FEED THE FUTURE FEEDBACK

INFORMATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

March 1, 2013

This report was produced by Westat for review by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Prepared for the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number GS-23F-8144H/AID-OAA-M-12-00006, Feed the Future FEEDBACK

Contact:
Detra Robinson, Chief of Party
Westat
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: 301-738-3653
Email: DetraRobinson@westat.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

1. OBJECTIVES 2

2. METHODS 2

3. RESULTS 3

3.1. PREFERRED DOCUMENT FORMATS FOR M&E UPDATE 3

3.2. PREFERRED DOCUMENT FORMATS FOR LEARNING 4

3.3. PREFERRED DOCUMENT FORMATS FOR RESULTS OF EVALUATIONS AND OTHER STUDIES RESULTS 4

3.4. CONSTRAINTS TO ACCESSING INFORMATION 5

3.5. USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA 6

Table 1: Summary of the Number of Social Media Users 7

3.6. BLOGGING 7

3.7. OTHER ONLINE COMMUNITIES, GROUPS, FORUMS 7

3.8. PORTALS PLATFORMS AND WEBSITES 8

3.8.1. AGRILINKS SITE 8

3.8.2. FEED THE FUTURE SITE 8

3.8.3. FTFMS DATA ENTRY AND REPORTING SITE 8

Table2: Summary of Reasons for Visiting Key Websites 9

3.9. INFORMATION ON VARIOUS ASPECTS OF IMPACT EVALUATIONS 10

Table 3: Aspects of Impact Evaluations Desired When Conducted in the Country in Which They Work 10

Table 4: Aspects of Impact Evaluations Desired When Conducted Outside the Country in Which They Work 11

3.10. USING M&E EVIDENCE FOR PROJECT DESIGN AND/OR IMPROVEMENT 12

3.10.1. PROJECT DESIGN 12

3.10.2. PREFORMANCE REVIEWS AND ANNUAL WORK PLANS 12

ANNEX A: PROTOCOL SUMMARY FOR FTF FEEDBACK FORMATIVE STUDIES AND ASSESSMENTS 13

ANNEX B: ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT 16

ANNEX C: SUMMARY OF CONSTRAINTS TO USING EVIDENCE 27

ANNEX D: WEBSITES VISITED FOR AGRICULTURE/NUTRITION INFORMATION 30

TECHNICAL NOTES 31

ACRONYMS

BFS	Bureau for Food Security
FTF	Feed the Future
FTFMS	Feed the Future Monitoring System
IE	Impact Evaluations
IP	Implementing Partner
IT	Information Technology
KM	Knowledge Management
KMWG	Knowledge Management Working Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
RSS	Rich Site Summary
SMS	Short Message Service
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

INTRODUCTION

The Feed the Future (FTF) FEEDBACK project's Year 2 Work Plan includes an activity to conduct an information needs assessment within the Knowledge Management (KM) component. The proposed needs assessment will inform development of the FTF FEEDBACK Knowledge Management Strategy.

On December 4, 2012, the Knowledge Management Working Group (KMWG) held its second meeting. During that meeting, the objectives were determined and a decision was made to start immediately. Following that meeting, a protocol summary was completed and circulated among the KMWG members for their input: it is provided as Annex A. This guided the development of an outline of the instrument to be used in the assessment, which also was circulated among the KMWG members. On December 18, 2012, the KMWG met by teleconference to review the outline of the instrument. The KMWG's responses were incorporated and the instrument was then developed and is presented in Annex B.

The week following the December 18, 2012, KMWG meeting, the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) principals sent an email to some United States Agency for International Development (USAID) staff around the globe asking them to participate in this assessment and introduced FTF FEEDBACK. BFS later sent an email to several Implementing Partners (IP) asking for their participation. Additional IP staff members were identified from interviews with USAID staff.

Due to the year-end holidays, it was difficult to schedule interviews with the designated respondents. Interviews with USAID staff and IPs were conducted in January and February 2013, with the last interview conducted on February 15, 2013.

1. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the needs assessment were to:

1. Identify USAID and IP staff preferred sources and formats for obtaining information about FTF FEEDBACK and related processes and results;
2. Identify USAID and IP staff's priority information needs about FTF FEEDBACK and related activities (Impact Evaluations, Population-Based Surveys, Performance Monitoring, Capacity Building, access to data, tools, approaches/methods, etc.);
3. Identify USAID and IP staff's constraints to accessing information when they need it;
4. Identify USAID and IP staff's use of www.feedthefuture.gov, www.Agrilinks.org, and www.FTFMS.gov sites; understand what they seek on these sites and when; and
5. Identify the extent to which USAID and IP staff are to use FTF FEEDBACK-related evidence during program/project design, IP annual work plan development, and systematic performance monitoring and reporting.

