
- 2.) Financial accountability
- 3.) Serve more clients in our region.

- 1.) Marketing strategy
- 2.) Volunteer mobilization
- 3.) Strategic planning

- 1.) Fund development plan to increase our budget two-fold while tripling our program capacity.
- 2.) Collaboration strategy for churches as covenant partners.
- 3.) Finalize outcome measurement strategy.

Baseline organizational profile 2010

Knoxville Leadership Foundation Strengthening Communities

Baseline Organizational Profile for Faith-based and Community-based Organizations (rev. 3/2010)
Project Code: 71181

Instructions

Representatives from organizations receiving technical assistance or funding as part of the Strengthening Communities Initiative should complete this form. The information from this form will be used to meet federal requirements to describe the organizations served by these funds and to evaluate the benefits of technical assistance. Persons completing this form may be contacted in the future to learn about any organizational changes that have occurred following technical assistance and to help identify potential ways to improve the assistance we provide.

When complete, copies of this form should be mailed, e-mailed, or faxed to Thalia Cooper at Wilder Research, 451 Lexington Pkwy. No., St. Paul MN 55104, or e-mail: tmc@wilder.org or fax to Thalia at 651-280-3700 .

Section A: Organizational background

1. Name of organization: _____

2. Director or head of organization: _____

3. Primary purpose of organization: _____

4. Name of contact person for the organization: _____

First

Last

Address:

Phone:

Fax:

Email:

5. Alternative contact person: _____ Phone #: _____

	Yes	No
6. Is your organization incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
7. Does your organization have a functioning Board of Directors?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
8. Does your organization have written By-laws?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
9. Does your organization have tax-exempt (501c3) status?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
10. Is the head of your organization (e.g., executive director) a paid position?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
11. Does your organization have a written description of your program(s), a brochure, or web site?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
12. Does your organization have a strategic plan or goals for the future?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
12. Does your organization have a yearly budget & accounting system?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
14. Does your organization have a fundraising plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
15. Has your organization had a recent audit of its finances/financial records by an external auditor?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²

16. How many paid staff and volunteers does your organization currently have?

Number of paid full time staff: _____

Number of paid part time staff: _____

Number of volunteers who provide services to participants: _____

Number of volunteer board members: _____

17. Who is generally served by your organization?

Age range of participants: _____

Geographic area served: _____

Types of needs or problems your organization addresses: _____

Assets and talents that you build on: _____

18a. Is your organization affiliated with a church?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO QUESTION 19)

18b. Do members of the affiliated church provide support to your program?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO QUESTION 19)

18c. What kind of support do they provide?

19. What is your organization's annual budget for the current year?

\$ _____

20. What percentage of your organization's budget comes from each of the following sources?

a. Individual gifts _____ %

b. Corporate/foundation gifts _____ %

c. Special events/product sales _____ %

d. Gifts from religious entities _____ %

e. Denominational support _____ %

f. Government grants/contracts _____ %

g. Other (Please specify: _____) _____ %

TOTAL (should add to 100%) _____ %

Section B: Reason for seeking assistance

21. Please list below the specific services provided (*or that will be provided*) by your organization, the percent of your overall budget devoted to this service, the approximate number of people served by this program during 2009, and the purpose of this service. (add additional page if more than 5 distinct services)

A. Service or program	B. % of total budget	C. Numbers served in 2009	D. Purpose of this service
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	100%	Total served	

22. Which of the services or programs listed above will be the focus of the capacity building assistance you receive from the Strengthening Communities grant?

Please record the number(s) from **Question 21** (1 through 5): _____ (number(s))

- ⁶ All programs listed above
- ⁸ Don't know

23. In which of the following ways, if any, does your organization help to promote **economic recovery** in the Knoxville area? **(Check all that apply.)**

- ¹ provide resources or counseling to help prevent foreclosures
- ² offer services that promote financial literacy
- ³ provide micro-loans to small businesses
- ⁴ refer participants to state or federal benefits such as WIC, Medicare, Free or Reduced Lunch, Earned Income Tax Credit, etc.
- ⁵ offer job or life skills training
- ⁶ other efforts to promote economic recovery (Please specify: _____)

24a. Do you currently partner with other organizations to achieve your goals?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No
- ³ Not sure

24b. List current partners: _____

- 25a. Are any of the partnerships described above focused specifically on jobs creation or encouraging the growth of new businesses in your community?
- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO QUESTION 26)
- ³ Not sure (GO TO QUESTION 26)
- ⁹ Not applicable (GO TO QUESTION 26)

25b. Do these efforts focus on...

