Capacity Building Needs Baseline of the Local Social Welfare and Development Officers (LSWDO) in the PHILIPPINES

DSWD
Department of Social Welfare and Development

Capacity Building Bureau

Copyright 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Republic of the Philippines 4

I. Rationale 5

II. Objectives 6

III. Description of the Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT) 7

IV. Coverage 9

V. Profile of the Respondents 11

VI. Tabular Presentation as to Average Rating and Average of Responses of the 14 Regions 18

a. Administration and Organization 18

b. Program Management 25

c. Networking and Partnership Building 33

d. Working with Politicians 40

VII. Summary of Findings and Conclusion 47

VIII. Recommendations 49

ATTACHMENT

I. The Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT) 54

LIST OF TABLES

Title of Tables	*Page No.*
Table 1: Covered Regions, Provinces, Cities and Municipalities For the Baseline Capacity Assessment for LSWDOs (2013).....	9
Table 2: Profile of Respondents by Office and Sex	12
Table 3: Profile of Respondents by Civil Status	13
Table 4: Profile of Respondents by Educational Attainment	14
Table 5: Profile of Respondents by Number of Years in Service	16
Table 6: National Average Rating on Administration and Organization	19
Table 7: National Average Responses Relative to Administration and Organization of the 14 Regions	20
Table 8: Comparative Assessment across Regions In terms of Administration and Organization	23
Table 9: National Average Rating on Program Management	26
Table 10: National Average Responses Relative to Program Management of the	27
Table 11: Comparative Assessment across Regions In terms of Program Management	30
Table 12: National Average Rating on Networking and Partnership Building	34
Table 13: National Average Responses Relative to Networking and Partnership Building	35

LIST OF TABLES

Title of Tables ***Page No.***

Table 14: Comparative Assessment across Regions In terms of Networking and Partnership Building 38

Table 15: National Average Rating on Working with Politicians 41

Table 16: National Average Responses Relative to Working with Politicians 42

Table 17: Comparative Assessment across Regions In terms of Working with the Politicinas 45

Republic of the Philippines (RP)

The Philippines is widely known as ***"Perlas ng Silangan*** " or ***"Pearl of the Orient"*** is unruffled of its seventeen regions where one, considered administrative, another as autonomous in nature and the rest are divided as geographical regions.

Map of the Philippines is the highest portion of a partly submerged mountain chain and is made up of 7, 107 islands. Its main island groups are Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. Historically, Spain (1565-1898) and the United States (1898-1946), colonized the country and have been the largest influences on the Philippine culture. The Philippines is one of the most westernized nations in Southeast Asia, hence, there is a unique blend of eastern and western culture as a nation. The Philippines share maritime borders with: China, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Palau, Vietnam, and Taiwan *(source: http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/philippines.htm).*

The three main island groups are composed of Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR), Regions I, II, III,IV-A, IV-B, V and National Capital Region (NCR) for main island of Luzon; Regions VI, VII, VIII for the main island of Visayas; and Regions IX, X, XI, XII, CARAGA and the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) for the main island of Mindanao.

Regional areas are divided into eighty (80) provinces where it has 125 Cities and 1,513 municipalities. Of the seventeen (17) regions, 16 were targeted for the capacity assessment. From the total 1,638 cities and municipalities, 1,067 were covered as priority for assessment considering its existing convergence as far as DSWD core programs is concerned.

Baseline of Capacity Building Needs of the Local Social Welfare and Development Officers (LSWDOs) in the Philippines

National Report

I. RATIONALE

The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) envisions a society where the poor, vulnerable and disadvantaged are empowered for an improved quality of life. To this end, DSWD aims to be the world's standard for the delivery of coordinated social services and social protection for poverty reduction by 2030.

Bearing in mind that DSWD is one of the agencies with devolved programs and services to Local Government Units (LGU), the achievement of its vision and goals is partly dependent on its partnership with intermediaries and stakeholders as stated in its mission to ***"provide social protection and promote the rights and welfare of the poor, vulnerable and the disadvantaged individual, family and community to contribute to poverty alleviation and empowerment through SWD policies, programs, projects and services implemented with or through LGUS, NGOs, POs, other GOs and other members of the civil society."***

As support to the Department's vision and mission, back in 2010, the Philippine Government adhered to implement the Performance Governance System (PGS) – Balanced Scorecard to measure the country's policy performance and reflect its scores on the 20 indicators set on international standard. DSWD's scorecards are rooted in its core values of respect to human dignity, integrity and service excellence. It develops, implements and coordinates social protection and poverty reduction solutions for and with the poor, vulnerable and disadvantaged to achieve the aim as mentioned above. The PGS is a tool that provides mechanisms to translate social protection and poverty reduction solutions into concrete strategies and measureable outcome for breakthrough results. Under the tenet of good governance, these results will make DSWD more sustainable and responsive to the needs of its constituencies.

One of DSWD scorecards is to develop high performing, proactive and supportive partners in the delivery of coordinated social services and social protection as reflected in its **Strategic Goal (SG) No. 3: *Increase the number of Provinces with majority of their Municipalities/Cities having fully functioning LSWDOs to 40 by 2016***. The Capacity Building Bureau (CBB), under DSWD Institutional Development Group (IDG) cluster, directly supports the achievement of this SG with its Unit Breakthrough Goal of establishing the baseline capacity building needs of P/C/MSWDOs in the targeted 40 provinces

by the end of December 2013. Consequently, the baseline result will be used by CBB in developing a competency-based leadership development interventions for the Local Social Welfare and Development Officers (LSWDOs) beginning 2014 and onwards.

II. OBJECTIVES

Performance Objectives:

The capacity assessment aims to identify the level of competency of LSWDOs in performing their functions as stipulated in the guidelines for LGU Social Welfare and Development Service Delivery System (AO. 07) and RA 7160 (Local Government Code).

Enabling Objectives:

a. *Assess the level of competency of LSWDO officers and heads in carrying out the roles and responsibilities efficiently and effectively;*

b. *Identify capacity building needs/gaps along LSWDOs performance of functions under AO No. 07; and*

c. *Draw out significant and relevant recommendations to address identified needs/gaps.*

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL (CAT)

DSWD is committed to three Strategic Goals(SG) by 2016. One of which is SG no.3: Increase the number of provinces and majority of cities/municipalities having a fully functioning LSWDO to 40 by 2016. Consequently, the Capacity Building Bureau (CBB) is responsible in ensuring that LSWDOs at the frontline of implementing Social Welfare and Development (SWD) programs and services which are responsive to achieve the strategic goals set by the Department. Hence, to achieve the Unit Breakthrough Goal for 2013, the Bureau developed, piloted and conducted a nationwide Capacity Assessment using the Capacity Assessment Tool *(please refer to Attachment A)*.

The Capacity Assessment Tool is divided into 4 parts, namely, (1) Profile of the Respondent to include personal and work information, (2) learning needs which covers 4 development areas, (3) other tasks by the LSWDO Officer/ not mentioned in the learning assessment, and (4) recommendations.

On the learning needs part of the tool, it seeks to identify levels of knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of the LSWDOs relative to the following learning areas:

1. **Administration and Organization**

    a. Develops Plans and Strategies on Social Welfare and Development
    b. Develops and Implements Financial Plans
    c. Formulates Measures/Strategies for the Approval of the Sanggunian and Provide Technical Assistance and Support to Local Chief Executive
    d. Implements and Reviews Human Resources Development Policies and Programs
    e. Conducts and Documents Work Process for Decision-Making, Policy-Making, Planning and for the Use of Identified End-Users

2. **Program Management**

    a. Planning
    b. Implementation
    c. Monitoring
    d. Evaluation

3. **Networking/Partnership Building**

    a. Identify or Map-Out Resources within the Area of Assignment that covers Financial Expertise and Existing Non-Government

organization and Business whose Interest are in Social Welfare and Development
b. Classify Resources in accordance to its Programs and Services offered
c. Mobilizes Resources from Partners to augment to the implementation of SWD Programs

4. Working with Politicians

a. Articulates and Communicates Social Welfare and Development Goal(s) and Advocates in a way that upholds Standards of Programs/Services of the Office
b. Relates with the Local Chief Executive's Demands and Aligns the Interest of the Politician with Social Welfare and Development
c. Demonstrates Objectivity and Professionalism in Dealing with and Among Superior or Authority who gives Commands
d. Conducts an Inventory of Stakeholders in the Community

Likewise, respondents were asked to indicate their learning needs by checking the box with level of operation based on the standards on social welfare and development service delivery system of the LGU. A rating scale of 1 to 4 with specific description of knowledge, skill and self-satisfaction were provided to guide the respondents of what best describe their level of development as LSWDOs. Said rating scale is describe for **KNOWLEDGE** as 1-No Knowledge, 2-Limited Knowledge, 3-Adequate Knowledge, 4-With high level of knowledge; for **SKILL** as 1-No Skill, 2-Limited skill, 3-Adequate skill, 4-With high level of skill; and for **SELF-SATISFACTION** as 1-Dissatisfied, 2-Somewhat satisfied, 3-Most of the time satisfied, 4-Always satisfied. To ensure that the tool will give enough space for respondents to substantiate their ratings, a REMARKS portion is provided for them to elaborate their responses.

Furthermore, the respondents were given opportunity to write their other tasks as LSWD Officer/Staff not mentioned in the learning assessment to capture important roles they perform. The last portion indicates the respondents' recommendations to sustain areas they are good at and suggest measures to address the areas they need to improve on along the four development areas mentioned above and other areas as well.

IV. COVERAGE

The Capacity Building Bureau(CBB) targeted 32 provinces across all regions for the administration of the Capacity Assessment Tool. Adhering to the standard set by the Department to cover majority of cities and municipalities under the targeted provinces, Table 1 below presents the nationwide coverage indicating the regions, number of provinces, and number of cities/municipalities.

Table 1: Covered Regions, Provinces, Cities and Municipalities for the Baseline Capacity Assessment for LSWDOs (2013)

Region	Total No. of Province	No. of Targeted Province	Total No. of City	No. of Covered City	Percentage	Total No. of Mun.	No. of Covered Mun.	Percentage	Overall Total of Covered City/Mun.	Overall %
CAR	6	3	1	1	100%	45	33	73%	34	74%
I	4	4	9	4	44%	116	72	62%	76	61%
II	5	4	3	2	67%	84	63	75%	65	75%
III	7	3	8	8	100%	59	34	58%	42	63%
IV-A	5	3	11	7	64%	87	59	68%	66	67%
IV-B	5	3	1	1	100%	31	22	71%	23	72%
NCR	0	0	16	12	75%	1	0	0%	12	71%
V	6	3	1	1	100%	37	28	76%	29	76%
VI	6	3	2	1	50%	65	59	91%	60	90%
IX	3	3	4	4	100%	67	52	78%	56	79%
X	5	4	9	5	56%	79	45	57%	50	57%
XI	4	3	4	4	100%	29	20	69%	24	73%
XII	4	3	3	3	100%	34	24	71%	27	73%
CARAGA	5	3	2	2	100%	30	18	60%	20	63%
GRAND TOTAL	**65**	**42**	**74**	**55**	74%	**764**	**529**	69%	**584**	**70%**

Note: Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) will be treated in a separate capacity assessment to consider its unique political and geographical situation as a region.

From DSWD perspective of Strategic Goal No. 3: ***"Increase the number of provinces and majority of their cities/municipalities having a fully functioning LSWDO to 40 by year 2016",*** the Capacity Building (CBB) Unit Breakthrough aims to establish the capability building needs (Capacity Assessment) baseline of Provincial/City/Municipal Social Welfare and Development Officers in the targeted 32 provinces by end of December 2013. Thus, out of the total 838 cities and municipalities with 420 as its majority, the Bureau was able to cover 584 or

70% of the cities and municipalities. In terms of CBB targets, there is 107.5% accomplishment which is 39% higher than the set targets. Nonetheless, from the original target of 32 provinces, there was an actual coverage of 42 provinces. Hence, it is higher by 31% from what was set or 131% accomplishment on the overall target.

