

# ChildFund Alliance Strategic Planning Process

## Phase I Deliverable Guidance for Working Groups

### Background

This document provides additional background on the Alliance strategic planning process, including detailed requirements for working group deliverables for Phase I. The guidance is relevant equally to all three working groups (Program, Identity, Operations). It supplements the Terms of Reference (TOR) for each working group. (The TORs provide specific details about the unique scope of work and key questions to be answered, for each working group.)

### Our aims for the strategic plan

Through this planning process, the Alliance aims to build on learning and accomplishments that resulted from its previous strategic plan. Our goal is to develop a strategic plan that clarifies the meaningful and measurable impact we will create — for children and Alliance members — in the next five years. To do so, we must develop a plan that strikes the right balance between boldness and realism, and for which all members feels a sense of ownership. The planning process is designed to help us achieve those aims.

### Two Phases of Planning — Three Decision Points

Phase I: Identifying, Evaluating and Selecting Options				Phase II: Building Out Options; Integration			
June- July	Aug- Sept	Oct	November Mtg Decision	Dec - Feb	Feb Virtual Mtg Decision	May -Apr	May Mtg Decision
Set focus and scope; Provide guidance	Identify and evaluate options	Deliverable: Explain options; make recommendations	<b>Select options to move forward</b>	Build out options — goals, key actions, etc. Identify alternatives; trade-offs.	<b>Make initial trade-offs; ensure alignment</b>	Continue to build the plan. Deliverable - Integrated Plan (Apr)	<b>Final Plan Approval</b> Sets ambitions/ directs resources.
Working Groups & SIT			<b>CEO Forum &amp; Board</b>	Working Groups & SIT	<b>CEO Forum</b>	Working Groups & SIT	<b>CEO Forum &amp; Board</b>

In the first stage of planning, we focus on exploring and identifying various options through which the Alliance can advance in three key areas — Program, Identity and Operations. (For example, in Phase I the Operations working group may offer several alternative strategies that the Alliance could implement to operate more efficiently or raise additional funds.) However, all of these alternatives cannot move forward. The focus of decision making in November is to review and then narrow the set of options, to create a smaller set of ideas for which more detailed plans will be developed in Phase II.

The second stage of planning involves building out the selected options, to further specify goals, actions etc., and to integrate these into a unified plan. Decision-making for Phase II will happen in February (initial review and tradeoffs) and May 2020 (final plan approval).

### Shared Decision Criteria

The Strategy Integration Team (SIT) and CEO Forum have identified criteria that will be used in all phases of the planning process to evaluate ideas and inform decisions. Explicit and consistent criteria can help ensure that we create a plan that is bold and ambitious while also being sustainable and feasible. Importantly, these criteria will not “make” decisions for us; rather, they will help us to consider all ideas from various perspectives. These criteria also clarify for working groups how the ideas they present in their deliverables will be evaluated.

The shared criteria that will be used in our process are:

- **Desirability — Is this right need/opportunity?**
  - Will this address a significant need for those we serve (or for the Alliance)?
  - Will it result in demonstrable impact —produce significant benefit to those we serve (or for the Alliance)?
  - Is this bold and innovative enough to be compelling to beneficiaries, members, or potential partners (institutional, individual)?
- **Viability — Is this financially sustainable?**
  - Can the Alliance realistically fund/support the development and ongoing maintenance of this effort?
  - Will it contribute to financial growth (through existing or new revenue streams)?
- **Feasibility — Does this build on the Alliance’s existing operational strengths?**
  - Does this leverage or strengthen the Alliance’s core competencies (advocacy)?
  - Does this leverage or strengthen the Alliance brand?
  - Does this leverage or strengthen existing technical expertise of a significant number of members? If new expertise, can it be built in 2-3 years?

In deliverables submitted to the SIT, working groups should evaluate the options they propose using these key criteria (desirability, viability, feasibility). In November, the CEO Forum and Board will also use these criteria when considering and deciding on options that will move forward for more detailed planning in Phase II.

Working groups may identify additional sub-criteria in each category (desirability, viability, feasibility) that help them clarify the relative strengths and weaknesses of alternatives they are considering. (Please see the Appendix at the end of this document for an example used by the Program Choices working group.)

## **Phase I (Fall) — Deliverable Requirements**

Each of the three working groups (Program, Identity, Operations) should submit **two (2) deliverables** to the SIT — a five to seven (5-7) page narrative document and an associated PowerPoint presentation deck — **no later than Wednesday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>**.

### **Narrative Document — MS WORD**

- **Due date:** Wednesday, October 2nd
- **Length:** 5 - 7 pages total
- **Format:** MS Word
- **Key Content — Three Sections**
  1. **Description of the scope/focus of the group** (relates to the Terms of References (TOR) for each working group).
  2. **Options for Consideration**
    - Each group should provide **at least two (2) but no more than four (4) options** for consideration, related to the scope/key questions they were tasked to address
    - Background on each option should include:
      - A **description of the option**, that clarifies what it is (and isn't)
      - An **evaluation of each option related to key the decision criteria** — desirability, viability, feasibility. What are its relative strengths? Relative weaknesses?
      - A **recommended option** and your rationale for the recommendation
    - **Challenges, assumptions or questions not yet answered.** This section provides the working group the opportunity to highlight key challenges they faced or anticipate related to a particular option. In addition, the working group can clarify major assumptions they made, or questions that have not yet been answered, but should be in the next stage.

