

Identifying Capacity-Building Best Practices:  
A 10 Year Retrospective Review of New Jersey's Faith-Based Initiatives

Anne M. Hewitt  
Seton Hall University

## Abstract

A 10 year retrospective review of the New Jersey Office of Faith-Based Initiatives (NJ OFBI) focused on the use of technical assistance (TA) activities provided to grantees. Over the years, the NJ OFBI has offered a diverse set of TA opportunities including state-wide faith-based resource expositions, seminar/workshops, one-on-one counseling sessions, and required pre-grant preparation trainings. A mailed survey yielded a 49% response rate (N = 77) from a representative group of NJ OFBI grantees. Findings from this study show that respondents, who participated in TA activities, most often selected sessions that focused on Evaluation Guidelines (64%), Financial Instruction (60%), Partner Relationships (57%) and Project Management (50%). Grantees particularly valued sessions on Partner Relationships ( $X = 3.92$ ) and Evaluation Guidelines ( $X = 3.77$ ). No significant differences were found between single award and multiple award grantees in achieving at least one capacity building outcome ( $\chi^2 = 1.31$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .28$ ). TA opportunities appear to be sought after by all NJ OFBI grantees. Additional analysis is necessary to identify appropriate delivery approaches, relevant topics and capacity-building activities to ensure faith-based and community agency success and sustainability.

## Introduction

Officially launched in 1998 by Governor Whitman and originally placed in the Department of Community Affairs, New Jersey's Office of Faith-Based Initiatives (NJ OFBI) was one of the first in the nation (New Jersey Department of State, 2005). The original tripartite focus was on (a) granting awards through a selective process, (b) providing technical assistance, and (c) incorporating community development training. The NJ OFBI was initially supported by state funding of \$5 million dollars for the first two years (Roper, 2004). In 2002, an official Executive Order (#31), signed by Governor McGreevey placed the NJ OFBI in the Department of State and created an official Advisory Commission (State of New Jersey, 2002). Since 2000, the NJ OFBI has funded more than 250 faith-based agencies selected from an applicant pool in excess of 500 non-profit community organizations. The 607 Federal grant awards to New Jersey's Faith-Based and Community Organizations, have provided \$428 million dollars with over \$48 million being specifically allocated to faith-based organizations (White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, 2008). The 2005-2006 budget for NJ-OFBI included 2.5 million in State revenue and 1.5 million from New Jersey's TANF block grant (New Jersey Faith-Based and Community Initiative Activities, 2007). For the last 10 years, technical assistance opportunities for faith-based and community organizations have been systematically integrated into the NJ-OFBI in order to facilitate agency and community successes. The New Jersey success story parallels the progress of Federal initiatives in helping Americans in need (The White House, 2008).

### Literature Review

A 2004 independent report suggests that the creation and continued existence of the NJ OFBI is directly linked to the extreme need for social service partners in this densely populated and diverse state that includes six large cities - all of which are highly impoverished (Roper, 2004). Previous reviews have identified that the majority of New Jersey faith-based and community agencies are located in urban areas, serve mostly minority residents (Center for Non-Profit Corporations, 2006) and that agency budgets are usually less than \$200,000 (Richard Boris Management Developers, 2006). Although the rationale and impetus for the NJ OFBI may originally have been politically motivated, the primary question of interest is an assessment of NJ-OFBI grantee accomplishments, regardless of initial policy considerations (New Jersey Department of State, 2005). Given the small size and limited resources of many NJ-OFBI grant agencies, and the extreme challenges of delivering human services to a vulnerable population, technical assistance (TA) opportunities provided by this state agency offer a welcoming opportunity and framework for capacity building that can lead to more successful human service programs.

New Jersey's commitment to capacity building via the provision of direct resources also reflects the national OFBI goal of providing technical assistance (Roper, 2004) and capacity building opportunities to faith-based organizations (The White House Office of Faith-Based Initiatives, 2008). In 2003, to support their capacity building effort, NJ OFBI initiated a Training Grant program awarding a one time grant (\$70,000) to eligible agencies for expanding training programs, executive leadership certificate programs, research projects and local faith-based training centers (Roper, 2004). In 2005-2006, the NJ OFBI also formed a partnership with the New Jersey Division of Addiction Services (DAS) and received funds from the US Substance

Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) to build capacity of faith-based nonprofit organizations to participate in Project ATLAS. The purpose of this initiative was to prepare agencies to deliver the New Jersey Access Initiative and New Jersey Access to Recovery services (Richard Boris Management Developers, 2006). For the latest grant year (2007), six agency intermediaries provided technical assistance to grantees (E. LaPorte, personal communication, March 24, 2008). NJ OFBI also provides technical assistance to non-grantee, faith-based agencies that are committed to organizational infrastructure development.