Table 1 displays the fourteen (14) regions covered for the LSWDOs' capacity assessment. Of the 16 regions targeted for the said capacity assessment, only fourteen were covered due to recent earthquake and super typhoon Yolanda that devastated Regions VII and VIII. Thus, by reason of *Force Majeure* the two regions were not included in the Capacity Assessment.

Of the 65 total number of provinces in the 14 regions, 42 or 65% were covered. From 74 cities, 55 or 74% were covered, while out of 764 municipalities, 529 or 69% were covered, hence, the 70% achievement of the overall target nationwide.

Largely, 8 regions had 100% coverage of their cities (CAR, III, IV-B, V, IX, XI, XII, CARAGA). More particularly, almost all of Region VI municipalities with 59 out of 65 (91%) were covered while most of the municipalities of Regions IX (78%), V (76%), II (75%) were covered. In contrast, a great majority of municipalities from Regions III (58%) and X (57%) were considered for the assessment. For NCR, items on number of province and municipality were noted with 0 or 0%, leaving the region with only 1 municipality to be covered and 4 cities.

Nonetheless, Regions VII and VIII LSWDOs responses are significant in terms of future focused interventions common or peculiar to LSWDOs. Thus, there is a need to push through with the capacity assessment in these regions soon after the places affected by the natural calamities become normal as far as operations of LGU is concerned.

V. PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Overview of the LSWDOs Roles and Responsibilities

The Local Social Welfare and Development Officers (LSWDOs) are called respondents of this capacity assessment. They compose the Head, Officer-in-Charge, Social Welfare Officers and Staff of the Provincial, City and Municipal Social Welfare and Development Offices. The roles of the respondents and responsibilities vary from management and supervision of their office and staff; implementation of programs and services among the different sectors in the locality; formulation of plans/programs; monitoring and evaluation; and budget utilization according to plans.

Likewise, the LSWDOs provide advice and technical support to the Local Chief Executives (LCEs) on the areas of Social Welfare and Development (SWD) programs and services. In line with this function, the respondents comply with implementation of national laws and policies at the local levels relative to SWD. The LSWDOs also serve as active members of the Local Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (LDRRMC), which is responsible for disaster operation. For areas with special projects such as Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, sustainable Livelihood and Kalahi-CIDSS, the respondents are also responsible in monitoring program implementation with counterpart DSWD Field Office.

The profile of the respondents as to ***Sex, Office, Civil Status, Educational Attainment and Number of Years in Service*** are presented in the succeeding tables:

Table 2: Profile of Respondents by OFFICE and SEX

REGION	PSWDO		CSWDO		MSWDO		TOTAL
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
CAR	0	2	0	3	0	33	38
I	2	2	0	2	1	75	82
II	0	2	0	3	6	66	77
III	1	1	1	11	2	34	50
IV-A	0	13	0	11	6	62	92
IV-B	0	0	0	1	4	46	51
NCR	0	0	1	14	0	0	15
V	0	5	0	1	1	37	44
VI	1	3	0	2	1	68	75
IX	0	2	0	10	2	59	73
X	2	0	0	5	6	40	53
XI	0	4	1	1	2	23	31
XII	1	1	0	2	1	25	30
CARAGA	0	2	0	5	0	16	23
Total	**7**	**37**	**3**	**71**	**32**	**584**	**734**
Percentage	**1%**	**5%**	**0%**	**10%**	**4%**	**80%**	

Table 2 shows that almost all of the respondents are females with a very high percentage of 94.27% or 692 LSWDOs. Of the total 734 LSWDOs, very few of the respondents are males with 42 or 5.7%. This is reflective of the reality that females dominate the nurturing professions such as Social Work and other related fields. Hence, at the Local Government Unit (LGU), specifically the LSWDO, more women are employed.

Common to all the covered regions, an average of 3-4 PSWDOs per region participated. It was noted that 13 or 35% of the respondents for PSWDOs came from Region IV-A while the rest of the regions represented only 3-8% for this level. Similarly with the CSWDOs, four (4) regions, namely: Region III, Region IV-A, Region IX and Region XI were noted with high participation of respondents. This is reflective of the regions covered with the most number of cities, particularly Region III (12) and IX (10) with 100% coverage. Expectedly, NCR gained a high percentage with 15 respondents from the 12 covered cities, where provinces do not apply given its geographical and political division, representing 75% of the total 16 cities of the National Capital Region.

Topping the list for the overall profile of respondents by ***Sex*** are Regions IVA (92), I (82), II (77), VI (75), and IX (73) with the most number of female respondents across the P/C/MSWDOs. CAR is noted as the only region with no male respondents at all levels of LSWDOs. Seven (7) of the regions or 50% have no male respondents at the PSWDO level. Eleven (11) or almost all of the CSWDOs are also represented by females. Three (3) Regions (CAR, NCR and CARAGA) had no male MSWDOs.

Table 3: Profile of Respondents by CIVIL STATUS

Regions	Married	Single	Widow/ Widower	No Answer	Total
CAR	33	4	1	0	**38**
I	61	13	5	3	**82**
II	57	10	8	2	**77**
III	34	7	2	7	**50**
IV-A	71	10	11	0	**92**
IV-B	39	10	2	0	**51**
NCR	11	3	1	0	**15**
V	32	3	6	3	**44**
VI	58	6	11		**75**
IX	52	4	13	4	**73**
X	46	3	3	1	**53**
XI	22	6	3	0	**31**
XII	26	2	2	0	**30**
CARAGA	17	2	4	0	**23**
TOTAL	**559**	**83**	**72**	**20**	**734**
Percentage	**76%**	**11%**	**10%**	**3%**	

Out of the 734 respondents, most of them are married with 599 or 76%, reflective of their skills in managing their LSWD Office and their domestic nurturing roles. Thoroughly, 11% or 83 of the respondents were noted single from Regions I (13), II (10), IV-A (10), IVB (10), while Widower counted 11 from Regions IV-A and VI, as well as 13 from Region IX.

It can be observed that there were 20 respondents or 3% who failed to answer the question on this item. Deliberately, this 'No Answer' can be viewed as ambivalence of respondent's situation of the status of LSWDO as far as "Civil

Status" is concerned. This can also be reflective of the LSWDO's personal acceptance of the situation they are in. Unless otherwise, failure to answer means it is an overlooked item of the respondents.

Table 4: Profile of Respondents by EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Regions	College Undergrad	Completed 2 year Course in College	College Graduate	Masters Graduate	With other bachelor course	With Units in Masteral Course	No Answer	Total
CAR	1	0	36	0	1	0	0	**38**
I	0	0	64	4	1	0	13	**82**
II	0	0	48	3	0	3	23	**77**
III	1	0	47	0	1	0	1	**50**
IV-A	2	0	82	0	8	0	0	**92**
IV-B	25	4	8	3	2	9	0	**51**
NCR	11	0	3	1	0	0	0	**15**
V	0	0	41	0	1	2	0	**44**
VI	0	0	65	2	7	0	1	**75**
IX	1	0	68	1	1	1	1	**73**
X	1	0	28	9	11	4	0	**53**
XI	0	0	20	8	1	2	0	**31**
XII	0	0	23	4	0	3	0	**30**
CARAGA	1	0	19	2	0	1	0	**23**
TOTAL	43	4	552	37	34	25	39	**734**
Percentage	**6%**	**1%**	**75%**	**5%**	**5%**	**3%**	**5%**	

In Table 4, most (75%) of the respondents are college graduate with only 25 (3%) of the respondents with masteral course taken. Being managers/in-charge of the LSWDO, educational qualification is important to be able to get the necessary educational training and experiences to guide the respondents in practicing the functions at the LSWDO. It is interesting to note that 43 (6%) of the respondents cited that they were undergraduate. This can be further verified as to their level of participation in decision-making, in implementing the LSWDO mandates and functions, and other areas that may have an effect to the overall LSWDO functioning.

Meticulously, very few (37 0r 5%) have taken up and graduated with masters degree with many of them noted from Regions X and XI. This data present a challenging thought to readers on two things such as (1) pursuing the masters

degree can reflect the respondents' drive for continuous upgrading themselves as a professional should their resources allow to accommodate this, and (2) not pursuing masters degree can also be reflective of the fact that the LSWDOs as managers of the SWD have no access and means to upgrade their knowledge and skills as reality of the post represent more action in the field than more office work which can allow other time for higher level of studies.

Likewise, noted in the table 4 were 34 or 5% of the respondents have taken up other bachelor courses. Related or not, they have chosen to work with LSWDOs. This fact can be further studied and valued why these groups have chosen the service with LSWDOs and not with other office at the LGU level. This data can also be a reference for validation how the other related or not related course contribute or provide complements to the overall functioning of the LSWDOs as a member office of the LGU and how their involvement in the LSWDOs makes them a person and as a professional.

Similarly, a number of respondents with 39 or 5% had no answer which can be viewed as ambivalence of respondents' in stating their educational attainment, which can be either related or not related to Social Work as the known course for LSWDO professional. This can also be considered as an indication of low self-esteem as far as respondents' declaration of their highest educational background is concerned. Otherwise, it is a forgotten or overlooked item during the assessment. Therefore, this area can be another concern for further validation as to the respondents' major contribution to LSWDO functioning, as well as the lack of it due to misfit for the job or high potentials are undermined for lack of opportunity.

Table 5: Profile of Respondents by NUMBER OF YEARS IN SERVICE

Regions	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16 – 20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	Above 30 years	No Answer	Total
CAR	6	1	9	4	14	1	3	0	38
I	10	5	8	13	23	11	9	3	82
II	8	3	7	15	22	12	8	2	77
III	4	4	2	4	7	4	5	20	50
IV-A	13	10	9	9	31	10	9	1	92
IV-B	10	6	5	7	18	4	1	0	51
NCR		2	4	2	1	1	2	3	15
V	2	3	7	1	21	5	5	0	44
VI	3	4	10	11	18	11	17	1	75
IX	5	3	6	16	20	8	14	1	73
X	5	8	5	1	16	5	13	0	53
XI	3		4	3	6	9	5	0	30
XII	2	3	3	1	5	4	11	2	31
CARAGA	1	1		2	5	8	6	0	23
TOTAL	72	53	79	89	207	93	108	33	734
Percentage	10%	7%	11%	12%	28%	13%	15%	4%	

Table 5 indicates some 207 or 28% respondents with 21-25 years in service and 108 or 15% respondents with above 30 years in service. This is remarkable of their commitment and care for LSWDO service which is evident on their 2-3 decades stay in their offices. Generally, almost half of the respondents 315 or 42% have spent half of their lives with their Local Social Welfare and Development Offices.

Substantial too are the years of service rendered of the 93 (13%) respondents from 26-30 years in service. Very few have served LSWDOs for 16-20 years (89 or 12%), 11-15 years (79 or 11%), 1-5 years (72 or 10%). These data is reflective of the 221 or 30% of the respondents who had at least served for 1 or 2 decades and very few (72 or 10%) of the respondents are new in their service.

Very few (33 or 4%) of the respondents had 'No Answer' to the item required. This can indicate of the respondents' unsure of the number of years they have rendered reflective of an "on and off service" in the post. The significant number of 20 respondents noted for Region III on this area can also be revalidated.

Conversely, with the long years of service of almost half of the respondents, categorically it can be interpreted that "No Answer" can also mean that the

respondents may had difficulty in recalling and computing for their exact number of years in service. Otherwise, the cause of "No answer" could be because the other respondents had less than a year in service, which is not available in the choices of responses in the Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT).

