

# Life-Stages and the Four Core Capacities: *Leadership Capacity*

	<b>Start-Up</b> <i>“Labor of Love”</i>	<b>Growing</b> <i>“Becoming Who You Are”</i>	<b>Mature</b> <i>“Maintaining Your Edge”</i>	<b>Stagnate/ Decline</b> <i>“..used to be”</i>
<b>Vision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No clear vision articulated</li> <li>• Little shared understanding of the long term aspirations of the group</li> <li>• Frequently works only from project to project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A specific understanding of what the organization aspires to achieve on behalf of the community is developed</li> <li>• Begin to communicate vision to address needs within the broader community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear and compelling understanding of what the organization aspires to achieve that is universally held in the organization and known in the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision has lost relevancy within the community.</li> <li>• Perhaps vision has been achieved and new work is now more compelling within community.</li> <li>• Current assumptions about the vision are challenged.</li> </ul>
<b>Board Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Friends of the founder” frequently describes the board at this stage.</li> <li>• Roles of board and management are unclear.</li> <li>• Board rarely operates according to formal procedures and has poor or no evaluation practices in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board forming as a body with clear understanding of role.</li> <li>• Functions thru bylaws.</li> <li>• Functions as a working board, but with recognition of its oversight evaluation and assessment functions.</li> <li>• Board has moved beyond “friends of the founder.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Directors is functioning well as a policy / governance board with clear bylaws, policies, and review processes in place.</li> <li>• Board term limits and rigorous nomination process is in place.</li> <li>• Board / CEO both evaluated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board has become complacent</li> <li>• Little challenge to deeply held, long term assumptions re. vision and role in community</li> <li>• No longer rigorous about setting strategic direction for the organization</li> </ul>
<b>Senior Management Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership driven by passion for the immediate work</li> <li>• Leadership not attentive to long term organizational vision</li> <li>• Leadership perhaps not skilled in organizational management</li> <li>• Leadership has limited track record of learning and personal development</li> <li>• Very strong dependence on one leader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership gaining visible commitment to an org. and a long term vision / management</li> <li>• Leadership recognizes role in motivating and mobilizing constituents</li> <li>• Leadership self-aware of personal needs vs. those of a growing organization and learning self-management</li> <li>• High dependence on key leader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sr. Leadership role in place with understanding of nonprofit management</li> <li>• Leadership effectively inspires others around vision—creates interdependent team</li> <li>• Leadership shows constant commitment to organization</li> <li>• Smooth transition to new leader could be expected; reliance but not dependence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership has become complacent – comfortable with the past and not wanting to “rock the boat”</li> <li>• Leadership prefers assessment that confirms the past rather than challenging old assumptions</li> <li>• Leadership has become insular, surrounding him/herself with those that confirm old path.</li> </ul>

# Life-Stages and the Four Core Capacities:

## *Adaptive Capacity*

	<b>Start-Up</b> <i>“Labor of Love”</i>	<b>Growing</b> <i>“Becoming Who You Are”</i>	<b>Mature</b> <i>“Maintaining Your Edge”</i>	<b>Stagnate/ Decline</b> <i>“..used to be”</i>
<b>Strategy Development / Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited focus on any long range thinking</li> <li>If any strategic plan exists, it is rarely or never referenced – it is simply a document on a shelf</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First true strategic plan developed</li> <li>Plan focuses on organization, not simply programs, and on overall strategic direction (i.e., a “high level” plan)</li> <li>Plan begins to be used to direct management decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A concrete, realistic and detailed strategic plan is in place</li> <li>Strategic planning process is carried out on a regular basis</li> <li>Strategic plan is used routinely to guide management decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning has become a habit that does not challenge assumptions</li> <li>Plans may be updated regularly, but adjust old plans without challenging the vision or thinking</li> <li>Plans reflect organizational complacency – lack validation through external assessment</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment and Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very limited measurement or tracking of the work</li> <li>Limited feedback from constituencies</li> <li>Feedback usually anecdotal only</li> <li>Feedback usually counting “outputs;” little or no focus on outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More formal evaluation begins; used to make program decisions</li> <li>Some external performance comparisons made to determine what to change to better meet community’s needs</li> <li>Beginning to focus on longer term outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation systems routinely tracking in multiple ways</li> <li>External as well as internal assessment process in place</li> <li>Evaluation systems look at outputs, outcomes, quality</li> <li>All decision-making includes discussion of eval. findings</li> <li>Evaluation systems modified to measure “what matters”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar concerns as with strategy—</li> <li>Evaluation systems are no longer routinely modified to insure measurement of “what matters”</li> <li>Assessment completed that likely will confirm the past rather than challenge old assumptions</li> </ul>
<b>Program Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core programs vaguely defined; lack clear alignment with vision and mission</li> <li>Poor awareness of community profile and changing demogr.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most core programs and svcs. well-defined and solidly linked with mission and vision</li> <li>Reflection of community profile and changing demographics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All programs well-defined and fully aligned with mission, vision, constituency needs and demographics, and are tied to clear strategic direction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programs no longer aligned with current community demographics</li> <li>Out of step with today’s reality</li> <li>No program development; just do what they’ve always done</li> </ul>
<b>Collaboration and Community Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no work to form partnerships or alliances with other nonprofit, public or for-profit sector entities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early stages of building relationships and collaborating with other entities across business sectors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong, high-impact, mutual relationships with a variety of relevant entities have been built, leveraged and maintained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may be some key relationships, but likely these too have become stagnant—taken for granted, no longer vibrant.</li> </ul>

