



"Effective Boards For Effective Governance"
Program for
PACS Partner CSOs in Maharashtra
Pune, June 2004

A
Workshop Report

Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy
C-8/8704, Vasant Kunj
New Delhi-110 070
Tel:91-11-2689 9368/2612 1917
Email:icp@ndb.vsnl.net.in

Table of Contents

- I Executive Summary**
- II List of Abbreviations**
- III. Introduction**
 - III. 1 Background to Program**
 - III. 2 Brief Introduction to S I C P**
 - III. 3 Background Work**
 - III.3.1 Training Needs Assessment**
 - III.3.2 Distribution Material**
 - III.3.3 Case Studies**
 - III.3.4 Shortlisting Resource Persons**
 - III.4 Structure and Methodology**
 - III. 5 Objectives of the Workshop**
 - III. 6 Profile of Participating CSOs**
 - III. 7 Constraints and Challenges**
- IV Day Wise Session Reports**
 - IV.1 Pre Workshop Evening**
 - IV.2 Role of Boards in Governance**
 - IV.2.1 Concepts**
 - IV.2.2 Discussion**
 - IV.3 Creating Good Boards**
 - IV.3.1 Concepts**
 - IV.3.2 Discussion**
 - IV.4 Quest for Credibility**
 - IV.4.1 Concepts explained in presentation**
 - IV.4.2 Discussion**
 - IV.5 Women Hold up Half the sky**
 - IV.5.1 Concepts explained in presentation**
 - IV.5.2 Discussion**
 - IV.6 Engaging the Board**
 - IV.6.1 Concepts explained in presentation**
 - IV.6.2 Discussion**
 - IV.7 The Board in Action**
 - IV.7.1 Concepts explained in presentation**
 - IV.7.2 Discussion**
 - IV.8 Governance vs Management**
 - IV.8.1 Concepts explained in presentation**
 - IV.8.2 Discussion**
- V Outcome**
 - V.1 Positive Outcomes**
 - V.2 Follow Up Action Plan - Participant Consensus**
- VI Recommendations**
- VII Annexes**

- VII. 1 Profile of Participating CSOs**
- VII. 2 Workshop Agenda**
- VII. 3 Check list of Vision statement**
- VII. 4 Board Meeting Madness**
- VII. 5 a. Version of Prioritisation of Agenda**
 - b. Version of Prioritisation of Agenda**
- VII. 6 Board Meeting Evaluation**
- VII. 7 Cases for use in Session 7**
- VII. 8 List of Persons attending the Workshop**
- VII.9 List of Resource Persons**
- VII 10 Brief Profile of Resource Persons**
- VII.11 Workshop Evaluation by participants**
- VII.12 Evaluation Format Samples**
 - a. Session Evaluation**
 - b. Overall Evaluation**

I. Executive Summary

Poorest Areas Civil Society (PACS) Program is a large, non-governmental effort against poverty in India. Supported by Department for International Development (DFID), a UK, government department working to promote sustainable development and eliminate world poverty, the PACS Programme is managed by a consortium of two reputed organisations, namely, Development Alternatives, a 25-year-old development agency headquartered in New Delhi, and recognised the world over for its diverse programs, and also the largest professional consultants of India - PriceWaterhouse Coopers (P) Ltd. This consortium of management consultants (MC) is directly accountable to the program's sponsors, DFID. Being implemented in six contiguous states, the program has been designed to determine and implement the most effective strategies to empower the poor and build the capacities of local communities. It supports an integrated approach to key development concerns around specific thematic areas like improved local self-governance, women's empowerment, social cohesion, policy advocacy and self-help. The primary objective of this program is to empower millions of poor people in almost a hundred backward districts of the states of Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Chhatisgarh, Jharkhand, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The program functions through a network of established civil society organisations (CSOs) in each state who are termed program partners.

It is fairly well known that with increased amounts of funding coming into the development sector, concern about credibility and accountability of the recipient organisation towards all its stakeholders has been growing. PACS Program is primarily focused on the poor, however, since it operates through CSOs and aims to develop clusters of CSOs, its other objective remains strengthening the capacity and roles of CSOs. It is felt that stronger CSOs with enhanced skills, exposure and knowledge will ensure that the benefits of the program are sustained over the long term. Governance is one such issue that contributes significantly to the strengthening process. Within the long term 'capacity building framework' that PACS has adopted, governance issues have been perceived to be as important and relevant to an organisations growth and sustenance, as the program management issues. This has led to a focus on good governance of Boards. An engaged and active Board can make the difference between an organisation that is merely surviving from day to day and one that approaches the future with vision and determination to further the organisation's goals.

For attempting to promote the concept of 'good governance' among its partners, it was felt that the organisation of specific 'governance related' workshops, adopting a communication process of discussions, based on an agenda relating to issues governance, would initiate the process of attaining the long term goal of 'strengthening' CSOs. It was precisely with the aim of introducing a consciousness and an appropriate mind set followed by a willingness among Board members of partner organisations, to adopt good governance practices in their Board processes, that the first of its kind workshop was conducted for PACS partner CSOs of Maharashtra in Pune in June 2004. It may be worth mentioning here that while good governance workshops for the corporate sector are a regular feature, no such examples exist in the development sector. This exercise was, therefore, to a large extent, a learning experience for all stakeholders, and most importantly it had its origin in the concern of PACS –MC to strengthen capacities of CSOs.

The services of Sampradaan Indian Center for Philanthropy (SICP), a New Delhi based organisation were therefore contracted to conceptualise and conduct a workshop, in Pune, on "Effective Boards for Effective Governance" for its CSO partners in the state of Maharashtra. Approximately 45 participants, who included two Board members each from 14 partner organisations implementing programs under PACS, attended the two and a half-day workshop between 31 May to 2 June 2004. The programs of the participating organisations were mainly with people at the grassroots, or work in backward districts and the organisations varied in terms of their establishment, size and resources. However, it was believed that due to the vast range and richness of experiences of Board members, as also the changing environment in the development scenario, a whole new set of expectations might emerge based on ground realities. Besides the participating organisations, the workshop was also attended by members of the PACS program team from Delhi, and representatives from their Managing and Financial Consultants – Development Alternatives and PriceWaterhouse Coopers (P) Ltd.

A Training Needs Analysis (TNA) preceded the actual workshop. The Supportive Supervision Resource Organisation, (SSRO) for PACS Program in Maharashtra – Green Earth – conducted the initial need assessment and also provided the much needed support in Pune. This was planned to facilitate an understanding of the specific training needs and areas of concern on governance for PACS partners. This exercise was also to assist the designers of the workshop and the resource persons to familiarise themselves with the target audience, know and understand the background of all participating CSO representatives, their range and diversity in experience and expertise, as also help in the identification of possible resource persons who could be involved directly in the current workshop or be co opted at a later, follow up stage. The TNA exercise was based on direct interviews with a representative sample of participating Board members and recommendations made were guided by the observations made by members regarding the challenges, constraints faced by Boards as also the unique situations under which programs were carried out.

A two-day agenda was worked out highlighting the major concerns of 'governance'. Even though the expectations had been adequately spelt out in the TNA Report, the actual workshop was preceded by an evening session that focused on a participatory discussion on issues concerning governance, their relevance and implementation and the expectations from the workshop. The first day began with introductory remarks on 'The Need for Program and PACS Perspective' followed by 'Importance of Good Boards'. The theme for the day was 'Boards: Assets or Liabilities' and the morning session on 'The Role of Boards' encompassing roles and responsibilities, vision/mission of organisations, legal compliance and financial oversight was conducted. The afternoon discussions focused on types of Boards, skills on Boards, getting good people aboard, managing expectations and conflict of interest' in a session on 'Creating Good Boards'. The day closed with a presentation and discussion on 'The Quest for Credibility' in the evening.

The final day highlighted the theme 'Bridging Role of Boards'. The day began early with a session on 'Gender Representation' and was followed by group work on an analysis on specified situations dealing with 'Keeping the Board engaged'. A session on conducting effective meetings and evaluation of Board performance was carried out through examples under a session titled 'Board in Action'. The last session was aimed at analysing the issues concerning 'Governance and Management' with the help of case

studies. The workshop concluded with a wrap up, where in addition to participant evaluation of the workshop, discussions and consensus building on the introduction of some key elements of governance was arrived at.

Facilitation for the workshop was done by renowned resource persons like Noshir Dadrawala from Center for Advancement of Philanthropy, Sanjay Patra from Financial and Management Services Foundation, Renu Suri from Gender Training Institute, BN Makhija from SOSVA, Revathi Narayanan from CHARKA -UNDP, Vishal Talreja from Dream a Dream and Pushpa Sundar from Sampradaan.

The methodologies adopted were aimed at facilitating greater interaction, along with presentation of appropriate information. The workshop employed participatory methods, like role-play, case study analysis and an open forum for discussions.

The key outcomes may be summarised as an acceptance and willingness on the part of participants to transfer some of the learnings to their Board processes. Participation in such a workshop was a 'first' for most members, and there was unanimity in thinking that incorporation of certain principles of governance in their respective Boards would most certainly lead to increased accountability, credibility and transparency. The organisers also needed to reflect on the importance of developing a program firmly rooted in ground realities.

Another key outcome was a general consensus among participants on framing a 'common minimum program'. This listed certain good governance practices to be adopted by the participating NGOs immediately. A Follow Up procedure for monitoring the changes incorporated will be put in place soon. This would be introduced in a phased manner. Participants, however, voiced a word of caution. And that is, that the ground realities remain different to the theoretical principles of 'good governance', and application of such practices needs careful adaptation. In conclusion this workshop - a 'learning exercise' - has indisputably heralded a significant beginning for all in general and PACS in particular.

II. List of Abbreviations

AS	Accounting Systems
CA	Chartered Accountant
CAP	Centre for Advancement of Philanthropy
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CHARCA	Coordinated HIV/AIDS Response through Capacity-Building and Awareness
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DA	Development Alternatives
DFID	Department for International Development
FMSF	Financial Management Service Foundation
GB	Governing Board
GTI	Gender Training Institute
IGP	Income Generating Program
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NPO	Non Profit Organisation
PACS	Poorer Areas Civil Society Program
PACS - MC	Poorer Areas Civil Society Program Management Consultants
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institutions
PWC	PriceWaterhouse Coopers
SC	Scheduled Castes
SEDT	Socio Economic Development Trust
SICP	Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy
SNVS	Sankalp Manav Vikas Sanstha
SOSVA	Society for Service to Voluntary Agencies
SSRO	Supportive Supervision Resource Organisation
ST	Scheduled Tribes
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Effective Boards for Effective Governance

Workshop Report

III: Introduction

III.1 Background to program

The governance of non-profit organisations becomes increasingly important as organisations grow and develop. Almost all organisations have Governing Boards – large or small, and even though their commitment is of a high order, there is often a challenge to utilize their skills and experiences wisely. As the non-profit establishes itself and diversifies its operations and programs, the work of the Board takes on a new meaning. An engaged and deliberate Board can make the difference between an organisation that is merely surviving from day to day and one that approaches the future with vision and determination.