	Yes	No
a. Creating or retaining jobs?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
b. Providing access to state and federal resources?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
c. Helping people become more job ready?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
d. Helping people get or keep a job?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²

26a. Does the organization or program have a way to count the number of people it serves?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO QUESTION 27a)

26b. Please describe.

27.a Does the organization or program have a way to count and track the amount of service provided to each participant?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO QUESTION 28a)

27b. Please describe.

28a. Does the organization or program have a way to gather feedback (satisfaction information) from the participants who are served?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO QUESTION 29a)

28b. Please describe.

29a. Does the organization or program have a way to determine if program participants benefit from your services?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO QUESTION 30)

29b. Please describe.

30. How do people learn about your programs or services? Are people referred to your program by others? Who refers?

Section C: Support needs

31. All organizations or programs assisted through the Strengthening Communities Initiative will receive help to further develop their organization or program. In the space below, please describe your primary development or capacity building goals.

Goal 1: _____

Goal 2: _____

Goal 3: _____

32. Select the capacity building areas from the list below that most closely match your priorities.

Organizational development

- ¹ Strategic Planning
- ² Marketing Strategy
- ³ Financial Accountability
- ⁴ Fund Development
- ⁵ Human Resources

Leadership development

- ⁶ Leadership Team
- ⁷ Volunteer Mobilization
- ⁸ Board Governance and Development

Evaluation of effectiveness

- ⁹ Evaluation of the mobilization/use of volunteers
- ¹⁰ Program Evaluation and Learning (Performance Measurement Systems)

Program development

- ¹¹ Program Development (Program Design, Mission Fit, or Processes)

Collaboration and community engagement

- ¹² Community Engagement/Collaboration

Thank you for completing the survey.

Please return it to the individual who gave it to you or mail, e-mail or fax to Thalia Cooper at Wilder Research Center, 451 Lexington Parkway N. St. Paul, MN 55104, e-mail tmc@wilder.org or fax to Thalia, 651-280-3700.

Follow-up interview

CASE ID #: _____

**Knoxville Leadership Foundation
Strengthening Communities
Follow-up Survey 2011**

Project code: 71181

Introduction:

Hi, this is _____ calling from Wilder Research regarding the follow-up interview we have scheduled with you to talk about your participation in Center for Communities sponsored by the Knoxville Leadership Foundation. We are getting in touch with organizations that have received grants, training and technical assistance from the project and we want to learn about how any of this assistance may have helped your organization. Is this still a convenient time to talk? (If needed, the interview takes about 45 minutes.)

IF YES, PROCEED.

IF RESPONDENT INDICATES THEY ARE NOT THE RIGHT PERSON, ASK: IS THERE SOMEONE ELSE I SHOULD TALK TO?

(SPECIFY) _____
Name Phone #

IF NOW IS NOT A CONVENIENT TIME, SET ANOTHER APPOINTMENT. EXPLAIN THAT SOMEONE FROM WILDER RESEARCH WILL CONFIRM THE TIME WITH THEM. NOTE THE TIME AND DATE AND OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION ON THE FACE SHEET AND GIVE IT TO THALIA.

IF REFUSED, ASK: Is there any particular reason that you do not want to participate in the follow-up interview?

**Knoxville Leadership Foundation
Strengthening Communities
Follow-up Interview 2011**

1. I just want to verify the information we have about your participation in the project is correct. Our records show that your organization received a grant in the amount of \$_____ for the project. Is that correct?
- Yes 1
 No..... 2
 Refused.....-7
 Don't know-8

As you know the Center for Communities project is designed to help strengthen and build the capacity of faith-based and community-based organizations so that they can help more people and do it more efficiently and effectively.

2. First, I would like to ask you a few things about your organization. What year did it start? (**PROBE:** When was the organization founded?)
- Year _____
 Refused.....-7
 Don't know-8

3. Do you feel that your organization was in a good position to benefit from this type of capacity building help when it received the grant, assistance, or training?
- Yes 1
 No..... 2
 Refused.....-7
 Don't know-8

- 4a. Has your organization experienced any changes in leadership since you first began participating in the program?
- Yes 1
 No..... (GO TO Q. 5a) 2
 Refused..... (GO TO Q. 5a)-7
 Don't know (GO TO Q. 5a)-8

4b. How did that/those change(s) affect the organization?

5a. Since you first received capacity building assistance, has your organization gone through any (other) changes that may have made it **difficult** to benefit from the grant, from the training, or from the assistance?

- Yes 1
- No..... (GO TO Q. 6a) 2
- Refused..... (GO TO Q. 6a) -7
- Don't know (GO TO Q. 6a) -8

5b. What changes, issues, or problems came up?

5c. How did those changes make it **difficult** to benefit from capacity building assistance?

6a. Do you feel that your work with Knoxville Leadership Foundation staff, consultants, or trainers has helped to **improve** your organization or its programs in any way?

