MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR No. 04
Series of 2010

SUBJECT: “Institutional Development Framework”
Amending for the purpose Memorandum Circular No. 32, Series of 2004

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION
The Department as a dynamic organization operates in the context of Philippine Social Protection environment where there is a plurality and intensity of needs, diversity of stakeholders and complexity and urgency of issues. The results of the organizational assessment conducted under the National Sector Support for Social Welfare and Development Reform Project (NSS-SWDRP) reflected the following:

1. An imbalance in task/function – person/unit mismatch was seen as a result from the shift in key role from rowing to steering function from the devolution agenda,
2. Weak preferential practices in continuous policy, institutional and organizational development and strategic human resource development,
3. Unarticulated and uncoordinated systems in program/project cycle development,
4. Strategic Planning more formalistic than fully operating driver of quality performance and
5. Learning organization principles and values upheld but not actively pursued and systematized in work programs and culture; uneven across DSWD.

Apparently, these results emanated from both the internal environment and external environment expectation of the Department as a leader in social protection and as such it has to put much premium to external partners/allies, intermediaries and other stakeholders.

The NSS-SWDRP has paved the way in the formulation of the DSWD Reform Agenda as the strategy in getting to where the organization would want to go, keeping in mind its mission, aspirations and values. The Institutional Development Framework should clearly illustrate the internal reform processes that have bearing or implications to its external environment. Hence, the amendments to MC #32 – Institutional Development Framework, s. of 2004 specifically on the following:

a. the inception of risk/vulnerability analysis in the Social Protection (SP) environment in addressing the gaps through improved policies/programs, capacities, systems and structures and resources

---

b. expanding the roles and functions of Social Welfare Institutional Development Bureau as lead in Institutional Development and the different offices as Partners

c. demonstrating the internal reform processes under the DSWD Reform Agenda

This Framework shall help align change efforts with DSWD aspirations (internal-external environment), clarify the focus (strategy and boundaries), map out executive decisions and accountabilities (roles and work/tasks) and provide means to connect the dots in the various elements and component. Further, the approved DSWD Corporate Plan reflects the general objective of the Department’s reform and provides a rough sketch of the Agency’s long term institutional development for it to effectively assume as the leader in Social Protection sector.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

As used in this Memorandum Circular, the following definitions are adopted:

1. **Organizational Diagnosis** is the process of identifying, assessing and prioritizing the current needs and core competency requirements of the organization.²

2. **Intervention Design Development** is the process of developing needs-based design and concept papers of different interventions for the organization to perform effectively.³

3. **Capacity Building** is a continuing process of creating an enabling environment with appropriate policy support and working for the installation of legal framework and undertaking continuing organizational development efforts especially for DSWD as the lead sponsor of the change processes inherent in championing/leading the Social Welfare and Development/Social Protection reform agenda.⁴

4. **Capability** includes awareness, skills, knowledge, motivation, commitment and confidence.⁵

5. **Capability Building** refers to a range of activities by which individuals, groups, and organizations improve their capability to achieve their goals.⁶

6. **Organizational Development** is the sustained effort through which DSWD as an organization learns about and develops its internal capacity to be the most effective it can be in its mission work and to sustain itself over the long term.⁷

² MC#32 series of 2004 - Institutional Development Framework
³ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid
⁶ Ibid
III. DESCRIPTION OF THE FRAMEWORK

Institutional Development is defined as the distinct interconnected practice and process by which a diversity of individuals, organizations and social systems continuously increase their capacities and improve their performance in achieving shared social aspirations. It involves:

A. A sustained process of internal socialization
B. Goal and shared aspirations
C. Increasing Level of Performance and Effectiveness of Human Organizations
D. Strategic and Planned Intervention

The diagram shows how institutional development shall be conducted starting from the assessment of risks and vulnerabilities in the SP environment. The assessment of major social
risk shall provide a clear picture of current SWD situation specifically on the needs or gaps to be addressed in the areas of improved capacities, policies, systems and structures, etc. Identified gaps shall be the basis of planned interventions.

IV. OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE FRAMEWORK

To enable the Department deliver its major final outputs in an efficient and effective manner, and contribute in the attainment of the societal outcomes, organizational diagnosis takes place followed by intervention designing and implementation. As an integrated system and process, it shall include a deliberate and planned monitoring and evaluation to ensure relevant and sustained responses to the needs of the SP sectors.