Despite extraordinary commitment to capacity building activities to ensure program success, systematic evaluation of grantee achievements is lacking. Previous Congressional reports have identified a lack of evaluation data at both the national and state levels (Canada, 2003). The NJ OFBI Strategic Plan clearly encourages research on NJ faith-based initiative capacity building and program outcomes (NJ OFBI Strategic Plan, 2007). However, little published research on New Jersey's initiative is available. Recent reports address needs assessments and reviews of current activities (Richard Boris Management Developers, 2006; Roper, 2004, S. Weiner, personal communication, March 26, 2008). Another New Jersey review, based on a survey of 245 of both faith and community –based organizations (F/CBOs) revealed that infrastructure development and capacity building to be “one of the five most important issues in improving the nonprofit sector” (Center for Nonprofit Corporation, 2006). A recent GAO report examining federal Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, suggested that even at the national level the most common program evaluation methods consist of single audits, site visits and desk audits (United States Government Accounting Office, 2006). For NJ grant recipients, program outcomes (fiscal and narrative) are self-reported through quarterly updates and a final report (NJ Dept. of State, OFBI, 2008). Although strong evidence exists for the “need

for and potential from fundamental capacity building” (Richard Boris Management Developers, 2006), grantee participation in technical assistance opportunities and subsequent linkage to capacity building achievement and successful program accomplishments has not been documented.

Capacity building generally refers to any activities that help an organization pursue its mission, and technical assistance can include activities that increase organizational development and actions that improve nonprofit effectiveness (Blumenthal, 2003). Szabat and Otten (2007) successfully mapped regional nonprofit capacity building services and discovered that despite the mission, one-quarter of the providers were for-profit. They also delineated the common types of support available: advocacy, assessment, management (TA), education, convening, research and financial support. A recent article by Clerkin and Gronbjerg (2007) focusing on the capacities and challenges of faith-based human service organizations concludes that many congregation organizations offer a narrow range of services and may encounter more extensive management challenges than secular organizations. Other research (Gruidl & Hustedde, 2003) suggests that in evaluating capacity-building programs, a learning organization approach may be needed specifically because changes in organizational behavior may not be evident for years.

## Research Methodology

### *Study Objectives*

An evaluation of TA best practices for faith-based organizations should begin with a complete identification of the technical assistance process and system components capable of impacting a desired outcome such as organizational development and/or program success. For the purposes of this historical review, the research objectives were to:

- Explore which types of technical assistance activities and their components have been beneficial for New Jersey faith-based organizations over a 10 year period and
- Identify opportunities to leverage technical assistance activities provided by the NJ OFBI to further enhance successful capacity building for all grantees.

### *Study Questions*

The following research questions were formulated based on the literature review and synthesis of relevant information.

- *Of the diverse TA activities presented by the NJ OFBI, which resources are most utilized?*
- *Which specific type of TA programs experience the highest participation and satisfaction rates?*
- *Does the use of an outside TA evaluator provide additional advantages to a faith-based organization?*
- *Which capacity building activities were identified by TA participants?*
- *Which type and category of faith-based agency is most likely to gain from the technical assistance program?*
- *Can TA best practices be identified?*

### *Data collection and administration protocols*

Building on previous research completed by the Seton Center for Community Health, a survey was developed for faith-based agencies to assess their participation in any NJ OFBI sponsored TA opportunities. Specific sections of the survey included: *Agency Profile* (agency size, affiliation, years active, date of NJ-OFBI grant, and services provided), *Agency Participation* in TA activities (number, type, value ranking) and *Changes in Agency/Organization* (a retrospective review) examining capabilities of the organization based

prior to NJ OFBI involvement and a current perspective. The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved this research project on February 19, 2008.

A listing of all faith-based and community agencies receiving an NJ OFBI award was obtained from the state office (S. Uphill, personal communication, January 17, 2008). For those faith-based agencies with email addresses, the survey was sent electronically, and for faith-based agencies without email addresses, hard-copy questionnaires were mailed. Follow-up reminders were sent via the appropriate communication venue for each agency. In addition, intermediaries (contracted agencies providing technical assistance support) were also requested to encourage all agencies to participate in the survey.