PACS (Poorer Areas Civil Society Program), a DFID funded program managed by the Management Consultants from DA and PriceWaterhouse Coopers(P) Ltd., is currently operating in six states through civil society organisations. It was evident from the operation of the program that organisational capacity building measures cannot be limited to training of staff and management but also must include capacity building of the top decision making and governing level. In other words, 'governance' is equally critical to the sustainability of the organisation as program management is. Many would say they are two sides of the same coin.

The focus of PACS program, alongside poverty reduction is also to strengthen the capacities of the CSO partners. The objectives have a symbiotic relationship, as one is not possible without the other.

Why a Workshop on Effective Governance? The current workshop "Effective Boards for Effective Governance" has its genesis in this thinking. This was an attempt to assess the existing capacities of participating CSOs as well as to enhance capacities in making them more transparent, credible, accountable and taking on leadership roles.

PACS Management Committee assigned the task to Sampradaan Indian Center for Philanthropy (SICP), a New Delhi based organisation to conceptualise and organise the first of its kind workshop in a planned series, for providing an orientation to Board members of their (PACS) partner CSOs in Maharashtra. The workshop was coordinated through the efforts of Green Earth Social Development Consulting Pvt. Ltd, a local organisation that also functions as SSRO with PACS.

This report pertains to the workshop held in Pune (Maharashtra) between 31 May and 2 June 2004.

III.2 Brief Profile of Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy

Sampradaan- Indian Centre for Philanthropy (SICP) is a New Delhi based NGO, registered in 1996, under the Societies Registration Act. SICP's vision is a social order where private resources (time, money, skills, and assets) are shared willingly and

deployed effectively to create a developed and equitable society. It represents an effort to facilitate the practice of philanthropy and to increase its social impact. Its objectives are to undertake and co-ordinate research that can influence the policy environment and design of programmes and institutions within civil society in India, to act as a resource center for philanthropy in India, to advocate a public policy supportive of philanthropy through dissemination of the results of research and other relevant information to the government, the media, civil society organizations, and the public, and, finally to build capacities of donor organizations and civil society organisations to further social development by providing them relevant information, technical advice and training. In pursuit of its objectives SICP plays three interlinked sub roles, viz.: A Resource Center role (research, documentation, dissemination), An Advocacy role, and an Intermediary advisory and convening role for capacity building of both grantees and donors. A unique clearinghouse of information on national and international philanthropy it also acts as a catalyst for promotion of new ideas and concepts.

III.3 Background Work

III.3.1 Training Needs Analysis (T N A)

Since this workshop was a 'first' for PACS, and not many attempts have been made at 'good governance practices' in the development sector, this exercise was undertaken for the following reasons:

- a. To be informed about the specific training needs and areas of concern relating to 'governance' among the PACS partner CSO Boards.
- b. To enable the designers to frame an appropriate curriculum with identified areas of concern in the agenda.
- c. To provide an adequate profile of participating Boards facilitating an understanding of the background of target audience, their diversity in experience and expertise, the nature of their programs etc among resource persons.
- d. To create a local resource pool through identification of appropriate resource persons who may be involved directly or those who may be trained to take on future follow up work.

SICP in New Delhi prepared the questionnaires listing out the possible issues of concern. Frequent interactions and discussions between Green Earth, Pune, and SICP, New Delhi took place, and it was felt that obtaining responses on a pre formulated structured questionnaire would neither reflect the concerns of members nor capture the essence/richness of the experiences of senior and vastly experienced individuals. The decision to carry out personal interviews was taken. The structured questionnaire was to serve as a guideline only. This task was carried out by PACS SSRO – Green Earth. The data were collected through in-depth interviews of 'Board of Trustees' of eight CSOs (out of 15 currently working in Maharashtra), by using semi structured interview schedule. The schedule was first tested with a social organisation in Pune, and based on the responses, study areas were crystallised and sharpened. Members interviewed were found to be co operative and open and they shared freely their experiences, views, difficulties experienced in running an organisation under difficult and challenging

circumstances. A complete Report on the findings and recommendations is available separately.

To recapture what has been stated in the TNA Report, the salient points emphasised were:

Concept of Good Governance

- What is concept of good governance
- Checklist of characteristics for good governance
- Ways and means to achieve good governance
- Skills required for good governance
- Discussion on cases of NGOs having good governance
- How to use new technology in promoting good governance
- Problems faced by CSOs and ways to overcome them.

Role of Governing Board

- Effective contribution of trustees in development of organisation
- Selection of trustees
- Developing understanding and vision of governing Board
- Developing good working relationships in general and CEO in particular
- Roles and responsibilities of trustees
- Accountability towards work, people, donors and resources
- Mechanisms for internal evaluation
- Value orientation relating to obtaining financial benefits

Information Related with Procedures and Rules

- Information on Acts like Bombay Public Trusts Act, FCRA, Income Tax Act
- Updating and submitting administrative, financial, and legal records
- Changes required in these Acts
- Different legal procedures involved

Sustainability of NGOs

- Information on resource organisations supporting NGOs
- Self-existing mechanisms for NGOs and role of donor agencies.

Gender sensitivity among NGO heads and its functioning.

This was an exhaustive list of identified issues. Surely, a two-day workshop would not suffice. It was necessary to prioritise the issues and frame the agenda accordingly.

III.3.2 Preparation of Distribution Material

Folders for distribution to participants were prepared by SICP with appropriate background reading material. Material was arranged session wise and each section contained the session plan, the presentation by the resource person, and some related background reading.

A list of Resource persons with their brief profiles was also included. Each session carried an evaluation form. There was an evaluation form for the overall evaluation of the workshop also. A sample Folder was submitted to PACS, prior to the training in

Pune, for their review and suggestions. The folder was suitably modified based on the feedback.

III.3.3 Case Studies

Three case studies were commissioned and were prepared by Aarti Madhusudan who is based in the UK. They were used as teaching material during the workshop.

III.3.4 Shortlisting of and Confirmation by Resource persons

An indicative list of issues for discussion was framed and for each particular area an appropriate resource person was identified. SICP began a dialogue with approx 25 resource persons before arriving at the final seven. Most Resource persons were present for the entire duration of the program to get an overview of the direction of the workshop which was intended to guide them in their own sessions. This was in conformity with the expectations of participants as indicated in the Training Needs Report.

III.4 Structure and Methodology

The workshop was conducted in seven sessions. Each session discussed a different issue and was also facilitated by a different resource person.

The methodology was participatory for most sessions. There were cases and sub group exercises, particularly on the second day. Some sessions, however, like Credibility Norms, did not have much scope for participatory exercises. Also time limitations did not permit much exchange of experiences between participants. These issues are discussed towards the end of this Report under 'Outcomes'

The Board members of CSOs represented were a veritable storehouse of knowledge. The organisers took advantage of this and asked one participant from the group to chair each one of the sessions. Thus seven CSO participants were given the opportunity to not only represent views of the participating group, but also to steer the session, summarise the proceedings and also indicate their own opinions.

It can be observed from the Agenda – Annex 2 – that with the exception of two sessions (Gender and Credibility) there was sufficient time allocation to allow for participatory exercises and discussions. Each session allowed the resource person to make his/her presentation and also facilitate discussions on the same later.

An Open Forum was planned at the end of the first day and this provided an opportunity to participants to share their concerns and experiences. The resource person facilitated the discussions and participants were free to ask any questions relating to good governance practices or comment on any issue of concern to them. Participants expressed greater involvement in the proceedings as a result of this session.

It may not be out of place to mention that the workshop was planned as a two-day exercise with an additional evening for registrations, introductions and discussions on expectations. Focus was on several issues (as will be evident from Annex 2) and efforts were made to keep the sessions as participatory as possible. While it may be legitimate

for participants to demand completely participatory exercises, there is also a danger of the proceedings to move off track in such situations. Since the workshop was planned both as a medium of imparting knowledge regarding good governance practices as well as debate and discuss problems unique to the participating organisations in introducing these practices, some amount of 'structuring' was necessarily a prerequisite. At times "ideal" situations had to be pointed out – but these were more to make a point rather than indicate that organisations needed to conform to them. The format was thus a mix of formal presentations interspersed and followed by discussions.

Session wise evaluations were carried out at the end of each session. An overall evaluation of the entire workshop is available and the findings are presented as **Annex 11**.

III.5 Objectives of the Workshop

- a. To provide awareness on a wide range of issues of effective governance.
- b. To build capacities of the top decision making and governing level for improved NGO governance, through Board development measures.
- c. To share and disseminate 'best practices' in governance.
- d. To help participants in identification of key areas for improvement in good governance practices and to suggest appropriate methodology/practices.
- e. To develop a Follow up procedure for tracking and ensuring implementation of good governance practices highlighted during training.

III.6 Profile of Participating CSO's

A total of 13 partner organisations of PACS program in Maharashtra participated. Two other partners (Sandhniketan and IYW) were not represented. Specific geographical areas represented were Parbhani, Beed, Yavatmal, Aurangabad, Latur, Osmanabad, Jalna and Nanded districts.

Two Board members represented each organisation. However, while Paryay had three participants, GRASP, and Yuwagram was represented by only one member each. The target group for most organisations consisted of women, migrant labour, landless farmers, children, SC/ST and nomadic tribes. Almost all organisations were in existence for more than 9 years.

It may be worthwhile noting that the two partners who were not represented have been in existence for 24 and 31 years respectively.

Annex 1 is a matrix showing the important parameters of the participating organisations, and a brief analysis of their significant features.

In addition to the CSO participants, there were six members representing PACS- MC team, and four from Green Earth. There were seven resource persons – most of them stayed for the entire duration of the program. SIPC was represented by its Executive Director, who also served as a resource person, and a Senior Program Officer incharge of the Governance workshop. The workshop had two visitors from Action Aid and Info Change. This makes it a total of 46 participants.