# Life-Stages and the Four Core Capacities: *Management Capacity*

	<b>Start-Up</b> <i>“Labor of Love”</i>	<b>Growing</b> <i>“Becoming Who You Are”</i>	<b>Mature</b> <i>“Maintaining Your Edge”</i>	<b>Stagnate/ Decline</b> <i>“..used to be”</i>
<b>Financial Resources Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor or no financial planning</li> <li>• Budget only generally developed, not understanding costs by program as well as general operating costs.</li> <li>• Performance or “actual” – to – budget loosely or not monitored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited financial plans, updated on an ad hoc basis</li> <li>• Budget utilized as routine tool to guide operations decisions</li> <li>• Some attempt to isolate prog. budgets within central budget</li> <li>• Performance –to – budget monitored periodically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solid financial plans in place, updated regularly</li> <li>• Budget integrated into op’s. and reflects org. needs</li> <li>• Solid separation of program budgets within central budget</li> <li>• Performance – to – budget monitored regularly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board likely not utilizing financial projections in relationship to strategic plan and external assessment benchmarks</li> <li>• Financial forecasts no longer relevant to community demand</li> </ul>
<b>Funding Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong dependence on a very few funders, largely of the same type, likely project funding only.</li> <li>• No long-term planning for diversifying revenue streams</li> <li>• Funding strategy largely focuses on “project grants”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple fund sources/types</li> <li>• Balance of earned sources as well as contributed sources</li> <li>• Beginning to develop sys’s for long range fund development</li> <li>• Developed some sustainable revenue-generating activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solid base of funders from many types of funding sources</li> <li>• Some ability to “buffer” against market instabilities, including an operating reserve</li> <li>• Development tied to strategic plan and financial forecasts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downturn in ability to generate new money, likely tied to issues named elsewhere under leadership capacity and strategic planning / evaluation.</li> </ul>
<b>Audience Development Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little cultivation of audience beyond immediate event</li> <li>• Little outreach to stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies for audience development loosely developed</li> <li>• Key stakeholders identified</li> <li>• Key messages defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully developed audience development, marketing and communications plans in use</li> <li>• Communications to stakeholders are consistent, coord.</li> <li>• Relationships well maintained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downturn in audience, likely tied to issues named elsewhere under leadership capacity and strategic planning / evaluation.</li> </ul>
<b>Human Resources Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of any human resource planning activities</li> <li>• Job descriptions do not exist</li> <li>• HR needs are addressed only when too large to ignore</li> <li>• No volunteer mgt. systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some human resource mgt. and planning in place</li> <li>• Human resource development tied loosely to strategic plan</li> <li>• Job descriptions tend to be static</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forecasts of HR needs tied directly to strategic plan</li> <li>• Job descrip. updated in resp. to changing org. needs</li> <li>• Excellent volunteer recruitment and mgt. in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be rapid turnover in employees and/or volunteers, and limited interest by job-seekers</li> </ul>

# Life-stages and the Four Core Capacities: *Operational Capacity*

	<b>Start-Up</b> <i>“Labor of Love”</i>	<b>Growing</b> <i>“Becoming Who You Are”</i>	<b>Mature</b> <i>“Maintaining Your Edge”</i>	<b>Stagnate/ Decline</b> <i>“..used to be”</i>
<b>Communications and Outreach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No or poor marketing materials; unprofessional in presentation</li> <li>Messages are inconsistent</li> <li>No/poor tools or human res’s to assist outreach efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mat’s in place but not updated to reflect current activities</li> <li>A few key tools and human resources to assist in outreach efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications customized to stakeholder groups; carry a powerful, consistent message</li> <li>Tools and staffing in place for ongoing, quality outreach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications tend to be “staid” or no longer exciting and stimulating new interest</li> </ul>
<b>Members, Volunteers, Leaders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteers not working up to their potential or ill-equipped</li> <li>Staffing inadequately filled, or unfilled; may lack experience</li> <li>High turnover/poor attendance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many volunteers working up to their potential; mostly reliable, loyal and committed to org.</li> <li>Critical positions are staffed, although some inappropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteers bring required skills to org.; culturally competent; reliable; work easily with most staff</li> <li>Appropriate paid staff in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members and volunteers may be declining</li> </ul>
<b>Fundraising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No or limited systems for tracking constituents, participants, volunteers, donors</li> <li>Generally weak fundraising skills or lack of expertise within the organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electronic databases and mgt. reporting systems perform a few basic features</li> <li>Fundraising skills covered by internal skills and access to external fundraising assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electronic database and management reporting commonly used for tracking donors, constituents, etc.</li> <li>Highly developed internal fundraising skills and systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely a decline in funding (see management capacity) which may be due to loss of skills or current technology to manage donor relations</li> </ul>
<b>Technology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Telephone and fax facilities are an impediment to day-to-day effectiveness / efficiency</li> <li>Limited use of computers or other technology day-to-day</li> <li>Little / poor use of web capacity</li> <li>No website</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate basic telephone and fax facilities; accessible to most; may lack features to increase effectiveness / efficiency</li> <li>Satisfactory use of web</li> <li>Most receive training</li> <li>Basic website in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solid basic telephone and fax facilities accessible to all staff (paid or vol.) who need access</li> <li>Include add’l. features to incr. effectiveness and efficiency</li> <li>Excellent interactive website</li> <li>Training routinely provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declining revenues limit ability to stay abreast of current technology</li> </ul>
<b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate physical infrastructure</li> <li>Insufficient workspace to meet programming and admin. needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical infrastructure can be made to work well enough to suite organization’s most important / immediate needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully adequate infrastructure</li> <li>Well designed to enhance effectiveness and efficiency</li> <li>Developed to respond growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities may be deteriorating, or no longer responsive to needs</li> </ul>