



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact



Capacity Building Literature Review

Pact HIV/AIDS Capacity Building Summit
November 17, 2009



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

Presentation Outline

1. Purpose of Literature Review
2. Methodology
3. Findings from Literature Review
4. Conclusions and Implications
5. Final Note



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

I. Purpose of Literature Review

- **Collect and organize** all known, documented information regarding capacity building for HIV/AIDS.
- **Synthesize** results of review regarding impact/outcomes of capacity building.
- **Make recommendations** regarding strategies/processes based on review of impact.
- **Prepare to Disseminate** complete categorization of processes, standards, tools, indicators etc. for use by capacity building community.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

2. Literature Review Methodology

- Develop search and inclusion criteria
 - Review peer journals, gray literature, websites, key informant interviews.
- Catalogue materials used in international setting
- Delineate categories by application or key characteristics
- Review and document evidence of impact
 - Categorize strategies and tools by evidence of efficacy



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

2. Literature Review Methodology (cont.)

- 200 capacity building tools identified.
- 100 journal articles identified
- Contact made with 38 organizations (AIDSTAR II IQC leads)
 - Over **50** organizations provided with tool capture and definition forms
 - More than **20** organizations interviewed



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

3. Findings from Literature Review

Approaches:

Numerous articles described approaches to capacity building including:

- communicating well
- providing mentoring, supportive supervision
- being team-oriented, collaborative
- working within the local context (organization, culture, country, etc.)



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

3. Findings from Literature Review (cont.)

- Journal articles tended to:
 - define capacity building.
 - advocate for capacity-building.
 - *equate capacity building with training.*
- Limited number of peer-reviewed articles (n≈70)
 - research was general, with few specific approaches or strategies rigorously reviews;
 - Very limited evidence of documented impact.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

3. Findings from Literature Review (cont.)

Tools collection & analysis: findings

- many well known and appreciated tools
- some easily available on websites
- many situation-specific tools
- many similar approaches
- minimal discussion or evidence of impact
- few common indicators



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

3. Findings from Literature Review (cont.)

Limitations:

- quantity & quality of responses were limited;
- level of detail on self-assessments was variable;
- Sense of “competition” may have limited disclosure of tools, other information;
 - tools considered to be proprietary information
- some informants express concern about a penalty for “bad” evaluation of their strategies or tools.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

4. Conclusions and Implications

1. There appears to be little consensus about what constitutes a *best practice* for capacity building;
2. Numerous tools exist to improve individual and organizational performance – there may be redundancy;
3. Great need for rigorous evaluation of impact (which could help build consensus about what works).



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

4. Conclusions and Implications (cont.)

Evidence Gap

- **No** rigorous, controlled studies demonstrating that capacity building leads to changes in service delivery;
- **No** common standards of what's acceptable (critical minimum) or ideal (aspirational), independent of the capacity building approach used;
- **No** widely applicable indicators of progress with which to measure capacity-building , independent of the capacity building approach used.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

5. Conclusion: final note

Although the capacity building community is committed and executing excellent programs, progress in our field may be constrained by:

- Lack of commonly agreed-to definitions, standards, or indicators;
- Insufficient evidence base to make compelling case to for increased investment in essential capacity building programs.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



AIDSTAR-Two
capacity for impact

Thank you

John Berman
jberman@msh.org