III.7 Constraints and Challenges

1. The Training Needs Assessment report was made available to the organisers approx. two weeks prior to the commencement of the program. The agenda needed to be organised into sessions in the meantime, even though tentatively. The urgency to do this is self-explanatory. The resource persons needed to be booked and informed about the sessions they were required to take. However, once the TNA Report arrived, the recommendations were studied and the observations in the Report were not far removed from what had already been incorporated in the Agenda. Broadly the agenda issues incorporated most of the concerns expressed by Board members. The agenda was formally then finalized. However, in the course of discussions, the degree of flexibility involving change was understandably limited.
2. The language for communication was a constraint. Participants expressed their inability to communicate in English or Hindi. While the participants spoke only in Marathi (which was translated for the benefit of those who did not know Marathi), the resource persons spoke largely in Hindi or Marathi. This, however, limited the expressions and communications to some extent, and some valuable time was lost in translations.
3. Most participants were senior members in their Trusts and had considerable grassroots as well as "Trustee" experience, and even though they had been briefed about the purpose of the workshop, there was an unstated and unfounded reservation that coloured their initial responses and kept them 'holding back' their participative spirit. This became a constraint in reaching out to the participants by the resource persons and the organisers initially. However, happily, these perceptions were short lived and changed positively as the workshop progressed.
4. The summing up session attempted to remove some of the reservations expressed informally by members. The Management Consultants representative clarified that the workshop in no way had the agenda to suggest introduction of new practices in the existing systems of governance. There was also no suggestion that existing Boards needed to be changed wholesale. Further, SICP's Executive Director, pointed out that Ramayana paints the ideal situation and provides models for behaviour, though adopting all of such practices may not achieve everything. So also, it was understood and appreciated by both the donors and the organisers that due to difficult ground realities it may not be possible to immediately adopt the good practices discussed. Everyone could take from the workshop the learning that was relevant to his or her own situation. Good governance was, in fact, in their own self-interest.
5. Time limitations did not permit the much needed peer exchange of experiences. The agenda's design included too many issues.

Comment [DAK1]: It may be – participants were more convenient in Marathi rather than English and Hindi

IV: Day wise Session Reports

IV.1 Pre Workshop Evening

A pre workshop evening was planned, on the first day with a view to go right away into the workshop mode the next day, and in addition provide an informal evening for

interactions. The formal registration being over, an icebreaker was planned. However, the general consensus was that given the seniority and vast experience of participants, there might not be much appreciation regarding any formal and accepted methodology of introductions. The SSRO – who was familiar with all members, took it upon himself to introduce each participant briefly.

PACS Program Manager and Executive Director of SICP then explained the objectives of the program. This was followed by a discussion on what participants understood by 'governance', the challenges/constraints faced by them and their expectations from the workshop. Following is a listing of observations made by participants.

Issues in Governance

Participants Understanding of Meaning of Governance and Role of Boards

1. Governance is sustainable development (owned by people)
2. Role of Boards is to give direction
3. Good governance streamlines work and makes it more effective
4. Formalisation of working of organisation (professionalisation)
5. Collective decision making
6. Working effectively towards realisation of MISSION
7. Process of implementation of vision and mission

Problems Faced by CSOs – as expressed by them

1. How to ensure involvement of Board members.
2. Lack of knowledge of legal and fiscal infrastructure
3. Lack of knowledge of roles and responsibilities on being a Board member
4. Difficulty in getting /recruiting volunteers on Board
5. Criteria of selection of members
6. Conflict Resolution
7. Fund raising
8. Accountability to all stake holders
9. Gender representation
10. Bringing change/continuity/fresh blood
11. Composition
12. Splitting of Board and Crisis Management
13. Leadership
14. Management and Implementation
15. Building consensus on policy issues
16. Setting up Norms
17. Managing external environment in relate to fund raising?
18. Can a trustee receive any benefits from organisation?
19. Board – staff relationship
20. Limitations/Interference by donors (managing pressures), (managing relationships with donors).
21. Monitoring Board. Evaluation of Board performance. Who does it?
22. Role of Board in managing growth
23. Board accountability /role in organisation image building.

On reviewing the structure of the workshop as planned by organisers and the proposed agenda by participants as indicated above, it was felt that the planned structure largely covered most of the points mentioned above. Nevertheless this pre-conference feedback was shared with the resource persons the next day to facilitate them provide a relevant focus to their presentations.

Expectations of participants

Mainly to gain information and share experiences. Also develop certain parameters based on which their future activities could be assessed on the issue of good governance. In their words they are as follows:

1. Learning characteristics of good Board
2. Experience sharing – feedback from others
3. Agreement on a common action/follow up program
4. Know that good governance is possible (conviction)
5. Group to produce faculty for further workshops.

Day 2

The theme for the second day of the workshop was "Boards: Assets or Liabilities". Three sessions were planned for this day.

IV. 2 Session 1

Role of Boards in Governance

Good governance is the price we pay for the freedom to exercise power and authority in a free, enlightened and democratic society

IV.2.1 Concepts

Session Plan: The structure of the session involved three resource persons. The session began with discussion on roles and responsibilities of Board members, and legal compliance. Then followed a discussion on vision and mission statements. Finally there was a presentation and discussion on understanding financials.

The session began by pointing out the kinds of governing Boards for Not for Profit organisations these included:

- a. Board of Trustees (in a Trust)
- b. Managing Committee or Governing Council (in a Society)
- c. Board of Directors (in a section 25 company).

A. Role of Boards in Governance-

Began with an overview of governance. Good governance is a transparent decision making process in which the leadership of the organisation, in an effective and accountable way, directs resources and exercises power on the basis of shared values. As the organisation passes through the stages of its life cycle (forming, norming, transforming, conforming), the governing body's style may need to change, but the basic areas of responsibility remain the same.

The key areas of responsibility pointed out were:

- a. Mission and Vision: A mission statement is like a road map for the organisation while the vision statement is the final destination the organisation is attempting to arrive at.
- b. Oversight: or overseeing the management of the organisation. These are checks and balances that include significant legal and ethical obligations, relationship with staff, particularly the CEO. Oversight is particularly important because public charitable trusts are often the subject of intense public scrutiny. Financial information and openness and honesty in maintaining financial statements are essential elements of good governance. Avoidance of conflict of interest and evaluation of the overall performance and effectiveness of the organisation to ensure that the organisation is serving the community within its mission are essential
- c. Resources: Is the most challenging responsibility including both financial and human resources. Skills needed are development of strategy for fund raising, actual fund raising, diligence in reviewing financial reports, and contribution in terms of time, skill and influence to raising money.
- d. Outreach: Members provide links to the community in which the organisation operates. Outreach can be to potential donors and to community at large that would benefit from the organisation activities.

B: Determine the Organization's Vision and Mission

NPOs exist because of values, compassion, equal opportunity social justice, and belief in gratitude, repaying a debt to society and social progress. One way of communicating these values is through vision and mission statements. A vision is a "guiding image of success formed in terms of a situation you want to see, in terms of a contribution to society", while a mission statement is why you do what you do. It is the organisation's reason for being.

Purpose of vision/mission statements

Vision and mission statements are not only words, but are statements arrived through consensus, shared understanding.

Creating a Vision/Mission statement involves understanding of the belief, values and environment of organisations by board members. Review and Revision are necessary periodically.

Group Exercise

1. A simple interactive exercise to analyse and discuss shared and common understanding between the CEO and a Board member of the mission and how it had been arrived at, was planned. However, both because of lack of time, and because many organisations did not have a CEO and a Trustee as two distinct categories, this could not be carried out.

Participants were handed out a checklist for a good vision and mission statement. They were requested to go through their vision/mission statements and analyse it against each of the points in the checklist. This is attached as Annex 3. This activity will form a part of the post workshop Follow up work.

C: Understanding Financials

Separate legal entity is required for NGOs to adhere to various legal statutes and ensure compliances on an ongoing basis.

Legal Identity

Created by registration under the following laws:

1. As a Society under the Societies Registration Act 1860
2. As a Company under The Companies Act 1956
3. As a Trust under General Law with guidance from:
 - a. Charitable and Religious Trusts Act 1920
 - b. Religious Endowment Act 1863
 - c. Bombay Public Trusts Act 1950

Points relating to Evidence of Creation of registered bodies in the form of certificates were pointed out.

After having been registered it is important to obtain mandatory approvals/registrations under the Income Tax Act 1961,

The various laws require that a not for profit organisation functions within the prescribed broad legal parameters. Issues in maintenance of account book in relation to Foreign Contributions (Regulation) Act 1976, and Income Tax Act 1961 was pointed out.

Audit of the annual financial statements and the books of account are required to be undertaken. Accounting standards (AS) normally applicable to NGOs were explained. Preparation of statement of accounts for audit was also explained.

Compliances with regard to various requirements greatly facilitate accountability and transparency to the stakeholders leading to good governance and greater confidence. Legal and financial requirements under the Bombay Public Trusts Act were given out as handouts as ready reference material.

IV.2.2 Discussion

- Board members need to understand the Legal/statutory duties and responsibilities. The responsibilities vary from providing leadership (vision, mission, planning, setting policy), to stewardship (managing, monitoring the implementation of the program) and lastly trusteeship (understanding and accepting the legal/fiscal accountability to all the stakeholders). Participants were in agreement with the importance of this need.
- There was lack of uniformity and standardisation with regard to various regulations and the Board members need to be knowledgeable about them.
- The peculiar situation in Maharashtra was to set up a society and also register it as a Trust, while the reverse was not required. Hence most NGOs register themselves as Trusts alone. This saves them the problems associated with the dual registration and accountability.
- Boards outreach includes the needs and interests of all stakeholders. Some thought needs to be given to how these can be included and integrated in the Board processes.

- In most trusts and societies the CEO was the chief of Staff and carried out the day to day work by allocating it to various members. However, the organisations represented consisted of only one Managing Trustee, who was entrusted with the responsibility of program implementation, fund raising, decision making etc. Under these circumstances Managing Trustees found themselves frequently engaged in multi tasking and carrying out tasks not directly related to their roles and responsibilities.
- This part of the session was very interactive since most of the participants had questions to be answered by the resource person who was a qualified CA. Clearly this indicates the existence of a demand for legal and financial information.

IV.3 Session 2 **Creating Good Boards**

A Board member's success is determined not only by her/his business skills and experience, but also by her/his personality traits, or character.

IV.3.1 Concepts

Serving as a Board member is one of the most challenging and rewarding of honorary assignments. Board members have important legal and fiduciary responsibilities that require a commitment of time, skill, and resources.

Governance of NGOs

In NGOs the legislative functions are handled by the General body, judicial functions by Board members, and the Executive Functions by CEO and Managers. In handling Financial governance, Kautilya's principles of 'Raksha' – Protection of wealth, 'Vridhi'- Enhancement of wealth, 'Palana'- subsistence through wealth, and, 'Yogakshema'- safeguarding the value/purpose are helpful.

Types of Boards

The character and issues associated with Family Boards, Invisible Boards, Staff Boards, and Professional Boards were discussed. While the membership and style of NGO Boards is one representing a family, this often becomes limiting for its growth, expansion and accountability. The line between governance and day to day management gets hazy and confused. Efforts need to be made to make the Boards move towards 'professional', which can be difficult in terms of skills and commitment.

Change in Priorities in governance in an NGO

The life cycle of an NGO determines the nature and character of governance structure and role. In the formative stage Boards need to provide support and space for founders to make a base and establish the organisation. Most participating NGOs had however, crossed that stage of development. Boards need to become more formal in structure and professional in process in the growth and consolidation stage of an NGO. In the maturing stage, there needs to be a rebirth or death – here Boards need to become more supportive and provide space for newly appointed persons to redevelop the organisation.