Of the 192 surveys mailed, 35 (18%) were returned as undeliverable. Although this appears to be a relatively high number, the agency mailing list reflected grantee addresses for the last 10 years. Every effort was made to track down agencies via internet and phone searches. The possibility exists that many agencies may have relocated, changed their names or were no longer in business. A primary state TA intermediary estimated that the turnover rate for non-profit organizations in New Jersey to be approximately ten percent (S. Ross, personal communication, March 27, 2008). It is also important to note that for the 2007 grantees, whose email addresses were available, 19 of the 56 emails (34%) were returned as incorrect. Not all of the addresses were available for the 2005 grantees. (See Appendix A for data analysis procedures and instrument reliability statistics).

### Initial findings

#### *Agency Profile*

Of the 157 faith and community-based agencies who received the survey, 49% (77)

completed and returned the questionnaire. Thirty (39%) of the respondents indicated they had received more than one NJ-OFBI grant, and 11 agencies indicated they had been awarded a special training grant only offered in 2005.

#### Insert Table 1

There appears to be a wide range in size of the various grantee agencies with one indicating no full-time employees and other, more-established statewide agencies, indicating 3000 full and part-time employees. Similarly, the number of individuals served by these agencies ranged from eight (8) up to 50,000. A most impressive finding was the mean (X) for “number of years in business” equaled 27 years. Significant correlations were found for relationships between organization size and number served ( $r = .381, p = 0.01$ ), size and the number of years in business ( $r = .688, p = 0.01$ ) and the number of years in business and the number served ( $r = .389, p = 0.01$ ).

NJ OFBI awarded a variety of grants during the past 10 years. These include: (a) Organization Infrastructure Development (OID) grants (up to \$20,000), OID grants offered to Intermediaries (up to \$90,000 to CBA and T/TA providers), and Direct Service Grants (up to \$80,000). Additional support was made available for Project ATLAS during the 2005-2006 yearly cycles. An initial classification of NJ OFBI grant recipients, based on almost 10 years of data, shows a diverse group of faith-based programs offering the delivery of basic human services as well as specialty programs for age, gender, and ethnic populations. In addition, programs that focus on faith-based partnerships, community economic development and workforce/ prisoner re-entry activities appear to be well represented. Table 2 presents the NJ OFBI grant award program categories.

#### Insert Table 2

It is evident that grantee recipients offer multiple services. With their NJ OFBI grant, they may have selected to highlight, introduce or expand outreach of one specific program. Very few agencies reported providing only a single service to a specific population. The study revealed that 63% of the grant recipient agencies were involved in programs for At-Risk Youth and 37% included Senior programs. The smallest number of agencies (12%) indicated involvement with diversity initiatives.

### *Agency Participation*

A preliminary examination of the NJ OFBI technical assistance (TA) efforts reveals a plethora of activities ranging in scope and depth of outreach. A preliminary framing of TA opportunities from initial pre-grant activities to state-wide expositions is presented in Figure 1.

#### Insert Figure 1

Each TA activity was offered and made available to all grantees. All applicant agencies are encouraged to attend the initial TA Preparation Sessions. The state-wide, Faith-based Resource Exposition brings together federal and state agencies, foundations, corporations, and capacity building training organizations to discuss funding and other resource opportunities. In addition, two statewide conferences were convened (2000, 2001) and in collaboration with Kean University, a Leadership Certificate Program was developed.

#### Insert Table 3

Agency respondents were asked to indicate their participation in each type of TA activity offered by NJ-OFBI over the years. Three-quarters (75%) of the survey respondents attended the pre-grant preparation meetings and 69% completed a workshop/or seminar sponsored by NJ-OFBI. Only 36% of the grantees participated in partnering sessions but, almost half (48%) of the respondents entered into one-on-one consulting sessions with the TA intermediaries. Less than

half of the agencies reported participating in the list-serv (40%) or attending one of the Faith-Based Resource Expositions (44%). Currently, a little over half of the respondents (56%) report using the NJ OFBI website.

#### Insert Table 4

To further assess the importance of TA activities, respondents first indicated the type of TA assistance they received and then provided a ranking using a Likert scale as to the “valuability” of the activity. In Table 4 the frequency for the TA activities is provided and in Table 5 the corresponding value rating by the agencies.

Findings from this question show that those respondents, who participated in TA sponsored activities, primarily focused on topics such as Evaluation Guidelines (64%), Financial Instruction (60%), Partner Relationships (57%) and Project Management (50%). Common capacity building activities such as developing Grant Writing Skills (56%), Fundraising Ideas (49%) and Advisory Board Development (48%) were also highly desirable areas for TA instruction. Respondents appear less likely to have sought assistance for Advocacy (36%), Research (22%) and Technology Expertise (13%).

