



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

A RELEVANT					Score	Comments	
Coherent argument is provided to demonstrate consistency with, and support of, international, governmental and donor priorities. Problems and linkages with other actions, sectors, and themes have been analyzed. Target groups and final beneficiaries are strategically chosen. Addresses high priority needs and constraints.					↓	↓	
1	Donor analysis	A No reference made to any potential donors for the program or the current priorities of these donors.	B Program makes reference to donor priorities and requirements, but provides no argumentation to demonstrate relevance to them.	C Program is consistent with donor requirements and supportive of donor priorities, but the argumentation provided is incoherent.	D Program is consistent with donor priorities and a coherent argument is provided to demonstrate how the program will support them.		
2	Policy analysis	A No reference is made to any international or governmental planning documents (e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategy, National Plan of Action, Regional Development Plan).	B Wider planning documents and policies are referred to, but no argument is provided to demonstrate that the program is consistent with policies and supportive of defined objectives.	C Program refers to relevant planning documents and provides, argumentation, but this fails to demonstrate that the program is consistent with policies and supportive of defined objectives.	D Program refers to relevant documents and it is clearly demonstrate how the program is consistent with policies and will support relevant goals.		
3	Problem analysis	A No written problem analysis provided.	B Some problems facing the target groups and final beneficiaries are identified, but they are not described any further and no assessment of cause and effect relations between them is provided.	C Identifies a wider range of factors impacting key stakeholders and establishes clear cause-effect relationships. The set of problems and opportunities that the program will address is not identified.	D Identifies a broad range of factors impacting key stakeholders and establishes clear causal relationships. Clearly identifies the set of problems that the program will address and explains these have been selected.		
4	Analysis of institutional framework	A No reference is made to lessons learned from other actions and complementarity with other actors/actions are not assessed. No other local organization have been considered to take responsibility for program activities.	B Reference is made to lessons learned from other actions and linkages with other actions are assessed, but duplication of effort and loss of potential synergies is not really avoided; there is one or more self-evident lesson/partner left out.	C Evidence of awareness of institutional framework, with some impact on program design in terms of reducing duplication of effort and using the best of available insights. Partners have been reasonably well chosen, but there is room for improvement.	D Reference is made to lessons learned from other actions and linkages with other actions are assessed, and the proposal clearly demonstrates that duplication of efforts and loss of potential synergy is avoid. Partners have been strategically chosen.		
5	Final beneficiaries & target groups	A No or no appropriate distinction is made between those with whom the program interacts directly (target groups) and those for whose benefit the program is ultimately undertaken (final beneficiaries). Both are poorly identified.	B Distinguishes appropriately between target groups and final beneficiaries, but no or insufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate vulnerability of selected beneficiaries and appropriateness of selected target groups.	C Evidence is provided to demonstrate vulnerability of selected beneficiaries and appropriateness of selected target groups, but provided evidence actually shows they are not the most vulnerable and most appropriate groups.	D Provided disaggregated data clearly demonstrates vulnerability of selected final beneficiaries. Points at relative strengths demonstrating that target groups are strategically chosen.		