Founder Leader and Managing Change for the founder leader

In most NGOs it is the founder leader providing bulk of the ideas and energy. Positives are quick results and timely action taken, however, for long term organisation sustainability there is a need to develop beyond the vision and leadership of the founder.

The Board needs to be strengthened to become capable of supporting a transition period, affirm the achievements of the founder leader and take time to plan change and also recognise the pain of change.

Governance and Accountability

A Board's first duty was to govern, to determine the ends for which the organisation exists. It is to discern, to think, to exercise judgment and to plan. Sadly, many members do not think for themselves. They become very good at sensing which way the wind is blowing and predictably vote with the majority. They lack confidence in what they believe. Not wanting to embarrass themselves they take refuge in the majority – to get along...you go along.

Getting Good people/skills on Board

As indicated earlier, as the organisation develops and the diversity in programs/areas increases, the skills on Board become a necessity. The Board needs to move from family to professional and expand to include specific skill requirements that may be beneficial to the work of the organisation. A strategic thinking Board focuses its communication on important and key issues of the organisation. Boards can learn to be strategic.

Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest arises whenever the personal or professional interests of a Board member are potentially at odds with the best interests of the organisation. Such conflicts are common, like, a Board member performing professional services for the organisation, or proposing that a relative or friend be considered for some position in the organisation. Such instances may be of interest and benefit to the organisation, but may lead to misunderstandings. However, these issues can be resolved if the Board members decide not to act on financial self-interest and prevent the organisation from operating in a manner that favors board member.

Group Exercise

A handout stating the "ten basic responsibilities of non profit boards" was distributed. Participants were required to identify areas where their Board was strongest and where it needed strengthening. Reflections on filled out forms to be done individually and with members.

IV.3.2 Discussion

- The required commitment of time and effort was of utmost significance to participants. While there was some truth in getting skills on Board, some participants expressed resentment towards the idea of introduction of new members. Perception was that the organisations were functioning well and existing structure was well equipped to handle situations/problems.
- The need to restructure and expand was perceived as being thrust on them – perhaps by the donor.
- It was suggested that upgradation of existing skills through appropriate training and exposure may perhaps provide an alternative to getting new individuals on Board.
- There were difficulties in the recruitment of strategic thinkers (skills). There are very few available and those who do exist are stretched too thin to spend time on planning. At best they are guest advisors only.
- Given the realities in rural areas or small NGOs, participants challenged the practicality of having only non-related members on Boards
- Introduction of change was accepted by participants as good theory only. They pointed out that in the light of difficulties and inadequacies of getting skilled board members it becomes necessary to continue the work of the organisation with existing members who had proved themselves to be dedicated and committed. Change of Board members should not be advocated simply for the sake of theory.
- Organisations do have the best and brightest to sit on their Boards. However, often times these talented individuals are not involved completely in the decision making or problem solving of the organisation. Often times they end up as recipients of series of progress reports. Many of the strategic questions are either not taken up for discussion for lack of time, or not given adequate attention as they are not in consonance with the founders thinking or challenge the leadership of the organisation. There was a need to provide more space to the existing members, which may, perhaps, add to the effectiveness of the organisation.
- A conflict of interest policy should be framed as a practice of good governance. Among other issues this may include issues concerning voting rights when both husband and wife (and additional family members) are members in the same Board.
- Gender issues. Difficulties in getting appropriate and qualified women on Board were discussed. To facilitate this process a consensus on adjustment of expectations in terms of timings, travel etc could be a way out. Further a woman Board member need not be necessarily involved in every decision making process of the organisation. Her presence and inputs could be taken on issues concerning her specific area of skill and knowledge.

IV.4 Quest for Credibility

Do the Watchdogs need watching?

IV. 4.1 Concepts

This session was planned as an evening session on the first day of the workshop. It had been a long and intense day of reflections and discussions. However, the theme chosen was one of much interest to the participants.

Reasons behind credibility norms

The growing role of government funding and support to the voluntary sector has raised questions about the state of governance in this sector. It is argued that the government is responsible to the Legislature, which is accountable through the electoral process, whereas private corporates are subject to the discipline of the market and face bankruptcy for failure to perform. Who are the voluntary agencies accountable to? What are the ethics and values underlying voluntary work particularly in the case of large scale funding?

These questions are important because of:

1. the reach and size of the voluntary sector
2. the attitude of voluntary sector to critique other sectors of society.

Monitoring and Evaluation of the voluntary sector

A number of laws and regulations in the legal/statutory areas exist for governing this sector. However, there are limitations due to the extent of the applicability, their relevance and adequacy. For example, the transparency requirements of the registration acts are still minimal and differ across states leading to lack of uniformity.

Donor Evaluation

Typically carried out at three levels: prefunding appraisal, monitoring of projects and post evaluation.

Variations in procedures and guidelines differ from state to state in relation to government funding.

Variations also exist in the basic minimum norms prescribed by various government agencies. (Examples of CAPART and Department of Social Justice Department where the duration of bank accounts held by voluntary agencies differ pointed out).

Self regulatory frameworks

In 1980s a draft bill envisaging an all India Council, which would lay down and uphold certain values and modes of behavior was made.

In 1997 attempts to validate the voluntary sector were carried out by the Charities Aid Foundation on behalf of the Planning Commission. A total of only 1342 organisation responded to certain set parameters.

In 2001 several NGOs came together to consider the feasibility of a self-regulatory framework built by the sector for establishment of 'credibility norms'. This group was named "Credibility Alliance".

Draft Norms

These ensure good governance in the sector and are at three levels.

1. Minimum norms which all consenting members must voluntarily adopt

2. Desirable norms which organisations must move over a period of time , and,
3. Good practices which are recommendatory in nature.

The minimum norms comprise a Panchsheel of five basic criteria: Identity, Vision/aims/objectives/and achievements, governance, operations, and, accountability and transparency.

At the same time Government of India, through SOSVA, has recommended establishment of an autonomous agency, managed largely by the voluntary agencies, for the accreditation of NGOs through a peer review system.

IV.4.2 Discussion

- Participants expressed interest not only in the process of drafting of norms, but also what these norms were.
- A handout on the "Draft Norms for enhancing the credibility of the voluntary sector' in Marathi translation, was distributed to the participants, to serve as a ready reckoner on what these norms were.
- There was willingness on the part of most participants to implement the required norms for better governance in their organisations. This was definitely a positive outcome.
- Some went further to make a commitment to participate in credibility alliance process. **A count on how many sign up and for what reasons would be part of the envisaged Follow Up plan of action.**

Day 3

The theme for the last day was "Bridging Role of Boards". Four sessions were conducted on this day.

IV.5 Women Hold up Half the sky

Women hold up half the sky, but get less than half the pie.

IV.5.1 Concepts

What is gender

Is a value-loaded term and refers to the social differences between men and women that are learnt and are dynamic.

Gender Assessment

At the world level only 98.6% women for every 100 men. Among the states in India Kerala is closest to having 50 – 50 population figures for men and women. The state of Haryana has only 46% women compared to almost 54% men.

However, women status has improved and the 10th Plan strategy combines high growth with equitable growth, social development and good governance as a priority.

Gender Change

Restructuring of patterns of interaction between men and women in the family/community and society are needed.

Institutions, particularly CSOs have important roles to ensure their commitment to gender equality.

Institutional level

Changes at policy level, Structure, Benefits, and Approaches and Strategies to be framed for integration of gender were discussed.

Gender Budgeting

Is a dissection of the budget to establish its gender commitments into budgetary commitments. Gender budget tracking to ensure valid flow of funds was explained.

Gender Sensitive Governance

A gendered approach to planning offers solutions to many of the challenges. Women's participation needs to be harnessed. Process could be through interventions in mechanism, budget, policies and programs.

One needs to make changes in the style of management to allow a more democratic and empowering system of participation for both men and women.

IV.5.2 Discussion

- Only one woman participant representing a CSO Board highlighted the need for more gender representation on Boards.
- Some participants, while being desirous and willing to get women on Board, expressed their inability to find them. It was difficult to find suitable and keen women, particularly in the geographical areas they were working in.
- Participants were of the view that women could not and did not have the adequate time to attend to Board meetings and organisational work. It was suggested that one needs to consult the women trustees as to when and how to reach women in the community. Certainly there were ways in which the Board could accommodate and tailor its programs to overcome such difficulties.

IV.6 Engaging the Board

Congratulations! You have just joined the Board of a CSO! Now you need to join the bandwagon of 'movers and shakers'. But ... just how?

IV.6.1 Concepts

Four subgroups were formed. Each group participated in discussions and made a presentation on his/her group's thinking. The issues were- How to:

1. Provide external perspective and vision
2. Define organisations role in influencing public policy
3. Build credibility locally and involve stakeholders in management
4. Adopt participant's suggestions for strategies for financial sustainabilityThe responses were as follows:

Group 1: Provide External Perspective and Vision:

- Increase rapport with other like minded visionary, experienced and successful NGOs.
- Brain storming, positive discussion through interaction with expert, consultant about vision among Board members. (Books/Internet/Study tour/Exposure visit)
- Capacity building of Board members through seminar /conference/ workshop)
- Collaboration and interaction with other NGO network
- Sharing experience from other sectors like private, govt., media, international
- Updating Board by providing current knowledge, situation, information affecting organisation vision like WTO, 73 rd amendment etc.

Group 2 : Organisation's role in influencing public policy

1. Panchayati karan
 - Women to become participants in Gram Sabha
 - Rights to be given to women sarpanch
 - Advocate formation of Women Sabha before Gram Sabha
 - Influence to bring about change in non cooperative behaviour of gram members
 - Change attitudes of men
 - Motivate people
 - Generate awareness
 - Leadership change
 - Increase self confidence
 - Decrease women oppression

2. Income generation activities

Group 3: Building Credibility locally involving stake holders

Stakeholders: Intervention community, PRI, Professional Experts We reaffirm and ratify the proposition that there is need of involving stake holders for credibility

a. Challenges: nobody of high social status on Board affects credibility with donors, and Donor should be a non interfering partner

Group 4: Fund Raising Strategies for Sustainability

Income Generating Programs (IGP) for raising local resources were suggested and were being increasingly adopted by the participating CSO's.

Self Assessment by the Governing Board –

- IGPs, Training Centers for all, providing consultancy services and linkages with government, raise donations

- Providing training to other organisations: IGP – income generation for income sharing by creating infrastructure (processing and Branding and Marketing)
- Raise Funds from donor organisations (govt., Banks, Funding agencies)
- Trying out various methods to raise the funds
- Giving responsibilities to some GB members for fund raising
- The two important points which emerged were:
 1. There is a shift in thinking in relation to local resource mobilisation and Fund Raising. They have acquired greater significance.
 2. The jury is still out on how much time and effort should go into fund raising as opposed to the real work of the organisation.

