



**Rubric for Assessing Intermediary Organizations**  
**Break Away and The Haiti Compact**  
**June 2010 (revised September 2014)**

*\*This rubric was designed primarily with international intermediary organizations in mind.*

|   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Housing</b>  | Doesn't provide and has no suggestions.   | Doesn't provide, but has connections.                                  | Does provide, but high cost.   | Provides on-site. Low or no cost.  |
| <b>Security</b>   | Actively downplays need for security, despite other trustworthy warnings.                 | Will need to find/provide own.   | Site is able to hire.  | On-site, included in cost.   |
| <b>On-Site Access</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation</li> <li>• Cooks</li> <li>• Translators</li> </ul> | No capacity for this.   | Has connections or is willing to help make them.                       | Has relationships and is willing to provide to group, but high cost.   | Has or can arrange for a "full package" according to need, at an appropriate group cost and fair wage. These jobs are filled by local labor and are sustainable.   |
| <b>Personality of Community Partner Connection</b>  | Had an extremely difficult time, for whatever reason, communicating in person and online. | A bit guarded in person and erratic communication beforehand.          | A bit guarded in person, but friendly and proved reliability beforehand in communication. Has worked at their job for over a year. | Understands the alternative break concept, is excited to host group, and has been helpful, responsive, and even innovative in working with our group. Can articulate goals of organization and projects in succinct way. Has been with organization for multiple years. Transparent. |
| <b>Capability to Work with a Volunteer Team (10 – 12 people)</b>  | Does not have capability or interest.   | Hasn't worked with volunteer groups in the past but is willing to try. | Has worked with volunteer groups before or is currently, though 10-12 might be a bit much to handle.                               | Has a volunteer coordinator/direct supervisor, who has demonstrated understanding of the work load that can be carried by a large group and has indicated this through projects developed.   |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Language</b>                            | Translator absolutely needed. No email; no phone.                                | Limited ability to communicate due to language barrier and limited use of technology.                                      | Ability to communicate thanks to their and our use of several languages. Fairly accessible through phone/email.                                      | Contact is fluent in English and in other languages of the region. Ability to communicate through email and phone.   |
| <b>Potential for Long-term Partnership</b> | Unstable organization. "We'll call you, if we're around next year at this time." | Interested - doesn't know feasibility. We would have to work hard on our end to build capacity and long-term relationship. | Could be persuaded - very interested. Will need some work, but likely will be completely on board after the first try with alternative break groups. | Pursing next steps with alternative break group. Have an established rapport with community. They have other well established, clear and identified partnerships, potentially with groups that look like our own. Interested in developing multi-year service workplans. |
| <b>Need</b>                                | High level of bureaucracy. Our group is at the end of the trickle down.          | Will work with us , but we're not doing them any favors.   | Has need, will use alternative break groups to both serve immediate needs and build capacity.  | High need; grassroots level work. Volunteer groups are part of capacity building in a sustainable way as well as meeting some pressing and immediate needs for labor and resources.  |
| <b>Issue Specificity</b>                   | Very broad – scattershot. Have to work hard to understand what the issues are.   | Many issues, though not well developed projects or depth. No sense of education around the project.                        | Multiple issues and well developed projects.   | Clearly defined vision and mission and population served. Conversations with host site generate deeper interest in educational component and possibilities for later advocacy. Projects are related directly to social issue of organization.                            |
| <b>Current Partnerships</b>                | None.  | Unilateral "partnership."  | Strong partnerships with other organizations.  | Symbiotic relationships present within the organization. Their work is not just their issue – focused on community organizing and supporting other organizations.  |

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Education/Direct Service</b>                 | Weak in both.   | Strong in one, no ties to the other.   | Strong in direct service, can help with education.  | 30% education, 70% direct service. Direct service based on needs assessment conducted by community. Work builds community relationships.  |
| <b>Community Development and Sustainability</b> | We are doing work that could/should be done by locals. Very little interaction with members of the community.                           | We are working with a few members of the community, but mostly carrying out the ideas of an outside organization as outsiders.   | We are working with members of the community and having conversations about creating projects that build community. We are welcome.                     | Our group of volunteers is not displacing local employment, rather creating funds and supporting efforts at self-sufficiency and dignity. The community sees and understands our role and looks forward to our work side by side with them. We are able to “pass the torch” of our work on to other groups and involve them in a long-term effort.  |
| <b>Intermediary Organization Model</b>          | The organization has no real identifiable model and seems to be far removed from the issue and community in which work will take place. | The organization is set up to work with individuals, who have no structure or expectations for a volunteer experience. “Pay and go” arrangement. One local staff person – most staff are at U.S. based office. | Individuals and groups work with this organization, but model is not differentiated. Organization seems well connected to community.                    | They are their community. The intermediary is structured, primarily to work with groups, but the model and staff is flexible and encouraging of student leadership involvement and break program accountability. AB programs have feedback in setting the itinerary to ensure appropriate balance of service and cultural or educational activities, implementing alcohol policies, and creating group space/time for reflection. |
| <b>Reorientation</b>                            | Once the trip is over, it's over.   | Trip participants have opportunity to informally or formally evaluate experience.  | It is part of both AB and organization programming to do post-trip engagement activities for individuals and group, such as advocacy and local service. | The service work and community partnership is connected to other campus efforts and/or university values or commitments. Participants engage in community impact assessment and evaluation. Group leaders are briefed and trained by leaders from prior year. Post-trip advocacy is the culmination of strong pre- and on-trip education.   |