

# The Foundation Review

---

Volume 6  
Issue 2 *Open Access*

---

7-2014

## Survey Instruments Used to Evaluate Foundation-Funded Nonprofit Capacity- Building Programs: Considerations for Organized Philanthropy

Catherine H. Brown  
*University of Nebraska*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/tfr>



Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Brown, C. H. (2014). Survey Instruments Used to Evaluate Foundation-Funded Nonprofit Capacity-Building Programs: Considerations for Organized Philanthropy. *The Foundation Review*, 6(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1200>

Copyright © 2014 Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University. The Foundation Review is reproduced electronically by ScholarWorks@GVSU. <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/tfr>

# Survey Instruments Used to Evaluate Foundation-Funded Nonprofit Capacity-Building Programs: Considerations for Organized Philanthropy

Catherine H. Brown, M.A., University of Nebraska

*Keywords:* Capacity building, survey instruments, evaluation, program design, organized philanthropy, foundations

## Introduction

In the mid-1990s, the philanthropic community – spurred by such phenomena as venture philanthropy and increasing professionalization – embraced the concept of nonprofit capacity building. Following this initial wave of enthusiasm, a second wave has followed that focuses on foundations' efforts to evaluate and assess the processes and outcomes associated with such efforts. After all, whether foundations continue to invest in efforts to build the capacity of nonprofit organizations depends in part on whether such efforts have any demonstrable effect.

Especially when foundations support nonprofit capacity-building programs with unrestricted or undesignated funds, foundation leaders must decide how to maximize the impact of those funds. In other words, they must think strategically. For example, in designing a nonprofit capacity-building program, foundation leaders should identify the objectives of the program and consider whether the design is likely to achieve these goals. They also should gather information that will enable them to assess the extent to which the program meets these goals and how the program's design may need to be modified. Evaluations of nonprofit capacity-building programs can provide such information, and foundations report that they spend between \$500 and \$1.25 million on such evaluation efforts (Backer, Bleeg, & Groves, 2010).

Once a foundation has decided to evaluate its nonprofit capacity-building program, there is

## Key Points

- Alongside a growing interest in nonprofit capacity-building programs has come a growing concern with the impact of these programs, especially by organizations that fund them. This article describes how the McKinsey Organizational Capacity and Assessment Tool and, to a lesser extent, the Abt Associates survey have been used to assess changes in nonprofit capacity as part of nonprofit capacity-building programs.
- Drawing on field experience with both survey instruments in the context of a foundation-funded nonprofit capacity-building program, this article compares the respective benefits and costs of these instruments from the perspective of evaluators as well as survey respondents. Both perspectives are combined to offer guidance for organized philanthropy, particularly for foundations that are considering the incorporation of surveys into the design and evaluation of their nonprofit capacity-building programs.
- The more foundation leaders and evaluators can be aware of how survey instruments compare with one another, the better situated they will be to effectively integrate these tools into their capacity-building programs and, more broadly, their philanthropic practice.

another set of decisions – more tactical than strategic – to be made. An example of such a tactical decision is choosing the tools that will be used to gather evaluation data. Foundation leaders and evaluators should be aware of the array of tools

## *The original OCAT breaks organizational capacity into seven elements: aspirations, strategy, organizational skills, human resources, systems and infrastructure, organizational structure, and culture.*

available for such a job. Different tools have different advantages and disadvantages, and how a tool is incorporated into the evaluation design and the program as a whole has implications for the success of both.

Surveys are among the tools most commonly used by foundations to evaluate their capacity-building programs. While not all foundations evaluate these programs, more than 46 percent of those that do report using surveys, making them the most common among methods that also include interviews, document reviews, focus groups, grantee self-reports, participatory evaluation, site visits, and some combination of methods (Backer, Blegg, & Groves, 2010). Case studies that illustrate how various foundations have evaluated their capacity-building programs corroborate the fairly frequent use of surveys as part of an evaluation strategy (e.g., Leviton, Herrera, Pepper, Fishman, & Racine, 2006; Sobeck, Agius, & Mayers, 2007).

