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Executive summary

This report presents results from Landcare NSW’s 2017 and 2018 surveys of the capacity of its member organisations who are Local Landcare Coordinator Initiative (LLCI) hosts. The survey uses an assessment framework (Mitchell & Allan, 2018) that categorises capacity into five capital types, three of which relate to social capital: bonding social capital (how cohesive the group is), bridging social capital (how well the group connects with others) and organisational capital (how well the group organises internally). Thirty-two organisations completed the survey in 2017, while 27 did so in 2018, with 17 of these completing the survey in both years.

Scores for each capital type were obtained and standardised from responses to survey questions. This approach to capacity assessment builds on an assumption that the organisations answering the questions are best placed to understand and assess their own capacity strengths and needs. Each organisation received a snapshot report of their results enabling them to easily identify aspects where extra effort may be required. The report included a section to guide organisations in how to create a group discussion on the results as part of its future planning.

The Landcare NSW survey results suggest that, overall, Landcare organisations have high levels of bonding and bridging social capital relative to their desired levels of these capitals. There is slightly lower satisfaction with their organisational capital, and physical and financial capital. This picture is unsurprising, given the coordinating and supporting roles of the organisations surveyed, and the constrained funding context in which they operate. A key finding relates to the strength of their assessed social capital (both bonding and bridging). In some cases, a maximum score of 5 out of 5 was obtained. This should not be interpreted as achieving perfect capacity, but rather as a reflection of the groups’ complete confidence in their current ability specific to that capacity. It would be appropriate for that group to reconsider their aspirations to allow for future growth.

The change in averaged results between 2017 and 2018 for the 17 organisations that completed the survey over both years is hardly discernible. Most organisations showed slight increases in scores over time, and overall improvement was greatest for physical and financial capital. It was also difficult to identify patterns of differences between organisations according to attributes such as organisational planning and how often their committees meet. This suggests the survey instrument offers a degree of reliability, as one would not expect major changes over a space of one year, nor would one expect significant variation in responses from among a set of organisations with sufficient capacity to act as LLCI hosts. Indeed, the difficulty in discerning patterns across this particular cohort suggests local context and engagement is more important for understanding each organisation’s capacity strengths and needs. This reinforces the value of local Landcare Coordinators, and relying on that strategy as a means to guide investment.

Capacity measures for each organisation can be usefully tracked over time, which can further enhance understanding about group capacity, and the consequences of investing in that capacity. This approach can also be adopted for a combined set of Landcare organisations across NSW and can provide evidence of support for programs and activities on each of the organisations. It is recommended, therefore, that this survey is re-administered regularly over time.
1. Introduction

This report presents and discusses the results of two Landcare organisation capacity surveys conducted by Landcare NSW in 2017 and 2018. The survey instrument administered by Landcare NSW is based on that developed for Murray Local Land Services (LLS), in collaboration with the Holbrook Landcare Network (Mitchell & Allan, 2018), and a prior investigation by Landcare NSW (2015).

1.1 Landcare, groups/networks and their capacity

The current arrangement of Landcare groups and networks in Australia builds on a long history of relationships between private landowners and governments. When the Australian states assumed primary responsibility for NRM upon Federation in 1901, agriculture and related agencies in each state developed issue-based programs targeting threats to productivity such as soil erosion, rabbits and weeds (Breckwoldt, 1988). Through the 1970s, a vanguard of Australian soil conservationists, extension agents, and farmers were influenced by new rural development theory that emphasised self-help and cooperative community effort supported by change agents (Curtis, 1998). In the 1980s, the agencies for agriculture, soil conservation, wildlife and rivers began integrating within each state, in an attempt to manage landscape processes holistically (Head, 2009). New alliances began forming across government and non-government sectors. In 1985, a new approach called ‘Landcare’ in Victoria expanded rapidly from local farming community groups into what became a nation-wide ‘Decade of Landcare’ program funded by federal and state governments (Curtis & Lockwood, 2000). The focus of Landcare was on local participatory action and capacity building to improve agricultural productivity through sustainable management of natural resources, on private and sometimes public land (Youl, Polkinghorne, Naben, & Marriott, 2001). Development of Landcare over time drew, both consciously and unconsciously, on the concept of social capital.

In 1997, the importance of social capital was recognised at the state level and highlighted to coordinators at a NSW Landcare Conference by Dr Eva Cox. Webb and Cary (2005, p. 123) clarified that ‘Community Landcare forms the basis of community level social capital for Landcare, with both bonding and bridging ties contributing to various consequences for Landcare groups and their members… [while] Bureaucratic Landcare forms the basis of state or institutional level social capital with consequences being influenced by the integrity of the state or institution arrangements and their synergy with civil society.’ Locally focused Landcare groups were the foundation of the Landcare approach in the 1980s (Love, n.d.). Community based facilitators/ co-ordinators, mostly funded by government, were an important support for Landcare group activities (Curtis & De Lacy, 1998), and by 1992 there were 160 facilitators employed by Landcare groups across Australia (Love, n.d.).

Networks of Landcare groups began to emerge early in the history of Landcare, although they were not ‘planned’ as part of government visions of Landcare (Sobels & Curtis, 2001). Rather, Landcare networks emerged to provide the regionally co-ordinated local action needed to meet the complexity of Landcare issues (Bailey, 1996). Landcare networks were seen as a way to bridge local and regional, and even local and state, offer economies of scale and exert stronger influence on policy development. Landcare networks are thus specific types of groups, with a designed stronger emphasis on the bridging and organisational capitals. Support for Landcare networks was provided by Regional Landcare Facilitators from 1996 (M.
Stark, pers. comm.), gaining momentum and coordination through the Australian Government’s Natural Heritage Trust program. In 2016, the NSW Government committed to funding the Local Landcare Coordinator Initiative (LLCI) with funding to employ part-time Local Landcare Coordinators in regions until June 2019 (Earl & Allan, 2018). This report is focused on this specific LLCI program and time frame.