IV.6.2 Discussion

- New and younger members on Board was a good way for sustaining interest levels and keeping the Board engaged. However, participants had some reservations on the efficacy of such an exercise. They believed that this may, perhaps, have a reverse effect as there was a possibility of the "dreams" being diluted by new members.
- Also, sometimes the level of commitment in new members may not equal their personal commitment.
- Too often, Board meetings are routine and incidental information providers. To sustain interests/motivation levels, Boards need to be specific about what they want their members to do. This may mean soliciting individual and skill specific involvement. Specific skill related individual presence means all Trustees need not be present for all meetings.
- An alternative form of organisation – a two-tier Board could be constituted, where a specific Advisory Board may be set up to which persons possessing exceptional skills may be elected/appointed.
- There was a need to expand the Board in many organisations.
- Board composition needs to go beyond family and friends. Ideally, they should have between themselves subject matter familiarity, grip over legal and financial framework, ability to raise funds, monitor programs and relate well to the external environment – donors, target groups, government and any other stakeholders.
- It is a myth that only retired people have the time and are willing to join the Board. While it may be difficult to get good members, one needs to make the effort to cast the net wide, as governance is everything.
- Orientation to new members post induction is a prerequisite to good governance. There is a need for them to familiarise themselves with the organisation's mission, strategy, its programs and other related issues.
- Board -community/beneficiaries/target group relationship threw up interesting ideas. There is a general belief that Board members selected from the target community is advantageous as they bring to the Board relevant experience and unique perspectives of a particular segment of the organisation's constituency and its functioning. In addition, inviting a member from the target group on the Board may serve as a model. The example of Kutch Mahila Sangathan was discussed. However, it was felt that while it may not be a difficult proposition to include persons from the target community in rural and informal CSO's, in a more formal set up, the backgrounds would be very different and diverse and this may not really work.
- An alternative could be to provide back up information to Panchayat women and help them to orient themselves towards integration in the Board activities.

IV.7 The Board in Action

A good Board is a victory not a gift. Everyday planning should be ongoing and meaningful – not just another 'best practice' that is adopted with fanfare and quickly forgotten.

IV.7.1 Concepts

A: Conducting Effective Meetings

The processes and procedures of fixing and conducting meetings were discussed with a view to making them more effective.

Prioritizing Issues on Agenda

Often organisations have a long list of issues to be taken up for discussion at the Board meeting. In such cases to save time and sustain interests, prioritisation of issues is necessary.

A case entitled 'Board Meeting Madness' *Annex 4* was distributed and two volunteers were asked to prioritise the issues on the agenda according to their perceptions. The two differing versions are attached as *Annex 5a and 5b*. Discussions followed and the following points emerged:

Improving Meeting Productivity

While planning a meeting adequate attention needs to be paid to the following:

- Relate specific agenda items to the larger goals of the organisations,
- Determine in advance the two or three critical questions that need to be addressed once an item is placed on the agenda .
- Provide related information to assist studying the problem in question
- Indicate whether the Board is to give advice or take a decision?
- Arrange the agenda to allow important issues to be addressed
- Establish a consent agenda that includes routine items requiring Board's approval
- Invite committees and staff to report at the meeting only when they need guidance or action from the Board.

Helping Meetings Run Smoothly

Care to be taken on the following issues:

- Schedule meetings well in advance
- Distribute the agenda with supporting documents at least one week prior to meeting
- Insist that people come prepared for the meeting
- Ensure that conversation stays on track and agenda is respected
- Begin and end meeting punctually.

B. Evaluation of Board Performance

Importance of evaluation

The Board needs to periodically assess how well it is functioning and to identify areas where the Board as a whole might need to improve. For an assessment of this a Board Meeting Evaluation format - *Annex 6* was handed out to participants.

Due to lack of time, the format could not be taken up for discussion. However, the Board members were requested to reflect on the issues listed and evaluate themselves objectively. **This could be part of the Follow Up Action Plan.**

IV.7.2 Discussion

- The procedures for setting up a meeting were well received. Participants were desirous of adopting the procedures as a good governance practice.
- Annual self-appraisal of Board's contribution to the organisation, collectively and severally, did not evoke much response. While most agreed that there clearly was a need, the mechanisms required further discussions.

IV.8 Governance vs Management

No single relationship in the organization is as important as that between the board and its chief executive officer. Probably no single relationship is as easily misconstrued or has such dire potential consequences. That relationship, well conceived, can set the stage for effective governance and management.

IV.8.1 Concepts

The session began with a role-play. Four participants constituted the Board and discussed mechanisms and processes for expansion of existing program and arrangement of funds. One person was the Chair and had to deal with another Board member who had different set of views.

Importance of the relationship between Board and CEO

The participants were divided into four groups and were given different cases for analysis. The cases dealt with issues concerning the relationship between the Board and the CEO. As most participating organisations did not have CEOs, they were asked to presume that the Managing Trustee is the CEO. In actual fact he is the CEO, as, besides being on the Board, he/she is also managing the day to day affairs of the organisation.

The cases are attached as *Annex 7*.
Each group made its presentation and discussions followed.

IV.8.2 Discussion

- The working and interdependent relationship between the Managing trustee and other Board members was perceived and accepted to be of critical importance.
- Over involvement/ micro management by the Board, or the CEO making decisions belonging actually to the Board could at times be unhelpful. The roles therefore need to be delineated and clearly defined.
- The life cycles of organisations are dynamic and change all the time. There is a need to revisit the set boundaries between the Board and CEO at every new stage of development.
- To a very large extent the cases helped in understanding the differing and different roles. However, increased relevance and meaning could have been obtained if they were developed locally.

V Outcomes

V.1 Positive Outcomes

1. The workshop was a "first" in many ways. It is true that there are not adequate studies/examples on governance available in the development sector and this workshop provided the first exposure provided to participant group.
2. A majority of the participants expressed verbally, and through their evaluations, Annex –11 that they had gained from the exercise.
3. As a test pilot it enabled organisers to understand, in more detail, the process of fulfilling participant needs more effectively. These became more especially relevant when dealing with small NGO groups operating in or for rural areas.
4. Enough material was provided and exchanged in terms of thoughts and theory. Adequate time, however, needs to be budgeted for reflections and introduction of certain good governance practices.
5. Some Indian case material has been made available in this field for the first time.
6. There was a consensus among participants on a common minimum program that they would try and put in place.

V.2 Follow up Plan of Action

Participant Consensus

The workshop led to the adoption of an **agreed common action plan**. This may be taken as a historic event heralding a new beginning for PACS, even though there was no agreement on time lines.

The **Agreed Common Action Plan** covered the following issues:

1. Planning For More Effective Board Meetings:

- a. Regularity
- b. Scheduling meetings with adequate advance information
- c. Agenda predetermined and circulated/ decided at time of meeting
- d. Material prepared for Board meetings
- e. Recording Minutes

2. Review, Discuss and Revise, if necessary, vision/Mission Statements

3. The Budget –Future Plans of the organisation to be jointly reviewed and agreed

4. In terms of Composition of Board they would attempt to

- a. Clarify Roles and expectations of members
- b. Get skilled members on Board
- c. Give inputs to activate women members
- d. If there are no women members, try to get them on Board

5. Make attempts to increase participation of Trustees in Field level Programs

6. Work towards Consensus Building among members

7. Build and strengthen a network of partners.

Methodology to track the changes towards 'good governance' practices will be worked out in the Follow Up Stage.

VI. Recommendations

The field of governance is a relatively new field. Very few workshops have been held in this area. Those that have been held have been largely for urban-based organisations. This was a first attempt at organising a workshop for NGO Boards at a district level. A number of valuable lessons have emerged which would guide future directions. These are:

1. The lead-time in the preparation and organisation of a workshop of this nature is important and crucial, particularly in terms of its effectiveness. This should involve study of
 - a. Participants and their organisations. Sufficient time needs to be provided to organisers to study the respective Boards, their compositions and interact with a few members. This would result in the much-needed 'participant profile'. This may be done in an unstructured way.
 - b. Participant expectations and needs through a training needs analysis – structured.
 - c. The TNA to be conducted concluded and recommendations made available atleast a month before the scheduled date of training, to facilitate development of need based agenda, mobilising support (resource persons etc), and sharing of recommendations with concerned facilitators.
2. The workshop emphasised the importance of communication in the local language, and therefore the need to build up a cadre of trainers from the local language gains further relevance. The Resource Persons were experts in their respective areas, however, even though they all tried hard to speak either in Marathi or simple Hindi the participants all spoke in Marathi only – this severely constrained the communications.
3. Exchange of experiences and peer learning has its own relevance. Design of agenda should allow adequate time for this to happen.
4. Not more than two sessions per day should be the norm for such programs. Ideally only brief presentations followed by group exercises and discussions would be the appropriate methodology.
5. Articulation of roles and responsibilities of partners when more than one organization is involved in the planning and implementation of the workshop/program is necessary.
6. There is a need to develop and strengthen the research and pedagogy for the subject, to assist in the design and conduct of workshops. More cases and examples from the field level need to be developed. The mechanism for 'mapping' and developing such cases so as to enable trainers to use them as teaching cases need to be worked out.
7. "Best practices" need to be documented and exposure of participants to such organisations made possible.
8. As long as the sessions related to aspects dealing with regulations – legal or financial – essential for the functioning of the organisation, sustained interest of participants was observed. However, sessions recommending the introduction of changes – in attitudes, mindset, alterations in composition of Boards etc, met with fair amount of resistance and resentment. This leads to two conclusions:
 - a. Organise programs dealing with legal/financial functioning issues more frequently, or allocate longer length of time on them in each program.
 - b. Provide adequate time for 'preparing' the participants and 'readying' them.

9. Work out carefully the duration of the workshop and the number of sessions. Seven sessions spread over two days was an intense program. Success of the program would depend largely on how well one incorporates reflections on grassroots experience alongside provision of information/knowledge. One way could be holding shorter modules – theme based – these could be 'legal compliance and financial understanding' (a theme which is perceived as most relevant), followed by 'issues in Board compositions' (getting good people, skills, keeping the Board engaged, etc), and a module on Board processes (meetings, procedures, hiring, evaluations). Other methods need to be worked out jointly with participating CSO Board members.
10. Some participants expressed the need to re- understand, promote and revisit organisations vision /mission in the light of new activities and achievements. Follow up procedures need to take this into account.
11. There needs to be a prioritisation for implementation in the indicators of 'good governance practices'. Dialogue with participating Board members is essential, as these may be different for different groups. Implementation to be introduced in a phased manner – again, depending upon the need and circumstances of the organisation.
12. In view of the fact that there was only one woman Board member among 26 others, modalities for gender representation need to be given importance.
13. Identification of trainers from within the participant group needs to be made simultaneously. This would create a valuable local resource pool, and ensure continuity in terms of setting up follow up procedures and widening the net to include 'network partners'.
14. Finally, there is a need for clear articulation of expectations between donor and grantees.