Several survey instruments have been used to evaluate nonprofit capacity-building programs. Among the most common is the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT), available through the Foundation Center and Venture Philanthropy Partners and recently available in an updated form as OCAT 2.0 through McKinsey & Co. The original OCAT breaks organizational capacity into seven elements: aspirations, strategy, organizational skills, human resources, systems and infrastructure, organizational structure, and culture. Each element is further split into subele-

ments. The element "aspirations," for example, consists of four subelements: mission, clarity of vision, boldness of vision, and overarching goals. For each subelement, survey respondents see four descriptions, each of which corresponds to a different level of organizational capacity. Levels range from a "clear need for increased capacity" to a "high level of capacity in place." Survey respondents are then asked to choose the description that best fits their own organization (Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001). The updated OCAT – OCAT 2.0 – uses a similar format but is designed to be easier to use; it includes new content related to advocacy, volunteers, and metrics and provides users with additional materials to help them discuss and interpret their results (McKinsey, 2014a).

Both the original and updated OCATs are designed to help nonprofit organizations assess their organizational capacity. The original OCAT was developed based on McKinsey consultants' collective experience as well as the input of many nonprofit experts and practitioners; the updated version builds on feedback from users (McKinsey, 2014a; Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001). Among the ways in which the developers of this tool suggest it be used is to measure changes in an organization's capacity (Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001). Along these lines, the Marguerite Casey Foundation and Social Venture Partners have used it to measure growth in organizations they fund (Guthrie & Preston, 2005). The developers caution, however, that

the grid is not a scientific tool, and should not be used as one [because] it is very difficult to quantify the dimensions of capacity, and the descriptive text under each score in the grid is not meant to be exact. The scores are meant to provide a general indication – a "temperature" taking, if you will – of an organization's capacity level, in order to identify potential areas for improvement. (Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001, p. 78)

As a result, in using the tool it may be best to look at changes in capacity at the group level as opposed to within a given organization, especially if the time line is short, such as a year or less (Guthrie & Preston, 2005). It should also be

recognized that there is no “perfect” score, either for one organization or a group of organizations. Rather, an organization’s level of capacity depends on a number of factors and the unique context in which it operates (Guthrie & Preston, 2005; Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001).

Another survey instrument that has been widely used to evaluate nonprofit capacity-building programs was developed by Abt Associates for multiple evaluations of the Capital Compassion Fund Demonstration Grant, a nationwide, federally funded nonprofit capacity-building program. While those that developed and have used OCAT note that its primary use is not evaluation per se, the Abt Associates survey was specifically developed for evaluation purposes. It includes 70 questions, most structured as binary choices, that focus on organizational characteristics – for example, 501(c)(3) status or whether the organization has a written mission statement; program services, such as whether any programmatic areas have been added or expanded in the past 12 months; and organizational capacity in areas such as financial management (e.g., whether the organization has had an audit performed by an external auditor), fundraising (e.g., whether it has a written fund-development plan), human resources (e.g., number of staff and existence of job descriptions), governance (e.g., number of board members or of vacant board positions), technology (e.g., number of computers), recordkeeping (e.g., the organization’s computer software for financial records), and community engagement (e.g., actions taken in the past year to expand awareness about the organization). For each question, survey respondents are asked to select the option that fits their organization.

The OCAT and the Abt Associates survey commonly have been used to evaluate nonprofit capacity-building programs; other survey instruments have been used less widely (e.g., Kapucu, Healy, & Arslan, 2011; Leake, et al., 2007). Overall, the proliferation of survey instruments prompts questions about how they differ from one another and how those differences impact the ways in which such surveys may be most effectively used. This article answers these questions

*It should also be recognized that there is no “perfect” score, either for one organization or a group of organizations. Rather, an organization’s level of capacity depends on a number of factors and the unique context in which it operates.*

by discussing how the OCAT in particular, has been used in evaluations of a foundation-funded nonprofit capacity-building program. The Abt Associates survey is also discussed because some of the OCAT’s benefits in measuring incremental change did not become clear until the Abt survey was also in use. This article concludes with considerations for foundations and evaluators who might use these or other survey instruments as part of a nonprofit capacity-building program.

### **Study Site: The Omaha Community Foundation’s Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative**

The issue of how different types of survey instruments compare is examined through the experience of the Omaha Community Foundation, which primarily serves the areas of Omaha, Neb., and Council Bluffs, Iowa. In 2010, the foundation began offering its Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative to nonprofit organizations in the area. To date, four groups of nonprofits have participated; each group spends about a year in the program.