Capacity can be defined as ‘having the ability to act’ (Moore, Severn, & Millar, 2006). Some factors influencing this ability to act emerge from within and between individuals, while others are externally imposed constraints or opportunities for action. Mitchell and Allan (2018) developed an assessment framework based on community capacity to assist groups understand their own capacity strengths and needs. The significant innovation of this framework is its more detailed elaboration of different aspects of social capital (sensu Putnam, 1995). Drawing on Mountjoy (2014), the framework categorised social capital into bonding social capital (how cohesive the group is), bridging social capital (how well the group connects with others) and organisational capital (how well the group organises internally).

The survey instrument was originally developed for use with Landcare groups, but for this study it was administered to organisations that host a Landcare network co-ordinator. For simplicity the general term ‘organisation’ was adopted by Landcare NSW for its survey, and we have continued to prefer this term when referring to survey respondents. The survey instrument is suitable to help Landcare organisations assess their capacity but given the differing goals and operations of networks compared with groups, it can be anticipated that the assessments and how they are used will be different from those achieved with individual Landcare group assessments.

1.2 Assessing impact from investing in Landcare

1.2.1 Methods for assessing impact: a role for group capacity measurement

The survey instrument administered by Landcare NSW is based on that developed by Mitchell & Allan (2018). The theoretical underpinnings of the survey are described in detail in Section 2 below. Only slight modification to the language of the survey developed for the Murray LLS 2016 survey was introduced by Landcare NSW (e.g. reference to ‘groups’ was changed to ‘organisations’), and additional questions were added to help Landcare NSW evaluate the roles of Regional Landcare Facilitators (RLF) and Regional Communities of Practice (RCoPs). The surveys conducted by Landcare NSW focused on organisations acting as Landcare networks (see list of organisations in Appendix 2). Two organisations completed the surveys as part of the Murray LLS survey and the subsequent two surveys administered by Landcare NSW.

1.2.2 Relative and absolute measures of organisation capacity

As explained below, we have designed this decision support framework as a self-assessment tool based on questions about group/ network function, activities, needs and goals. Levels of each of the five capitals are derived from the answers to these questions. Achieving a top-level score in any particular area does not mean perfect capacity has been attained. Because capacity is defined for our purposes as networks and groups ‘having the ability to act’, a specific network or group’s capacity must always be considered in relation to the level of activity and achievement desired. For groups this can be completely self-determined, while
networks may need to consider both internal and external expectations. A top-level score simply means that the organisation believes it has top level confidence on that particular aspect of capacity in terms of their current aspirations.

Because the capacity level determined through the assessment is only meaningful in context, one of the best uses of the assessment is to monitor and explore capacity levels over time. However, the conclusion may not necessarily be a simple case of identifying capacity improvement or decline over time. As levels of capacity increase, it is reasonable to expect aspirations for activities and achievements to increase. A decrease in capacity levels over time may reflect an organisation’s desire to do more and indicates where new capacity is needed to achieve these new levels of aspiration. Fluctuations in capacity could also be attributed to unexpected changes such as committee succession or external factors such as drought conditions.

The relativity of the capacity measure makes comparisons of absolute capacity across groups and networks impossible. The capacity score achieved for an individual group or network only makes sense in terms of the aspirations of that particular group or network. It also means that any attempt to present capacity levels in the form of a ‘league table’ would be misleading and erroneous. The assessments instead enable Landcare organisations and those who support them have better informed conversations, which, as a consequence, should enable more effectively targeted investments. Capacity measures for each organisation can also be usefully tracked over time, which can further enhance understanding about group capacity, and the consequences of investing in that capacity. This approach can also be adopted for a combined set of Landcare organisations across NSW and can provide evidence of support for programs and activities on each of the organisations. A relative measure of capacity is no more or less ‘real’ than an absolute number in this regard; a drop-in capacity caused by increased aspirations indicates that programs may be unbalanced in that particular aspect of capital. Success will still be measured by high scores.

1.3 Using group capacity assessments

1.3.1 To frame conversations

Completing the survey instrument provides an initial opportunity for respondents to think about – and potentially discuss with other members – aspects of their organisation’s operations which may be lost in the busyness of day-to-day activity. While some of the questions in the instrument can be answered with records, other questions require reflection on expectations and practice. Each organisation that completed the survey is subsequen tly provided with an individual snapshot with an analysis of the survey results for their organisation, and a guide on how to interpret and use those results (see Section 5). Discussion of the results among the organisation’s members is particularly useful once more than one survey is completed over time, as this enables consideration of change, both planned and unanticipated.

1.3.2 To guide investments

The social capital concept borrows from, but is not identical to, the economic theory of capital. Similarly, the concept of investment in relation to Landcare organisations relates to, but is more than, the economic term. Investment in a Landcare organisation could involve resources such as money or in-kind equivalents and time, but individuals and organisations might also invest their goodwill, information, or even power. With so much at stake, good information is needed to guide investments. The capability assessment shows organisations where
investment in them may be needed to result in positive impacts. It also suggests strengths and weaknesses that could be considered by investors before they commit resources, goodwill and devolve power.

2. A package for assessing group capacity

The package used for assessing group capacity builds on an assumption that the organisations undertaking the assessment are in the best position to assess their own capacity, provided they are led through the assessment by being asked questions about activities and aspirations that they can easily answer. Group members have access to records and recollections and understand their particular contexts. The package therefore relies on self-assessment by one representative of the organisation, usually the coordinator, undertaking the survey. The survey instrument (a questionnaire) was designed around theoretically derived and tested indicators of aspects of the topic of interest, social capital, following the general approach to questionnaire design provided by Sarantakos (2005). The questionnaire did not ask respondents to make direct judgments about their capacity, but rather it sought responses related to group function, activities, needs and goals, as these can be answered accurately. The apparent subjectivity of self-assessment is greatly reduced by this focus on clear and objectively answerable questions. The results from the survey are then reorganised into key facets of community group capacity as explained in the following sections.