#### Insert Table 5

The top four TA areas rated as the most valuable by the agency participants were Partner Relationships ( $X = 3.92$ ), Evaluation Guidelines ( $X = 3.77$ ), Grantwriting Skills ( $X = 3.74$ ) and Advisory Board Development ( $X = 3.66$ ). Financial Instruction ( $X = 3.65$ ), Education Strategies ( $X = 3.58$ ) and Fundraising Ideas ( $X = 3.45$ ) were skills that also seemed to be viewed as more valuable. The technical assistance areas of Project Management, Research Options and Technology Expertise were not perceived as valuable and received lower ratings. Interestingly Advocacy Tips, for which fewer agencies indicated that they had participated in a session,

received one of the higher means ( $X = 3.63$ ) indicating that those who did receive instruction in this area found it valuable.

### *Changes in Agency/Organization*

To further understand the role of TA in helping the NJ OFBI grantee organizations develop capacity, a survey question addressed the use of outside evaluators and the potential for additional evaluation advantages. Of the 70 agencies who responded to the question, 20 (28%) indicated use of an external evaluation consultant. Several respondents ( $N = 15$ ) provided additional comments, including the following impact statements: *“Assistance through independent analysis and review of program outcomes documenting success of program,”* *“We learned how to show and measure outcomes, not just the numbers of people assisted,”* and *“This extremely helped us with the infrastructure of the organization.”*

The final survey question was a multi-item query that requested agency respondents to indicate improvements or positive changes that resulted from their participation in any NJ-OFBI technical assistance activity. Capacity building was defined as “positive changes in how the organization may have developed and learned”. The response rate for the capacity building item ranged from 21 to 31 agencies. Table 6 presents the percent of those respondents who stated they had improved or made positive changes in the specific capacity building area due to their direct participation in NJ OFBI sponsored TA activities.

### Insert Table 6

Although Program Sustainability (38%) and Program Improvement (38%) were both mentioned frequently, more respondents indicated that TA had helped them in the Program Development (40%) context. Other capacity building areas identified were Program Evaluation (34%), Program Support (30%), Program Reporting (27%) and Needs Assessment (27%).

Using a contingency table format, relationships between agency characteristics (size, number served and years in business) and evidence of capacity building were examined. Participating agencies were categorized into one of four levels for agency characteristics. Chi-square analysis indicated no statistical significance between agency characteristics of size, number served and years in business and the indication of any capacity building activities. (Please see Appendix A for categories and chi-square results).

One important finding was that 49 agencies (67%) provided comments specific to their capacity building efforts. (For a complete listing of the grantees' comments, see Appendix B). Further analysis, using a qualitative software package (QSR – N6), revealed three consistent patterns in the responses. These three themes were identified as (a) impact of TA learning on agency activities, (b) linkages to program specific capacity building, and (c) concerns about the relevance of TA to individual agency needs. First, most of the agency directors who responded provided specific examples of new skills or activities that emerged from having attended a TA session. Two agency examples are presented to illustrate this theme: *“The TA allowed the organization to develop partnerships and get an outsider’s view of the organization.”* and *“We have a strategic plan that guides our work and includes input from wide range of stakeholders which has expanded our capacity and our network of support.”* Second, NJ OFBI grantees provided specific examples that matched the seven, program specific capacity building activities identified in the survey. Agency directors listed these capacity building examples: *“Program Evaluation”*, *“Program Reporting”*, *“Increased knowledge of substance abuse prevention, program development and evaluation”*, and *Program Sustainability and capacity building (expansion of technology).* Finally, a small minority of respondents indicated a concern with the appropriateness of TA offerings and current agency needs. One agency director summarized this

concern: *“The technical assistance was geared toward new non-profits, we’ve been in business for 35 years and require more advanced training. Thank you!”* Overall, the open comment section reflected a positive link between the TA offered and current capabilities as summarized by this agency director’s final comment: *“The sustainability of the program was improved, evidenced by the fact that we’re still here!”*

### Summary

Major findings from this study are presented in response to each of the original study questions.

