

# Programme management assessment framework

Purpose – To allow ACORD to plan the transition phase of the transfer of management responsibilities from the London office to the programmes. All Country Programmes to be assessed. To be plotted on a spider diagram for each country programme.

1 – highest 3 - lowest

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions
<b>Strategic Management</b>				
	All ACORD programme teams working in accordance with ACORD's values and Mission	3. Programme teams all conversant and working to ACORD's values. 2. Some best practice adopted and staff aware of values. 1. Poor monitoring of best practice values of ACORD ignored at best disregarded at worst	Teams able to discuss the objective of the programme in relation to our mission (programme strategy) Discussion on what has worked well and how it moves us towards our mission (methodology) Systems and structures that demonstrate our values in the way we work as teams and with our partners. (ways of working, organisational culture). Staff know and agree with the mission and values of ACORD Team understanding of similar programmes and processes in ACORD and have a take on them	A n induction process on ACORD's mission, values and ways of working is designed and becomes part of establishing new programme teams and staff recruitment processes  A section on the relationship between programme goal/objective and the mission is included in the reporting format..  Systems are established to review the impact of induction, personal commitment and leadership on the values
	Up to date country / area / regional strategy in place (Regional being country + other contiguous countries)	3. Updated and agreed document exists 2. Consultation process underway 1. No strategic planning undertaken	The strategic plan is understood by programme teams who can articulate the implications of it in their regions, programmes and specific work Discussion on the development of the strategic plan reflects that the way of developing it reflects our values and mission	Process for approving documents need to be clear  Process for developing regional strategies needs to be participatory and inclusive

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions
	The country / area strategy aligns theme, global, regional and local strategies and issues	3. Clear alignment and reference made to global and regional strategies and issues in plan 2. little reference made to regional / international issues 1. No strategic planning undertaken	Mapping out the content of the strategy document to show global, regional and local issues and strategies and explain their relationships	Documents in place Visualisation of analysis skills developed in programmes
	All programme strategies are coherent with theme and regional strategies	3. Knowledge of the broad thrust of each programme and how they ally with each other 2. Some idea of what other programmes are doing 1. Only know about their own programme	Mapping of programmes and their strategic overlaps (by themes and by area) Ability to articulate how different programmes impact on each other through Venn diagrams	Information systems exist and are used/usable as a means of sharing across Africa
	Programme Co-ordinators have all means necessary to manage their programmes.	3. Clear system of devolved management at programme level 2. Some management information systems in place 1. No management information in place.	Indicators of devolved management; Policy in place, strategies defined, systems developed, systems functional (e.g. personnel, assets, finance, decision making etc)	SMT and Desks trust in the capacity of PCs to manage their programmes and devolve power as well as responsibility
	Programme co-ordinators empowered to manage the day to day running of their programme / component	3. PCs communicate with other ACORD staff and programme stakeholders proactively keeping the CC / AM informed and asking advice when needed. 2. PCs communicate with programme stakeholders but not with those outside the programme area. 1. No communication unless by CC.	Sharing information – systems and practice regularity, who has access, what they do with it, - HQ, London, regional, Theme, programmes, donors, external networks (finance, funding, networks, alliances, advocacy groups,	PCs have the capacity to manage programmes
	Decision making is made at the lowest possible level	3. Staff are empowered to make appropriate decisions and are held to account for them 2. Consultative 1. Top down	Participatory mapping and analysis of decision making structure in the programme (including local partners) How involved were programme partners in decisions made	Secretariat is also able to devolve decision making and responsibility

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions etc
	Annual strategic review of programmes	3. Programme strategy, methodology and implementation aligns with mission and values 2. Programme strategy reflects mission and values but methods and implementation unclear 1. Programme is unclear on its alignment with the mission	SEA of programme issues and assessment of the strategies that have been developed to address them	
	All programmes regularly reviewed with use of systematic, participatory monitoring and evaluation.	3. Programme managed against participatory M and E system and impacts on programme direction visible, strategic review able to use monitoring in assessment of programme progress 2. Regular Participatory M and E is not analysed and acted upon. 1. Little quality participatory M and E and done on an Ad Hoc basis.	Monitoring done and centralised by WEB for ALL ACORD access Programme documents discuss impact of monitoring on their programme direction Programmes have visual monitoring chart/ diagram in the programme office that they can 'talk to'	WEB base for monitoring. Standard monitoring system ( with room for manoeuvre) Process for programme to programme strategic reviews budgeted and prepared for... assessors inducted
	Team members cultivate relationships and alliances across internal and external boundaries	3. Country programme is involved in and feeding into national and international networks. 2. Some active participation in one network 1. Occasionally goes to meetings.	Programme map of alliances, with implications of the links Networking links are fed into regional alliances	Time, financial resources and prioritisation allocated to alliancing
<b>Information management</b>				
	Programme produces quality, organised information and research which is used for influencing change	3. Data collected, analysed into information and used in advocacy 2. Programme information quality or availability poor, or data collected and analysed but not made into information 1. Little relevant information produced by programme or data collected but not used	Research and work is used to collect data, analysis is available and articulated by staff ( and programme partners) , Information is produced. Information is used for advocacy Process and outcomes of advocacy are monitored and shared regionally and across the organisation	