2.1 The assessment framework and survey instrument

The assessment framework is the same as was used for the Murray LLS 2016 survey (Mitchell & Allan, 2018). It comprises five capital types that are further elaborated into a set of 21 more specific assessment categories (see Table 1).
Questions aligned with the different assessment categories were drawn from existing capacity assessment surveys and self-assessment tools (Curtis & Sample, 2010; DSE, 2010; Murray Landcare and Producer Groups, 2013; Landcare NSW, 2014a, 2014b, 2015). These questions are listed in Table 2, with question numbers matching those used in the Landcare NSW survey of 2018. As with the Murray LLS survey, a key emphasis of its design was to enable the survey to be completed within ten minutes, limiting the number of questions included. One outcome is that there was no question that addressed the assessment category under bonding social capital of ‘group identity and shared history’. Another outcome is the limiting effect on the quality of the results due to scores for each of the different types of capital being based on very few questions, some of which are yes-no type questions. The implications of these limitations need to be explained to assist groups interpret what the results mean for them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Landcare NSW survey questions used for assessing community-based group capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group skills and experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Up-skilling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect/ trust/ commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community catalyst</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships with other groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brokering and external partnerships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation and advocacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness of decisions making etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical reflection and flexibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational systems and procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finances, budgeting, access to funding, assets, infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scores for this aspect were calculated from responses to questions 14 (does your organisation engage/ employ a project officer) and 15 (if during the last 12 months your organisation did not employ staff, has your organisation had access to part-time or full-time coordinator(s) or project manager(s) employed by another organisation?)
2.2 Approach to data analysis and reporting

As with the survey design, the emphasis on data analysis and reporting has been to make it as easy as possible for members of an organisation to quickly understand the results so that the focus of discussion can be on how and where the organisation can implement change. Snapshot reports that incorporated visual displays for transparent and simple presentation of results were developed for each organisation.

To create these snapshot results, standardised scores for all questions were developed by converting survey responses into numbers, followed by rescaling so scores for all questions were out of 5. Conversion of the 7-point Likert scale from ‘strongly disagree’ through to ‘strongly agree’ into numbers was straightforward. If a group responded ‘Don’t know’ or ‘Haven’t tried’ to one of these questions, a score was not applied, and the question was not included in the scoring system.

A simple scoring system of 1 and 0 was used for ‘yes-no’ type questions. For Q17, we extended this to give a score of 2 for ‘Yes and the plan is current’ to denote a higher level of organisational capital than having a plan that may not be up to date (score of ‘1’). This question, which relates to the assessment of strategic planning, was also linked to Q18, which is part of the assessment of critical reflection and flexibility: ‘If you answered yes to Question 17, does your organisation regularly monitor performance against the strategic plan?’ However, the online survey allowed respondents to answer this question even if they answered ‘No’ to Q17. As the two questions assess different aspects of organisational capital, we decided to keep both questions. This decision led us to assign a zero score to the three respondents who did not answer the question (two of whom had answered ‘No’ to Q17). Normally, respondents who choose not to answer a question would not have that question included in the analysis. The effect of this scoring system resulted in the following scores across the two questions (out of 10, as each question was given a standardised score out of 5 – see below):

- 0.0 = no plan
- 2.5 = plan is not current, and is not monitored
- 5.0 = plan is current, but is not monitored
- 7.5 = plan is not current, but is monitored
- 10 = plan is current, and is monitored

This scoring system thus places stronger emphasis on using a plan rather than just having a plan.

The results from Q15 also required manipulation. This question asked, ‘If during the last 12 months your organisation did not employ staff, has your organisation had access to part-time or full-time coordinator(s) or project manager(s) employed by another organisation?’ The survey was administered to host organisations, so most organisations employed their own coordinator(s) and/or project managers; to reflect this in the scoring system we created a new score that combined Q15 responses with details provided by the organisation about the staff they employed, as follows:

- 0 = no project management or coordination staff employed by group, and no access to project managers or coordinators employed by another organisation
1 = no project management or coordination staff employed by group, but group has access to a project manager or coordinator employed by another organisation
2 = organisation employs their own project management and/or coordination staff

The scores out of 5 should not be used to create ‘league tables’ that rank capacity levels across organisations. The scores are an indication of the degree to which the organisation perceives it has reached its aspirations, relevant to each question. Organisations should interpret comparatively high or low scores in terms of how the questions were answered, and where their aspirations lie. A lower score could indicate an area where an organisation would like to make improvements. Strategies to make those improvements can then be determined by the organisation, if deemed relevant to their aspirations.

3. Landcare NSW survey administration

The authors were not involved in survey administration, as this had already been undertaken by Landcare NSW. Landcare NSW also took responsibility for dissemination of results back to organisations. An aim of developing the survey in 2016 was to provide an easily accessible survey instrument for regular self-assessment. The report authors are delighted to see Landcare NSW champion this aspiration.

3.1 Survey, 2017: distribution, response and comments

Landcare NSW sent, by email, an invitation to complete the survey, together with a link to the online platform used to administer the survey, on 29 September 2017. The email was distributed to all 57 Landcare NSW members who act as host organisations in the LLCI program (listed in Appendix 2). No follow up emails were sent, but the Report Card 2 is a requirement mentioned in the schedules of each host contract. The link, instructions and a PDF of the form were always freely accessible and available on the NSW Landcare Gateway site under the heading ‘Reporting for the LLCI’ during each reporting window for Report Card 2.

In total, 32 responses were received (excluding three duplicated responses and one response from a group that had not completed any of the questions – see Table 3).