- *Of the diverse TA activities presented by the NJ OFBI, which resources were most utilized?*

Although study participants indicated strong attendance at pre-grant preparation meetings, more than half also completed NJ OFBI workshops/seminars or participated in one-on-one consulting sessions with the TA intermediaries

- *Which specific type of TA program experienced the highest participation and satisfaction rates?*

This study found that NJ OFBI grantees average participation rate in the various TA activities was 60%. Grantees most often participated in TA sessions that focused on Evaluation Guidelines, Financial Instruction and Partner Relationships and they also most strongly valued these same three sessions. TA activities that focused on Grant Writing were also valued more highly than other session topics.

- *Does the use of an outside TA evaluator provide additional advantages to a faith-based organization?*

Although grantees reported highly valuing TA sessions that focused on evaluation guidelines, a very small number (20 agencies) indicated using an outside evaluator for their OFBI grant. However, fifteen (15) agencies provided examples of immediate and beneficial capacity building activities due to their participation in an evaluation TA session.

- *Which capacity building categories were identified by TA participants?*

Survey respondents identified several capacity building categories, such as program development, program implementation and sustainability activities, as areas in which their organization had improved or developed. Fewer than one in five participants did not indicate at least one capacity building area “that may have been improved because of their participation in the NJ-OFBI technical assistance activities”, and more than 65% of the respondents provided additional comments to describe their increased organizational capacity.

- *Which type and category of faith-based agency is most likely to gain from the technical assistance program?*

The diversity of agencies participating in the survey did not permit this study to clearly delineate a set of characteristics which would identify agencies most likely to participate in the TA programs. The majority of agencies provided multiple services to a myriad of populations. Although agency size, number of individuals served and number of years in business were significantly correlated, no statistical correlation was found between these agency characteristics and identification of any of the seven capacity building activities assessed by the survey. Anecdotal comments suggest that start-up organizations or agencies providing new outreach programs were most likely to respond to TA activities.

Although 30 agencies identified they had received multiple NJ OFBI grants, details concerning the exact years and the number of grants were not provided. A chi-square analysis

( $\chi^2 = 1.141$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .288$ ) indicated no significant difference between agencies who had received more than one grant and those who had received only one grant and their identification of a capacity building outcome.

- *Can TA best practices be identified?*

Based on the number and scope of agency responses to TA options, various TA types and value of particular TA activities, it is clear that faith and community based organizations seek a range of TA opportunities that are tailored to fulfill their capacity building efforts. The cumulative evidence derived from the NJ OFBI survey respondents characterizes the types of TA activities most sought after and valued during the past 10 years (See Tables 4 and 5). Clearly, one of the NJ OFBI TA strengths is the diversity and complexity of the various TA opportunities and TA session topics. The findings also suggest which TA opportunities could be expanded or enhanced to increase participation and agency integration. Leveraging the over-all TA participation rate (60%) could result in an increase number of agencies reporting capacity building activities and also broaden the scope beyond those most commonly mentioned. This study answers the two research questions by presenting descriptive findings that indicate support for the NJ OFBI program and identifying best practices culled from 10 years worth of TA programs.

The limitations to this retrospective review include potential threats to both reliability and validity as all data was collected through a self-report survey using a convenience sample. Due to the large number of non-respondent agencies, generalizing of the findings beyond this convenience sample may not be warranted. In addition, although the response rate was almost 50%, the potential for selection bias is still a concern based on the contact availability of the priority population. Finally, a social desirability bias may exist in the responses if agency's believed future grant awards would in any way be impacted by their responses to this survey.

### Implications for future research, policy and practice.

This retrospective review highlights the importance of providing not only essential technical assistance, but also a sophisticated array of TA activities at the state level for NJ OFBI grantees. TA appears to be a resource sought after by all grantees, but it needs to be tailored to their needs. Future research should focus on grantee agency motivations for participation in particular activities. For example, although an opportunity existed for each individual agency to participate in a one-on-one consultation with an established intermediary, only 55% of those responding indicated they took advantage of this opportunity. As more agencies become repeat grantees, additional analysis will be needed to develop TA modules that meet their needs.

One set of TA activities that appear to be in demand are the large NJ OFBI-sponsored statewide meetings. Consensus for this specific activity is evidenced by overall higher rates of participation and supported by grantee anecdotal comments focusing on these helpful interactions, (*“The opportunity to meet, work with and learn from other faith-based organizations.”*) Together these findings suggest that a valued service NJ OFBI can provide is to become the recognized convener for C/FBOs and establish additional networking opportunities for grantees to learn from each other, both formally and informally. Personal phone interviews with each of the six intermediary agencies strongly support the advantages of NJ OFBI serving as a state-wide facilitator for community based organizations (Hewitt, 2008). A recent article focusing on capacity building reaffirms this strategy, “Formal training opportunities are not the only way to build capacity. Mentoring, partnering, networking, and collaboration with colleagues are useful strategies to enable staff to see what others are doing”(Monroe et al, 2005, p. 68).