VI. TABULAR PRESENTATION AS TO AVERAGE RATING AND AVERAGE OF RESPONSES FOR THE 14 REGIONS

Overview of the LSWDOs Learning Baseline

The LSWDOs, as respondents of the capacity assessment, rated their knowledge and skills on the four (4) development areas, with specific indicators based on the Social Welfare and Development Service Delivery System of the LGU *(Administrative Order No. 07)*. A self-rating on their level of development as LSWDO Officer or Staff was also included. Said four (4) Development Areas are along: (1) Administration and Organization, (2) Program Management, (3) Networking and Partnership Building, and (4) Working with Politicians. After an exhaustive consolidation of the provinces to regional reports, the following pages presents the findings based on the national consolidation along the four (4) development areas:

1. Administration and Organization

The first development area under AO # 07 which includes execution of activities and processes as the means of carrying out the vision, mission, goals and mandate of the organization. This area is comprised of but not limited to management of information, progressive administrative processes and human resource development.

Table 6: National Average Rating on Administration and Organization *(Please refer to the attached in the next page)*

Table 6: National Average Rating on Administration and Organization

Indicators	CAR			Region 1			Region 2			Region 3			Region IV A			Region IV B			Region V			Region VI			Region IX			Region X			Region XI			Region XII			Region 13			NCR			Overall
	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	Average Rating
a. Develops plans and strategies on Social Welfare and Development	2.79	2.68	2.66	2.65	2.62	2.54	2.68	2.69	2.66	2.84	2.86	2.86	2.85	2.76	2.71	2.57	2.65	2.82	2.59	2.59	2.50	2.83	2.76	2.72	2.77	2.78	2.82	2.92	2.85	2.70	3.10	2.97	2.68	3.03	2.90	2.90	2.91	2.74	2.52	3.00	2.80	2.80	2.76
b.1.Develops financial plans according to standards, norms and procedures	2.79	2.76	2.61	2.61	2.59	2.44	2.68	2.66	2.62	2.96	2.88	2.86	2.73	2.68	2.63	2.84	2.49	2.47	2.57	2.59	2.55	2.72	2.67	2.59	2.71	2.70	2.68	2.77	2.77	2.83	3.03	2.94	2.74	3.00	2.97	2.97	2.74	2.65	2.57	2.93	2.93	2.73	2.73
b.2. Implements financial plans following budget, standards, norms and procedures	2.95	2.84	2.79	2.74	2.72	2.60	2.71	2.66	2.65	2.84	2.84	2.82	2.78	2.72	2.61	2.55	2.59	2.53	2.64	2.64	2.59	2.84	2.80	2.67	2.78	2.73	2.71	2.89	2.83	2.72	3.06	2.94	2.74	3.07	3.03	2.97	2.78	2.65	2.61	2.80	2.87	3.00	2.77
c. Formulates measures/ strategies for the approval of the Sanggunian and provide technical assistance and support to the Local Chief Executive.	2.76	2.71	2.61	2.67	2.60	2.62	2.68	2.68	2.65	2.82	2.82	2.80	2.80	2.71	2.55	2.45	2.37	2.29	2.57	2.59	2.55	2.76	2.72	2.64	2.77	2.79	2.77	2.96	2.87	2.70	3.06	3.13	2.87	3.00	2.97	2.97	2.78	2.78	2.74	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.73
d. Implements and reviews Human Resource Development policies and programs	2.53	2.50	2.42	2.44	2.41	2.39	2.36	2.40	2.36	2.70	2.70	2.66	2.38	2.33	2.21	2.25	2.24	2.14	2.39	2.41	2.34	2.48	2.47	2.44	2.79	2.53	2.52	2.60	2.58	2.49	2.87	2.90	2.58	2.87	2.93	2.87	2.43	2.43	2.22	2.60	2.53	2.47	2.50
e. Conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy making, planning and for the use of identified end users	2.71	2.61	2.53	2.70	2.66	2.61	2.57	2.61	2.53	2.72	2.68	2.66	2.64	2.60	2.51	2.51	2.45	2.37	2.59	2.52	2.48	2.52	2.49	2.44	2.25	2.64	2.68	2.75	2.75	2.62	3.77	3.19	2.71	2.80	2.80	3.67	2.70	2.61	3.22	2.80	2.60	2.27	2.68
Average Rating	2.75	2.68	2.60	2.63	2.60	2.53	2.61	2.62	2.58	2.81	2.80	2.78	2.70	2.63	2.54	2.53	2.46	2.44	2.56	2.56	2.50	2.69	2.65	2.58	2.68	2.70	2.70	2.82	2.78	2.68	3.15	3.01	2.72	2.96	2.93	3.06	2.72	2.64	2.64	2.81	2.74	2.67	2.70

Legend:

K - Knowledge	Top regions in terms of knowledge	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of knowledge	
S - Skills	Top regions in terms of skill	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of skill	
SS - Self-Satisfaction	Top regions in terms of self-satisfaction	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of self-satisfaction	
		indicator with the lowest average rating	

Table 7: National Average of Responses Relative to Administration and Organization of the 14 Regions

Covered Regions	Knowledge				Skills				Self-Satisfaction			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
CAR	0.8	12.0	20.8	4.3	1.0	13.7	19.7	3.7	1.7	15.0	18.2	3.2
Region I	1.2	34.0	40.5	6.3	1.7	35.7	38.5	6.2	1.3	39.7	37.0	4.0
Region II	0.3	35.3	35.2	6.2	0.5	33.2	38.7	4.7	0.7	36.2	35.0	5.2
Region III	0.8	11.7	33.5	4.0	0.5	12.5	33.7	3.3	1.0	12.2	33.8	3.0
Regioon IV-A	1.2	30.5	55.3	5.0	2.0	33.5	52.8	3.7	5.0	37.5	44.7	4.8
Region IV-B	3.7	22.3	19.3	5.7	3.5	22.8	22.2	2.5	6.3	21.0	18.7	5.0
Region V	0.8	19.0	23.0	1.2	0.5	19.5	23.0	1.0	0.7	21.8	20.3	1.2
Region VI	0.3	24.8	47.3	2.5	0.3	26.8	46.5	1.3	1.5	31.3	39.2	3.0
Region IX	2.7	20.7	47.2	2.5	0.5	22.8	48.0	1.7	0.8	23.3	45.8	3.0
Region X	0.0	16.2	30.3	6.5	0.2	17.3	29.7	5.8	2.5	17.3	28.0	5.2
Region XI	0.3	3.2	19.0	8.5	0.7	4.7	19.2	6.3	1.7	7.8	19.0	2.5
Region XII	0.0	5.8	19.5	4.7	0.0	5.8	20.3	3.8	0.0	4.8	18.7	6.5
Region XIII	0.7	6.3	14.7	1.3	0.7	8.0	13.2	1.2	2.0	7.2	10.8	3.0
NCR	0.0	4.8	8.2	2.0	0.0	5.2	8.5	1.3	0.0	6.2	7.7	1.2
Total of the Average Responses	**13**	**247**	**414**	**61**	**12**	**261**	**414**	**47**	**25**	**281**	**377**	**51**
Percentage	**2%**	**34%**	**56%**	**8%**	**2%**	**36%**	**56%**	**6%**	**3%**	**38%**	**51%**	**7%**

Total Respondents: 734

Legend:

Rating	*Knowledge*	*Skill*	*Self-Satisfaction*
1	*No knowledge*	*No skill*	*Dissatisfied*
2	*Limited knowledge*	*Limited skill*	*Somewhat Satisfied*
3	*Adequate knowledge*	*Adequate skill*	*Most of the time Satisfied*
4	*With high level of knowledge*	*With high level of skill*	*Always Satisfied*

Table 6 shows that Region XI has the highest rating of 3.15 in terms of knowledge *(almost with adequate knowledge),* followed by Region XII with 2.96, Region X with 2.82 and a tie rating of 2.81 for NCR and Region III, as well as a noted little difference of 2.75 for CAR *(near to adequate knowledge)*. However, the regions that were noted *(a little higher than limited knowledge)* with lowest rating on this indicator are Regions VI (2.69), I (2.63), II (2.61), V (2.56), IVB (2.53). To ensure that limited knowledge of the respondents of 5 Regions (VI, I, II, V and IVB) will be upgraded to a certain level for them to function as expected, priority intervention along administration and organization is necessary.

Similarly, in terms of skills, top in the list is Region XI (3.01) with adequate skills. Regions XII (2.93), III (2.80), X (2.78), and NCR (2.74) gained these average ratings which means almost with adequate skill. Consequently, Region XI's rating on this area indicates the respondents' competencies in the performance of its functions along administration and organization. Nonetheless, 4 Regions got the lowest average ratings for skills, namely Region VI with 2.69, Region I with 2.6, Region II with 2.6, Region V with 2.56, and Region IV-B with 2.53 are priority for technical assistance to enhance their limited skills on this development area.

On self-satisfaction, Region XII tops the list with 3.06 *(most of the time satisfied),* and Regions III (2.78), IX (2.70), X (2.68) were a little higher of somewhat satisfied. Noted bottom in this area are Regions IVA (2.63), II (2.62), I (2.60), V (2.56) and IVB (2.46) leaning towards somewhat satisfied.

More particularly, across the 14 Regions, the indicators which need more support because of the low overall average rating are (b.1) develops financial plans according to standards, norms and procedures with an average rating of 2.73, (c) Formulates measures/ strategies for approval of the Sanggunian and provide technical assistance and support to the Local Chief Executive with an average rating of 2.73, (d) implements and reviews Human Resource Development policies and programs with an average rating of 2.50 and (e) conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy-making, planning and for the use of identified end users with an average rating of 2.68.

Comparing the rating of each region on Knowledge, Skills and Self-Satisfaction, it is interesting to note that across all 14 regions, the over-all average rating for skills is lower compared to the over-all average rating of knowledge. Nine (9) Regions, specifically, CAR, Region I, III, IV-A, IV-B, VI, X, XI and NCR, have a declining pattern of over-all average rating wherein the rating for knowledge is the highest compared to the rating of knowledge and self-satisfaction, while the rating for the skills in the middle and the rating for self- satisfaction has the lowest average rating. Two regions, namely: Region IX and CARAGA, have the highest

over-all average rating for knowledge and the over-all average rating for skills and self-satisfaction decreased at the same rating. This implies that knowledge acquisition may be easier to acquire than skills and self- satisfaction.

Some peculiarities were noted in 3 Regions. For Region V, the over-all average rating of knowledge and self-satisfaction is equal while the self-satisfaction declined. For Region II, the over-all average rating for the skills was higher than that of the knowledge while the over-all self- satisfaction average rating remained the lowest. For Region XII, the over-all average rating for skill was at the lowest while the over-all rating for self-satisfaction was at the highest, as opposed to what was observed in the rest of the regions. This implies that out of the 14 Regions, respondents from Region XII are most confident in executing their tasks as LSWDOs.

Comparing the 6 indicators under the development area of Administration and Organization, the indicator (d) implements and reviews Human Resource Development policies and programs got the lowest average rating of 2.50 which means that across the13 Regions (Region XII not included), this indicator is the lowest. For Region XII, the indicator which is lowest in terms of average rating is indicator (e) conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy making, planning and for the use of identified end users. To increase the level of competencies of the LSWDOs on the said indicators, technical assistance should be provided accordingly.

In terms of the average rating of the 6 indicators, five (5) Regions (IVA, II, I, V, IVB) are in dire need of total learning intervention to upgrade their competencies on administration and organization and eventually level up their satisfaction as LSWDOs.

Table 7 shows that a great majority of the respondents (414 or 56%) have adequate knowledge and skills while majority (377 or 51%) of the respondents are most of the time satisfied. Assessing further, some (34%-38%) of the respondents have limited knowledge, skills and somewhat satisfied.

Analyzing further the data presented in Table 6 and Table 7, this means that a great majority of the respondents (414 or 56%) have an average rating of 2.74 for knowledge (near to adequate knowledge), 2.70 for skill (near to adequate skill) and majority (377 or 51%) of the respondents have a rating of 2.64 for self-satisfaction (almost midway of somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied) while 6%-8% of the respondents have high level of knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. Results imply that some (36%-41%) of the respondents, with great concentration coming from Regions I, II, IV-A, IV-B, V, VI, IX, CAR and Caraga, need support on the development area of Administration and Organization.