Institutional Development Process

A. Organizational Diagnosis

This is determining core competency requirements of the organization vis-a-vis the Department’s vision-mission-goals, the macro and micro societal situations as well as the organization’s resources. Under this process, the following activities are essential:

1. Conduct organizational assessment and validation of findings.

2. Conduct periodic gap analysis on the Department’s policy, program, implementing structures, delivery systems and capacities. There are three existing mechanisms done by the Department:

   a. Performance-Based Monitoring and Evaluation to determine the extent of program implementation with regard to the achievement of the Department’s Major Final Outputs (MFOs), Reform Agenda, contribution to the achievement of the Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP), Millenium Development Goals (MDGs), as well as various international commitments. Performance measures/indicators contained in MFO, Sectoral Reporting Forms shall be utilized and to be submitted by the Field Offices to the PDPB for consolidation and analysis on a quarterly, semestral or annual basis.

   b. Program/Project/Services-Based Monitoring and Evaluation to determine the impact as well as issues on the implementation as basis for policy decisions; program enrichment, expansion, replication; development of social technologies and for further research/study conducted through field visits, periodic monitoring, program review and evaluation workshop (PREW) and provision of technical assistance, policies to address the identified issues/gaps.

   c. Performance Management System – established under Memorandum Circular No. 5 series of 2003, to improve the quality of service being offered to poor, marginalized and disadvantaged individuals, families and communities. The PMS holds officials and employees accountable for both organizational and individual performance in order to focus/improve organizational and individual performance. It applies to career officials and employees as well as non-career, casual, and contractual employees.
B. Intervention Design Development involves the following:

1. Setting of objectives based on the organizational competency required
2. Conceptualize content areas based on the identified objectives,
3. Describe the mode of interventions or the methodologies to be used for such undertaking. Milestones shall also be established to ascertain a series of interventions as well as resource requirements. The assurance of having quality output and results from the intervention shall also be put in place.

Desired outcomes shall be achievable under the following conditions:

a. For Organic Staff

a.1 Competent staff performing their mandated functions with confidence

a.2 Nurturing community of professionals working for the growth of its members

a.3 Institutional capacity to become and remain a learning and dynamic organization;

b. For the intermediaries, partners and stakeholders

b.1 SWD delivery systems are convergent, accessible to, and create maximum impact of services among target beneficiaries.

b.2 Capacities of LGUs, NGOs, and POs for the delivery of quality and adequate social services developed.

b.3 Participation of NGOs, POs, academe, business sectors and the rest of civil society in social welfare and development institutionalized.

c. For the Constituency

C. Implementation of Institutional Development Interventions

This involves the actual conduct of the planned interventions with and through the operating units, programs, and services.
D. Monitoring and Evaluation of the Implemented Intervention

The monitoring and evaluation phase is the follow through activity where interventions are assessed and analyzed based on current implementation and its actual application to and by different units.

The assurance of having quality output and results from the intervention shall be put in effect during this phase. Performance indicators for each intervention shall be established and would serve as basis for determining the quality of the intervention used.

Information surfaced during the implementation of the intervention shall be assessed during this phase. SWIDB with the concerned OBS shall determine its implications to current policies and programs as the Department’s current operations.

V. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

To ensure the quality of conduct of all institutional development and related activities and maximizing the scarce resources to be utilized for such, below are the roles and responsibilities of the following offices:

**A. SWIDB as Leader in Institutional Development**

1. Lead in the formulation of a 3-Year Agency Institutional Development Agenda.

2. Communicate to partners and provide technical assistance along institutional development to sustain and elevate the partnership toward higher level of consensus building, collaboration and attainment of shared vision.

3. Conduct Institutional Development Assessment with social welfare partners and engage them in reformulating subsequent year’s institutional development plan.

4. Provide access to knowledge and other learnings necessary to promote capabilities.


**B. Offices/Bureaus/Services as Partners in Institutional Development**

1. Identify institutional development concerns based on the units needs as contribution in the formulation of the agency ID Agenda and possible actions.

2. Include in their respective WFP institutional development interventions tasked to their units and ensure or lead its implementation as appropriate.
C. Field Offices

1. Identify its institutional development concerns based on the results of needs assessment of organic staff, organizational diagnosis, and TARA Plan with LGUs and recommend possible actions.

2. Include in their respective WFP institutional development interventions tasked to the Field Offices and ensure its implementation.

3. Conduct institutional development activities for its organic staff and intermediaries as well as stakeholders.

4. Prepare and furnish SWIDB copy of their report at least by semester in relation to their ID Plan.

VI. Repealing Clause:

Memorandum Circular No. 32 series of 2004 is hereby amended accordingly.

VII. Effectivity:

This Memorandum Circular shall take effect immediately.

Issued in Quezon City, this 15th day of April, 2010

[Signature]

Acting Secretary, DSWD