3. **Background on Sources and Process.** We aim for this planning process to be inclusive, meaning a diversity of perspectives should be considered by each working group. Therefore, each group should explain:
- How were perspectives of Alliance members, beyond those represented by individuals on the working group, included in your analysis?
  - How were National Office staff perspectives included in your analysis?
  - How were European Office staff perspectives included in your analysis?
  - What other sources of evidence/expertise did you use to identify options or inform your evaluation of these options?

**Note:** The SIT will integrate the narrative deliverables received from each working group into a single, 10-page summary document. This summary document will be shared with November meeting participants as a pre-read well in advance of the meeting (to allow time for translation as necessary.) The original narrative deliverable submitted by each working group will also be made available to participants as optional reading.

### **Presentation – PowerPoint**

The presentation should closely mirror content provided in the narrative document. The presentation provides the opportunity for the presenter (assumed to be the CEO Sponsor of the working group) to emphasize key points of the analysis related to each option under consideration, explain the rationale for the group's recommendations, and answer questions during the November meetings.

**Due Date:** Wednesday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Presentation length:** Plan for a maximum 30-minute presentation, with 20-30 minutes for discussion.

**Format:** PowerPoint

**Key Content** (Aligns with Narrative Deliverable)

1. Description of the scope/focus of the group
2. Options for Consideration: Description of the Option; Evaluation using shared criteria; Recommended Option(s) and Rationale; Challenges/Assumptions
3. Summary of Information Sources and Process

**NOTE:** Presentation decks will not be summarized or integrated by the SIT. However, they should be presented in November as submitted to the SIT, given that some members will have translated them into local languages.

### **Phase 2 (Spring) – Integrated Plan**

The final format of the strategic plan has not yet been developed; however, we anticipate that more detailed planning for selected options will include things such as: goals/targets; major initiatives; resources, etc. Guidance for Phase II deliverables will be provided in early December, informed by decisions made at the November meetings.

### **Additional Considerations for Working Groups**

In addition to this shared guidance, it is likely that working groups may develop internal processes to support their work, such as:

- Sub-criteria to be used for preliminary evaluation of options within the working group (these should align with the desirability, feasibility, viability framework).
- A plan for how the working group will engage other stakeholders (other Alliance members, national office staff, external experts, EU office staff) to inform its efforts. (This could be via surveys, interviews, advisory panels, or direct engagement in the group's work.)

- Interim deliverables to support the identification and discussion of options at the working group level. The working group will need to identify how it will consolidate these interim deliverables into a single final deliverable for submission to the SIT.
- Information management. It's anticipated that each working group will gather background information/data that will be useful in Phase II as well as during implementation. We ask each group to consider how it will manage and organize this background information, so it is available for future use.

### **The Role of the Strategy Integration Team (SIT)**

The SIT was created to provide support and guidance necessary to maintain alignment throughout the planning process. The SIT works directly with major stakeholders in the process —working groups, CEO Forum, Board —to ensure shared expectations for the process and end product. In addition, the SIT creates detailed guidance, such as this document, to support alignment, and also plays an active role in integrating working group efforts into a unified plan.

### **Questions?**

Please don't hesitate to reach out to Wendy Hirsch, ([wendy@wendyhirsch.com](mailto:wendy@wendyhirsch.com)), Strategy Manager, with any questions or concerns.

**Appendix: Example of Criteria and Sub-criteria**

Shared Alliance Strategic Planning Criteria	Related Program Choices Sub-criteria
<p><b>DESIRABILITY — Does this address the right need/opportunity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this address a significant <u>need</u> for those we serve (or for the Alliance)?</li> <li>• Will it result in demonstrable <u>impact</u> —produce significant benefit to those we serve (or for the Alliance)?</li> <li>• Is this bold and innovative enough to be <u>compelling</u> to beneficiaries, members, or potential partners (institutional, individual)?</li> </ul>	<p>a) <i>Is this a <u>critical issue</u> for vulnerable children?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Is this issue <u>compelling enough</u> to build internal and external momentum?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Can we demonstrate <u>impact</u> through this effort?</i></p> <p>d) <i>Is this issue aligned with “Ending Violence against Children”? (EVAC)</i></p>
<p><b>VIABILITY — Is this financially sustainable?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the Alliance realistically <u>fund/support</u> the development and ongoing maintenance of this effort?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to financial <u>growth</u> (through existing or new revenue streams)?</li> </ul>	<p>e) <i>Is this relevant to <u>institutional donors</u>?</i></p> <p>f) <i>Is this relevant for <u>sponsor/supporter (financial) engagement</u>?</i></p> <p>g) <i>Is this relevant to Alliance <u>members’ fundraising priorities</u>?</i></p>
<p><b>FEASIBILITY — Does this build on the Alliance’s existing operational strengths?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does this leverage or strengthen the Alliance’s <u>core competencies (advocacy)</u>?</li> <li>• Does this leverage or strengthen the Alliance <u>brand</u>?</li> <li>• Does this leverage or strengthen <u>existing technical expertise</u> of a significant number of members? If new expertise, can it <u>be built in 2-3 years</u>?</li> </ul>	<p>h) <i>Can this be addressed through <u>global advocacy</u>?</i></p> <p>i) <i>Can this be addressed through <u>CO level advocacy</u>?</i></p> <p>j) <i>Does this build the strength of the Alliance <u>brand</u>?</i></p> <p>k) <i>Does this leverage existing expertise based on ChildFund’s <u>programmatic experience</u>?</i></p>