On the overall, to supplement and gauge the results of the Capacity Assessment, the next table will show the Comparative Assessment Across Regions along the four (4) development areas. In particular, this is a summary of regions with "Adequate/High Level of Knowledge and Skills" and those "Needing Capacity Building Intervention" based on each of the indicators under said development areas.

Below is the Comparative Assessment Across Regions along Administration and Organization.

Table 8: Comparative Assessment across Regions in terms of Administration and Organization

INDICATORS	Regions With Almost Adequate to Adequate Knowledge, Skills and Most of the Time Satisfied	Regions Needing Capacity Building Intervention on Development Areas
a. Develops plans and strategies on Social Welfare and Development	Region III Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII NCR	CAR Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga
b.1.Develops financial plans according to standards, norms and procedures	Region III Region X Region XI Region XII NCR	CAR Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Caraga
b.2. Implements financial plans following budget, standards, norms and procedures	Region III Region X Region XI Region XII NCR CAR	Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Caraga
c. Formulates measures/ strategies for the approval of the Sanggunian and provide technical assistance and support to the Local Chief Executive.	Region III Region X Region XI Region XII	Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Caraga CAR NCR
d. Implements and reviews Human Resource Development policies and programs.	Region XII	Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Region XI

		Caraga CAR NCR
e. Conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy making, planning and for the use of identified end users.	Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X CAR NCR

Note: The regions enumerated above under the priority regions needing capacity building have an average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of less than 2.8 per indicator.

Under the development area of Administration and Organization, table 8 shows that Region XII respondents are strong in all of the indicators; Region XI and Region X respondents are strong in 5 out of 6 indicators; Region 3 respondents are strong in 4 out of 6 indicators; National Capital Region (NCR) respondents are strong in 3 out of 6 indicators and Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) and Caraga are strong in 1 out of 6 indicators. The regions which need support in all of the 6 indicators are Regions I, II, IV-A, IV-B, V, VI and IX.

Among the 6 indicators, priority learning intervention should be on Human Resource Development policies and programs which are needed by the 13 regions listed above. The next priorities are on indicator (c) formulates measures/strategies for the approval of the Sanggunian and provide technical assistance and support to the Local Chief Executive and (e) conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy making, planning and for the use of identified end users. The said indicators have a total of 10 Regions which need capacity building interventions. Likewise, since 13 Regions rated themselves lower on self-satisfaction compared to their rating for knowledge and skills, support on strengthening the self- satisfaction at varying levels should be extended.

Since the assessment was based on the over-all picture per region, it should be noted that within a region, there are certain peculiarities as to the provinces which needs more support relative to specific indicators. *(Kindly refer to the Capacity Building Baseline Needs of P/C/MSWDOs per Region for the details.)*

2. Program Management per Region

Program Management refers to the process of managing several related projects and services of the LSWDO. It is composed of different components such as planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Table 9: National Average Rating on Program Management per Region *(Please refer to the attached in the next page)*

Table 9: National Average Rating on Project Management

Indicators	CAR			Region 1			Region 2			Region 3			Region IVA			Region IVB			Region V			Region VI			Region IX			Region X			Region XI			Region XII			Region 13			NCR			Overall
	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	Average Rating
a.1. Conducts situational analysis and identify problems, gaps and issues	2.79	2.71	2.66	2.63	2.66	2.61	2.77	2.71	2.64	2.90	2.88	2.86	2.80	2.76	2.61	2.53	2.55	2.47	2.61	2.57	2.52	2.72	2.73	2.68	2.74	2.74	2.70	2.85	2.81	2.68	2.90	2.74	2.68	2.97	2.90	2.90	1.91	2.83	2.52	3.07	3.07	2.87	2.74
a.2. Identifies a sequence of key intervention on activities for effective execution of plans and strategies	2.74	2.68	2.58	2.65	2.61	2.65	2.66	2.66	2.61	2.78	2.80	2.76	2.74	2.68	2.64	2.47	2.45	2.45	2.68	2.57	2.64	2.65	2.63	2.55	2.70	2.71	2.66	2.94	2.91	2.66	3.42	2.81	2.74	2.90	2.87	2.87	1.87	2.78	2.43	3.20	3.13	3.00	2.74
a.3. Formulates responsive plans and programs that respond to the needs and situation of disadvantaged individuals, groups and communities	2.87	2.79	2.71	2.79	2.78	2.74	2.77	2.77	2.68	2.88	2.84	2.82	2.88	2.77	2.55	2.63	2.69	2.57	2.68	2.66	2.66	2.93	2.89	2.80	2.88	2.85	2.81	2.98	2.91	2.89	3.52	2.81	2.71	3.07	3.03	2.97	3.09	3.00	2.83	3.33	3.20	3.27	2.86
a.4. Prepares budgets in accordance to standards	3.00	2.97	2.89	2.85	2.88	2.80	2.83	2.81	2.62	2.84	2.86	2.78	2.79	2.74	2.60	2.57	2.59	2.35	2.64	2.68	2.66	2.92	2.88	2.71	2.81	2.79	2.77	3.11	3.09	2.94	3.32	2.68	2.68	3.10	3.17	3.17	2.96	2.96	2.57	3.20	3.13	3.27	2.86
b.1. Caseloads	2.97	2.84	2.66	2.84	2.84	2.80	2.86	2.81	2.66	2.82	2.84	2.74	2.82	2.70	2.65	2.57	2.51	2.41	2.68	2.70	2.66	2.73	2.75	2.63	2.86	2.86	2.81	3.00	3.00	2.87	3.35	2.84	2.68	3.00	3.03	2.83	2.57	2.57	2.35	3.00	3.00	2.93	2.79
b.2. Helping process/ Case management	2.92	2.76	2.66	2.88	2.89	2.84	2.79	2.74	2.61	2.94	2.90	2.82	2.88	2.82	2.52	2.59	2.67	2.65	2.66	2.59	2.57	2.81	2.75	2.64	2.86	2.84	2.79	2.96	2.91	2.83	3.10	2.84	2.94	3.07	3.07	2.93	2.70	2.61	2.30	3.00	3.00	2.93	2.80
b.3. Case recording	2.82	2.71	2.55	2.76	2.76	2.70	2.78	2.69	2.58	2.72	2.72	2.64	2.77	2.74	2.49	2.63	2.61	2.51	2.66	2.57	2.55	2.72	2.65	2.60	2.81	2.75	2.74	2.85	2.64	2.72	3.10	2.74	2.61	3.03	2.93	2.73	2.74	2.52	2.30	3.13	3.00	3.00	2.72
b.4. Program menu of Social Protection/Social Welfare and Development interventions and services	2.71	2.61	2.53	2.78	2.76	2.72	2.68	2.64	2.57	2.68	2.66	2.66	2.75	2.66	2.48	2.47	2.49	2.41	2.45	2.48	2.52	2.67	2.60	2.52	2.74	2.71	2.71	2.79	2.75	2.66	3.55	2.81	3.13	2.87	2.83	2.67	2.78	2.57	2.48	2.93	3.00	2.93	2.70
c.1. Develops monitoring tool	2.35	2.32	2.32	2.71	2.71	2.61	2.79	2.74	2.62	2.82	2.80	2.76	2.73	2.64	2.30	2.47	2.43	2.41	2.50	2.50	2.52	2.76	2.71	2.48	2.86	2.85	2.81	2.85	2.85	2.85	3.52	2.81	2.65	3.00	2.93	2.80	2.26	2.26	2.22	2.93	2.73	2.73	2.67
c.2. Utilizes monitoring tools to identify process gaps, challenges, corrective measures for effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery and roll-out good practices	2.37	2.34	2.39	2.52	2.51	2.46	2.40	2.39	2.36	2.68	2.66	2.64	2.61	2.54	2.42	2.08	2.12	2.04	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.48	2.43	2.31	2.60	2.59	2.55	2.68	2.57	2.45	3.55	2.48	2.52	2.83	2.77	2.63	2.30	2.35	2.22	2.87	3.00	2.93	2.51
d.1. Conducts evaluation as designed in the program and/or project plan	2.76	2.68	2.61	2.55	2.57	2.48	2.58	2.57	2.47	2.78	2.76	2.66	2.62	2.57	2.40	2.24	2.25	2.22	2.43	2.43	2.34	2.53	2.52	2.36	2.73	2.70	2.70	2.75	2.60	2.57	3.16	2.84	2.77	3.00	2.90	2.80	2.57	2.52	2.26	2.93	2.93	2.87	2.62
d.2. Utilizes the results for program development and policy recommendation	2.71	2.68	2.63	2.61	2.61	2.55	2.49	2.49	2.42	2.72	2.72	2.64	2.60	2.55	2.65	2.39	2.61	2.33	2.41	2.43	2.43	2.55	2.52	2.40	2.66	2.63	2.62	2.72	2.62	2.55	3.26	2.97	2.58	2.97	2.90	2.77	2.30	2.30	2.22	3.07	3.13	2.93	2.63
e. Adapts measures to ensure safety and well-being of staff and clients	2.79	2.74	2.74	2.85	2.87	2.77	2.78	2.77	2.71	3.02	3.02	3.00	2.88	2.86	2.65	2.63	2.67	2.63	2.59	2.59	2.57	2.85	2.79	2.69	2.90	2.85	2.86	3.08	2.94	2.92	3.19	2.94	2.81	3.07	3.03	3.00	2.78	2.70	2.65	3.27	3.33	3.20	2.86
Average Rating	2.80	2.70	2.60	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.60	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.70	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.40	2.60	2.50	2.50	2.70	2.70	2.60	2.80	2.80	2.70	2.90	2.80	2.70	3.30	2.80	2.70	3.00	3.00	2.90	2.70	2.60	2.40	3.10	3.10	3.00	2.74

Legend:

K - Knowledge	Top regions in terms of knowledge	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of knowledge
S - Skills	Top regions in terms of skill	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of skill
SS - Self-Satisfaction	Top regions in terms of self-satisfaction	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of self-satisfaction
		indicator with the lowest average rating

Table 10: National Average Responses Relative to Program Management

Covered Regions	Knowledge				Skills				Self-Satisfaction			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
CAR	0.5	12.1	21.5	3.9	0.5	13.8	20.8	2.8	0.8	14.6	21.3	1.3
Region I	1.0	26.9	47.7	6.4	0.8	27.0	47.9	6.2	1.4	30.4	44.3	6.2
Region II	0.9	29.2	38.4	8.5	1.0	30.6	37.8	7.6	1.8	35.0	33.7	6.5
Region III	0.5	13.5	30.8	5.2	0.5	13.8	30.7	5.0	0.7	15.0	30.3	4.0
Region IV-A	0.2	27.8	57.9	6.1	1.1	30.8	55.3	4.8	4.5	37.8	45.3	4.3
Region IV-B	3.8	20.7	24.5	1.9	3.7	19.8	25.4	2.2	4.8	21.2	24.0	1.1
Region V	0.5	19.2	23.4	0.9	0.5	20.0	22.7	0.8	0.6	20.1	22.5	0.8
Region VI	0.4	24.7	45.9	4.0	0.5	26.5	44.5	3.5	2.1	31.7	37.9	3.3
Region IX	0.7	19.3	48.3	4.7	0.5	20.8	47.5	4.2	1.3	22.4	43.8	5.5
Region X	0.1	13.0	32.6	7.3	0.3	16.2	29.4	7.1	1.7	17.7	26.5	7.2
Region XI	0.1	3.2	14.6	13.2	0.5	7.6	20.8	2.1	1.7	8.1	18.2	3.1
Region XII	0.1	5.5	19.2	5.3	0.0	6.1	19.3	4.6	0.2	7.5	19.1	3.3
Region XIII	0.6	7.5	13.6	1.3	0.6	8.8	12.4	1.2	2.5	9.8	9.4	1.3
NCR	0.2	2.4	8.7	3.8	0.1	2.8	8.3	3.8	0.1	3.5	7.8	3.5
Total of the Average Responses	**10**	**225**	**427**	**73**	**11**	**245**	**423**	**56**	**24**	**275**	**384**	**51**
Percentage	**1%**	**31%**	**58%**	**10%**	**1%**	**33%**	**58%**	**8%**	**3%**	**37%**	**52%**	**7%**

Total Respondents: 734

Legend:

Rating	*Knowledge*	*Skill*	*Self-Satisfaction*
1	*No knowledge*	*No skill*	*Dissatisfied*
2	*Limited knowledge*	*Limited skill*	*Somewhat Satisfied*
3	*Adequate knowledge*	*Adequate skill*	*Most of the time Satisfied*
4	*With high level of knowledge*	*With high level of skill*	*Always Satisfied*

On Table 9, top regions in terms of knowledge are Regions NCR (3.10), XI (3.30) and XII (3.00) with adequate knowledge on program management. Similarly, Regions X (2.90) and III (2.80) had an average rating of almost with adequate knowledge on the said area. However, it can be noted significantly that Regions CARAGA, II, I, and VI, have low rating in some of the indicators contributing to the decrease in the overall average rating. This means that the respondents from these regions may be knowledgeable in some but not all of its indicators. Furthermore, Regions V (2.60) and IVB (2.50) were noted to have a solid response of midway of limited knowledge and adequate knowledge on program management.