- Yes (GO TO Q. 6b) 1
- No..... (GO TO Q. 6d) 2
- Refused.....(GO TO Q. 7a) -7
- Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 7a) -8

6b. How has it helped **improve** your organization or its programs?

6c. Would you say that help came **mainly**.....

- from a consultant you worked with individually,.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....1
- from classes or training you attended, or.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....2
- from one of the Leadership Foundation staff?.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....3
- [DON'T READ: A combination of help]**.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....4
- Refused.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....-7
- Don't know.....(GO TO Q. 7a).....-8

6d. Why do you think it did not help?

7a. Are you involved in any work either by yourself or with other organizations that focused specifically on creating jobs or encouraging the growth of new businesses in your community?

- ¹ Yes
- ² No (GO TO Q. 8)
- ³ Not sure (GO TO Q. 8)
- ⁹ Not applicable (GO TO Q. 8)

7b. Do these efforts focus on...

	Yes	No
a. Creating or retaining jobs?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
b. Providing access to state and federal resources?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
c. Helping people become more job ready?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²
d. Helping people get or keep a job?	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²

8. During your work with the Center for Communities, did you receive any help to strengthen or diversify the funding for your organization? (PROBE: Was there anything that the consultants or trainers did to help you learn about and seek new funding? If yes, please describe.)

9. Compared to when you first got involved with the project, would you say that, **financially**, your organization is doing...
- Better,..... 1
 - Worse, or..... 2
 - About the same as when you first started the project? 3
 - Refused.....-7
 - Don't know-8
10. Would you say your annual budget is higher or lower than when you first started the project, and by how much has it increased or decreased?
- Increased\$ _____
(ask for amount increased)
 - Decreased.....\$ _____
(ask for amount decreased)
 - [IF VOLUNTEERED: About the same as when you first started the project] 3**
 - Refused.....-7
 - Don't know-8
11. What percentage of your overall budget comes from the grant (sub-award) you received?
- _____ (percent)
 - Refused.....-7
 - Don't know-8
- 12a. As you look at your current funding, about what **percentage** of that comes from *private donors*, such as a foundation, a church, or a private individual?
- _____ (Percent) (IF 0% GO TO Q. 13a)
 - Refused.....-7
 - Don't know-8
- 12b. During your involvement with the project, did the amount of money that you received from this type of source....
- Increase, 1
 - Decrease, or..... 2
 - Stay about the same as when you first started the project? ...(GO TO Q. 13a) ... 3
 - Refused.....(GO TO Q. 13a) ..-7
 - Don't know(GO TO Q. 13a) ..-8
- 12c. By how much did it increase or decrease?
- \$ _____ (amount)
 - Refused.....-7
 - Don't know-8
- 12d. If it increased, how much of this was new funding? (*Note: Ask for funds not received before*)
- \$ _____ (amount)

13a. What percentage of your current budget comes from a *public source* such as a city, state or county government or federal grant, **not including** the Center for Communities sub-awards?

_____ (Percent) (IF 0% GO TO Q. 14)

Refused..... -7
Don't know -8

13b. During your involvement of the project, did the amount of money that your organization received from this type of source ...

Increase, 1
Decrease, or..... 2
Stay about the same as when you first started the project? (GO TO Q. 14)..... 3
Refused..... (GO TO Q. 14)..... -7
Don't know (GO TO Q. 14)..... -8

13c. By how much did it increase or decrease?

\$ _____ (amount)

Refused..... -7
Don't know -8

13d. If it increased, how much of this was new funding? (*Note: Ask for funds not received before*)

\$ _____ (amount)

14. Since you became involved in the project, would you say, generally, that the size and scope of the programs or services that you offer ...

Expanded, 1
Contracted, or 2
Stayed about the same? 3
Refused..... -7
Don't know -8

15. On your baseline profile you indicated that your organization had: [*From Baseline Assessment; Question 16; page 2*]

____ paid full-time staff, ____ paid part-time staff, ____ volunteers who provide regular services to participants, and ____ volunteer board members.

- a. What is the current number of your **paid full-time staff**? _____
- b. What is the current number of your paid **part-time staff**? _____
- c. What is the current number of your **regular volunteers**? _____
- d. What is the current number of your **board members**? _____

16a. Before you became involved in the project, how many people did you serve in the year immediately before getting your Center for Communities grant? (*Note: In 2009*)

_____ (number)

Refused..... (GO TO Q. 17a).....-7

Don't know (GO TO Q. 17a).....-8

16b. About how many people did you serve in the last year? [*Note: Any 12-month period in 2009 to 2010*]

_____ (number)

Refused.....-7

Don't know-8

17a. Did you participate in any partnerships or get involved with any networks (outside of trainings) **because** of your work with the Center for Communities and the Knoxville Leadership Foundation?