In general, each group consisted of organizations that meet the Omaha Community Foundation’s basic eligibility requirements for the program – that they have 501(c)(3) status, at least two full-time-equivalent staff, and an annual budget of more than \$300,000; be founded at least five years previously; and be able to demonstrate a history of sound financial position through audit or budget information. The groups were also

*These organizational- and leadership-development activities are intended in the short term to help organizations do such things as develop a reporting system linked to their strategic plan and strengthen relationships between executive directors/CEOs and board leaders. The longer-term vision is to further the development of effective, resilient organizations that are able to achieve their missions and adapt to changes in their operating environment. It is also envisioned that leaders of the participating organizations will gain a greater sense of focus and empowerment, enabling them to continue to create change and to develop professionally after the program ends.*

relatively diverse in terms of their age, service area (e.g., housing, arts), and the population they served. Each organization's geographic area of focus within the greater Omaha and Council Bluffs region also varied.

The Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative provides assistance with both organizational and leadership development. Both types of assistance are largely organized and facilitated by a project director on contract with the Omaha Community Foundation. While the design of the program has changed slightly over the past four years, the organizational capacity-building component consists of:

1. An online organizational-capacity assessment, tailored to nonprofit organizations. For the first three years, board members, the executive director/ chief executive officer, and selected staff have taken some version of the OCAT. After they take the survey and responses are summarized, the project director facilitates a discussion of findings during a board meeting or similar group context.
2. Assistance, if needed, in developing or refining a strategic plan for the organization.
3. A grant of \$5,000.

The leadership-development component targets both executive directors/CEOs and board leaders and consists of monthly, half-day roundtables. Executive directors/CEOs attend these meetings each month over the course of the year; board leaders attend four times. The meetings include discussions and dissemination of tools related to nonprofit leadership, development of organizational narratives, team building, strategic planning, board development (roles and responsibilities, board reporting, recruitment, agendas, financial reporting, board self-assessment), dashboards/key indicators, and performance evaluation for the executive directors/CEOs. Some of these components – specifically the inclusion of board leaders and content addressing fund development, communication plans, and social media policies – were not part of the program's initial design and were added in response to survey findings.

These organizational- and leadership-development activities are intended in the short term to help organizations do such things as develop a reporting

TABLE 1 The Role of Survey Instruments in the Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative

Year	Survey Instrument	When and How Survey Instrument Was Used
Jan. 2010- Dec. 2010	OCAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OCAT was administered at the outset; results were used to begin a conversation among executive directors/CEOs and board members.</li> <li>• 190 individuals participated in the OCAT survey.</li> </ul>
Jan. 2011- Dec. 2011	Tailored OCAT; tailored Abt Associates Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A shortened/tailored OCAT was administered at the outset; results were used to begin a conversation among executive directors/CEOs and board members.</li> <li>• A shortened/tailored Abt Associates Survey was administered at the outset and conclusion, given that the OCAT is considered to have more limited value as an evaluation tool; results were used to measure change.</li> <li>• 148 individuals participated in the OCAT survey.</li> <li>• 19 individuals participated in the Abt survey.</li> </ul>
March 2012- April 2013	Tailored OCAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A shortened/tailored OCAT was administered at the outset; results were used both to begin a conversation among executive directors/CEOs and board members and to measure change.</li> <li>• The OCAT was also administered at the conclusion; results were used to measure change. The decision to use the OCAT for this evaluation purpose stemmed from issues in using the Abt survey during the prior year.</li> <li>• A control group was added to both above.</li> <li>• 131 individuals participated in the OCAT survey at the outset.</li> <li>• 13 individuals participated in the OCAT at the conclusion.</li> </ul>

system linked to their strategic plan and strengthen relationships between executive directors/CEOs and board leaders. The longer-term vision is to further the development of effective, resilient organizations that are able to achieve their missions and adapt to changes in their operating environment. It is also envisioned that leaders of the participating organizations will gain a greater sense of focus and empowerment, enabling them to continue to create change and to develop professionally after the program ends.