Table 3: Response rate for capacity survey distributed in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys distributed</th>
<th>Surveys returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Survey, 2018: distribution, response and comments

The 2018 survey was distributed before analysis of the 2017 results had been undertaken. While this was a regrettable situation for recipients, especially those who had taken the time to complete the 2017 survey, 53% of those who had completed the 2017 survey chose to complete it again in 2018. As previously, Landcare NSW sent invitations via emails and the link to the survey, on 17 August 2018 to the same 57 participating LLCI host organisations (listed in Appendix 2).
By the time the 2018 survey was closed (2 October 2018), 27 responses had been received (excluding one duplicated response – see Table 4). Of these, 17 respondents had also completed the survey in 2017 (63%). Two organisations had also completed the Murray Local Land Services survey in 2016-2017, and these two thus had three consecutive years of data that were analysed.

**Table 4: Response rate for capacity survey distributed in 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys distributed</th>
<th>Surveys returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During administration of the survey in 2017 and 2018 it is unclear how much emphasis was placed on the desirability for organisations to use group discussion as the basis for responding to the questionnaire. While such discussion is desirable from an organisational capacity building perspective, most of the questions in the survey instrument sought factual data that ought to be available from the organisational records. The following results and discussion can still be considered a reasonable reflection of the state of the organisations, regardless of whether a discussion was held or not.

### 4. Results

An overarching message that the Landcare NSW survey results provide is that Landcare organisations pride themselves on the strength of their social capital (both bonding and bridging); that is, that they assess they have high levels of these capitals relative to their desired levels. If survey respondents provided results that suggested capacity needs, these were most often associated with aspects related to the so-called ‘nuts and bolts’ of group capacity (organisational capital, and physical and financial capital), such as being able to access funding, or to have an effective accountability framework in operation to enable critical reflection of organisational performance.

#### 4.1 Overall results, 2017

The comparative strength among the cohort that completed the survey in 2017 is in their bonding social capital, with similarly high scores achieved across all types of human and social capital (see Figure 1). The comparatively lower average score for physical and financial capital can primarily be attributed to the question exploring ease of access to funds. While the results varied considerably across organisations, the overall average suggested moderate difficulty, especially in accessing funds for staff and on ground consumables, with slightly easier access to funds for events. Despite this, most responding organisations (78%) agreed they had adequate physical infrastructure and equipment to support their activities.
The above positive results across the human and social capitals can be better explained by examining how they have been compiled from the more specific assessment category results, as shown in Table 5. The assessment category that attained the highest score related to ‘relationships with other groups’ (4.6). It is a result worth celebrating as it demonstrates confidence by the LLCI host organisations completing the survey that they were fulfilling the networking task they were responsible for. The score for this question was drawn from four questions, one of which was a ‘yes-no’ question that is arguably superfluous: ‘is your organisation part of a formal network or relationship based collective?’ Not surprisingly, all Landcare NSW respondent organisations answered yes to that question, which was not the case for the Murray LLS survey. The assessment categories receiving the next highest scores were both related to bonding social capital (4.4). The category with the lowest score was related to physical and financial capital (3.2), with the next lowest exploring the aspects of accountability and critical reflection (3.7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital types</th>
<th>Score out of 5</th>
<th>Assessment categories</th>
<th>Score out of 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding social capital</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect/ trust/ commitment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging social capital</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community catalyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships with other groups</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brokering and external partnerships</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness of decision making and knowledge availability</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Group skills and experience</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up-skilling</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational capital</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical reflection and flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational systems and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and financial capital</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Finances, budgeting and access to funding</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assets and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Overall results, 2018

The cohort of 27 respondents that completed the survey in 2018 showed greater consistency in scores across the five capital types than was the case for the 2017 cohort (see Figure 2). Bonding and bridging social capital were again the comparative strengths (4.3 and 4.2 respectively), with the score for physical and financial capital being the lowest (3.5). In terms of assessment categories (see Table 6), the top score for the 2018 cohort, as it has been for the 2017 cohort, concerned ‘relationships with other groups’ (4.5). The next highest related to organisational management (4.4) followed by the two assessment categories relating to bonding social capital (4.3).

Figure 2: Spider web graph showing average results for all 27 respondent organisations surveyed in 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital types</th>
<th>Score out of 5</th>
<th>Assessment categories</th>
<th>Score out of 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding social capital</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect/ trust/ commitment</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging social capital</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community catalyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships with other groups</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brokering and external partnerships</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness of decision making and knowledge availability</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational capital</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical reflection and flexibility</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational systems and procedures</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Group skills and experience</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up-skilling</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and financial capital</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Finances, budgeting and access to funding</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assets and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Longitudinal insights

It would be incorrect to compare the average results provided in the two sections above to explore changes over time, as the two sets of data are from a different set of respondents. Instead, the spider web graph (Figure 3) shows the change over time for the 17 respondents who completed both the 2017 and 2018 surveys. As might be expected, any changes in averaged results over the space of one year are hardly discernible. Individual organisations can interrogate specific changes in response to questions and consider what this may mean for them. For example, the slight drop in values from 2017 to 2018 for human (from 4.1 to 4.0) and bonding social capital (from 4.3 to 4.2) can be almost entirely attributed to a significant change in how one organisation responded to the questions related to bonding social capital. The reasons for the organisation’s change in responses to these questions from 2017 to 2018 can only be explained by the organisation involved.

![Spider web graph comparing average results for the 17 organisations who completed the survey in both 2017 and 2018](image)

Most organisations showed slight increases in scores over time, and overall improvement was greatest for physical and financial capital (from 3.4 to 3.6). The changes in responses to the two questions concerning physical and financial capital varied considerably across individual organisations, but on average, the improvement can mostly be attributed to an increase in the average score for the question ‘Our organisation has adequate physical infrastructure and equipment to support the activities we undertake’ (from 3.5 to 4.0), with no noticeable increase in score for the question related to ease of access for funding.