Equally, the same Regions - NCR (3.10) and XII (3.00) have adequate skills on program management and followed by Regions X (2.80) and IX (2.80) with an average rating of almost with adequate knowledge on this development area. In as far as overall average rating in this area, Regions CAR and II, IVA, VI, I, (2.70) and CARAGA (2.60) have limited skills in some other indicators of program management which can be identified as areas for upgrading. On the overall average rating for skills, Regions IV-B and V are most in need of upgrading as far as skills in program management is concerned given the overall rating of 2.50 or midway of limited skill and adequate skill on program management.

Notably, NCR respondents were most of the time satisfied with a rating of 3.00 while the regions which are near to most of the time satisfied are Regions XII (2.90), III (2.80), IX and X (2.70). On one hand, other indicators on this areas were rated low in Regions I (2.70), II (2.70) , VI (2.60), and CAR (2.60) , hence, their rating of almost midway between somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied rating. In terms of prioritizing, Regions IV-A (2.50), V (2.50), IV-B (2.40) and CARAGA (2.40) are in need of upgrading on this area to ensure that the respondents will have the necessary competency on program management.

More particularly, across the 14 Regions, the indicators which need more support because of the low overall average rating are (a.1) conducts situational analysis with an average rating of 2.74 (a.2) identifies a sequence of key interventions on activities with an average rating of 2.74, (b.3) case recording with an average rating of 2.72, (b.4) program menu of Social Protection/ Social Welfare and Development intervention and services with an average rating of 2.7, (c.1) develops monitoring tool with an average rating of 2.67, (c.2) utilizing monitoring tools to identify process gaps, challenges, corrective measures for effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery and cull out good practices with an average rating of 2.51 (the lowest), (d.1) conducting evaluation as designed in the program and project plan with an average rating of 2.62, and (d.2) utilizing results for program development and policy recommendations with an average rating of 2.63.

Comparing the rating of each region on Knowledge, Skills and Self-Satisfaction, it is interesting to note that across all 14 regions, 5 regions, namely, CAR, Region IV-A, X, XI and Caraga have the highest over-all average rating for knowledge and the lowest over-all average rating is for self-satisfaction. This implies that technical assistance on increasing the skills and self-satisfaction at varying levels is needed by the said Regions. Notably, two regions, namely Region I and III have the same over-all average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. For Regions II, IV-B, VI, IX, XII and NCR, the over-all average rating for knowledge and skills are the same and the over-all average rating for self-satisfaction declined which implies support in terms of increasing the level of self- satisfaction at varying levels. For Region V, the over-all average rating for knowledge was higher and the over-all average rating for skills and self-satisfaction are the same which implies that interventions on increasing the level of skills and self-satisfaction are both needed. In general, for many respondents, knowledge acquisition may be easier for them while for others, both knowledge and skill acquisition were easier for them.

On Table 10, results of the assessment shows that a great majority of the respondents (427 or 58%) have adequate knowledge and skills (423 or 58%) while there is a decline (384 or 52%) in the number of respondents who are satisfied most of the time. It can also be observed that the number of respondents who are somewhat satisfied increased to 275 or 37% from the 225 (31%) respondents with limited knowledge and 245 (33% respondents with limited skills for the development area on Program Management.

Analyzing further the data presented in Table 9 and Table 10, this means that a great majority of the respondents (427 or 58%) have an average rating of 2.81 for knowledge (almost with adequate knowledge), 2.74 for skill (almost midway of limited skill and adequate skill) and majority (384 or 52%) of the respondents have a rating of 2.65 for self- satisfaction (midway of somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied) while 7%-10% of the respondents have high level of knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. Results imply that some (32%-40%) of the respondents, with great concentration coming from Regions I, II, IV-B, V, VI, IX, CAR and Caraga, need support on the development area of Program Management.

In the next page is the table with the summary of regions with Adequate/High Level of Knowledge, Skills and Self-satisfaction and Regions Needing Capacity Building Intervention per indicator under **Program Management**:

Table 11: Comparative Assessment across Regions in terms of Program Management

INDICATORS	With Adequate Knowledge and Skills	Areas Needing Capacity Building Intervention
a. Planning		
a.1. Conducts situational analysis and identify problems, gaps and issues	NCR Region III Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Region XI Caraga
a.2. Identifies a sequence of key intervention on activities for effective execution of plans and strategies	NCR Region X Region XI Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Caraga
a.3. Formulates responsive plans and programs that respond to the needs and situation of disadvantaged individuals, groups and communities.	NCR Region III Region VI Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	CAR Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V
a.4. Prepares budgets in accordance to standards	NCR CAR Region I Region III Region VI Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region IX
b. Implementation		
b.1. Caseloads	NCR CAR Region I Region III Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga
b.2. Helping process/ Case management	NCR Region I Region III Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	CAR Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga
b.3. Case recording	NCR Region XI Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Caraga
b.4. Program menu of Social Protection/Social Welfare and Development interventions and	NCR Region XI	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B

services.		Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Region XII Caraga
c. Monitoring		
c.1. Develops monitoring tool	NCR Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga
c.2. Utilizes monitoring tools to identify process gaps, challenges, corrective measures for effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery and cull-out good practices.	NCR Region XI	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Region XII Caraga
d. Evaluation		
d.1. Conducts evaluation as designed in the program and/or project plan	NCR Region XI Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Caraga
d.2. Utilizes the results for program development and policy recommendation	NCR Region XI Region XII	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Caraga
e. Adapts measures to ensure safety and well-being of staff and clients	NCR Region I Region III Region IV-A Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	CAR Region II Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga

Note: The regions enumerated above under the priority regions needing capacity building have an average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of less than 2.8 per indicator.

Under the development area of Program Management, table 11 shows that NCR respondents are strong in all of the 13 indicators; Region XI respondents are strong in 12 out of 13 indicators; Region XII respondents are strong in 11 out of 13 indicators; Region X respondents are strong in 7 out of 13 indicators; Region III respondents are strong in 6 out of 13 indicators; Region IX respondents are strong in 5 out of 13 indicators; Region I respondents are strong in 4 out of 13 indicators; Region VI, Caraga and CAR are strong in 2 indicators and Region IV-A is strong in 1 out of 13 indicators. The regions which need more support in all of the 13 indicators are Regions II, IV-B, and V.

Among the 13 indicators, priority learning intervention should be on indicator (c) Monitoring and (d) Evaluation having the lowest average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. The next priorities for technical assistance are on these indicators - (a.1) conducts situational analysis, (a.2) identifies a sequence of key interventions on activities, (b.3) case recording, and (b.4) program menu of Social Protection/ Social Welfare and Development intervention and services. Likewise, since 12 regions (Region II, IV-A, IV-B, V, VI, IX, X, XI, XII, CAR, Caraga and NCR) rated themselves lower on self-satisfaction compared to their rating for knowledge and skills, support on strengthening the self- satisfaction at varying levels should be extended. Appropriate learning interventions to address these major gaps on program management is highly recommended to be taken by identified regions with low rating, and to have refresher courses for the regions with limited to adequate knowledge and skills on the above mentioned indicators.

Since the assessment was based on the over-all picture per region, it should be noted that within a region, there are certain peculiarities as to the provinces which needs more support relative to specific indicators. *(Kindly refer to the Capacity Building Baseline Needs of P/C/MSWDOs per Region for the details.)*

3. **Networking and Partnership Building per Region**

Networking and Partnership Building is working closely with stakeholders towards the enhancement of their mutual capabilities to deliver people empowering programs and services.

Table 12: National Average Rating on Networking and Partnership Building per Region *(Please refer to the attached in the next page)*

Table 12: National Average Rating on Networking and Partnership Building

Indicators	CAR			Region 1			Region 2			Region 3			Region IVA			Region IVB			Region V			Region VI			Region IX			Region X			Region XI			Region XII			Region 13			NCR			Overall
	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	Average Rating
a. Identify or map-out resources within the area of assignment that covers financial, expertise and existing non-government organization and business whose interest are in Social Welfare and Development	2.84	2.74	2.66	2.77	2.76	2.65	2.73	2.74	2.62	2.74	2.74	2.66	2.75	2.65	2.60	2.47	2.47	2.37	2.52	2.48	2.45	2.76	2.65	2.56	2.81	2.79	2.74	2.77	2.92	3.00	3.58	2.90	2.94	2.93	2.93	2.90	2.61	2.57	2.43	2.93	3.00	2.87	2.74
b. Classify resources in accordance to its programs and services offered	2.92	2.87	2.79	2.80	2.79	2.76	2.81	2.74	2.65	2.94	2.90	2.84	2.87	2.75	2.70	2.67	2.65	2.57	2.61	2.64	2.59	2.83	2.80	2.69	2.97	2.95	2.90	3.00	2.91	2.79	3.58	2.84	2.77	2.97	2.97	3.00	2.83	2.74	2.57	3.27	3.27	3.20	2.85
c. Mobilizes resources from partners to augment to the implementation of SWD Programs	2.89	2.84	2.76	2.85	2.89	2.79	2.81	2.69	2.69	2.86	2.84	2.76	2.91	2.83	2.76	2.61	3.27	2.49	2.70	2.68	2.66	2.88	2.80	2.68	2.89	2.90	2.88	3.15	3.00	2.91	3.23	2.94	2.87	3.10	3.07	3.03	3.09	3.00	2.74	3.00	3.13	2.93	2.88
Average Rating	2.90	2.80	2.70	2.80	2.80	2.70	2.80	2.70	2.70	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.70	2.70	2.60	2.80	2.50	2.60	2.60	2.60	2.80	2.80	2.60	2.90	2.90	2.80	3.00	2.90	2.90	3.50	2.90	2.90	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.80	2.60	3.10	3.10	3.00	2.82

Legend:

K - Knowledge — Top regions in terms of knowledge; Regions with the lowest rating in terms of knowledge

S - Skills — Top regions in terms of skill; Regions with the lowest rating in terms of skill

SS - Self-Satisfaction — Top regions in terms of self-satisfaction; Regions with the lowest rating in terms of self-satisfaction

indicator with the lowest average rating

Table 13: National Average Responses Relative to Networking and Partnership Building

