## **Tool 5: Intervention Profile**

## **Table 8: Organizational Profile**

1. Type of agency/organization (check one box)

Government			Private Sector			
National Ministry		State Agency		Not for Profit		For Profit
2. Number of yea	rs intervention ha	as been in operatio	on (check one box)			
Less than 3		3-5		6-10		More than 10
3. Budget used to	o implement the in	ntervention				
Year 1 budget of model (\$USD)			Percent of total agency budget, Year 1			
Latest full annual budget (if different from Year 1)				Percent of total agency budget, last year		
		ntion (check one bo	ox)			
All in one district		In multiple districts, but in same/single state/province		In multiple states/ prov- inces, but not all		Nation- wide (all states/ prov- inces)
	ollowing best desc on? (Check all that		of funding the org	anization used to	finance the int	roduction and us
a. Financed inter	nally from general	revenues or budge	et allocation of the	organization		
b. Self-financed c	on a fee for service	basis				
c. Special resour	es provided to the	organization from	n national or local g	government source	es for this purp	ose
d. Foreign assista this purpose	nce donor resourc	es provided by one	e or more foreign g	overnment, found	ation, or corpo	ration for
e. National donor	resources provide	ed by one or more l	local foundation(s)	or corporation(s)	for this purpose	ž
	ortant additional ir	formation on the	method used to fin	ance the intervent	tion below:	

6. Number of people directly affected by or receiving service(s) from the intervention during the last 12 months (total number from ALL service sites combined)

# Men		# Women		Children under 12		Total	
6a. Average number of people served or affected per service site/area (only for interventions implemented in multiple sites)							
# Men		# Women		Children under 12		Average of all people served	
7a. Staff hours per day required to implement intervention at original site (for multiple delivery sites, use an average)							
Total number of staff members implementing inter- vention in all locations				Average number of hours worked on the intervention at each location by staff members			

7b. Supervisory staff (technical) hours required to implement intervention (for multiple delivery sites, use an average)					
Total number of supervisors implementing interven- tion in all locations	Average number of hours worked on the intervention at each location by supervisors				
7c. Administrative staff hours required to implement intervention (for multiple delivery sites, use an average)					
Total number of admin staff implementing interven- tion in all locations	Average number of hours worked on the intervention at each location by admin staff person				

If there are more types of staff required to implement the intervention (e.g., volunteers), add additional lines and repeat the exercise.

## 8. Which of the following best describes the Originating Organization's monitoring and evaluation of its intervention?

Options	Check all that Apply
a. The organization did not monitor or evaluate implementation of the intervention in any structured way.	
b. The organization monitored the introduction of the intervention against a timeline and set of progress/ results benchmarks it established before implementation began.	
c. The organization formally evaluated the introduction of the intervention for the purpose of determining whether it was as effective as or more effective than previous practices.	
d. The organization formally evaluated the introduction of the intervention for the purpose of determining whether it was as cost-effective as or more cost-effective than previous practices.	,

Provide any additional comments on the monitoring and evaluation of the introduction of the intervention in the space below.

9. In the view of the Organization's leadership, in what ways is the intervention a significant improvement over past practice?

9a. In the view of the Organization's leadership, what aspects of their vision, values, or culture, if any, contributed to the successful development and implementation of the intervention?

10a. In the view of the Organization's technical/supervisory staff, in what ways is the intervention a significant improvement over past practices?

10b. In the view of the Organization's technical/supervisory staff, what aspects of the organization's vision, values, or culture, if any, contributed to the successful development and implementation of the intervention?

11a. In the view of the Organization's front-line service/delivery staff, in what ways is the intervention a significant improvement over past practices?

11b. In the view of the Organization's front-line service/delivery staff, what aspects of the organization's vision, values, or culture, if any, contributed to the successful development and implementation of the intervention?

12. Which of the following best describes the interest/commitment of the Organization's leadership to scaling up the intervention? (Check only one response)

a. Views scaling up positively, but is not committed to playing an active role

b. Committed to scaling up, but does not perceive itself as capable of leading that process

c. Committed to scaling up and leading the effort to do so

Provide any important additional comments below.

**13.** Which of the following best describes the Organization's view of its capacity for scaling up the intervention? (Check only response per column)

a. Capacity to scale up intervention themselves	Select one	b. Capacity to advise/supervise others in how to scale up the intervention	Select one
Very limited capacity		Very limited capacity	
Some capacity		Some capacity	
Strong capacity		Strong capacity	

Provide any important additional comments in the space below.

Briefly describe the decision-making process (i.e., on whose authority) that would enable the scale up of the intervention or would allow others to scale it up (e.g., the CEO, board of directors, management team, donor, etc.). Include any conditions the Originating Organization may place on allowing others to scale up the intervention.