For organisations attaining the highest possible scores, the implication is not that they have achieved perfect capacity. Instead the implication is that they are now in a good position to consider stretching their future applications. Should they choose to do so, this might result in lower scores in the future as their higher aspirations create capacity needs to fulfil. Such an effect from a change in aspiration could explain the outcome for one organisation. According to the changes in response provided by that organisation, it had undertaken a vision exercise in 2018. Then comparing the results for 2017 and 2018, by 2018, the organisation no longer
agreed that it had the necessary skills and experiences to do what it wanted to do and expressed less confidence in knowing ways to develop its capacity. It would be easy to conclude that the visioning exercise sparked a desire to do more, and then link this to a desire for greater human capital related capacity, but it is of course the organisation itself that is best placed to interpret a connection, if any, and what should be done about it.

4.4 Comparing capacity differences according to group attributes

Previous reports investigating group capacity have identified factors deemed as significant influences (Curtis & Sample, 2010; Landcare NSW, 2015; Mitchell & Allan, 2018). These include whether or not a group has a documented plan and the number of group meetings held. We sought to identify if these factors were also significant for the cohort of Landcare NSW organisations making up the current set of survey respondents.

4.4.1 Organisational planning

As explained above, our analysis related to organisational planning goes deeper than simply whether or not the organisation has a plan. The scoring system was also based on whether or not the plan was current, and whether or not it was used for monitoring purposes. Interestingly, for both the 2017 and 2018 cohorts, we did not find any pattern of higher capacity scores matching an increase in the overall scores for these two questions. The exception was when we divided the 2018 cohort into those that had a current plan which they used for monitoring purposes and all the other respondents, where the former cohort scored marginally better on average than the remainder, as shown in Figure 4. Organisational capital is not included, as the questions being analysed are part of the score for that capital type.

![Figure 4: Comparison of average 2018 cohort self-assessed capacity scores for human, social (bonding and bridging) and physical and financial capital types between organisations with a plan that is current and monitored and all other organisations surveyed](image)
4.4.2 How often the organisation meets

We also were unable to identify any noticeable pattern of increased self-assessed capacity matching an increase in how often the organisation’s committee met over the past year. The exception this time was for the 2017 cohort, whose scores for most capital types were slightly higher among groups whose committee had met seven or more times over the past year than those who met less often (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5: Comparison of average 2017 cohort self-assessed capacity scores for capital types between organisations whose committee had met <6 or >7 times over the past year](image)

4.4.3 Satisfaction with level of on ground action

When analysing the results from the survey of Murray community-based groups (Mitchell & Allan, 2018), a noticeable trend was identified when comparing self-assessed capacity and level of agreement with the question ‘our group is satisfied with its level of on ground actions.’ Again, it was interesting to discover that this trend was not as easily identifiable among respondents of the Landcare NSW administered surveys. And again, we were able to identify only one exception, which is when we compared the answers provided by the 2018 cohort between the 20 organisations that agreed with the question and the seven other organisations that were either undecided or disagreed with the statement.
Figure 6: Comparison of average 2018 cohort self-assessed capacity scores according to their agreement with the statement ‘our organisation is satisfied with its level of on-ground action that we undertake/facilitate’

4.4.4 Implications

Overall, difficulty in identifying patterns in capacity levels when compared against the above attributes should not be surprising given the two survey cohorts. All the Landcare organisations that responded to the survey had taken on active roles as Landcare networks and by hosting local Landcare coordinators. Thus, despite a significant diversity in strengths and aspirations across all individual Landcare networks, those that responded to this survey have similar levels of capacity, some of which would be reflected in their responses to the survey. A contrast could be drawn here with the analysis of the results from the 2016 Murray LLS survey. Patterns were more readily discernible when comparing across that cohort because the Murray LLS cohort comprised considerably more diversity in types of respondents. There were also a larger number of respondents and a higher response rate, and this would have an increasing effect on the diversity of the sample.

We also draw a second implication, which we believe to be more important. Difficulty in discerning patterns across the cohort of Landcare NSW respondents can suggest that each organisation’s particular context is highly influential on that organisation, and investors may not be able to rely on simplified and mainstreamed investment strategies applied en masse. That is, the current strategy of a healthy, engaged committee working with local Landcare coordinators to guide investment through robust strategic processes based on their understanding of local organisational contexts is entirely apt. However, the reality is more complex with a reliance on program-specific National and State funding grants which are usually short-term and highly competitive.
4.5 Influence of Regional Landcare Facilitators and communities of practice

The Landcare NSW survey included questions seeking opinions on the roles of Regional Landcare facilitators and the regional communities of practice. Nine questions were added to the 2017 survey, focusing on Regional Community of Practice (RCoP) activities, with an additional three questions added in 2018 concerning the Regional Landcare Facilitator (RLF). Two of the RCoP questions were included in the score for bridging social capital: how often the organisation participates in RCoP activities, and whether the organisation has shared its learnings and experiences with other organisations through the RCoP. Most organisations who responded to the survey always or nearly always participate in RCoP activities (88% and 81% among 2017 and 2018 respondents respectively) and all respondents agreed that they shared their learnings and experiences with others through the RCoP. Responses to other questions suggest organisations are generally positive about their engagement with RCoP activities (see Tables 7 and 8). This included a question where respondents could provide some comments. Three themes came through this commentary:

1. The RCoPs play ‘an important role’, are ‘valuable’, ‘helpful’ with sessions that were ‘informative’ and good for ‘idea generation’.

2. Several respondents explained that they were members of multiple RCoPs, one highlighting the benefit of cross-border partnerships, one feeling ‘under pressure to participate’ (links with the third theme below), another indicating that there was occasional duplication, and one suggesting there were too many forums.