Annex1

Workshop On "Effective Boards For Effective Governance"

For PACS partner CSOs in Maharashtra

Pune May 31 – Jun 2, 2004

Brief Profile of Participating CSOs

Name of Organisation	Founder	Age of Orgn	Background of members	Beneficiary Group	Activity
Gramin Vikas Mandal	Group of like minded youths	19	SSC and Post graduates	Women, weaker sections	Service Delivery
Grassroots Action For Social Participation		12		Women, Poor	Service delivery Advocacy
Indira Gram Sudhar Sanstha		17		Women, Migrant labour Marginal farmers	Service Delivery
Janvikas Samajik Sanstha		9		SC, ST, Women, Children, Landless Farmers	Advocacy Capacity Building
Marathwada Sheti Sahayya Mandal	Male, Bar at law	30	Public Trust, Professionals	Small/marginal farmers,	Service Delivery
Paryay	Group of like minded collegians	10	Post graduates in social work	Child labour, women, nomadic tribes, landless farmers	Advocacy Service Delivery
Rural Development Center	Group of dalit group	19	Advocate	Dalit community, nomadic and criminal castes	Community mobilisation Advocacy Service Delivery

Name of Organisation	Founder	Age of orgn	Background of members	Beneficiary Group	Activity
Sahayog Nirmitee		11	Graduates and Post graduates	Women	Community mobilisation Service Delivery
Sandhi Niketan Shikshan Sansthan	Teacher	24		Physically challenged, Women	Service Delivery
Sankalp Manav Vikas Sanstha		12	HSC, and graduates	Dalits, Tribals	Advocacy, Service Delivery Capacity Building
Socio Economic Development Cooperation		24		Women, Children, Youth, Farmers	Service Delivery Advocacy Capacity Building
Yuva Gram Vikas Mandal		19		Backward classes, Landless and marginal farmers, Women	Service Delivery Advocacy Capacity Building
ASMITA Institute of Development	Group of youth (men and women)	9	Professionals in Social Work	Women, Local government officials	Service Delivery Advocacy Training (Capacity Building)
Bhartiya D. B. Gramin Vikas Sanstha	Group of young professionals	9	Post Graduates	SC, ST, Women, Adolescent Boys and Girls	Service Delivery Advocacy Capacity Building through training for other NGOs

Name of Organisation	Founder	Age of orgn	Background of members	Beneficiary Group	Activity
Indian Institute of Youth Welfare		31	Post graduates and professionals	Other NGOs	Training Capacity Building

Source: Training Needs Assessment Report by Green Earth, Pune

Highlights from NGO profiles and Training Needs Analysis

The participating CSOs ranged from being 9 to 31 years old.

Women are direct beneficiaries for 11 of the 15 participating CSOs

However, names of only two women figure in the list of participants from CSOs who were part of Training Needs Analysis exercise.

Lack of professional and educated women members on governing boards.

Tremendous **variation in the professional expertise** of Board members. .

There is **no representation from the beneficiary community**.

Trustees have assigned roles among themselves, but **some lack professional expertise** in carrying out responsibilities

No clearly defined concepts of good governance in NGOs established in the last 10 years or so

No clarity on commonly shared vision on **vision/mission** of organisation

Internal mechanism for evaluating trustees performance is almost absent.

Annex 2



EFFECTIVE BOARDS FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE

Workshop For PACS Partner NGOs in Maharashtra

PUNE, 31 May – 2 June

Monday, 31 May, 2004:

Day 1: Pre Conference Evening

4.00 –6.00 pm Registration
7.30 pm Ice Breaker and Finalisation of Agenda
Welcome dinner

Tuesday, 1st June 2004

Day 2: Boards: Assets or Liabilities

9.00 - 9.30 Welcome and Introduction
"Importance of Good Boards
for Good Governance" Pushpa Sundar, SICP
"Need for Program –
PACS perspective " Kiran Sharma, PACS
Session 1
9.30 – 1.30 Role of Boards in Governance
Roles and Responsibilities: Overview Noshir Dadrawala, CAP
Vision/Mission Pushpa Sundar, SICP
Legal Compliance PWC Team
Financial Oversight:
Understanding Financials :
a. Reading Balance sheets
b. Fund Management
Accountability
1.30 – 2.30 Lunch

Session 2

2.30 – 6.00 Creating Good Boards Sanjay Patra, FMSF
Types of Boards
Moving from Family to Professional
Skills on Board
Getting Good people on Board
Conflict of interest
Managing expectations

Session 3:
7.30 – 8.30 Quest for Credibility BN Makhija, Credibility Alliance

Wednesday, June 2, 2004

Day 3: Bridging Role of Boards

Session 4
9.00 10.00 Women Hold up Half the Sky Renu Suri, GTI

Session 5:
10.00 – 12.00 Engaging the Board Revathi Narayanan,
UNDP
Relationship of Board with
Donors
Beneficiaries
Community - outreach
Fund raising
Keeping the Board engaged.

Session 6
12.00 - 1.30 The Board In Action Pushpa Sundar, SICP
Conducting Effective meetings : Noshir CAP
a. Processes and Procedures
b. Evaluation of Board Performance

1.30 - 2.30 Lunch

Session 7
2.30 - 4.00 Governance Vs Management Vishal Talreja,
Board – CEO Interface Dream a Dream
Bangalore

4.00 – 4.45 Wrap up
Workshop Evaluation, and Development of Covenant
Consensus on Follow up Strategy
Vote of Thanks

4.45 onwards Tea and Departure of Participants.

Annex 3

Check list For Vision/Mission Statement

VISION

1. Does it convey why we do what we do; why the organization exists?
2. does it reflect our beliefs, our values?
3. Does it describe what outcome you expect in the future – the middle or long term?
4. How do you want your community to be different from what it is today?
5. What will success look like?
6. What role do you want your organization to play in your community?
7. Is it practical and achievable?
8. Is it unique to your organization or could it apply to any one of a dozen organizations.
9. Is it short and sharply focused?
10. Is it clear and easily understood
11. Does it describe "how"? It should not.
12. Is it sufficiently broad?
13. Does it provide direction for doing the right things?
14. Does it match our competence or is it overambitious?
15. Is it inspiring for those inside the organization as well as those outside?
16. Is it free of jargon?

MISSION

1. Does it reflect your beliefs?
2. Is it future oriented? Does it describe where you want your organization to be in future?
3. Does it show what role you want your organization to play in your community?
4. Does it focus on a common purpose?
5. Is it specific to your organization alone?
6. Is it short and sweet?

Annex 4

Board Meeting Madness

An exercise for prioritisation of agenda items

The seven-member board of the Smythe Foundations meets every two months. The following items were proposed for the agenda of the November board meeting. As the board chair, you must decide which items will be included. Remember that you have promised the other board members that the meeting will last only two hours.

Indicate which of the items below go into the meeting agenda and whether they are for decisions or for information only. Consider using a consent agenda if appropriate. Be aware that you don't have to include all the items below on this month's agenda. If there is a more effective way to handle certain items than at the meeting, indicate what your recommendation would be. If an item should be addressed at aboard meeting but there will not be time this month, indicate which items you would defer to a future meeting.

When you report back to the group, be prepared to present the full meeting agenda along with plans for handling item that you decide not to include.

- Proposed budget for next financial year
- Monthly financial statement
- Report from Chief Executive about progress in negotiating new lease for office
- Renewal of Chief Executive's contract
- Negative newspaper article about the organisation
- Minutes of last month's meeting
- Programme Officers report about last week's workshop
- Decorations for next week's reception at the Office
- Account of repair of burst pipes in Office
- Changing funding scenario in the country
- Report from fund raising committee
- Selection of the auditor
- Proposal for new Programme for the organisation
- Thank you letter to Mayor from board chair for letter of support
- Note of excuse from absent members
- Report from Chief Executive regarding options for new accounting software
- Proposed slate of candidates for vacancies on board
- Schedule for board retreat
- Maternity leave of staff members

Annex 5 a and b

Prioritisation of items on Agenda

5 a.

Note of excuse from absent members
Minutes of last meeting
Proposed budget for next financial year
Renewal of Chief Executive Contract
Proposed Slate of candidates for vacancies on Board
Selection of the Auditor
Report from Chief Executive about progress in negotiating new lease for office
Changing funding scenario in the country

For Information Only: Schedule for Board retreat and rest of the points on the agenda.

5 b.

Minutes of the last meeting
Proposed Budget
Negative newspaper article about the organisation
Renewal of CEO contract
Account of repair of pipe
Maternity leave of staff members
Report from CEO regarding new options for accounting software
Changing funding scenario in the country
Proposal for new program
Report from CEO about new lease for office.

Annex 6

Board Meeting Evaluation

#	Indicator	O K	Needs Improvement	Suggestions for Improvement
1	The agenda was clear, supported by the necessary documents, and circulated prior to the meeting			
2	All Board members were prepared to discuss materials sent in advance			
3	Reports were clear and contained needed information			
4	We avoided getting into administrative management detail			
5	A diversity of opinions was expressed and issues were dealt with in a respectful manner			
6	The chair guided the meeting effectively and members participated responsibly			
7	Next steps were identified and responsibility assigned			
8	All Board members were present			
9	The meeting began and ended on time			
10	The meeting room was conducive to work			
11	We enjoyed being together			

Cases Used by Trainer for Governance vs Management

CASE STUDY 1

Rashmi Mehra has joined Divya Jyoti Centre for Psychotherapy (hypothetical organization) as a senior counselor. She brings with her a wealth of experience spanning nearly 10 years in the field.

Divya Jyoti is 3 years old and was started by group of psychiatrists. The founder Board continues to hold the primary authority over the organization. The Board has in the past year grown to include two new members and also has hired more staff, thanks to additional funding that they have recently received.

Rashmi completed a year in the organization recently and is contemplating resigning. And the reason is that she feels she has no role to play and the organization is in fact wasting precious resources. So, why does she feel that way?

In her own words...

'When I walked into the office on day one, I was pleasantly surprised to find that most of the Board members were there to welcome me. It made me feel very positive and I was rearing to get started. My primary responsibility was to start a specialized psychotherapy unit for parents of disabled children. My boss, the CEO said to me that he wouldn't have the time to be very involved in that process and that they trusted my competence and ability to complete the assigned task and have the unit up and running in a year's time. He did however, say that if I needed a sounding Board at any time, I could approach 3 of the members of the Board all of whom were among the founders.

The Board members were supportive from the start- and then began to get 'too supportive'... One or the other of the three founder members would be in the office by my desk everyday.. catching up on what I was going to do for the day, how I was going to get something done, if I had met with the architect who was to build the rooms for the unit...making suggestions for the ways in which we could market the service and approach clients, how the latest techniques in the field could be used...from what was 'my job it had become 'our job' to get the unit up and running...they didn't need me...they wanted to do it all themselves'

Respond to the following

Is Rashmi justified in feeling resentful?

What should the Board's response to Rashmi and her new responsibility have been?