Covered Regions	Knowledge				Skills				Self-Satisfaction			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
CAR	0.0	7.7	27.0	3.3	0.7	8.7	25.7	3.0	1.7	8.7	25.7	2.0
Region I	0.0	22.0	53.7	6.3	0.0	21.7	54.0	6.3	0.3	27.7	47.7	6.3
Region II	0.3	24.7	43.7	8.3	0.7	28.0	40.3	8.0	1.7	30.0	38.7	6.7
Region III	0.3	12.3	32.0	5.3	0.3	13.3	31.0	5.3	0.3	15.3	30.7	3.7
Regioon IV-A	0.3	22.0	61.3	8.3	1.0	26.0	60.7	4.3	2.0	33.3	48.3	8.3
Region IV-B	3.0	16.3	30.7	1.0	2.3	14.0	26.3	8.3	3.7	19.7	27.3	0.3
Region V	0.3	17.7	24.7	1.3	0.3	17.7	25.3	0.7	0.3	19.0	24.0	0.7
Region VI	0.0	19.0	50.3	5.7	0.3	22.3	48.0	4.3	1.3	28.0	41.7	4.0
Region IX	0.3	14.0	52.0	6.7	0.3	15.0	50.7	7.0	0.3	18.3	47.0	7.3
Region X	0.0	11.7	31.0	10.3	0.0	14.3	27.3	11.3	1.3	15.0	24.3	12.3
Region XI	0.0	2.0	12.7	16.3	0.0	6.3	21.7	3.0	0.0	7.7	20.0	3.3
Region XII	0.0	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	4.7	21.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	22.0	3.7
Region XIII	0.3	4.7	16.3	1.7	0.3	5.7	16.0	1.0	1.7	7.0	13.7	0.7
NCR	0.3	1.7	9.7	3.3	0.3	1.3	9.3	4.0	0.3	3.0	8.0	3.7
Total of the Average Responses	**5**	**181**	**465**	**83**	**7**	**199**	**457**	**71**	**15**	**237**	**419**	**63**
Percentage	**1%**	**25%**	**63%**	**11%**	**1%**	**27%**	**62%**	**10%**	**2%**	**32%**	**57%**	**9%**

Total Respondents: 734

Legend:

Rating	*Knowledge*	*Skill*	*Self-Satisfaction*
1	*No knowledge*	*No skill*	*Dissatisfied*
2	*Limited knowledge*	*Limited skill*	*Somewhat Satisfied*
3	*Adequate knowledge*	*Adequate skill*	*Most of the time Satisfied*
4	*With high level of knowledge*	*With high level of skill*	*Always Satisfied*

Table 12 reveals that Regions XI (3.50), NCR (3.10), X (3.00) and XII (3.00) had adequate knowledge on networking and partnership building. Also, Region IX was noted to have an average rating of 2.9 (almost with adequate knowledge). Region XI, XII and NCR were consistently high in all the 3 indicators for knowledge. On the other hand, Regions IV-B and V had the lowest average rating of 2.60 which is leaning to the lower bracket of limited knowledge.

Adequate skills were also noted for Regions NCR (3.10) and XII (3.00) while Regions IX, X, and XI had an average rating of 2.90 which is evident that the respondents have almost adequate skills. However, Regions IVA (2.70) and V (2.60) are leaning towards the lower bracket of having limited skills.

Regions NCR (3.00) and XII (3.00) were most of the time satisfied on this development area. Regions X (2.90, XI (2.90) and IX (2.80) were in an upper bracket of somewhat satisfied while Regions V (2.60), VI (2.60), Caraga (2.60) and IV-B (2.50) leans on the lower bracket of somewhat satisfied.

Particularly, across the 14 Regions, the indicator which needs more support because of the low overall average rating is (a) identify or map-out resource within the area of assignment.

Comparing the rating of each region on Knowledge, Skills and Self-Satisfaction, it is interesting to note that across all 14 regions, CAR has the highest over-all average rating for knowledge and the lowest over-all average rating is for self-satisfaction. This implies that technical assistance on increasing the skills and self-satisfaction is needed by the said Region. Notably, 3 regions, namely Region III, V and XII have the same over-all average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. For Regions I, VI, IX, Caraga and NCR, the over-all average rating for knowledge and skills are the same and the over-all average rating for self-satisfaction declined which implies support in terms of increasing the level of self-satisfaction at varying levels. For Region II, IV-A, X, and XII, the over-all average rating for knowledge was higher and the over-all average rating for skills and self-satisfaction are the same which implies that interventions on increasing the level of skills and self-satisfaction are both needed. Surprisingly, Region IV-B respondents have the highest over-all average rating for skills, followed by knowledge and the self-satisfaction is the lowest. In general, for many respondents, knowledge acquisition may be easier for them while for others, both knowledge and skill acquisition were easier for them.

Table 13 provides for the overall number of responses relative to networking and partnership building. This data illustrates that a great majority of the respondents (465 or 63%) have adequate knowledge on this area while 181 or 25% of the respondents rated that they also have limited knowledge on this area. As leader and manager of SWD implementation at the local level, LSWDOs need to be

equipped with strong foundation on networking and partnership building to be able to lead and build a cohesive and responsive LSWDO and partners to address social protection and social welfare issues and concerns.

Correspondingly, on skills level, the responses ranges from midway of limited (199 or 27%) to adequate (457 or 62%) knowledge which represents from few to a great majority of the respondents are somewhat satisfied to most of the time satisfied as far as networking and partnership building is concerned.

On self- satisfaction, there is a decrease in the number of respondents who are most of the time satisfied. Four hundred nineteen (419) or 57% of the respondents are most of the time satisfied while 237 or 32% of the respondents are somewhat satisfied.

Analyzing further the data presented in Table 12 and Table 13, this means that a great majority of the respondents (57% - 63%) have an average rating of 2.89 for knowledge (almost with adequate knowledge), 2.83 for skill (almost with adequate skill) and 2.75 for self- satisfaction (almost midway of somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied) while 9%-11% of the respondents have high level of knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. Results imply that few (26%-34%) of the respondents, with great concentration coming from Regions I, II,IV-A, IV-B, V, VI, and Caraga, need support on the development area of Networking and Partnership Building

To further assess the extent of adequacy and the extent of the gaps on this area, the next page is the summary of regions with Adequate/High Level of Knowledge, Skills and Self-satisfaction and regions Needing Capacity Building Intervention per indicator under **Networking and Partnership Building**:

Table 14: Comparative Assessment across Regions in terms of Networking and Partnership Building

INDICATORS	Regions With Adequate Knowledge and Skills	Regions with Areas Needing Capacity Building Intervention
a. Identify or map-out resources within the area of assignment that covers financial, expertise and existing non-government organization and business whose interest are in Social Welfare and Development	NCR Region XI Region XII Region X	CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX Caraga
b. Classify resources in accordance to its programs and services offered	NCR CAR Region III Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	Region I Region II Region IV-A Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga
c. Mobilizes resources from partners to augment to the implementation of SWD Programs	NCR CAR Region I Region III Region IV-A Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	Region II Region IV-B Region V Region VI

Note: The regions enumerated above under the priority regions needing capacity building have an average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of less than 2.8 per indicator.

Of the three (3) indicators under the development area of Networking and Partnership Building, it is worthy to mention that Regions X, XI, XII and NCR are strong in all the three indicators; Regions 3, IX and CAR are strong in 2 out of the 3 indicators; while Regions I, IV-A and Caraga are strong in 1 out of 3 indicators. On the other hand, Regions II, IV-B, V, VI are the regions which need support in all of the indicators.

Among the 3 indicators, priority learning intervention should be on indicator (a) identify or map-out resources within the area of assignment that covers financial, expertise and existing non-government organization and business whose interest are in Social Welfare and Development. Likewise, since 11 regions (Region 1, II, IV-A, IV-B, VI, IX, X, XI, CAR, Caraga and NCR) rated themselves lower on self-satisfaction compared to their rating for knowledge and skills, support on strengthening the self- satisfaction at varying levels should be extended. Appropriate learning interventions to address these major gaps on networking and partnership building is highly recommended to be taken by identified regions with low rating, and to have refresher courses for the regions with limited to adequate knowledge and skills on the above mentioned indicators.

Since the assessment was based on the over-all picture per region, it should be noted that within a region, there are certain peculiarities as to the provinces which needs more support relative to specific indicators. *(Kindly refer to the Capacity Building Baseline Needs of P/C/MSWDOs per Region for the details.)*

4. Working with Politicians

The fourth Development Area - Working with Politicians includes the LSWDOs behavior in relating with politicians.

Table 15: National Average Rating on Working with Politicians per Region *(Please refer to the attached in the next page)*

Table 15: National Average Rating on Working with Politicians

Indicators	CAR			Region 1			Region 2			Region 3			Region IVA			Region IVB			Region V			Region VI			Region IX			Region X			Region XI			Region XII			Region 13			NCR			Overall
	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	K	S	SS	Average Rating
a. Articulates and communicates Social Welfare and Development goal/s and advocates in a way that upholds the standards of programs/services of the office.	3	2.89	2.79	3.15	3.13	3.01	2.92	2.87	2.79	3.1	3.04	2.94	3.03	2.98	2.83	2.57	2.65	2.82	2.75	2.77	2.77	3	2.93	2.85	2.97	2.95	2.92	3.09	2.96	3.04	3.19	3.13	2.90	3.17	3.13	3	3	2.91	2.65	3.07	3.13	3	2.95
b. Relates with the Local Chief Executive's demands and aligns the interest of the politician with Social Welfare Development	2.71	2.63	2.66	3.07	3.05	2.89	2.84	2.84	2.77	3.04	3.02	2.88	2.97	2.89	2.68	2.84	2.49	2.47	2.68	2.68	2.66	2.8	2.75	2.69	2.79	2.74	2.75	2.94	2.96	2.81	3.32	2.9	2.71	3.13	3.1	3	3.04	3	2.74	3.13	3.2	2.87	2.86
c. Demonstrates objectivity and professionalism in dealing with and among superior or authority who gives commands	3.13	3.03	2.97	3.37	3.35	3.30	3.1	3.08	3	3.1	3.08	2.96	3.2	3.15	2.99	2.93	2.59	2.53	2.86	2.86	2.84	3.01	2.95	2.92	3.07	3.05	3.04	3.15	3.17	3.11	3.32	3.26	3.03	3.37	3.4	3.27	3.13	2.96	2.91	3.33	3.47	3.33	3.08
d. Conducts an inventory of stakeholders in the community	2.82	2.79	2.68	2.94	2.95	2.88	2.87	2.82	2.81	2.74	2.68	2.62	2.86	2.77	2.66	2.45	2.37	2.29	2.75	2.52	2.52	2.79	2.68	2.64	2.88	2.84	2.84	3.11	3.09	2.55	3.16	2.87	3.13	3.17	3.09	3.03	2.87	2.7	2.61	3.2	3.27	3	2.82
Average Rating	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.00	2.9	2.9	2.8	3	3	2.9	3	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.1	3	2.9	3.3	3	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.1	3	2.9	2.7	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.92

Legend:

K - Knowledge	Top regions in terms of knowledge	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of knowledge	
S - Skills	Top regions in terms of skill	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of skill	
SS - Self-Satisfaction	Top regions in terms of self-satisfaction	Regions with the lowest rating in terms of self-satisfaction	
		indicator with the lowest average rating	