3. The third theme builds on the second: there is a ‘serious dose of volunteer fatigue’, ‘with a small group it is very difficult to resource’ presence at RCoP activities.

Table 7: Opinions among 2017 survey respondents concerning Regional Community of Practice activities (ordered according to average score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions included in 2017 Survey</th>
<th>% Agree (including somewhat agree and strongly agree)</th>
<th>Average score (where 5= somewhat agree; 6 = agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23c. We have shared our learning and experiences with other organisations through the RCoP</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a. The RCoP activities are useful in helping us improve the running of our organisation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23e. We now are more comfortable asking for advice from other Landcare or similar organisations within our region</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b. We have learnt things from other organisations within our region that we have applied in our own organisation’s activities</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23d. The time we spend away from working on our own organisation at the RCoP activities, is time well spent for our organisation</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23g. We feel that the RCoP is responsive to the needs identified by our organisation</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23f. We have increased the number of partnership activities/projects with one or more of the other participants in our RCoP</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Opinions among 2018 survey respondents concerning Regional Community of Practice activities and change in Regional Landcare Facilitator positions (ordered according to average score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions included in 2018 Survey</th>
<th>% Agree (including somewhat agree and strongly agree)</th>
<th>Average score (where 5= somewhat agree; 6 = agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23c. We have shared our learning and experiences with other organisations through the RCoP</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23e. We now are more comfortable asking for advice from other Landcare or similar organisations within our region</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b. We have learnt things from other organisations within our region that we have applied in our own organisation’s activities</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a. The RCoP activities are useful in helping us improve the running of our organisation</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. How do you feel about the statement? 'The changes in the position to a Regional Agricultural Landcare Facilitator are likely to see a reduction in support to our organisation'</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23f. We have increased the number of partnership activities/projects with one or more of the other participants in our RCoP</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23d. The time we spend away from working on our own organisation at the RCoP activities, is time well spent for our organisation</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23g. We feel that the RCoP is responsive to the needs identified by our organisation</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional questions added to the 2018 survey explored how the organisation describes the support given by their RLF, the difference having an RLF has had on their organisation, and their view on the change from RLF to Regional Agricultural Landcare Facilitator. Responses to the last question is included in Table 8 above, indicating that most organisations consider this an unwelcome change, reducing the level of support they are likely to receive as a result.

Options for describing the support provided by RLF were: unnecessary; helped a little bit; moderately helpful; helped a lot; and critical. Most respondents agreed (including ‘somewhat agree’ and ‘strongly agree’) that the RLF was either ‘moderately helpful’ (64%), ‘helped a lot’ (83%) or ‘critical’ (78%), with 39% of respondents strongly agreeing that the RLF was critical. Three respondents (9%) agreed that the support provided by the RLF was unnecessary.

Responses to the other question added are included in Table 9 below. Almost all organisations could identify how the presence of an RLF has made a difference, with only respondent unable to answer that question. The factor that most organisations identified as different following the RLF appointment related to relationships being built and improved networking.
Table 9: Opinions among 2018 survey respondents concerning the difference a Regional Landcare Facilitator makes

| Building relationships with other people/groups/organisations/agencies | 85% |
| Training/skills development | 77% |
| Getting funding/resources in (to groups/networks) or out (of agencies/organisations/networks) | 62% |
| Bringing new ideas/opportunities | 58% |
| Helping us to work together better/share common purpose | 50% |
| Leadership | 46% |
| Writing grant applications/lobbying for funding | 46% |
| Getting projects up and running | 38% |

5. Snapshot presentation of results for Landcare organisations

One of the most innovative and successful outcomes of the original group capacity project (Mitchell & Allan, 2018) was the re-presentation of the above results analysis in a form that can be easily digested for each participating group. This report format has been replicated for the Landcare NSW survey. Each organisation received a four-page snapshot report of their own results, with a tailored analysis. Results were provided in two forms. An overall summary of capacity levels was presented in a spider web diagram with five axes matching the five capital types, such as that shown in Figures 2 and 3 on pages 16 and 18. Brief interpretive comments highlighted each group’s comparative areas of strength.

Further details on these results were presented in a series of bar graphs that again matched each of the five capital types, and the questions used to create the scores. The implications of these results were briefly interpreted, with suggestions for aspects of group capacity that each organisation might like to further develop. Organisations could compare their own individual respondent answer to each question with the average result from all participating organisations. Organisations that had completed the survey in both 2017 and 2018 could also compare their 2017 and 2018 responses to individual questions.

Presentation of the results in this uncluttered and customised way has enabled each organisation to understand its own results, and also how those results relate to that of their peers. The organisation can easily identify and discuss its points of difference, including its strengths, and areas where the organisation could focus its energy in pursuit of its goals and aspirations. Additional explanatory text was also provided to assist organisations understand how to use and interpret the results, and how to create a group discussion on the results as part of its future planning.
6. Conclusion
Landcare NSW survey results suggest that, overall, NSW LLCI host Landcare organisations have high levels of bonding and bridging social capital relative to their desired levels of these capitals. There is slightly lower satisfaction with their organisational capital, and physical and financial capital. This picture is unsurprising, given the co-ordinating and supporting roles of the organisations surveyed, and the constrained funding context in which they operate.

7. Recommendations
Based on the information presented in this report we recommend that Landcare NSW:

1. Continue re-administering the survey in its current form with some minor adjustments if required.
2. Explore opportunities for ongoing collaboration on capacity assessment framework use and analysis.
3. Promote the survey in its current form as a reliable and appropriate capacity self-assessment tool for Landcare type groups and organisations of their own group capacity.
4. Encourage all those member organisations receiving a snapshot report to discuss the implications of their reported results for future planning, and to include Landcare coordinators and facilitators as part of their discussions.
5. Encourage all its other member organisations to use the survey as a self-assessment tool, discussing answers to questions as a group exercise, and then having a separate group discussion later to analyse the results and their implications for future planning.
6. Use the overall results to showcase the strengths among its members, especially in terms of their strengths in bonding and bridging social capital.
7. Use the overall results to argue against simplified and mainstreamed approaches to capacity investment, but to instead uphold and strengthen the strategy underpinning the Local Landcare Coordinators Initiative and Regional Landcare Facilitators.
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9. Appendices

Appendix 1: Survey questionnaire

The following survey is a pdf version of the online survey as used in 2018.
This report card collects information which provides measures of capacity.