When should Rashmi have approached the Board for help? Or should she have at all?

CASE STUDY 2

Vivek Gupta was one of the founding members of "Catalyst", an organization working towards empowering children from marginalized communities. Started by a group of 10 people 4 years back, Catalyst was run by the founder members and volunteers for 2 years. After 2 years, it was felt that a full-time person is required and for the benefit of the organization, it has to be one of the founder members. Vivek left his corporate job and decided to join Catalyst on a fulltime basis.

The Board which consisted of founder members was initially pleased and let Vivek run the organization. The organization steadily grew from servicing 60 children to over 200 children in 2 years. Vivek was able to raise funds, get more volunteers and also conduct many new programmes for the children. In the meanwhile, the board members who were all young and pursuing their own professional careers decided to take a back seat and let Vivek run the organization. They also did not have the time to engage in anything at Catalyst or make commitments. However, all governance and management level decisions were still taken by the board.

Vivek on his part has made sincere attempts to send all information to the Board members, engage them in meetings and programmes at the organization, invite them for activities, meetings, fundraising events, etc. However, except for 1-2 board members, most of the board members have always been busy. Vivek has always had a tough time taking quick decisions regarding fundraising or programmes since the Board takes its own time to make those decisions.

Since Catalyst was a startup, there were also no policies in place clearly defining decision making processes, roles and responsibilities and delineation of roles from board to management.

After 2 years, the Board realized that the organization has moved far ahead of them and Vivek has been getting credit for his work from all quarters. They feel that all the power has slipped from their hands.

They were not happy that they were not part of this growth process and felt the Vivek had taken away the organization they started. They also felt that Vivek had moved from the original mission of the organization.

Vivek on the other hand felt that the Board is being unfair to him because he worked really hard for the organization, made sincere attempts to involve them in all spheres of the organization and he is not getting the due acknowledgement and appreciation from the board. Infact, he is been questioned about the work done. He is very disillusioned with statements from the board such as, "You have taken all the credit for yourself" and "You have taken the organization away from the vision that we had for it."

Vivek feels that at this crucial juncture, it is important that the organization has a proactive, dynamic, mature and experienced board. Hence, he tells the board that either the organization brings in a new board that is experienced, mature and committed or he will have to leave the organization.

Respond to the following

Is Vivek justified in his stance to ask the board to leave and get a new board in place?

Has there been a gap in expectations here? What were the expectations of the board and what were the expectations of the CEO?

How could the Board and CEO together have solved this problem?

CASE STUDY 3

Henna Raj joined Divyashakti, an organization working with women's empowerment. 5 years back she was part of the founding team of Divyashakti and then she left to pursue further studies and research in the area of women's empowerment. When an opportunity to head Divyashakti came after 5 years, she was elated to join the organization that she had also helped start.

Coming from a strong academic and research background, Henna fit the job extremely well and brought in tremendous skills into the organization. She also helped start the advocacy and communication division at Divyashakti that brought to light atrocities against women.

In due course, Henna came to be respected for her work ethics, integrity and hardwork. Being the head of the organization, she was also very active in the local media with many articles written about her and her work at Divyashakti. Prior to Henna joining, the Board was primarily involved in marketing the organization's mission. However, they were irked with all the media coverage and publicity that Henna was getting for her work, since it seemed that 'she' was the one getting all the publicity and the mission of the organisation was being sidelined.. Henna was also mentioned as the founder member in many press articles.

The Board however did not mention their unhappiness to Henna, for the fear of alienating her. She was infact happy that with all the media coverage, Divyashakti was getting a lot of enquiries from other women's groups, volunteers, donors and corporates alike, which the Board was not aware of. Henna felt this was a 'management issue' that the Board had no role to play in

The Board decided to come up with a policy where only Board members could interact with the media and all media articles / press releases need to be approved by the Board. This was communicated to Henna in a terse letter with no explanations, nothing.

Henna Is shocked at this response, specially when she expected something totally to the contrary

Respond to the following

Is the board justified in coming up with a policy on media interaction?

Is the board justified in approving all media communication and being solely responsible for all media communication

What is a proactive and positive media policy that will communicate the difference in roles and authority between the Board and the management in this case.

CASE STUDY 4

"Sanghamithra," an Organization that designs and executes awareness and empowerment programs for women involved in prostitution in and around Bangalore, has been registered as a Trust.

The Board consists of a total of four people, three of whom are Founder members. Vidya, who is a Board member, is also the head of management. The Board has met several times, and drawn up a policy document pertaining to Board work ethics. They have decided things such as: Every Board member must attend at least one awareness workshop a month in order to assess the quality of Management, A Board member is liable to be show caused for non attendance of three consecutive Board meetings, etc.

Once these policies were set down, however, they were rarely put into practice. Although, legally, the Board members are accountable, this was not seen in reality. The Board members did not attend the monthly workshops, and their attendance at meetings was erratic.

Vidya was the only active Board member, who followed all policy decisions. When she expressed her disappointment, the other Board members did not take it seriously, since the majority were in agreement that it is not necessary for a Board member to be as active as management.

They justified their dormancy as Board members against Vidya, with the statement that all that Vidya had done was in her capacity as Management, and she could not expect Board members to meet her level of activity with the Organization.

When confronted with the fact that they had not behaved according to their own Board policies, they brushed it away by making promises to each other that they would begin to take their Board membership more seriously. Ultimately, this did not happen. Being accountable to only each other, the collective dormancy of all three of them ensured that they would never be a proactive Board.

This frustrated Vidya, who legally had no recourse against their obvious inactivity. She was up against a majority in her own Board.

Is it advisable for Head of Management to be part of the Board? If it is, where can one draw the line between Management work and Board work?

If the Board is legally accountable only to each other, what is the solution for an Organization beleaguered by a majority of dormant Board members?

What are the reasonable expectations from the Management as regards Board performance?

Annex 8

List Of Persons Attending the Workshop

CSO Board members

S.No	Name of Person	Name of Organisation	Remarks
1	Sangeeta Gaikwad	ASMITA	Attended full program
2.	Eknath Dagwar	ASMITA	Attended full program
3	Shailesh Pisalkar	BDBGVS	Attended full program
4	Shirish Umrey	BDBGVS	Attended full program
5	S B Sayyad	Gram Vikas Mandal	Attended full program
6	Tukaram Gaikwad	Gram Vikas Mandal	Attended full program
7	Yugandhar Mandavkar	GRASP	Attended full program
8	N R Singh	IGSS	Attended full program
9	B A Deore	IGSS	Attended full program
10	Ramesh Bhise	Janvikas Samajik Sanstha	Attended full program
11	Sharad Pawar	Janvikas Samajik Sanstha	Attended full program
12	JM Gandhi	Marathwada Sheti Sahyog Mandal	Attended full program
13	Vijay Borade	Marathwada Sheti Sahyog Mandal	Attended full program
14	Vishwanath Todkar	Paryay	Attended full program
15	Subhash KTagare	Paryay	Attended full program
16	Eknath Awad	Rural Development Center	Attended first day
17	Ashok Tangade	Rural Development Center	Attended full program
18	Ramakant Kulkarni	Sahyog Nirmitee	Attended full program
19	Uma P.Kurhade	Sahyog Nirmitee	Attended second day
20	Suryakant Kulkarni	S E D T	Attended full program
21	Nitin Shitole	S E D T	Attended full program
22	Sudhakar Kshirsagar	S M V S	Attended full program
23	Ashok Pandit	S M V S	Attended full program
24	H P Deshmukh	Yuwagram	Attended full program
25	Seema Khot	Paryay	Attended first day

List of Resource Persons

26	Noshir Dadrawala	C A P , Mumbai	Attended Full Program
27	Sanjay Patra	F M S F , New Delhi	Attended first day
28	B N Makhija	SOSVA, Mumbai	Attended first day
29	Renu Suri	GTI, New Delhi	Attended full program
30	Kaustubh Shah	Pune	Attended half day

31	Revathi Narayanan	UNDP, New Delhi	Attended second day
32	Vishal Talreja	Dream a Dream, Bangalore	Attended Full Program

Management Consultants Team

33	Kiran Sharma	Development Alternatives, P A C S Program	Attended first day
34	Poonam Mehta	Development Alternatives, P A C S Program	Attended full program
35	Robin Koshy	Development Alternatives, P A C S Program	Attended full program
36	Lata Satish	Development Alternatives, New Delhi	Attended full program
37	Devashish Banerji	P W C, New Delhi	Attended half day
38	Amit Phull	P W C, New Delhi	Attended first day

Local Support Team

39	Makarand Sahasrabuddhe	Green Earth, Pune	Attended Full program
40	Vasant Shendye	Green Earth	Attended Full program
41	Shirish Kulkarni	Constructive Catalyst Community Development Services	Attended Full Program
42	Lopa Dasgupta	Constructive Catalyst Community Development Services	Attended second day

Visitors

43	John Samuel	Action Aid	Visitor
44	Ashok Gopal	Infochange	Visitor

Program Organisers

45	Pushpa Sundar	S I C P, New Delhi	Attended Full Program
46	Rajni Patni	S I C P, New Delhi	Attended Full Program

Annex 9

List of Resource Persons

1	Noshir Dadrawala	Director, C A P , Mumbai
2	Sanjay Patra	Executive Director, F M S F , New Delhi
3	B N Makhija	Director, SOSVA, Mumbai
4	Renu Suri	Director, GTI, New Delhi
5	Kaustubh Shah	Chartered Accountant, Independent Consultant, Pune
6	Revathi Narayanan	National Program Director, CHARCA, UNDP, New Delhi
7	Vishal Talreja	Executive Director, Dream a Dream, Bangalore
8	Pushpa Sundar	Executive Director, S I C P< New Delhi

Annex 10

Brief Profiles of Resource Persons

Noshir Dadrawala

Noshir has been the Executive Secretary of the Center for Advancement of Philanthropy, Mumbai, for the last 17 years. CAP is a company specialising in areas of charity, law, finance, management, taxation, resource mobilisation and HRD.

He is affiliated to a number of international organisations like the Center for the Study of Philanthropy, University of New York., Board Source (Washington DC), Governing Council of the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium. He has presented research papers at national/international seminars and has authored several resource books like " Handbook on Trusts", " The Art of Successful Fund Raising", " Investment Opportunities for Charitable Organisations", " Management of Philanthropic Organisations", " Merchants of Philanthropy", "Laws Governing Voluntary organisations in India", and is co author of a publication entitled " Philanthropy and Law in South Asia".

He is a Trustee and member of governing council of various organisations like India Sponsorship Committee, Make a Wish Foundation, Polson Charity Trust, JD Bharda Education Society, Bombay Community Public Trust, Hellen Keller Institute for the deaf and Blind, Seva Sadan and the Samaritans.