Yes 1

No..... (GO TO Q. 18)..... 2

Refused..... (GO TO Q. 18).....-7

Don't know (GO TO Q. 18).....-8

17b. Please describe those partnerships or networks for me.

18. Did you change or enhance any of your accounting, billing, or record-keeping practices **because** of your work with the Center for Communities project and the Knoxville Leadership Foundation?

Yes 1

No..... 2

Refused.....-7

Don't know-8

19a. Has your involvement with the Center for Communities helped you to...

	Yes	No	19b. IF YES: could you give an example of that?
a. develop a better understanding of your organization's strengths and weaknesses?	1	2	
b. establish relationships with other organizations doing similar work?	1	2	
c. help the leaders to develop skills necessary to better manage human service programs?	1	2	Please describe:
d. implement improvements in the management of your organization?	1	2	Please describe:
e. strengthen your board or make your program more accountable to the community?	1	2	Why?

20a. Does the organization or program have a way to count the number of people it serves?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO Q. 21a)

20b. Please describe.

21a. Does the organization or program have a way to count and track the amount of service provided to each participant?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO Q. 22a)

21b. Please describe.

22a. Does the organization or program have a way to gather feedback (satisfaction information) from the participants who are served?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO Q. 23a)

22b. Please describe.

23a. Does the organization or program have a way to determine if program participants benefit from your services?

¹ Yes

² No (GO TO Q. 24)

23b. Please describe.

24. How do people learn about your programs or services? [PROBE: Are people referred to your program by others? Who refers?]

25. Training is an important part of the capacity building work. How would you rate the overall value of the training you received? Would you say...

- It helped you to address specific needs and caused you to actually change or strengthen your organization, 1
- It was informative and generally useful, but did not lead to any specific changes in your organization, or 2
- It was not that helpful to your organization? 3
- Refused -7
- Don't know -8

26. During your involvement with the project, which training was the **most helpful** for your capacity building work?
 [Note: If respondent provides more than one, record up to 3 and ask which training was the most helpful of all.]

27. Generally, do you prefer one-on-one assistance or coaching, or do you prefer taking trainings with others?

- One-on-one 1
- Monthly Trainings..... 2
- (DON'T READ) Combination 3
- Refused.....-7
- Don't know-8

28. When you completed the baseline assessment, you said that your primary capacity building goals included the following: (Note: ask respondent to list up to three capacity building goals identified at baseline)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

29a. You also said that you would like help with the following specific goals identified in your capacity building plan	29b. Did you get that kind of help? ↓			29c. With regard to this goal, did you ↓				
	Yes	No	DK	Exceed your goal,	Meet your goal,	Partially meet your goal,	Or not meet your goal?	DK
a. Goal 1	1	2	-8	4	3	2	1	-8
b. Goal 2	1	2	-8	4	3	2	1	-8

30. Representatives of participating organizations were required to create development plans addressing specific capacity building areas prioritized for their work during this initiative.

30a. According to our records, you said that your capacity building priorities were as follows: *[Note: Fill this in]*

1. ____ Organizational Development
2. ____ Leadership Development
3. ____ Program Development
4. ____ Collaboration and Community Engagement
5. ____ Evaluation of Effectiveness

30b. Please tell me how the capacity building areas you chose to focus on impacted your organization or program during your involvement with the project.

Now I am going to read some statements about the staff and services of the Knoxville Leadership Foundation including the consultants that helped with this project. Tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Do you...					
	Strongly disagree,	Disagree,	Agree, or	Strongly agree?	REF	DK
31. Staff and consultants at the Leadership Foundation have given me constructive suggestions and recommendations.	1	2	3	4	-7	-8
32. Staff and consultants were sensitive to cultural issues	1	2	3	4	-7	-8
33. Staff and consultants were knowledgeable and skilled	1	2	3	4	-7	-8
34. Staff and consultants made it easy for me to contact them when I needed to	1	2	3	4	-7	-8
35. Staff and consultants helped our organization to use its strengths to make progress on goals	1	2	3	4	-7	-8
36. Staff and consultants overall provided services that met my expectations	1	2	3	4	-7	-8

37. When you think about your work with the Knoxville Leadership Foundation, what has helped your organization the most?

38. As you think ahead to the next 12 or 24 months, what kind of help or service would be **most** useful to your organization to help you better serve people in your community.

39. And finally, what, if anything, would you do differently with funding and support like this in the future?

40. Is there anything you'd like to add regarding your work on this project or the work of the Knoxville Leadership Foundation?

Thank you for the time you have taken to complete the interview.