SWOT Analysis of a Consortia
Mapping Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

**EXAMPLE SWOT ANALYSIS:**
Working in a Consortium: Advantage or Disadvantage?

**Background**
Partnership2Gether consortia were established to enable sufficient resources to run a specific Partnership. Operating a P2G consortium is more complex than a one-on-one P2G relationship, however, there remains a real need for consortia for many communities and indeed there are inherent advantages. The benefits consortia communities enjoy vary as do the challenges.

**CONSORTIA SWOT EXERCISE**
The following is the result of a SWOT exercise undertaken with P2G directors who manage consortia. It is offered as to raise the level of awareness of its members and reassess the specific benefits that consortia communities can or should enjoy or to improve current operating practices.

### SWOT in Partnership Consortia “Language”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Perceived gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“What the Consortium has going for itself”</td>
<td>“What the Consortium needs to work on”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Partnership’s potential</td>
<td>Barriers or roadblocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“What the Consortium can take advantage of to advance its position”</td>
<td>“What is getting in the way of being successful”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRENGTHS

- Pool resources, energy, ideas, marketing, etc.
- Create synergy among multiple communities
- “The whole is bigger than the parts.” If one community becomes disinterested in a certain initiative or is experiencing challenges, the Partnership will continue due to the momentum and involvement of the other communities
- All communities garner the credit for Partnership achievements (irrelevant of budget, involvement, etc.)
- Discovery and Sharing through consensus provides exposure to new concepts and programming
- Community size and budget does not determine the community benefits or advantages
- Ability to leverage ‘Over & Above’ funds for community projects unable support alone
- ‘Over & Above’ opportunity creates opportunity to increase donor base, enables self-expression for donors and can address specific needs and interests for each community
- Ability to be part of programs and activities that the community could not do on its own (i.e. teachers missions, youth missions, volunteer apartment)
- Ease of strengthening people-to-people programming versus complexity and difficulty of social welfare programming which can be harder to reach agreement on
- Shared responsibility and division of labor among communities enables all communities to do more
- For smaller communities, P2G lay system creates opportunity for lay leadership to be part of and potentially advance in the national UJC system

WEAKNESSES

- Greater logistical challenges – takes more time and energy to manage
- Geographic distance between communities can challenge streams of communication
- Difference of community ‘DNA’ and needs can create issues
- Conflict of interest among the communities’ donors
- Conflict of interest and/or priorities for focus and programs
- Identity issues vis-à-vis donors when community is not alone
- Not all communities can take part in every program
- Challenge to reach consensus (example: when a program is a success in one community but a failure in another)
- Imbalance of budget can create a feeling/perception that bigger communities have or want more say/impact on decision making
- Smaller communities impacting the Partnership
- When Chair isn’t from same community of the professional coordinator there can be lack of coordination
OPPORTUNITIES

- Discover other worlds, communities, opportunities
- Means to an end – consortia creates a means to Partnership
- Kesher with Israel - offer greater opportunity, higher quality, and connection pathways that one community could not do on its own
- Programs that a single community couldn’t execute individually make THE difference (i.e., shinshinim, young leaders’ forum, medical missions, etc.)
- Allows a platform for a greater variety of projects
- Opportunity to show donors a program based on Partnership and synergy (Israel)
- FRD opportunities
- Leveraging opportunity for Federation
- Empowerment of lay leadership to effect something big and international
- Crisis often presents new opportunity
- Flexibility: can develop different models of partnership (TIPS, Charlotte, Western Network)
- Receive attention by P2G Director

THREATS

- High maintenance
- Ego of communities
- Big communities take control/throw their weight around or "threaten" impact of smaller communities
- Communities don’t take responsibility (assume others will)
- Complexity of decision making processes (need more consensus)
- Easier to decide alone or simply do on own
- Culture of individualism
- Less feeling of ownership
- Collective doesn’t allow individual community to be the star
- No glue to keep it together

FACTORS FOR SUCCESS

- All communities need to truly understand advantage of being part of consortia
- Participating communities need to agree on P2G mission and goals
- "Kibbutz Mentality” or “good will” among players
- Big communities have to give up on ego
- Professional coordinator (i.e., paid professional, rotation among communities)
- System for on-going communication among communities