To meet the requirements of future NJ OFBI grantees, the length of the grant (one year) may need to be expanded to allow for increased capacity building activity within the individual agency. Five of the six current Technical Assistance providers (Intermediaries) suggest lengthening the grant cycle (Hewitt, 2008). This policy concern can easily be addressed through a system of staggered grants for 1, 2 or 3 year duration. Future grant criteria can reflect a tailored approach to implementing this system.

The success of the NJ OFBI is replicated by hundreds of faith and community based agencies spread across the state and daily providing services to thousands of New Jersey residents in need. Providing technical assistance to these grantees facilitates their capacity building efforts and ultimately produces more responsive and more successful organizations that in turn enrich the quality of life for all state residents.

## References

- Blumenthal, B. (2003). *Investing in capacity building: A guide to high-impact approaches*. New York: Foundation Center.
- Canada, B. (2003). *Faith-Based organizations and their relationship with state and local governments: Analysis of recent initiatives*. Report for Congress. Retrieved on December 1, 2007 from <http://www.boozman.house.gov/UploadedFiles/FBO%20-%20FaithBased%20Organizations%20and%20Relationship%20with%20State%20and%20Local%20Governments%20Analysis%20of%20Recent%20Initiatives.pdf>
- Center for Nonprofit Corporation. (2006). *New Jersey non-profits 2006: Trends and outlooks*. New Brunswick. Retrieved on February 28, 2008 from <http://www.njnnonprofits.org>.
- Clerkin, R.M., and Gronbjerg, K.A. (2007). The capacities of faith-based human service organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 115-127.
- Gruidl, J. and Hustedde, R. (2003). Evaluation of capacity-building programs: A learning organization approach. *Journal of Extension*, 41.
- Hewitt, A. (Forthcoming). Aligning faith-based and community agencies technical assistance needs with intermediaries strengths: A analysis of New Jersey's OFBI.
- Monroe, C.M., Fleming, M.L., Bowman, R.A., Zimmer, J.F., Marcinkowski, T., Washburn, J., Mitchell, N.J. (2005). Evaluators as educators: Articulating program theory and building evaluation capacity. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 108, 57 -71.
- New Jersey Department of State. (January 25, 2005). Secretary of State Regena Thomas announces grants totaling \$2.2. Million for faith-based and community based programs. Retrieved on November 28, 2007. [http://www.state.nj.us/state/secretary/press\\_releases/01252005\\_press.html](http://www.state.nj.us/state/secretary/press_releases/01252005_press.html).

New Jersey Department of State - Office of Faith-Based Initiatives. (2008). Request for proposals. Retrieved on December 12, 2007 from

<http://www.state.nj.us/state/faith/acc2.html>.

New Jersey Faith-Based and Community Initiative Activities. White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Retrieved on December 1, 2007 from

[www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbic/gr6.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbic/gr6.html).

New Jersey Office of Faith-Based Initiatives. (2004) Strategic plan. Retrieved on November 14, 2007 from <http://www.nj.gov/faith/strategicplan.html>

Richard Boris Management Developers. (2006). Project ATLAS: Evaluation report. Richard Boris Management Developers.

Roper, R. (2004). *New Jersey's quiet faith-based initiative: A case study*. The Roper Group. The Rockefeller Institute of Government. Retrieved on December 1, 2007 from

[www.religionandsocialpolicy.org/docs/events/2004\\_annual\\_conference/case\\_study\\_2004\\_newjersey.pdf](http://www.religionandsocialpolicy.org/docs/events/2004_annual_conference/case_study_2004_newjersey.pdf)

State of New Jersey. Executive Order #31. Retrieved on December 1, 2007 from

<http://www.state.nj.us/infobank/circular/eom31.htm>

Szabat and Otten, (no date). *Mapping Nonprofit Capacity Builders: A Study by LaSalle*

*University's Nonprofit Center*. Philadelphia: LaSalle University's Nonprofit Center.

Retrieved on November 28, 2007 from [www.nonprofitcenter@lasalle.edu](http://www.nonprofitcenter@lasalle.edu)

United States Government Accounting Office (2006). *Improvements in monitoring grantees and measuring performance could enhance accountability*, GAO-06-616. Retrieved on March

25, 2008 from <http://gao.gov/new.items/d06616.pdf>

The White House. (2008). *The quiet revolution: A seven-year progress report, 2008*.