The full OCAT, a tailored and shortened version of OCAT, and a tailored and shortened version of the Abt Associates survey have all been used at some point in the implementation or evaluation of the Nonprofit Capacity Building Initiative. In Year 1, the full OCAT was used at the outset of the program and all executive directors/CEOs and board members were asked to complete it. In Year 2, a shortened version was used at the outset

and all executive directors/CEOs and board members were asked to complete it; executive directors/CEOs were also asked to complete a tailored and shortened version of the Abt Associates survey at the outset and the completion of the year. In Year 3, all executive directors/CEOs and board members were asked to complete a shortened and tailored version of the OCAT at the outset, and all executive directors were asked to complete the same survey at the conclusion. In that year, a comparison group of nonprofit organizations that did not take part in the initiative were asked to complete a tailored and shortened version of the OCAT during the same two time periods. Over the three years, 501 individuals participated in the OCAT and Abt Associates surveys. (See Table 1.)

The findings from the use of these different survey instruments draw on 63 semi-structured interviews with executive directors/CEOs and board leaders who participated in the Nonprofit

*Shortening and tailoring these survey instruments did not compromise their utility. Rather, the modifications allowed the instruments to better fit into a given year's evaluation approach. In Year 3 of the program, for example, the OCAT was modified to include only those questions about elements of capacity that might be expected to change based on the intervention – the program's logic model provided evaluators with a guide as to what aspects might be expected to change.*

Capacity Building Initiative during its first three years. Interviewees were asked to discuss their experiences with the initiative in terms of both its perceived impact and its processes, to include their reaction to the survey instruments being used. Unless otherwise noted, these interviews took place at or near the conclusion of the year. For Year 1, 18 interviews – nine executive directors and nine board presidents – were conducted at the beginning of the year and 13 interviews – seven executive directors and six board presidents – were conducted at the end of the year. For Year 2, 17 interviews – nine executive directors/CEOs and eight board presidents – were conducted. For Year 3, 15 interviews were conducted, of nine executive directors/CEOs and six board leaders. In addition, the findings and conclusions drew

on personal experience as a co-evaluator for this program in Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3.

### **Findings From the Case: Reflections on the Utility of Different Survey Tools**

From an evaluator's perspective, the OCAT's construction makes it amenable to those seeking to measure change – an important consideration for both evaluators and funders; importantly, this was not evident until a differently constructed survey instrument was used. That said, how the OCAT or tailored versions of it are incorporated into a broader evaluation design matters, and limitations of any given evaluation design must be acknowledged. From a survey respondents' perspective, the OCAT and tailored versions of it have benefits and drawbacks. The benefits included the opportunity to reflect on the organization as a whole and its use as a starting point for conversations. Drawbacks included the length of even tailored versions and the surveys' complexity. To the extent these challenges compromise the accuracy or completeness of responses, such drawbacks need to be considered by evaluators, too.

#### *Modifying and Tailoring Survey Instruments*

Both the OCAT and the Abt Associates survey proved amenable to modification when modification seemed appropriate in light of feedback from survey respondents in prior years and when modification seemed appropriate in light of how the survey was expected to fit within a given year's evaluation strategy. Over the three years, the OCAT was used in its original and in other forms. The Abt survey was used in Year 2, in a shortened form.

From an evaluator's perspective, shortening and tailoring these survey instruments did not compromise their utility. Rather, the modifications allowed the instruments to better fit into a given year's evaluation approach. In Year 3 of the program, for example, the OCAT was modified to include only those questions about elements of capacity that might be expected to change based on the intervention – the program's logic model provided evaluators with a guide as to what aspects might be expected to change, and why.

This shortened survey was expected to benefit respondents and increase the response rate. It also continued to provide evaluators with data relevant to measuring the impact of the program on the capacity of participating nonprofit organizations.

In addition to the survey instruments themselves, it was possible to modify how the overall instrument “fit” within the larger context of the program and the program evaluation. In Year 1, for example, the instrument was used at the outset of the program more to assess each organization’s level of capacity and less to measure change associated with participation in the program. In Year 2, however, the survey instrument was used not only to assess each organization’s level of capacity at the outset, but also to measure change. During Year 2, a survey was used as part of a pre- and post-test evaluation design that called for participants to assess their capacity at the outset and conclusion. Similarly, in Year 3 the survey instrument was used as part of a pre- and post-test evaluation design.

#### *Measuring Incremental Change*

Striking and unexpected results occurred in Year 2, when the Abt Associates survey was used. Evaluators of the Omaha Community Foundation’s program chose to use the Abt survey because it, unlike the OCAT, had been designed specifically to evaluate nonprofit capacity-building programs. In Year 2, executive directors of organizations participating in the program were asked to complete a shortened and tailored form of the Abt survey at the outset and the conclusion of the program. The survey consisted primarily of questions that favored a binary, yes/no response such as: “Does your organization have a strategic plan?”