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

6	Needs assessment & benefits analysis	A No participatory process mentioned. No identification of the constrains duty-bearers (target groups) face in performing their duty and what would be needed to improve implementation of the rights of final beneficiaries.	B A participatory process is mentioned, but not clearly described. Some needs and constraints are described, but it is not clear whose needs these are and how these have been identified.	C A participatory process is clearly described, but . Needs and constrains are described, but it is not made explicit where they conflict and how the program will address those benefits that are likely to be realized and sig-nificantly impact beneficiaries.	D It is clearly described who of the target groups and final beneficiaries have been consulted and how, what their reported needs and constraints are, where their interests conflict, and how the program will address the most feasible and effective benefits.		
7	Inclusion of key development principles	A No indication of issues that cut across sectors (e.g. HIV/AIDS, human rights), practices that are widely recognized as 'best practice', or partnerships with companies or government agencies.	B So-called cross-cutting, best practices, public or private partnerships are mentioned, but those mentioned only show that these concepts are not well-understood.	C Relevant cross-cutting, best practices, public or private partnerships are indicated, but it is not demonstrated how they are addressed by the program/why they qualify as best practice.	D Relevant cross-cutting, best practices, public or private partnerships are indicated, and it is demonstrated how such issues are addressed and why such practices qualify as best practices.		
Conclusion							
B	WELL-DESIGNED The elements of the program are well-defined and strategically chosen and will deliver sustainable benefits to selected target groups and final beneficiaries.					Score ↓	Comments ↓
8	Program goal	A No program goal provided.	B Program goal provided, but it has been made up; it does not identify an existing wider development goal (e.g. MDG, human right).	C Program goal identifies an existing wider development goal, but this is not consistent with the policy analysis and corresponding targets are not include in the logfram.	D Program goal identifies an existing development goal to which the program will contribute, and is consistent with the policy analysis. Targets derived from the policy are included in the logframe.		
9	Program purpose	A No program purpose provided or one that in fact describes a wider development goal (e.g. reduce poverty...) or an activity (e.g. to provide..).	A An improvement is identified, but it is not sustainable or not clearly related to the final beneficiaries identified.	C A sustainable improvement in the situation of the final beneficiaries is identified, but it is not consistent with the main problem identified.	D The program purpose clearly identifies a sustainable improvement in the situation of the final beneficiaries, and is consistent with the main problem.		
10	Program benefits	A No or only one or two benefits described. That which is entered at benefit-level describes in fact activities.	B Multiple improvements are identified, but these are not clearly linked with a specific target group and their facilities, roles, capacities, income etc.	C Improvements are linked with target groups, but incorrectly. Not all benefits clearly support the realization of the program purpose. Not all benefits are inconsistent with the benefits analysis.	D Each of the benefits is clearly and correctly linked with a specific target groups and clearly supports the realization of the program purpose. Benefits are consistent with the benefits analysis.		



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

11	Performance objectives	A No performance objectives formulated.	B Only indicators are specified.	C Objectives include indicators and targets, but baseline and time-boundaries are missing. Not all levels in the intervention logic have a corresponding objective. Not all objectives are relevant to the corresponding purpose/benefit. Some seem overly ambitious.	D Objectives formulated in relation to all levels. All objectives include a baseline, target, indicator and time-boundary. Objectives are relevant and can realistically be achieved within the constraints of the available time and budget.		
12	Program deliverables	A Not specified what the program will deliver in terms of outputs.	B Outputs have been defined for main activities, but not in relation to subactivities.	C Largely complete list of deliverables, but no sufficiently detailed specification of each output.	D Complete list of outputs provided, including detailed specifications of each output to be delivered.		
13	Program activities	A No activities identified.	B Activities defined, but defined as output (e.g. 'training of teacher', not 'organization of workshops'). Activities are not appropriately linked to results; there are results that lack a corresponding activity or vice versa.	C Activities are appropriately linked, but not appropriately subdivided and sequenced. Proposed activities are not sufficient to achieve objectives. Description and justification of activities is insufficient.	D Activities are properly linked, subdivided, and sequenced. Proposed activities are sufficient and justified, even considering risks identified. A clear description of each sub-activity is provided.		
14	Program means	A No or hardly any means specified.	B Broader list of means provided, but unclear what type and how many of each are required.	C Largely complete list of means, with detailed specifications for most of them.	D Complete list of means provided, including detailed specifications.		
15	Budget plan	A No program budget available.	B Budget available, but only cost categories are described and they are not linked with an activity. Amounts are not based on a unit rate multiplied by no. of units.	C Proper budget available, not all cost categories are clear and justified. The estimated costs is a bit high considering expected results. No financing plan is included.	D Where needed, costs are clarified and justified. The ratio between estimated costs and expected results is favourable. A plan for covering the budget is included.		
16	Action plan	A No action plan available.	B The activity plan is too detailed or too general, unrealistic in terms of its timeframe, and inconsistent with other planning documents.	C The action plan is, for the most part, feasible, sufficiently detailed, and consistent - with some minor shortcomings.	D The action plan is feasible and sufficiently detailed. The actors and activities in the action plan fully correspond to those in the proposal.		
17	Monitoring plan	A No monitoring plan available.	B A basic plan is in place, but indicators or information sources are not clearly defined.	C Most, but not all, indicators are clearly defined. There is some doubt about whether information can be collected and used in a timely and efficient manner.	D Indicators are clearly defined and information can be collected and used in a timely and efficient manner. Risk and impact indicators are included.		