Retrieved on March 25, 2008 from

<http://whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/02/print/20080225-7.html>

The White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. (2001). Guidance to faith-based and community organization on partnering with the federal government. Retrieved on November 25, 2007 from

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/guidance\\_document.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/guidance_document.pdf)

The White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, (2007). New Jersey: Faith-based and community initiative activities. Retrieved on February 1, 2008 from

<http://whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/reports.html>.

## Appendix A

## Technical Data

- (1) Survey – Survey face and panel validity were established through a two phase process of faculty expert, and panel review by non-profit agency personnel who had not received any NJ OFBI grants in the past. Content validity was established by comparison with previously published research .Survey reliability was examined post hoc by computing reliability scale analysis. The Cronbach alpha was computed for the following sets of items: NJ OFBI TA Activities: alpha = .89, Types of Technical Assistance: Alpha = .71 and Value Rating for TA: alpha = .87.
- (2) Survey respondents indicated if they had completed any capacity building activities as a result of attending TA sessions offered by NJ OFBI. A chi-square analysis was computed comparing agencies who indicated achieving at least one capacity building outcome and agency characteristics of size, number of individuals served and number of years in business. Results indicate capacity building activities appear independent of these three agency characteristics.

## Frequency and Chi Square for Agency Characteristics by Capacity Building

Agency Characteristic	Frequency	Chi-Square Value	df	Asymp.Sg. (2-sided)
Size		6.390*	4	.172
Large (>250)	4			
Medium (51-250)	5			
Smallmed (21-50)	11			
Small (<20)	35			
Number of Individuals Served		1.228*	4	.873
Large (>3000)	6			
Medium (651-2999)	13			
Smallmed (201-650)	11			
Small (<200)	15			

Years in Business		2.376*	4	.667
Small (< 10)	21			
Stable (11-20)	11			
Established (21-49)	18			
Historical (<50)	6			

\*cells have expected count less than 5

(3) The analysis of open comments provided by the survey respondents (Appendix B) was completed using NUD\*IST QSR N6, a qualitative data analysis computer software package (QSR International Pty. Ltd, Melbourne, Australia, 2002). The text was coded to identify recurring themes and to highlight common patterns.

## Appendix B

A more succinct outline of the Agency's vision & services offered.

Able to write a grant and have it awarded.

Access to and knowledge about funding sources.

Being able to translate our evaluation results in marketable language to expand our program.

Being inclusive during the evaluation process

Collecting your thought collaboration with others has allowed our organization to develop learned and grow in a positive way in all the above.

CUMAC has grown in capacity in significant ways since 1999. The OFBI assistance is only a small reason, as we have attended many other workshops designed for non-profit growth.

Developing a relationship with Pro bono partnership and learning how to set up a Memorandum of Understanding.

Development and implementation support.

Due to experience of our agencies, the TA was not helpful at all.

I do not have any records from the previous director concerning technical assistance. I think program evaluation and sustainability would be most important.

Ideas from different perspectives

Increased knowledge of substance abuse prevention, program development and evaluation.

Internal Structure & Growth participation

It helped our organization focus on the "next steps" as it relates to board and program development, as well as structure.

Learning how to write a very involved grant - along with involved reporting.

Needs assessment & implementation

New bookkeeping systems

None, the TA is not developed for an agency that has 20 years experience.

Not sure

Our pilot with OFBI helped us get a larger grant with the NJ DOL due to our success with OFBI.

Partnerships with the county welfare agencies in various counties, program evaluation and grant availability skills.

Program Evaluation

Program Reporting

Program Sustainability and capacity building (expansion of technology).

Stronger organization prepared to solicit greater funds and sustainability.

Suggested resources for us to access to complement our program.

Technical assistance was not particularly helpful

The ability to grow in outreach opportunities and expand funding opportunities for participation.

The capacity building sessions only reinforced existing knowledge as we've been in existence since 1972 as an IRS designated organization and we were in existence several years prior to the official designation.

The development of formal MOUs - legal advocacy

The fact that the grant was received.

The funded program excelled in developing programs needed in the community.

The funding was too limited to support significant change, we did receive federal OFBI training this year on outcomes measurement that is invaluable!

The Opportunity to meet, work with and learn from other faith-based organizations.

The seminars along with the tech-training.

The sustainability of the program was improved, evidenced by the fact that we're still here.