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions etc
	Articles and information about area / country found in newsletter / web site Team and stakeholders fully aware of up to date information available.	3. Accurate, exciting and up to date information found in office, on web etc. 2. Some information there but needs updating 1. Constantly needs reminders to update information	Teams able to refer to articles and information in relation to their work Teams and individuals recognising interesting issues and achievements in their work and articulating it to the organisation and other parties	Policy literacy is invested in by the organisation Intranet established – programme webs linked to organisational web Quality of web access for programmes is good
<b>Strategic people development</b>				
	Supportive and enabling appraisals undertaken by all staff with action plan agreed and followed	3. All staff have had a supportive and enabling appraisal within the last year 2. Some appraisals undertaken but poor quality / process 1. No appraisals undertaken	Appraisals set objectives and targets for individuals Results, in terms of staff development, are measured	System for accountability and grievance are established
	Staff development strategies and programme established to ensure knowledge, skills and attitudes reflect ACORD's mission, values and ways of working	3. Programme teams have KSA's required to achieve the programme objective and mission 2. HRD strategy in place, budgeted for and being implemented 1. No plans and limited or ad hoc access to training	Reports on HRD strategy and progress	CEAA programme established and budgeted for
	Support to programme teams is relevant, accessible and used	3. Programme team interacts with advisors /mentors regularly and this is apparent in their ways of working and thinking 2. Programme team occasionally interacts with advisors and mentors 1. Programme teams isolated and do their own thing	Participatory assessment by programmes of mentoring./ coaching/ advisory support to programmes Assessment by mentors/coaches/advisors/thematic coordinators of the programmes' use of their inputs	Mentoring, advisory and coaching systems established, funded and recognised within the organisation

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions etc
	Percentage of staff development budget spent appropriately on staff	3. Money always budgeted and staff development plans drawn up and implemented. 2. Money there, some training undertaken maybe inappropriate 1. Money, if there, never spent or spent inappropriately	Budget monitoring Staff development plans Course/training reports from participants	Accurate justifications
	Staff (M&F) have the capacity to be promoted as positions become available	3. Clear, fair system of recruitment balancing external with internal appointments. 2. No clear policy, some promotion / internal recruitment within the country programme 1. V. little promotion / internal recruitment within the programme	Annual Mapping of staff changes	Support to those who have potential but require additional skills is available
<b>People Management</b>				
	Objective, quality people management	3. Full time trained HR officer in place 2. Some responsibilities designated throughout the team. 1. All people management in hands of programme manager.	Discussion with teams on systems of management and 360 degree accountability	ACORD provides training to HR officers or other responsible for that function
	Personnel information well organised and confidential	3. Updated personnel files exist for all staff. 2. Personnel files exist for some senior staff 1. No files exist	Programme files	
	Job descriptions exist with each member of staff having a copy of their own JD	3. All staff members have an up to date Job Description. 2. Some JDs exist for senior staff. 1. Some JDs exist but are out of date	Programme files, discussions or questionnaire for each staff member applied during programme review	

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions etc
	All staff pass through a clear induction process.	3. Induction package exists, induction automatically planned and implemented 2. No package exists but new staff spend less than a week on induction 1. No induction undertaken	Development of induction process/package, Induction facilitators trained in area/ theme teams	Induction package designed and process invested in by the organisation
	Staff feel confident and supported when working on sensitive issues in conflict or tense situations.	3. Clear contingency plan and security policy in place and updated and adhered to. 2. Clear policy of confidentiality and some security guidelines in place. 1. Poor confidentiality and no contingency plan in existence.	Programme teams able to articulate and analyse the state of their security policy and systems	
<b>Donor management – Fund seeking</b>				
	Area / Country programme has a considerable proportion of its funding raised by the Area / Country team.	3. All funding possibilities followed up with quality proposals. 2. Some funding possibilities identified and followed up with proposals 1. Very few possibilities identified and no proposals generated from within the team.	Funding options grid in the programme office and visible to all staff Funding proposal - with state of play attachments Programme teams aware of different proposals	
	Donors and other stakeholders fully informed of any changes or developments.	3. Programmes report and respond to donor and stakeholder queries in a clear and timely manner. Programmes establish issues based links/interaction with donors and meet requirements of donor systems 2. Some responses or reports submitted after some reminders, little interaction around issues 1. Very little proactive communication to stakeholders.	Discussion with or questionnaires to donors Records of funding and support received and recorded in graph format, visible in the programme office	Assertiveness training for staff - how to deal with donors, make presentations, Advocacy skills training

Area of Responsibility	Target	Performance measure	Method	Assumptions etc
	Programme funding balanced with a manageable number of "complex" grants	3. All costs covered by programme grants with grant management system in place. 2. No clear system for management, managed on an ad hoc basis, conditionality occasionally thought through. 1. No thought given to complexity of grant, conditionality or strategic relevance.	Spread sheet and Visual system of monitoring grants (requested, expected received) – totals against required Break down by strategic relevance	
<b>Financial management</b>				
	All programmes have clear approved budgets with corresponding budget notes.	3. Budget used as a management tool for the programme 2. Budgets prepared and approved at start of year. 1. Budgets prepared poorly, late approval.	Budgeting is carried out as a team process based on proposed strategies and activities, staff understand how the budgets are developed	
	Any percentage of over / under spend on budget lines < 20% clearly justified with donors / London	3. Budget monitoring occurs with regular communication to donors / London 2. Some monitoring takes place with communication about major changes. 1. Budgets not monitored	Budget monitoring Budget monitoring is understood by the programme team Programme team able to explain what the implications are of reduced/ increased fund	
	Accurate accounts submitted to finance on time	3. Accounts always arrive on time with very occasional mistakes 2. Sometimes arrive late with some mistakes 1. Need constant reminders and often arrive with mistakes.	Calendar of accounts received and note of errors compiled and sent to ACORD ALL quarterly	Clear procedures and required support are given