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

18	Risk management plan	A No identification of stakeholder attitudes, program means or methods, and social, political, or economic conditions that could result in loss in value or quality, delay in completion, or negative impacts on the environment or vulnerable groups.	B Limited range of risks identified. Lists includes low probability and low impact risks, probably because risks are not formally described and assessed. Formulated responses are absent or minimal and very general.	C The range of risk factors is elaborate, but still some categories are missing. Most risk are clearly described and systematically assessed, although some arrangements for managing risks are unclear/inadequate.	D A wide range of risk categories are considered. Risk are clearly described and systematically assessed, so that only important and manageable risks are included. Arrangements are clear and adequate.			
Conclusion								
C	WELL-DELIVERED						Score	Comments
The project is implemented in a transparent, effective, efficient and timely manner. Adjustments are made based on evidence and feedback.								
19	Structure	A No formal description and division of roles and responsibilities available. It is not clear which actor is responsible for what aspect of the program.	B Formal description and division of roles and responsibilities available, but it is not yet sufficiently clear which actor is responsible for what aspect of the program.	C Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, divided, and understood, but some are allocated to actors with insufficient capacity.	D Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and divided. Responsibilities are allocated to actors with sufficient capacity.			
20	Governance	A No formal regulation of program governance available.	B Governance of the program is formalised, but arrangements are not fully clear and/or impractical to implement. Operational staff are not empowered or too much so.	C Coordination arrangements are clearly described and practical to implement, but do not allow operational staff sufficient access to senior decision-makers.	D Coordination arrangements are clearly described and practical to implement, and allow operational staff sufficient access to senior decision-makers.			
21	Monitoring	A No baseline, progress or impact data is being collected or made available.	B Some information is collected, but not systematically. Data regarding progress on activities and outputs is available, but no data on outcomes and impact.	C Output, outcome, and impact data is being collected systematically, but collected data is not analyzed and few adjustments are made.	D Systematically monitors and assesses the progress and impact of the program and adjusts its planning to improve results and mitigate negative effects.			
22	Reporting	A No result and accounting information is made available. Reports remain due.	B Reports are submitted only after repeated reminders. Reports follow their own logic and their content is generally useless for purposes of accountability and learning.	C Reports do not consistently follow the logic of the format, resulting in unclarity and non-information. Reports mostly meet the deadline.	D Required information is made accessible in the appropriate format and submitted on time. Reports give a clear overview of progress, expenditures, and changes made.			
23	Progress	A Means are being wasted, activities are not being implemented and outputs are not being delivered as	B Means are not put to their best use, there is significant delay in implementation, and outputs are	C Not all means are always put to their best use, there is some delay in implementation, and some	D Objectives are achieved in an efficient and timely manner. Outputs are of good quality. There is ample			