The TA activities were helpful in evaluating weak areas within the agency and exploring ways to strengthen them. They were more directed at the overall agency than the specific program.

The TA allowed the organization to develop partnerships and get an outsider's view of the organization.

The technical assistance was geared toward new non-profits, we've been in business for 35 years and require more advanced training. Thank you!

This really helped our Board become more engaging in the organizational infrastructure. We had so many positive results within our Board, organization, and staff in terms of capacity building as well helped many faith-based youth groups with a faith and arts mission succeed.

This support gave a grassroots organization the capacity to develop and sustain its infrastructure.

To understand the gaps and weaknesses that might exist in our infrastructure planning and capacity and how to overcome.

Understanding the importance of conducting program evaluations to assess the effectiveness of programs.

We began a respite program with Faith-based funding and have been able to sustain it with other sources of funding for the past six years. This program serves approximately 30 families a year and provides over 4000 respite hours.

We have a strategic plan that guides our work and includes input from wide range of stakeholders which has expanded our capacity and our network of support.

We really did not take advantage of the technical assistance offered by NJ-OFBI.

However, the staff at NJ-OFBI has been extremely helpful to us.

We received none.

We were able to enlarge our studio facilities and reach a larger audience, in cooperation with the other recipients.

Table 1

*Participant Profile*


---

	Agency Size (N = 72)	# of Individuals Served ( N = 68 )	# of Years in Business ( N = 77)
Range	0-3000	8- 50,000	2 - 150
Mean	112	4283	27
Median	17	700	19
Mode	5	500	7

Note: 0 = no full time employees

Table 2

*NJ OFBI Program Categories (N = 68)*


---

Initial Program Categories	# of Agencies (Single Service)	% of Agencies (Single Service)	# of Agencies (Combined Service)	% of Agencies (Combined Service)
At-Risk Youth	7	10	43	63
Community and Economic Development	0	0	14	21
Children's Initiatives	1	1	20	29
Diversity Initiatives	0	0	8	12
ESL	0	0	12	18
Health Initiatives (Behavioral, Vision, Maternal)	1	1	15	22
Homeless/Housing Programs	1	1	23	34
Offender Re-Entry	1	1	16	24
Substance Abuse	2	3	19	28
Senior Programs	5	7	25	37
Training and TA	1	1	11	16
Workforce Development	0	0	11	16

Table 3

*Participation in NJ OFBI Technical Assistance Activity*


---

Technical Assistance Activity	Yes %	No %	Not Sure %
Faith-Based Resource Expositions	51	37	12
NJ OFBI List-serv	49	42	8
NJ OFBI Website	64	34	2
Pre-Grant Preparation Meetings	81	8	11
TA one-on-one Consulting Session	55	40	5
TA Partnering Session	46	39	15
Workshop/Seminar	78	19	6

Table 4

*Grantee Participation by TA Type*

	<u>%</u>
A. Advocacy tips	36
B. Advisory Board Development	48
C. Education Strategies	33
D. Evaluation Guidelines	64
E. Financial (Budgeting) Instruction	60
F. Fundraising Ideas	49
G. Grantwriting Skills	56
H. Partner Relationships	57
I. Project Management Techniques	50
J. Research Options	22
K. Technology Expertise	13

Table 5

*Percent and Mean for Value of Technical Assistance*

	Most Valuable			Least Valuable			Missing	Mean
	5 %	4	3	2	1	n/a		
Advocacy Tips	9	10	12	1	3	26	39	3.63
Advisory Board Development	13	12	10	5	3	21	36	3.66
Education Strategies	8	8	13	0	3	29	40	3.58
Evaluation Guidelines	14	18	13	3	3	14	35	3.77
Financial Instruction	12	20	16	1	4	13	35	3.65
Fundraising Ideas	4	18	16	4	1	23	34	3.45
Grantwriting Skills	17	18	13	5	3	22	22	3.74
Partner Relationships	21	14	8	3	4	21	30	3.92
Project Management Techniques	5	10	14	5	3	22	40	3.28
Research Options	1	7	7	4	3	35	44	3.00
Technology Expertise	3	4	4	3	4	34	49	2.92

Table 6

*Categories of Capacity Building Reported by Grantees*

---

Type of Outcome	Percent
Program Development	40%
Program Improvement	38%
Program Sustainability	38%
Program Evaluation	34%
Program Support	30%
Program Report	29%
Needs Assessment	27%

Figure 1

New Jersey Office of Faith-Based Initiatives Outreach Activities