When analyzing the results of the Abt survey, evaluators were somewhat surprised to find that some executive directors who had responded “yes” to certain questions at the beginning of their participation in the program responded “no” at the conclusion. For example, when asked, “Does your organization have a strategic plan?” the executive director might have responded “yes” at the beginning of the year and “no” at the end.

*When analyzing the results of the Abt survey, evaluators were somewhat surprised to find that some executive directors who had responded “yes” to certain questions at the beginning of their participation in the program responded “no” at the conclusion. For example, when asked, “Does your organization have a strategic plan?” the executive director might have responded “yes” at the beginning of the year and “no” at the end.*

This seems strange especially given that development of a strategic plan for each organization was among the goals of the year’s program. Possible explanations for this include human error in taking the survey; it may also be that the program made executive directors/CEOs more aware of capacity areas to the degree that they understood better what it meant, for example, to have a strategic plan. As a result, they may have believed they had a strategic plan at the outset but, after participation in the program, felt that that whatever plan did exist did not qualify as a strategic plan. In Year 3, when a modified version of the OCAT was used to measure change in a similar pre-test and post-test evaluation design, such issues did not arise.

This experience suggests that how survey tools structure their questions matters to evaluators and funders interested in the impact of the program. Evaluators found that because of the

**TOOLS**

*The experience of survey respondents also echoed the utility of the OCAT not only as an evaluation tool, but also as a means of facilitating conversations about the state of the organization and its future.*

way its questions are structured, the OCAT and related versions proved more able to measure incremental change than did the survey instrument derived from the Abt Associates survey. Rather than structuring questions in a binary way, the OCAT asks respondents multiple questions that relate, for example, to the organization's capacity to develop a strategic plan and use this strategic plan to guide decision-making within the organization. Evidence generated from questions structured like this give researchers a better sense of not just whether the organization possesses a strategic plan, for example, but also whether the plan is sound and the extent to which it is used to guide decisions.

*The Experience of Survey Respondents*

Several themes recurred when nonprofit executive directors/CEOs and board leaders were asked about their reactions to OCAT. Some who completed the surveys had positive reactions, others negative, and some were mixed. Among the positive observations were that the survey had provided an opportunity to reflect on the organization as a whole and that it was a good diagnostic tool that "got to the heart" of what staff and leadership felt were the key developmental needs for their organization, even when some of these issues were already somewhat understood. As one board president put it,

I thought it was helpful because it helped us kind of look at ourselves and kind of to think deeply about some of the things that we're doing. And in that regard, it was helpful – it gave us an opportunity ...

to do some self-examination, go back and look at ourselves.

An executive director observed that OCAT validated existing understanding of how the board and staff felt about specific aspects of the organization while also revealing new issues that could then be addressed:

That was the one biggest surprise. ... The staff was pretty much where I thought they were going to be, the board was pretty much where I thought they were gonna be, and then it just popped out that the staff is so frustrated by our technology and the barriers that it was creating instead of, you know, helping business get done, and that was a quick and easy fix and everybody is much happier now. And I guess I'm just sort of used to ... you know, living very modestly around here and doing everything the hard way. It didn't occur to me at all, so [the OCAT] in that way was very beneficial to us.

The experience of survey respondents also echoed the utility of the OCAT not only as an evaluation tool, but also as a means of facilitating conversations about the state of the organization and its future. As one executive director explained,

We use [the OCAT], quite frankly, to just kind of drive our strategic-planning process. ... [We] found it to be very helpful. It was a very comprehensive tool; it allowed us to identify our goals and our objectives as well as our priorities. We took that and through the year we had not only that – so, we have a board retreat, and last year [it] coincided with kickoff of the initiative, and so [the project director] got a chance to sit in on our board retreat and provide feedback on the assessment. And we kind of used that as a tool to facilitate our board retreat.

The tone of the interview responses was similar to comments from participants in a midterm evaluation survey fielded the first year. When asked how effective OCAT was in helping to identify their organizational needs, five of six respondents said it was "somewhat effective" on a Likert scale ranging from "extremely effective" to "extremely ineffective." One of the six respondents said it was "extremely effective." The only comment on this

question was that the multiple variables contained within a single question made it a difficult tool, but the assessment also allowed for an opportunity to further explore issues presented.