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

		planned. Output are of poor quality. There is no evidence that the final beneficiaries will indeed benefit from the program.	of inferior quality. There is little evidence that the final beneficiaries will indeed benefit from the program.	outputs are of inferior quality. There is sufficient evidence that the final beneficiaries will indeed benefit from the program.	evidence that the final beneficiaries will benefit from the program and that activities and results contribute to this.		
24	Evaluation design	A No formal evaluation anticipated.	B Basic evaluation design available, but not sufficiently clear about purpose, scope and users of the evaluation. The evaluation contributes nothing to the capacity development of those directly involved in the program.	C Terms of Reference available and sufficiently clear, but the evaluation is still overly dependent on the evaluator’s views and does little to contribute to the capacity development of those directly involved in the program.	D Terms of Reference for evaluation study is clear and comprehensive. The views of local staff and participants are included in the evaluation and the evaluation contributes significantly to their capacity.		
25	Accounting and control	A There is excessive over-spending. Accounting is grossly insufficient for purposes of transparency and accountability. There is clear evidence of corruption.	B Expenditures on some cost categories are not kept in control. There is suspicion of corruption.	C Expenditures are effectively controlled, with minor exceptions. There is no indication of corruption, but accounts provided are insufficient for purposes of transparency and accountability.	D Expenditures are effectively controlled and adequately accounted for in a transparent manner. Corrupt practices are effectively ruled out.		
26	Downward accountability	A Program managers run the program as it pleases them and do not feel the need to collect feedback or allow beneficiaries and staff to influence decision-making and hold management accountable for organisational performance.	B Some system that enables beneficiaries and staff to influence the program to some extent. There is limited chance the beneficiaries can hold the organisation accountable for its performance.	C A system that enables beneficiaries the right to co-decide to some extent, especially about activities. Beneficiaries are in a position to enquire about organisation’s performance.	D Key stakeholders are provided with means by which they can voice their opinions and concerns and hold the organisation accountable.		
27	Programmatic cooperation	A There is no formal partnership or the partnership is basically non-functional. One or more partners consistently fail to honour agreements. There are frequent conflicts, which remain unaddressed unresolved.	B There is significant tension with the partnership, but conflicts are being addressed. Activities are carried out individually. Interaction is minimal.	C Partners are oriented towards each other and interact regular. Cooperation is effective, leading to some partners adding some value to each other.	D Tension is minimal and easily resolved. Cooperation is effective, leading to significant complementarity. It is clear that benefits are realized that would not have been realized if partners acted individually.		
Conclusion							
D	SUSTAINABLE Continuation of cooperation and realized benefits, extension and multiplication of results, and institutionalization of lessons learned are ensured.					Score ↓	Comments ↓



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

28	Implementation of program approach	<p>A There is no or little evidence of commitment to the program approach (in which a group of inter-related projects and activities are jointly managed by multiple actors to realise benefits that would not be realised if they were managed independently). WSN projects are not integrated into a program and WSN is the only partner in the projects, which are solely funded by WSN.</p>	<p>B The program approach is an idea of WSN, that is slowly beginning to sink in and be considered/implemented here. This happens under the guidance of WSN, but based on a growing local commitment. We are making progress, but the proposal/program is still very much a collection of ideas/projects, in which WSN is still the only partner and financier.</p>	<p>C As partners we both feel committed to the program approach as a useful approach. We are making good progress. Although WSN is still the only other organization taking responsibility for program activities, linkages are being made to other (local) actors. The program is becoming more coherent/realizes results that strength each other.</p>	<p>D As partner we both feel committed to the program approach, and are seeing evidence of its usefulness. The program that is being developed or implemented here involves various partners and associates who cooperate, not just on implementation, but also on design, financing, and evaluation. The program is realizing synergies between activities/actors.</p>		
29	Sustainability	<p>D Recurrent cost implications and institutional structures required to ensure continued operation are not described.</p>	<p>B Cost implications and institutional structures are described, but no sources of revenue are identified for covering future operating and maintenance costs after the funding ends.</p>	<p>C Recurrent cost implications and future sources of revenue are both identified, but identified sources are not sufficient or not sufficiently sure to ensure future cost coverage.</p>	<p>D Recurrent cost implications and future sources of revenue are identified, and identified sources are sufficient and sufficiently sure to ensure future cost coverage.</p>		
30	Multiplication	<p>A There is no scope for replication and extension of results.</p>	<p>B There are some ideas about replication and extension, but no concrete arrangements.</p>	<p>B There is some scope for replication and extension, and some concrete arrangements are made.</p>	<p>D There is ample scope for replication and extension of results and a clear plan for multiplication.</p>		
31	Evaluation design	<p>A No formal evaluation considered.</p>	<p>B Basic evaluation design available, but not sufficiently clear about purpose, scope and users of the evaluation. The evaluation contributes nothing to the capacity development of those directly involved in the program.</p>	<p>C Terms of Reference available and sufficiently clear, but the evaluation is still overly dependent on the evaluator's views and does little to contribute to the capacity development of those directly involved in the program.</p>	<p>D Terms of Reference for evaluation study is clear and comprehensive. The views of local staff and participants are included in the evaluation and the evaluation contributes significantly to their capacity.</p>		
32	Evaluation report & follow-up	<p>A No evaluation report available. At best some notes.</p>	<p>B Basic evaluation report available, but lacks clear findings, logical conclusions, and/or actionable recommendations.</p>	<p>C Clear overview of findings and separate conclusions logically following from findings, but report has not been discussed with stakeholders and includes no response from relevant decision-makers.</p>	<p>D Clear overview of findings and separate conclusions logically following from findings. Report has been discussed by stakeholders and includes a response from relevant decision-makers.</p>		
Conclusion							