Table 16: National Average Responses Relative to Working with Politicians

Covered Regions	Knowledge				Skills				Self-Satisfaction			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
CAR	0.5	7.5	24.8	5.3	0.5	8.8	25.3	3.5	0.8	10.5	23.3	3.5
Region I	0.0	11.7	48.3	22.0	0.3	10.3	50.8	20.8	0.8	16.3	45.5	19.5
Region II	1.0	16.7	45.3	14.0	0.5	19.5	44.0	13.0	1.3	21.3	43.0	11.5
Region III	0.7	9.0	32.0	8.3	0.5	9.8	31.3	8.5	0.8	13.0	29.3	7.0
Region IV-A	0.7	16.7	56.0	18.7	1.0	19.3	55.3	16.5	4.8	24.3	48.5	14.5
Region IV-B	4.3	21.0	15.7	10.0	2.8	22.0	23.0	3.3	5.5	20.0	18.5	7.0
Region V	0.3	11.7	30.0	2.0	0.3	14.3	27.5	2.0	0.3	14.8	27.0	2.0
Region VI	0.7	15.0	53.0	6.3	0.5	18.5	49.5	6.5	1.0	21.5	45.8	6.8
Region IX	0.0	16.0	47.3	9.7	0.0	17.0	46.8	9.3	0.0	18.3	44.8	10.0
Region X	0.7	9.7	28.0	14.7	0.5	10.5	28.0	14.0	1.3	15.3	25.3	11.3
Region XI	0.0	2.7	16.3	12.0	0.0	4.3	21.3	5.5	0.5	7.0	17.3	6.3
Region XII	0.0	1.7	20.0	8.3	0.0	2.3	20.5	7.3	0.0	3.5	20.8	5.8
Region XIII	0.0	2.0	18.7	2.3	0.3	4.0	16.8	2.0	1.5	4.8	15.3	1.5
NCR	0.0	2.0	6.7	6.3	0.0	2.3	6.5	6.3	0.3	3.8	6.0	5.0
Total of the Average Responses	**9**	**143**	**442**	**140**	**7**	**163**	**447**	**119**	**19**	**194**	**410**	**112**
Percentage	**1%**	**20%**	**60%**	**19%**	**1%**	**22%**	**61%**	**16%**	**3%**	**26%**	**56%**	**15%**

Total Respondents: 734

Legend:

Rating	*Knowledge*	*Skill*	*Self-Satisfaction*
1	*No knowledge*	*No skill*	*Dissatisfied*
2	*Limited knowledge*	*Limited skill*	*Somewhat Satisfied*
3	*Adequate knowledge*	*Adequate skill*	*Most of the time Satisfied*
4	*With high level of knowledge*	*With high level of skill*	*Always Satisfied*

As shown in Table 15, most of the regions laudably rated with adequate knowledge in working with politicians in their localities. Specifically, Regions XI (3.3) XII (3.2), NCR (3.2), X (3.1), I (3.1), III (3), IVA (3), and Caraga (3) expressed their awareness of their role as head/staff of office wherein their immediate supervisor is their Local Chief Executive (LCE) at the province, city and municipal levels. On the other hand, Region IV-B had the lowest average rating of 2.6 for knowledge (midway of limited and adequate knowledge). Much more is expected from them when they are confronted with new and challenging LCEs, and other politicians within their locality, as well as from outside areas like the senate and congress people on the level of the province; and governors, other mayors and barangay captains and councilors on the level of cities and municipalities.

In the same way, six (6) Regions such as NCR (3.3), XII (3.2), I (3.1), III (3), XI (3), and X (3) have adequate skills on this area of Working with the Politicians. Although a little consistent with the results as far as knowledge is concerned, it is interesting to note that Regions IVA (2.9) and CARAGA (2.9) are rated as almost with adequate skill. On the other hand, Region IV-B and V got the lowest rating of 2.5 and 2.7, respectively for skill which means that their skills is midway of limited and adequate skills. This means that the LSWDOs of these regions may have sufficient theoretical information in working with politicians but they lack the necessary skills in working with them. They are the LSWDOs who may want to have more exposure or opportunities in developing or enhancing this particular to be effective and efficient in articulating and communicating SWD goals with advocacy that upholds its standards.

Also, as LSWDOs, the skills in relating with LCEs demands and aligns the interest of the politician with SWD is a challenge to LSWDO in building a strong foundation of support or "basbas" in laymans term in order that SWD agenda will be supported. In leading the social protection arena in the locality, LSWDOs must have the skills of getting "sponsorship" from the politicians and other stakeholders for effective partnership in implementing SWD programs and services.

Consequently, demonstration of objectivity and professionalism in dealing with and among superior or authority who gives commands requires a lot of value formation to a Local SWDO. Likewise, conducting an inventory of stakeholders in the community is a skill in identifying allies in and outside the LSWDO environment. The vast resources, if not totally tapped, is a resource wasted.
In terms of skills, from the 14 regions, Region IV-B was consistently low in all the regions for skills, followed by Region V which was low in 3 of the 4 indicators. CAR got low ratings in 2 of the 4 indicators and Region III, IV-A, and Caraga got low rating in 1 out of 4 indicators.

On the respondents' self–satisfaction, Regions XII and NCR were most of the time satisfied with 3.1 rating. Low rating of 2.7 (almost midway of somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied) was obtained both by Region II and V while Region IV-B got the lowest rating of 2.5 (midway of somewhat satisfied and most of the time satisfied) for self-satisfaction. It was noted that Regions II, CAR and Caraga had low ratings in 2 out of 4 indicators while Regions III, IV-A, V, VI, X and XI had low ratings in 1 out of the 4 indicators.

The indicators which had the lowest average rating across the 14 regions are indicator (d) conducts an inventory of stakeholders in the community and (b) relates with the Local Chief Executive's demands and aligns the interest of the politician with SWD. Hence, regions with recorded bottom rating are recommended for upgrading on the four (4) indicators under working with politicians.

Comparing the rating of each region on Knowledge, Skills and Self-Satisfaction, it is interesting to note that across all 14 regions, 5 Regions, specifically, IV-A, X, XI, Caraga and NCR, have a declining pattern of over-all average rating wherein the rating for knowledge is the highest compared to the rating of knowledge and self-satisfaction, while the rating for the skills in the middle and the rating for self- satisfaction has the lowest average rating. Four (4) regions, namely: Region I, IV-B, V, VI and CAR, have the highest over-all average rating for knowledge and the over-all average rating for skills and self-satisfaction decreased at the same rating. This implies that knowledge acquisition may be easier to acquire than skills and self- satisfaction. For Region II, III, and XII, the over-all average rating for knowledge and skills are the same while the over-all self- satisfaction average rating remained the lowest. For Region IX, the over-all average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction are the same in value. This means that respondents from Region IX are generally confident on how they execute their functions.

In terms of the average rating of the 4 indicators, two Regions (V, IV-B) are in need of total learning intervention to upgrade their competencies on Working with the Politician and eventually level up their satisfaction as LSWDOs.

Table 16 shows that a great majority of the respondents (56%-61%) have adequate knowledge, skills and are most of the time satisfied. Assessing further, few (20%-26%) of the respondents have limited knowledge, skills and somewhat satisfied.

Analyzing further the data presented in Table 15 and Table 16, this means that a great majority of the respondents (56%-61%) have an average rating of 2.99 for knowledge (almost with adequate knowledge), 2.93 for skill (almost with adequate skill) 2.85 for self- satisfaction (near to most of the time satisfied) while

15%-19% of the respondents have high level of knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction. Results imply that few (21%-29%) of the respondents, with great concentration coming from Regions IV-B, and V, need support on the development area of Working with the Politician.

Below is the summary of regions with Adequate/High Level of Knowledge, Skills and Most of the Time Satisfied and those Needing Capacity Building Intervention per indicator under Working with Politicians:

Table 17: Comparative Assessment across Regions in terms of Working with the Politician

INDICATORS	With Adequate Knowledge and Skills	Areas Needing Capacity Building Intervention
a. Articulates and communicates Social Welfare and Development goal/s and advocates in a way that upholds the standards of programs/services of the office.	NCR CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region VI Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	Region IV-B Region V
b. Relates with the Local Chief Executive's demands and aligns the interest of the politician with Social Welfare Development	NCR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	CAR Region IV-B Region V Region VI Region IX
c. Demonstrates objectivity and professionalism in dealing with and among superior or authority who gives commands	NCR CAR Region I Region II Region III Region IV-A Region V Region VI Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII Caraga	Region IV-B
d. Conducts an inventory of stakeholders in the community	NCR Region I Region II Region IX Region X Region XI Region XII	CAR Region IV-B Region V Region VI Caraga

Note: The regions enumerated above under the priority regions needing capacity building have an average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of less than 2.8 per indicator.

Of the four (4) indicators under the development area of Working with the Politician, it is worthy to mention that Regions I, II, X, XI, XII and NCR are strong in all the 4 indicators; Regions III, IV-A, IX and Caraga are strong in 3 out of the 4 indicators; Regions VI and CAR are strong in 2 out of 4 indicators; and Region V is strong in 1 out of 4 indicators. On the other hand, Regions IV-B, are the regions which need support in all of the indicators.

Among the 3 indicators, priority learning intervention should be to Region IV-B which had the lowest over-all rating on all the indicators. The next priority region is Region V which needs support on indicators (a) articulates and communicates SWD goals, (b) relates with the LCE's demands and aligns the interest of the politician with SWD and (d) conducts and inventory of stakeholders in the community. Likewise, intervention on increasing the level of self-satisfaction at varying levels is needed by 13 regions, namely, Region I, II, III, IV-A, IV-B, V, VI, X, XI, 12, Caraga, CAR and NCR.

Since the assessment was based on the over-all picture per region, it should be noted that within a region, there are certain peculiarities as to the provinces which needs more support relative to specific indicators. *(Kindly refer to the Capacity Building Baseline Needs of P/C/MSWDOs per Region for the details.)*

VII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

After the exhaustive conduct of capacity assessment using the approved Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT) for four (4) months (August-November 2013), it was followed by the thorough process of consolidation and in-depth analysis, the following are the significant findings and conclusions:

a. Across all the four (4) development areas, it is remarkable that there were regions which were consistently on the top list. In terms of average rating on knowledge, the regions which had high average ratings are Regions XI, XII, X, III and NCR. In terms of skills, the regions which consistently had high ratings were Regions X, XI, XII and NCR. In terms of self- satisfaction, Regions IX, X, XII and NCR were consistently high in 3 of the 4 development areas. Based on the average ratings, these regions had high level of competency as LSWDOs.

b. There were regions which were observed to be consistently low in the average ratings. In terms of knowledge, the region which needs more support across the 4 developmental areas is Region IV-B, followed by Region V which was low in 3 out of 4 development areas. In terms of skills, Region V needs more assistance to increase their competency in the 4 development areas while Region IV-B needs assistance in 3 out of the 4 development areas. With regards to the self-satisfaction, Regions V and IV-B were consistently low across the 4 development areas. It is crucial that LSWDOs of these regions be given with utmost attention to be able to perform their functions, more importantly, as they are expected to work hand in hand with their LCEs and other stakeholders for sponsorship and alignment of the social welfare and social protection agenda. As major partners in the field, DSWD needs to prioritize the said regions.

c. Comparing the average rating for knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of each region, it was noted that most regions had the lowest average rating for self-satisfaction. This implies that for most of the LSWDOs, knowledge acquisition is easier than putting it into practice and being confident about one's work.

d. Interestingly, it was noted that of the four development areas, most of the regions were adequate in Working with Politicians having the highest over-all average rating of 2.92. This implies that most of the LSWDOs were able to adjust in the set-up of a devolved structure such as the Local Government Unit(LGU). The next development area with the highest over-all average rating is Networking and Partnership Building with 2.82 over-all average rating. The development area which was low is Program Management with 2.74 over-all average rating while the development

area on Administration and Organization had the lowest average rating of 2.70. This means that across the 4 development areas, the least priority in terms of interventions is the development area on Working with the Politicians. More learning interventions are needed on the development area of Program Management, and Administration and Organization.

e. It was noted that per development area, there were indicators which needs more attention. On the development area of Administration and Organization, more support is needed by the LSWDOs in terms of Human Resource Development and documenting work process for decision-making, policy-making, planning and for the use of identified end users. On Program Management, more assistance is needed by the LSWDOs on the conduct of situational analysis, identifying a sequence of key interventions, case recording, Program Menu of Social Protection/Social Welfare and Development interventions and services, monitoring, and evaluation. With regards to Networking and Partnership Building, support is needed on identifying and mapping-out resources. Although the ratings on Working with the Politicians were generally high, minimal support can be extended to the LSWDOs.

f. Although women dominate the LSWDOs at all levels, men should be encouraged to be in the helping profession as well.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and the analysis of the data, the following are the recommendations to enhance the competencies of the LSWDOs:

Development Areas	Specific Recommendations
1. Administration and Organization	***Capability building/technical assistance*** to enhance knowledge and skills on Administration and Organization particularly on the following: a. Human Resource Development b. Documenting work process. c. Volunteer Development and Management (to address the issue of limited budget and staffing) d. Formulation of Manual of Operation e. Leadership, administration and management (to include modern trends in management) ***Advocacy*** f. DSWD to augment the advocacy of the LSWDOs to their LCEs to support all social welfare programs and services ***Human Resource/ Staffing*** g. DSWD to provide technical assistance to Local Government Units on standardizing staffing in the LSWDOs to have adequate and qualified personnel. h. Complement human resources vis a vis programs/ services to efficiently and effectively deliver programs/services
2. Program Management	***Capability building/technical assistance*** to enhance knowledge and skills on Program Management focusing on the following: a. Situational analysis b. Rights-based and results-based planning c. Case recording d. Program Menu of Social Protection/ Social Welfare Development interventions e. Monitoring (to include monitoring tools and templates which LSWDOs can use. f. Evaluation g. technical writing skills and documenting best practices

	h. developing innovative programs i. project development and packaging j. Executive Management Course for LSWDOs. k. Supervisory roles of LSWDO Heads to enhance knowledge, skills and self-satisfaction of workers, especially those handling court related and special cases l. Teamwork within the organization (Train LSWDO heads on how they can foster teamwork within the organization) m. standard Participatory Review and Evaluation Workshop (PREW) for LSWDOs n. LSWDO Heads as trainers of newly hired staff on program management Note: Capability Building interventions provided by DSWD should include the actual implementers in the LSWDOs or focal persons, not just the LSWDO heads. ***Support Mechanisms:*** o. DSWD through DILG to orient LCEs on updates, new standards and programs it cascades to LSWDOs p. National government to continue to augment fund of the LSWDOs for the programs and services it implements, especially to LGU's whose Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA) are very minimal. (Note: Funds should be directly downloaded to the LGUs) q. Enhance convergence efforts among stakeholders for a coordinated delivery of services r. LSWDO workers be given the opportunity to pursue post graduate courses s. Grant financial incentives to special projects t. DSWD Field Office to closely provide technical assistance and strengthen monitoring and evaluation process at all levels of LSWDOs to keep track of updates and development of implemented programs and services u. Regularly update LSWDOs on new policies and laws ***Research in Aid of Policy Review*** v. Assess the effects of the devolution on the Social Protection and Social Welfare and Development services and interventions and over-all program management

3.Networking/ Partnership Building	***Capability building/technical assistance*** to enhance knowledge and skills on Networking and Partnership Building, specifically, on the following: a. Resource mapping b. Project proposal preparation c. Techniques on networking d. Social marketing and fund raising (to enhance their skills on resource generation) ***Support Mechanisms:*** e. Provide a directory of agencies (National Government Agencies, Non-Government Organizations and International Organizations) that provides services on Social Welfare and Development and Social Protection f. DSWD to provide LSWDOs a list of licensed NGOs within the locality g. Sustain the networking and partnership building skills of the LSWDOs h. Provide an opportunity to LSWDOs to interact with funding agencies i. Link LSWDOs to the Corporate Social Responsibility arm of the business sector/companies
4.Working with Politician	***Capability building/technical assistance*** to enhance knowledge and skills on Working with the Politicians with emphasis on the following: a. How to advocate, lobby and package SWD programs for presentation to the LCEs b. How to handle politicians/ art of dealing with politicians c. Accurate and proper representation during development council meeting of the LCE and city council ***Action Points for the LSWDOs:*** d. Maintain and sustain good working relationship with LCEs e. LSWDOs to continuously provide updates to politicians and recognize his support in the success of every undertaking f. LSWDOs to involve the LCEs in the whole program management cycle at varying levels of involvement depending on their availability and capacity to have a sense of ownership on the services at the LSWDO

	Support Mechanisms: g. DSWD to conduct regular dialogue with politicians and invite them to attend trainings and seminars on Social Welfare and Social Protection h. Provide an opportunity wherein LSWDOs will be able to share their best practices in dealing with the LCEs i. DSWD Officials (The Secretary, Undersecretary, Assistant Secretary, Directors) to ground work with the politicians for their support to SWD and Social Protection programs j. Influence DILG to train the LCEs on stewardship k. DSWD to discuss with DILG the cases wherein the LSWDOs are politicized. ***Policy Concerns*** l. Formulate policies for the protection of the LSWDOs against the manipulation of some politicians
5. Others	***Capability Building:*** a. Capability Building on personality development, life skills and corporate values for LSWDOs b. Provide an opportunity for the LSWDOs to process the negative experiences which were brought about by the devolution for them to gain a sense of ownership on the devolved office and its services c. Conduct learning visit to LGUs and LSWDOs with best practices d. Provide stress de-briefing with LSWDOs to enhance their self-esteem in their work in general ***Support Mechanisms:*** e. DSWD to recognize LSWD Officers who are performing according to standards f. DSWD to conduct regular consultations and dialogues with LSWDOs in all the development areas g. Allocate transportation allowance to LSWDOs attending training especially to 5th and 6th class municipalities h. DSWD to continue monitoring and evaluating the functionality of the LSWDOs i. DSWD to augment staffing in 5th and 6th class municipalities j. Provide opportunities to LSWDOs to access grant scholarships to upgrade their knowledge and skills.

	k. Invite LSWDOs to the important events in DSWD to strengthen the relationship and partnership l. Socialize support to LSWDOs - special considerations should be given to LSWDOs which are managed by a one-man-team m. Provide technical assistance to LSWDOs with labor relations concerns n. Special attention should be extended to some provinces which needs more support considering the peculiarity of their situations o. The schools of Social Work should encourage more men to take up the course. ***Advocacy:*** p. Advocate and assist in the full implementation of Magna Carta for Social Workers in the LGU q. Advocate to the LCEs the importance of having social workers as LSWDO Heads r. Advocate for the integration of LSWDO functionality to the Seal of Good Housekeeping of the LGU ***Research in Aid of Policy Review*** s. Research on the effects of devolution to determine which provisions of the law need to be amended, specifically the Local Government Code

ATTACHMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT
Capacity Building Bureau

Self-Administered Tool

Capacity Assessment Questionnaire

Introduction:

One of the Strategic Goals of the Department of Social Welfare and Development is to "Increase the number of provinces and majority of their municipalities/ cities having a fully functioning LSWDO from 0 to 40 by year 2016". As a major partner of DSWD in Social Welfare and Social Protection, the DSWD wants to generate data about the current level of knowledge and skills of the officer/staff of the Local Social Welfare and Development Office (LSWDO) in relation to its functionality. The set of indicators used in this questionnaire was based on the Administrative Order 07 – Guidelines on Local Government Units' Social Welfare and Development Service Delivery System. The responses in the Capacity Assessment will be the basis for designing and provision of technical assistance both in the form of training and other interventions to the LSWDO.

The target respondents of the tool are the Local Social Welfare and Development Heads and Officers of the Province, City and Municipality.

Note: Please print your answers or write legibly. Thank you.

I. Profile of Respondent

A. Personal Data

Name:_____
(Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Name)
Birthday: _____ Sex:_____ Civil status:_____

Highest Educational Attainment: _____
(Please specify your course.)

B. Work Information

Position Title: _____ Salary Grade:_____

Number of years in current position:_____ No. of years in the agency: _____

Office: _____

City/ Municipality:_____ Province: _____

Region: _____

Contact Number:_____ Email Address:_____

Brief Description of Work/ Responsibilities:

_____

_____

Trainings/ and Seminars Attended:

Title of the Seminars/ Trainings	Date Conducted	Organizer

II. Learning Needs

Please indicate (by checking the box) the level of operationalization of the following Standards on Social Welfare and Development Service Delivery System in the Local Government Unit. Kindly write in the remarks the brief explanation for your answer.

Legend:

Rating	**Knowledge**	**Skill**	**Self-Satisfaction**
1	No knowledge	No skill	Dissatisfied
2	Limited knowledge	Limited skill	Somewhat Satisfied
3	Adequate knowledge	Adequate skill	Most of the time Satisfied
4	With high level of knowledge	With high level of skill	Always Satisfied

Development Areas	**Level of Development of the LSWDO Officer/ Staff**														
	Knowledge				**Remarks**	**Skills**				**Remarks**	**Self Satisfaction Rating**				**Remarks** ***(Please elaborate)***
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	
1. Administration and Organization - *Execution of activities or processes as the means of carrying out the vision, mission, goals and mandate of the organization. This includes, but not limited to, management of information, progressive administrative processes and human resource development.*															
a. Develops plans and strategies on Social Welfare and Development															
b.1.Develops financial plans according to standards, norms and procedures															
b.2. Implements financial plans following budget, standards, norms and procedures															
c. Formulates measures/ strategies															

Development Areas	Level of Development of the LSWDO Officer/ Staff														
	Knowledge				Remarks	Skills				Remarks	Self Satisfaction Rating				Remarks *(Please elaborate)*
	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
for the approval of the Sanggunian and provide technical assistance and support to the Local Chief Executive.															
d. Implements and reviews Human Resource Development policies and programs															
e. Conducts and documents work process for decision-making, policy making, planning and for the use of identified end users															
2. Program Management - *Process of managing several related services and projects of the LSWDO*															
a. Planning a.1. Conducts situational analysis and identify problems, gaps and issues															
a.2. Identifies a sequence of key intervention on activities for effective execution of plans and strategies															
a.3. Formulates responsive plans and programs that respond to the needs and situation of disadvantaged individuals, groups and communities.															
a.4. Prepares budgets in accordance to standards															
b. Implementation Executes plans according to standards, policies, procedures and manual of operation and within the budget allocation b.1. Caseloads															
b.2. Helping process/ Case management															
b.3. Case recording															
b.4. Program menu of Social Protection/Social Welfare and Development interventions and services															
c. Monitoring															
c.1. Develops monitoring tool															

Development Areas	Level of Development of the LSWDO Officer/ Staff															
	Knowledge				Remarks	Skills				Remarks	Self Satisfaction Rating				Remarks *(Please elaborate)*
	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
c.2. Utilizes monitoring tools to identify process gaps, challenges, corrective measures for effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery and cull-out good practices															
d. Evaluation															
d.1. Conducts evaluation as designed in the program and/or project plan															
d.2. Utilizes the results for program development and policy recommendation															
e. Adapts measures to ensure safety and well-being of staff and clients															
3. Networking/ Partnership Building - *Working closely with stakeholders towards the enhancement of their mutual capabilities to deliver people empowering programs and services.*															
a. Identify or map-out resources within the area of assignment that covers financial, expertise and existing non-government organization and business whose interest are in Social Welfare and Development															
b. Classify resources in accordance to its programs and services offered															
c. Mobilizes resources from partners to augment to the implementation of SWD Programs															
4. Working with politicians - *Includes behaviors in relating with politicians*															
a. Articulates and communicates Social Welfare and Development goal/s and advocates in a way that upholds the standards of programs/services of the office.															
b. Relates with the Local Chief Executive's demands and															

Development Areas	Level of Development of the LSWDO Officer/ Staff														
	Knowledge				Remarks	Skills				Remarks	Self Satisfaction Rating				Remarks *(Please elaborate)*
	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
aligns the interest of the politician with Social Welfare Development															
c. Demonstrates objectivity and professionalism in dealing with and among superior or authority who gives commands															
d. Conducts an inventory of stakeholders in the community															

III. Other tasks by the LSWDO Officer/ staff not mentioned in the Learning Assessment

_____

_____

IV. Recommendations

Based on your ratings to the above set of questions, what are your recommendations to sustain areas you are good at, and how to solve or address areas which you are weak?

Development Areas	Recommendations
1. Administration and Organization	
2. Program Management	
3. Networking	
4. Working with Politicians	
5. Other recommendations	

Thank you for patiently accomplishing the survey questions. Your responses will be tabulated and consolidated to aid in the planning and decision making of the Bureau and the Department.

DSWD - Capacity Building Bureau (CBB) Team