He is also a member of the Core Committee on Social Development and Community Affairs of the Confederation of Indian Industries (Western India), and Social Infrastructure committee of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the Credit Rating g Board of Indian NGOs.com

He regularly conducts seminars, conferences and training programs for voluntary organisations in India., and is a visiting faculty at the Narsimonji Institute of Management Studies in Mumbai and Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

B N Makhija

Mr Bishambhar Nath Makhija has been awarded an MBA from University of Hawaii in USA, and a diploma in International Studies from Sweden. He also has degrees in Commerce and law from Delhi and Mumbai Universities. He taught Commerce and Economics at Delhi University and worked with the State Bank of India. After a brief stint with Indian Railways, in 1964 he joined the IAS (Maharashtra Cadre). He has worked in several capacities and in several Districts of Maharashtra till 1993, in fields like Rural Development, Urban Development, Welfare administration and Health Services. He has also worked with the Union Government for 1993 – 1997 in the energy sector and in the Planning Commission.

After retirement in 1997, he is now associated with voluntary organisations, like Lok Hith (an advocacy group in Mumbai working for integrity in Public life), SOSVA (a support service organisation working for strengthening the institutional infrastructure of voluntary sector) and Credibility Alliance (a consortium of voluntary agencies working for promotion of norms of good governance in the voluntary sector).

Sanjay Patra

After obtaining masters degree in Commerce, Sanjay Patra has been through an MDP program at IIM Calcutta on "Management of Non Profit and Non Government Organisations". He is also a Fellow of the Institute of Chartered accountants of India.

Sanjay Patra has been with the NGO world for the last 15 years and has been the Executive Director of FMSF for last 5 years.. He has been a Resource person and a trainer in Financial Management, legal compliance and governance in NGOs and has facilitated more than 30 workshops in India and abroad. He is the Editor of a magazine "Interface" which provides information on financial, legal and governance issues. He has published two books " Legal and Finance Handbook for Voluntary organisations", and, " Manual of Financial Management and Legal Regulations" and also co authored a book on " Audit of Charitable Trusts" published by Chartered Accountants of India. He is widely traveled in India and abroad and has a wide experience of NGO governance and has been associated with evaluations of many development projects.

Pushpa Sundar

Pushpa Sundar is the Founder-Director of the Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy, and was a Senior Fellow under the International Fellows in Philanthropy program of the Johns Hopkins University in 1995. She is on the board of several nonprofit organizations such as Winrock International India, Indian Institute of Health Management Research, Sanskriti Foundation, and South Asia Fund Raising Group.

After resigning from the IAS in 1966 she worked for FICCI, Gujarat Government, and Ford Foundation, and consulted for the World Bank among others. She is the author of two books: "Patrons and Philistines: Arts and the State in British India", 1995, Oxford University Press. This is a historical analysis of government attitudes and policies towards the Indian arts during British colonial rule.

The second book is titled "Beyond Business: From Merchant Charity to Corporate Citizenship", Tata McGraw Hill, 1999. It is a history of Indian business philanthropy and traces its development, especially in terms of changes in attitudes and practice, in the context of socio economic developments in India from mid 19th century to the present.

In addition she has contributed several papers to other books and professional journals, and articles to leading newspapers.

Renu Suri

Dr. Renu Suri is an Anthropologist by Academic qualifications from Delhi University. She has been awarded a Ph.D. in Physical Anthropology from Guwahati University. She represents a good blend of academia and social work. A diverse work experience of over 28 years in development projects reaching out to the areas of education, health, small economic activities, relief and rehabilitation have enriched the learning. Having traveled extensively nationally and internationally she is currently working as Director, Gender Training Institute, Centre for Social Research, New Delhi.

Vishal Talreja

Vishal is the Managing Trustee of Dream a Dream. As Managing Trustee, he is involved in the day-to-day management of Dream A Dream. He handles multiple tasks such as financial management, fundraising, strategy and long-term target execution. He couples this with project management involving program design, resource mobilization, program execution, monitoring and review.

Vishal was earlier Vice-president at Technology Holdings, an Investment Banking firm based out of Mumbai and US. Prior to this, he was a research analyst with Xerox, handling research and sales for their high-end systems division. Vishal also did a consulting assignment for a global non-profit organization, called AIESEC, in Finland, which involved restructuring a local branch and developing relationships between Finland and India in the corporate and NGO sector. Vishal aims to set benchmarks for professionalism, transparency and accountability in Dream a Dream.

Revathi Narayanan

Revathi is a development professional with several years of program management experience at senior and responsible positions in the social sector. She has worked at district, state, national and international levels on gender and development.

Dr Revathi Narayanan has a Ph.D. in Life Sciences and started her career as a freelance writer associated with education and scientific publications, popular science films and educational institutions. She was a Research Coordinator with Institute of Social Studies Trust and joined as State Program Director for the GOI sponsored Mahila Samakhya Program in Karnataka. As Director she implemented the program successfully with 20,000 poor rural women and adolescent girls in 1200 villages of 7 districts of Karnataka. This required detailed knowledge of gender and development issues and skills in linking field processes to concepts.

She is currently the National Project Coordinator of the Joint United Nations Project, CHARCA, which is working to reduce the vulnerability of young women to HIV/AIDS. With an emphasis on participatory planning and

implementation, this project is a dynamic partnership between government, civil society and nine partners within the UN system (ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UNODC, WHO, and UNAIDS).

As part of her work on gender and governance she has been a resource person at several national level workshops and conferences. She has many papers/documents published on issues of development and empowerment of women, grassroots, gender and governance.

Aarti Madhusudan

Currently in UK, works for Give Foundation. SICP has liaised with her through email, and, she has provided valuable inputs in the development of program, selection of resource persons and has developed case studies, which will be used by the trainers in some of the sessions. SICP acknowledges her immense contribution with thanks.

Annex 11

Workshop Evaluations

Session wise Evaluation

The methodology included participant evaluation at the end of each session. The parameters for evaluation on a four-point scale were content, presentation, ability to communicate, and information materials used. In addition participants expressed their opinion (again on a four-point scale) on issues like session was interactive, session met my expectations, usefulness of contents, relevance of coverage, duration of session and methodology used.

Session wise evaluations have been analysed and the comments made by participants have been communicated to the concerned resource persons.

Feedback from the participants regarding the content of session and good governance practices mentioned therein.

The overall evaluation of the workshop has also been analysed. The form asked participants to evaluate the workshop on six parameters on a three-point scale (by indicating whether the workshop met expectations, met some expectations and did not meet my expectations). A total of 20 participants filled out this form.

The results (mean average) are as follows:
(3 = met my expectations, 2 = met some of my expectations, and, 1 = did not meet my expectations).

Indicators	Mean Averages
1. To provide effective practical learning opportunities	2.2
2. To provide formal and informal networking opportunities	2.1
3. To provide opportunities for exchange of information and resources	2.1
4. To create a sense of belonging and partnership within the network	1.9
5. To gain sufficient knowledge regarding work done on governance	2.4
6. To be able to identify gaps and be aware of good governance practices.	2.5

In addition there were some open-ended questions also. Participants found the sessions on Boards Roles and Responsibilities, Conducting Board Meetings and the background material given to them as most valuable.

On the question as to how they anticipate making use of information obtained in the workshop, various views emerged. They ranged from writing an article, develop understanding further, try and implement principles of governance, good management, and participation in Board meetings, to try and obtain a good pattern of governance within the organisation.

Some of the suggestions for improvement of the workshop include alignment of workshop closer to the needs assessment, optimal use of resource persons, having fewer sessions, not using the word 'training', more role plays, and more use of local language.

Difficulties Expressed by Participants at the time of Evaluation

While the participants agreed that there was a need for good governance and the contents of the session showed what the ideal situation should be, they had a number of difficulties in putting the ideas in to practice. The situation at the ground level was very different from that in the theory. Some of the difficulties mentioned by them were:

A genuine difficulty was expressed in finding good people, with appropriate skills, to serve on Board.

This difficulty was even more acute when it came to seeking women trustees/members.

Some women trustees experience difficulties in attending meetings – hence are women representatives only in name. Only one woman participant amply proves this point.

Though roles and responsibilities of individual members were spelt out, they were not defined in legal terms.

The size of Board was limited and each member was engaged in multitasking. In reality there is no such thing as separation of CHAIR and executive Director. The managing trustee is the CEO.

Vision mission statements do not necessarily have a vision and mission. They were statements required for purposes of registration of organisation. Some participants wished to revisit these statements, and arrive at common understandings regarding these with other trustees. They said that though they did not have an explicit vision/mission statement in place it does not mean that they do not have a Vision and Mission. It is part of the Memorandum of Association.

Meetings were held as and when required. It is difficult to be formal about these. Formal meetings adopting standardised procedures were still to be planned.

The legal and fiscal information was extremely valuable and this information needs to be updated from time to time. Setting up of some mechanism on legal/financial issues from where updates/checks could be made was a genuine need of the hour.

One needs to adjust expectations. Women trustee needs to be consulted when to reach. No reason why Board cannot accommodate and tailor around the difficulties.



Effective Boards for Effective Governance:
Training Workshop
EVALUATION FORM
(SAMPLE)

The Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy appreciates your participation in this event. To assist us in monitoring our performance and plan for the future, please complete this form.

Wednesday 2nd June, 2004
Session 7: Governance Vs Management

Please mark using this scale:

Excellent = 4 Good = 3 Average = 2 Poor = 1

FACULTY (S)	CONTENT	PRESENTATION	
		Ability to Communicate	Info Materials Used

Please mark using this scale of the followings:

Excellent = 4 Good = 3 Average = 2 Poor = 1

RATING (in average)

The session was interactive

The session met my expectations

Usefulness of the contents

Relevance of the coverage

Duration of the session
Methodology used

What did you find most useful in this session?.

How could the session be improved?

Annex 12 b

TRAINING WORKSHOP
OVERALL EVALUATION FORM
Sample

The Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy appreciates your participation in this event. To assist us in monitoring our performance and plan for the future, please complete this form.

PLEASE COMMENT ON HOW SUCCESSFULLY GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP WERE MET

Please in the appropriate box.

	Did not meet my expectations	Met some of my expectations	Met my expectation
To provide effective, practical learning opportunities			
To provide formal and informal networking opportunities			
To provide opportunities for the exchange of information and resources			
To create a sense of belonging and partnership within the national network in the sector of philanthropy			

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions and share any additional comments you may have regarding this Training Workshop.

1. What aspects of the conference did you find most valuable?

2. How do you anticipate making use of the information obtained during this workshop?

3. Are there any other issues that you would have liked to explore further?

Was this the first time you have been to a conference organised by SICP?

Yes No

5. How can SICP work with your organisation in future?

6. Suggested topics for future workshops.

7. Would you recommend this programme to others?

8. Please share any additional information that would help SICP prepare for future workshops.

Name:
(Optional)

Organisation :
(Optional)

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it to the organizers before you leave.

Sampradaan Indian Centre for Philanthropy

Sector – C, Pocket - 8 / 8704, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi – 110 070