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FORM (P-SCAN)

Organization:	Program that was scanned:	Date of scan:	Participants (full name & position)
Conclusions and recommendations:			
•			

Please remove this information after completing the scan.

What is the P-scan?

The Program Management Capacity Assessment Form (P-scan) is an assessment tool designed to help partner organization 'see where they are' in relation to key program management criteria and standards used in professional development cooperation. The P-scan particularly focuses on the quality of formulation and argumentation. The scan consists of 32 items, grouped into 4 sections: relevant, well-designed, well-delivered, and sustainable. For each item, there are 4 assessment options. The options are designed to reflect the real-life development of program management capacity from unawareness and non-existing of documents (option A), through existing but insufficient documentation/ implementation (option B or option C), to program management that meets professional standards (option D). In conducting the P-scan, participants first make an individual assessment of the program and then share and discuss their scores in order to come to an agreed-on score for each item.

How to use the P-scan?

- Step 1: Identify the program to be assessed and select who will participate in the P-scan exercise. Preferably, those directly involved in managing the program, as well as those with decision-making power over the program, should be involved. Enter organization name, program title, date, participants in the table above.
- Step 2: Collect any existing documents related to the program, such as proposal, budgets, activity plan, organisation structure, job descriptions, progress reports, evaluation designs, evaluation reports. This will serve as the evidence on which to base your assessment.
- Step 3: Provide each participant with a copy of the P-scan, as well as a (digital or printed) copy of the collected documents.
- Step 4: Complete the scan individually, reviewing the evidence and reading the scan carefully. Circle either A, B, C or D.
- Step 5: Appoint a facilitator who will lead the discussion and ensure that scores are based on a correct understanding of the items/assessment-options of the scan.
- Step 6: Share individual scores and, if scores deviate from one another, discuss why you gave your scores, until the group reaches a consensus. Enter the agreed-on score in the column "score". Where necessary, add comments to explain or qualify the choice. Draw a conclusion after completing each section.
- Step 7: Reflect on the results as well as the process of using the P-scan and record any conclusions and recommendations.

Important notes:

- Most users find the language of the P-scan rather technical and difficult to understand. However, part of program management capacity involves just that: understanding program management concepts and tools.
- Some users tend to assess the program as it exists 'in their head'. The P-scan, however, seeks to evaluate the program 'as it is written'. Therefore, as much as possible, individual and agreed-on scores should be based on the written evidence available before you on the table: proposal etc. (see documents under Step 2).
- The scan's assessment options are designed to reflect reality. If you think a particular option or set of options does not fit the reality of how program management capacity develops, then please mention this under conclusions and recommendations, so the scan can be improved.