Data provided from the following questions will be used to evaluate the 5 capitals (human capital; social bridging capital; social bonding capital; organisational capital and physical and financial capital) that collectively help build a picture of the capacity of your organisation.

The changes seen in capacity will be an important measure used to evaluate the effectiveness of the LLCI.

The survey has also been designed to help your group identify areas where you can build your own capacity.

Thank you for completing this report – your efforts will help Landcare NSW build the case for ongoing support to Landcare.

We will provide your organisation with a report based on the information provided so that your organisation can monitor its progress throughout the LLCI program.
2. Contact Details

The following questions will help us produce reports based upon the region your organisation operates within. (Note these same questions are asked on report cards 1 & 2 to allow for regionally based data analysis).

1. What is the name of your organisation? *

2. Which Local Land Services area does your organisation operate within? If your organisation crosses several regions please indicate the main region, and in Q3 indicate the other Local Land Services regions within your area of operations *
   - Central Tablelands
   - Central West
   - Greater Sydney
   - Hunter
   - Murray
   - North Coast
   - Northern Tablelands
   - North West
   - Riverina
   - South East
   - Western

3. If your organisation operates across several Local Land Services regions, please indicate which three additional regions are within your area of operation.
   - Central Tablelands
   - Central West
   - Greater Sydney
   - Hunter
   - Murray
   - North Coast
   - Northern Tablelands
   - North West
   - Riverina
   - Western
   - South East

4. Which LANDCARE region does your organisation operate within? *
   - North Coast Regional Landcare Network
   - Hunter Region Landcare Network
   - Mid-Coast to Tops Landcare Connection
   - New England North West Landcare
   - Western Landcare
   - LachLandcare
   - Central West NRM Working Group
   - Central Tablelands Regional Landcare Network
   - South East Landcare Inc
   - Murray Landcare Collective
   - Greater Sydney Landcare
   - Riverina Landcare
   - Southern Highlands/ACT
   - Other

   Other, please specify
3. Governance – Committee Operations

This section relates to meetings and process concerned with the running/administration of your organisation.

5. Does your organisation have a board, committee or leadership team with assigned roles? *
   - Yes
   - No

6. Checking your Constitution, Charter or other governing documents, what number of committee meetings are you required to hold each year? *

7. How many Committee meetings were held in this previous year? *
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2–4
   - 5–6
   - 7–10
   - greater than 10

8. Checking your Constitution, Charter or other governing documents, how many people are required for a quorum at your committee meetings? *

9. Does your Committee have an agreed agenda and rules for making decisions at meetings? *
   - Yes, an Agenda and Rules
   - Yes, an Agenda only
   - No

10. Are the minutes of your Committee meetings recorded and a copy, or a communique/newsletter article providing the outcomes of the meeting, made available to your members? *
    - Yes
    - No

11. How do you feel about the statement "Our committee meets often enough to achieve what we want to achieve for our organisation and its members". *
    - Strongly Disagree
    - Disagree
    - Somewhat Disagree
    - Undecided
    - Somewhat Agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree
    - Don’t know
## 4. Group Resources and Capacity

12. Group Resources and Capacity – Please indicate how well the following statements apply to your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a. Our organisation has the necessary skills and experience to do what it wants to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. Our committee and members are usually highly motivated to achieve the organisation's goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c. Our organisation can easily fill committee positions and other key roles from among our members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d. Those who take on responsibilities in our organisation are given clear instructions about what they are responsible for doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e. Our organisation provides training to meet our members' needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f. Our organisation has a good understanding of ways to develop our organisation's capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12g. Our organisation knows where to get the knowledge, skills and resources we need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Group Resources and Capacity con’d

13. Over the past three years how easy has it been for your group to access funds for the following items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
<th>Haven’t tried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On ground consumables (e.g. fencing materials, plants etc) *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (e.g. CSO/project manager)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items (please specify below)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other items (please specify)

14. Does your organisation employ/engage any of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>0.4FTE or less</th>
<th>0.4–0.6FTE</th>
<th>0.6–1.0FTE</th>
<th>greater than 1.0FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Officer *</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator *</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager *</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer *</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors or staff undertaking on-ground project work *</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If during the last 12 months your organisation did not employ staff, has your organisation had access to part–time or full–time coordinator(s) or project manager(s) employed by another organisation?

☐ Yes, LLS officer  ☐ Yes, Local Govt officer  ☐ No  ☐ Other

Other (please specify)
5. Group Planning and Activities

16. Has your group undertaken a visioning exercise with its members to establish the group’s purposes and goals? *
   - Yes
   - No

17. Does your group have a strategic plan? *
   - Yes and our plan is current
   - Yes but our plan is not current
   - No

18. If you answered yes to Question 16, does your group regularly monitor performance against the strategic plan?
   - Yes
   - No
5. Group Planning and Activities con’d

19. Group Planning and Activities – Please indicate how well the following statements apply to your organisation

19a. Our organisation has a shared view of its purpose/reason for existing *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19b. Our organisation checks that our strategic direction matches our members' priorities *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19c. Our organisation is satisfied with its level of on-ground action that we undertake/facilitate *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19d. Our organisation always takes action to address aspects of our performance that need improving *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19e. Our members often share information and ideas with other members in our group *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19f. Our organisation always gets feedback from those with an interest in our organisation on what they think of our organisation and its activities *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19g. None of our members have ever felt excluded from key decisions made by our organisation *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19h. Our organisation can make decisions even when there are strong differences of opinion *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19i. A characteristic of our organisation is a high level of trust and respect between our members *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know