Negative reactions tended to focus on the survey's length, accessibility, and complexity. Even in Years 2 and 3, when the survey was shorter, participants expressed concerns about the survey's length. Some interviewees said a survey available in languages other than English was necessary. Another concern, expressed by two executive directors in two different program years, was whether survey respondents – particularly board members – had or should have the knowledge to answer the types of questions the survey posed.

*Executive Director 1:* We did [the OCAT] and ... from what I could tell from the board, they had ... a lot of difficulty filling it out. They don't know the nitty-gritty – they don't really need to, either – but I think maybe in the future I would recommend ... either a higher-level end or just kind of more simplistic, more from their point of view as opposed to the agency point of view. I think even [the previous executive director, who also completed the OCAT] and I had, not “trouble” filling it out, but we really had to stop and think through stuff and look up stuff, whereas the board wouldn't even have the capacity to be able to do that. So I think it was helpful in one sense, but ... it was almost too fine of a tool, if that makes sense, for what we needed to or where we needed to start.

*Executive Director 2:* Our whole board filled out [the OCAT] or was asked to fill [it] out and I think actually we had a good number [do] that. I think ... it describes things pretty abstractly. I think that, unless you think in that way, ... the assessment skews things because it looks at these people that are much more conceptual thinkers as opposed to thinking in more – on our board we have accountants ..., we have attorneys on our boards, we have business owners that talk in very concrete terms. I don't think [the OCAT] necessarily is set up to do that. ... I think just how the questions are posed, probably ... if they were asked a different way I'm sure our board would respond in a completely different way. Like, do you know [our organization's] mission statement? Yes. Do you know what services our [organization] offers? Yes. Do you

*It is important to match the level of the evaluation effort to the level of the intervention; it may not make sense to invest significant resources in evaluating a relatively small-scale nonprofit capacity-building program. In cases where the goal includes assessing the outcomes associated with a nonprofit capacity-building program and the level of the intervention justifies a more robust evaluation approach, surveys may be one method to gather data to meet this goal.*

know the purpose of each service that [our organization] offers? Yes. I mean ... asking kind of the same things, but just in a different way.

Overall, those who completed the survey said the experience was neither entirely positive nor entirely negative.

### Considerations for Funders and Evaluators

Foundation funders and evaluators have a number of choices to make in designing a nonprofit capacity-building program and in evaluating it. The primary evaluation choice deals with the sort of information being sought – determining the evaluation's goals (Community Toolbox, 2013). Moreover, for many foundations it is important to match the level of the evaluation effort to the

*The philanthropic sector as a whole should consider the linguistic accessibility of the tools it uses to gather and share information. This includes making tools available in languages other than English. This consideration is partly practical; potential survey respondents are more likely to respond if evaluators make the survey more accessible or more convenient to complete.*

level of the intervention; it may not make sense to invest significant resources in evaluating a relatively small-scale nonprofit capacity-building program (Linnell, 2003). In cases like the one discussed here, where the goal includes assessing the outcomes associated with a nonprofit capacity-building program and the level of the intervention justifies a more robust evaluation approach, surveys may be one method to gather data to meet this goal.

The findings from this case suggest that not all surveys are created equal, even those that have been widely used in outcome evaluations. Some key considerations for organized philanthropy, and particularly foundation funders and evaluators, emerge from this case:

- When designing a survey to evaluate a nonprofit capacity-building program, funders and evaluators do not need to reinvent the wheel. Not only do survey instruments exist for this purpose but, to echo the point made by Guthrie and Preston (2005), these instruments may be tailored to meet the needs of specific evaluations.
- Assisting nonprofit capacity building is a process, and this process may be gradual. Survey instruments for outcome evaluations should, like the OCAT be able to capture incremental change. One of the main issues for those engaged in the evaluation of nonprofit capacity-building programs is that the expectations for these programs may be unrealistic, given both the difficulty of organizational change and the resources available for any one program (Wing, 2004; Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2001). By opting for survey tools that can capture information on gradual change, funders and evaluators will be better able to assess progress toward desired program outcomes.
- Funders and evaluators should consider not only ability of a survey instrument to measure change, but also how the survey will be received by those who are being asked to complete it. Specific considerations include the length and complexity of the survey instrument. Given that the estimated time to complete OCAT 2.0 is 90 minutes, for example, the effect that such a demand for time will have on those being asked to complete the survey should be considered and, if needed, alternatives should be explored (McKinsey, 2014b).
- The philanthropic sector as a whole should consider the linguistic accessibility of the tools it uses to gather and share information. This includes making tools available in languages other than English. This consideration is partly practical; potential survey respondents are more likely to respond if evaluators make the survey more accessible or more convenient to complete. This logic is reflected in the shift from paper-based to web-based surveys (Evans & Mathur, 2005). This consideration also addresses the need to ensure that the practices associated with organized philanthropy are ethical, inclusive, and effective (Jaigpal, 2009).
- Funders and evaluators who use a survey at the outset of a nonprofit capacity-building program should consider the possible dual uses of such a survey. In the case discussed here, the project director implementing the program used the

survey results as a basis to begin a discussion with the executive director and board members participating in the program. This proved a good mechanism in terms of helping executive directors and board members reflect on the organization as a whole, and to begin a conversation with one another about where increased organizational capacity might be needed.

## References

- BACKER, T. E., BLEEG, J. E., & GROVES, K. (2010). *Evaluating foundation-supported capacity building: Lessons learned*. Encino, CA: Human Interaction Research Institute. Available online at <http://www.humaninteract.org/images/finalrep129c.pdf>
- COMMUNITY TOOLBOX. (2013). Evaluating the initiative. Available online at <http://ctb.ku.edu/en/evaluating-initiative>
- EVANS, J. R., & MATHUR, A. (2005). The value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, 15(2), 195-219.
- GUTHRIE, K., & PRESTON, A. (2005). Building capacity while assessing it: Three foundations' experiences using the McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid. Seattle, WA: Blueprint Research & Design. Available online at <http://www.arabellaadvisors.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/building-capacity.pdf>
- JAIGPAL, N. (2009). *Criteria for philanthropy at its best: Benchmarks to assess and enhance grantmaker impact*. Washington, DC: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. Available online at [http://www.ncrp.org/files/publications/paib-fulldoc\\_lowres.pdf](http://www.ncrp.org/files/publications/paib-fulldoc_lowres.pdf)
- KAPUCU, N., HEALY, B. F., & ARSLAN, T. (2011). Survival of the fittest: Capacity building for small nonprofit organizations. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 34(3), 236-245.
- LEAKE, R., GREEN, S., MARQUEZ, C., VANDERBURG, J., GUILLAUME, S., & GARDNER, V. A. (2007). Evaluating the capacity of faith-based programs in Colorado. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17(2), 216-228.
- LEVITON, L. C., HERRERA, C., PEPPER, S. K., FISHMAN, N., & RACINE, D. (2006). Faith in action: Capacity and sustainability of volunteer organizations. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 29(2), 201-207.
- LINNELL, D. (2003). *Evaluation of capacity building: Lessons from the field*. Washington: Alliance for Nonprofit Management. Available online at <http://seerconsulting.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/Evaluation-of-Capacity-Building-Lessons-from-Field.pdf>
- McKINSEY & Co. (2014A). *History of the OCAT*. Available online at <http://mckinseysociety.com/ocat/history-of-the-ocat/>
- McKINSEY & Co. (2014B). *What is the OCAT?* Available online at <http://mckinseysociety.com/ocat/what-is-the-ocat/>
- SOBECK, J. L., AGIUS, E., & MAYERS, V. N. (2007). Supporting and sustaining grassroots youth organizations: The case of new Detroit. *Voluntas*, 18, 17-33
- VENTURE PHILANTHROPY PARTNERS. (2001). *Effective capacity building in nonprofit organizations*. Available online at [http://www.vppartners.org/sites/default/files/reports/full\\_rpt.pdf](http://www.vppartners.org/sites/default/files/reports/full_rpt.pdf)
- WING, K. T. (2004). Assessing the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives: Seven issues for the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33, 153-160.

*Catherine H. Brown, M.A., is a doctoral candidate and adjunct instructor at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Catherine H. Brown, School of Public Administration, University of Nebraska, 6001 Dodge Street, Omaha, NE 68182-2682 (email: chbrown@unomaha.edu).*