19j. Our organisation has adequate physical infrastructure and equipment to support the activities we undertake *
   ○ Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Somewhat Disagree ○ Undecided
   ○ Somewhat Agree ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○ Don't Know
6. Relationships with Others

20. Please indicate how well the following statements apply to your organisation with regard to relationships with others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20a. Our organisation often shares information and ideas with other similar organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b. Our organisation has a high level of engagement with our community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20c. Our organisation is satisfied by our communities level of participation in activities we undertake/facilitate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20d. Our organisation influences people in our community beyond our membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20e. Our organisation makes it easy for non-members to access information and expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20f. Our organisation targets influential people at regional, state and/or national levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Regional Community of Practice

21. Is your organisation part of a formal network or relationship based collective? *
   - Yes
   - No

22. If yes, how often does your organisation participate in the Regional Community of Practice activities?
   - Always
   - Nearly Always
   - Sometimes
   - Not often
   - Never

Comment

23. The following statements refer to your experiences resulting from participating in your Regional Community of Practice (RCoP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23a. The RCoP activities are useful in helping us improve the running of our organisation *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b. We have learnt things from other organisations within our region that we have applied in our own organisation's activities *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23c. We have shared our learning and experiences with other organisations through the RCoP *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23d. The time we spend away from working on our own organisation at the RCoP activities, is time well spent for our organisation *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23e. We now are more comfortable asking for advice from other Landcare or similar organisations within our region *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23f. We have increased the number of partnership activities/projects with one or more of the other participants in our RCoP *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23g. We feel that the RCoP is responsive to the needs identified by our organisation *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LLICI Report Card 2, 2018 Organisation Capacity Survey
8. Regional Landcare Facilitator

24. Thinking about the relationship between your coordinator and/or your organisation and the RLF since 2014, which of the following best describes the support given by the RLF?

24a. Unnecessary (the [item] would have happened anyway)
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know

24b. Helped a little bit
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know

24c. Moderately helpful
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know

24d. Helped a lot
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know

24e. Critical (the [item] wouldn't have happened without the RLF input)
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know

25. Thinking about the relationship between your organisation and the RLF since 2014, what difference has the RLF made to your organisation? Please choose from the following areas of support received if applicable.

- Getting projects up and running
- Training/skills development
- Writing grant applications/lobbying for funding
- Helping us to work together better/share common purpose
- Building relationships with other people/groups/organisations/agencies
- Getting funding/resources in (to groups/networks) or out (of agencies/organisations/networks)
- Bringing new ideas/opportunities
- Leadership
- Other, please indicate

26. How do you feel about the statement? "The changes in the position to a Regional Agricultural Landcare Facilitator are likely to see a reduction in support to our organisation"
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Undecided
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Don't Know
9. Certification

27. Details of person completing this Report Card

First Name * 

Last Name * 

Mailing Address

City/Town 

State/Province 

Postal Code 

Phone 

Email *

28. Certification – by checking these boxes you certify that the information contained in the report card is accurate and that you are authorised to complete the report card on behalf of the organisation. *

☐ I certify that the information contained in this report card is accurate

☐ I am authorised to complete this report on behalf of the organisation

29. Date *

Submit
Appendix 2: List of survey recipients

Bellinger Landcare Inc.
Border Ranges-Richmond Valley Landcare Network Incorporated
Brunswick Valley Landcare Inc.
Central Tablelands Landcare Inc.
Central West Lachlan Landcare Incorporated
Clarence Landcare Incorporated
Coffs Harbour Regional Landcare Incorporated
Condobolin & District Landcare Management Committee Inc
Coonamble Neighbourhood Centre/Environment Group
Corowa District Landcare Incorporated
Eurobodalla Landcare Network Incorporated
Far South Coast Landcare Association Incorporated
GLENRAC INC
Granite Borders Landcare Committee Inc
Greater Sydney Landcare Network Incorporated
Gwymac Incorporated
Hastings Landcare Incorporated
Hawkesbury Environment Network Incorporated
Holbrook Landcare Network
Hunter Region Landcare Network Incorporated
Karuah & Great Lakes Landcare Incorporated
Lachlandcare Incorporated
Lithgow Oberon Landcare Association Incorporated
Little River Landcare Group Incorporated
Liverpool Plains Land Management Committee Inc
Macleay Landcare Network Incorporated
Macquarie 2100
Manning Coastcare Group Incorporated
Manning Landcare Incorporated
Mid Lachlan Landcare Incorporated
Mid Macquarie Landcare Incorporated
Murrumbidgee Landcare Association Incorporated
Nambucca Valley Landcare Incorporated
New England North West Landcare Network Chairs Incorporated
North Coast Regional Landcare Network Incorporated
North West Plains Sustainability Group Incorporated
Northern Slopes Landcare Association Incorporated
NSW Farmers Association (Central Coast Horticulture Branch)
OceanWatch Australia
Parramatta River Catchment Group
Petaurus Education Group Inc
Rice Growers Association
Richmond Landcare Inc
Shoalhaven Landcare Association Incorporated
Southern New England Landcare Ltd
Tamworth Regional Landcare Association Inc.
Tweed Landcare Incorporated
Upper Clarence Combined Landcare Incorporated
Upper Lachlan Landcare
Upper Shoalhaven Landcare Council Incorporated
Upper Snowy Landcare Network Incorporated
Watershed Landcare Group Incorporated
Western Landcare NSW Incorporated
Western Murray Land Improvement Group Inc.
Yarkuwa Indigenous Knowledge Centre Aboriginal Corporation
Yass Area Network of Landcare Groups Inc
Young District Landcare Incorporated