2. METHODS

Interviews were conducted by telephone. The study instrument combines a topical outline for open-ended questions with some closed-ended and semi-open-ended questions. It is organized along the following themes:

1. Information Format Preferences
2. Constraints to Accessing Information
3. Social Networking Site Participation
4. Blogging
5. Other Online Communities, Groups, Forums
6. Portals and Other Platforms
7. Aspects of Impact Evaluations
8. Using M&E Evidence for Project Design and/or Improvement

For the closed-ended and semi-open-ended questions, the responses were coded and entered into a spreadsheet from which counts and proportions were calculated. For the open-ended questions, the responses were reviewed and grouped into common themes. These themes were then reviewed, interpreted and summarized in the report.

A convenience sample was used with potential interviewees identified by BFS. The selection intentionally captured a diverse group of BFS, USAID Mission and IPs staff that are FTF, M&E-related information users. These results are based on 26 interviews[i].

3. RESULTS

3.1 PREFERRED FORMATS FOR RECEIVING M&E UPDATES

For this topic, we began by asking the interviewees how they like to receive *announcements and updates* about impact evaluations, performance monitoring and capacity building. We explained that by *format*, we mean text, video, audio, live or any combination of these.

We started with an open-ended question and later asked participants if they preferred reading material on a computer or tablet screen or as a hardcopy. Discussions around this question gave a great variety of answers resulting, however, in some clear themes.

The vast majority of people preferred announcements through emails with links to further information. Several of those individuals specified that they like a short description of one to two sentences describing the information contained within the link. Several individuals further clarified a desire to have emails that consolidate information and contain several announcements. Furthermore, this sample of respondents noted that consolidation and well organized emails are the most helpful due to the volume of email communication received. These responses where again reflected when asked how they would prefer to receive reminders, in which all interviewees (100%) stated they wanted to receive reminders by email. Only 4% stated that a phone call or voicemail would be acceptable whereas nearly 20% indicated they would accept text messages (SMS).

We later asked if there were any formats of communication that they "really did not like." This was a general, open-ended question but, with respect to updates and announcements, we found that mass emailing and too many emails (even if directed only to them) are disliked. Phone and text message was not their preferred format.

3.2 PREFERRED DOCUMENT FORMATS FOR LEARNING

We started this topic with an open-ended question about formats they preferred for *learning,* specifying that we were interested in informal learning (as opposed to formal learning, for academic credits.) In this context, we explained that *Format* might also be live, in-person; live and interactive on-line; self-paced, recorded multi-media, etc.

About one third of the respondents described preferences for online webinars for learning, particularly if there is an interactive question and answer component, and many noted that they prefer to have this accompanied by written materials sent via email. Several people stated that although they listed distance learning as a preferred method, they still prefer face-to-face learning when possible.

When later asked specifically about pre-recorded webinars, about 60% of the respondents liked them. When asked about live webinars, about 50% like these. The reason most commonly given for not liking live webinars was that they are provided a "one time only" option for accessing this information, which conflicts with availability, and is also problematical due to time zone differences. Internet connectivity problems (low bandwidth resulting in poor reception and interruptions) was also noted. Respondents explained that pre-recorded webinars can be replayed and paused, alleviating the above challenges noted above.

Forty percent of the respondents subscribe and listen to audio recordings through mechanisms such as podcasts and Rich Site Summary (RSS) feeds. Several persons noted that they have issues with streaming videos, and therefore preferred audio feeds because of easy download and portability.

3.3 PREFERRED DOCUMENT FORMATS FOR RESULTS OF EVALUATIONS AND OTHER STUDIES RESULTS

This topic also began with an open-ended question about preferred formats for receiving *results of evaluations and other studies*. The most common response was to receive results by emails that contain links to documents from which they could download and read when convenient. Many respondents prefer face-to-face presentations and workshops for obtaining results of relevant studies conducted in their own country (i.e., the common practice of sharing results by the persons/organizations performing the Impact Evaluations or Performance Monitoring studies.)

Without exception, respondents indicated they wanted *access* to the full report, either by receiving the full report with an executive summary or by receiving an executive summary with a link to the full report located within it. Several people noted that long technical documents are not preferred, clarifying that it is too technical or too long, meaning they could not readily find the information that they need. Recorded or live interactive webinars are equally liked but, as mentioned previously problems with low bandwidth and/or unstable connectivity can result in an unsatisfactory experience using the live format.

When asked if there was a preference to reading work-related documents on the screen versus a hard copy, nearly half stated their preference depends on the length of the document (shorter documents are preferred on screen, longer documents are preferred in hardcopy). Hard copy format was preferred if the respondent intended to keep the document for future referencing. About one third prefers reading on the screen at all times and the remaining respondents like hard copies at all times. A few respondents noted that their Missions had provided them with iPads and now prefer utilizing these resources to read documents when possible (meaning they want documents formatted for reading on tablet screens).

Later in the interview, we asked specifically about the preferred length of reports on study progress, methods, and results. Interviewees were asked to select from a full length report (with executive summary), a 2-4 page abstract/executive summary and a ½ - 2 page executive summary; multiple responses were possible. Nearly all respondents indicated they liked the full report but preferred a longer 2-4 page executive summary/abstract to the shorter one because the shorter version did not provide enough information.

3.4 CONSTRAINTS TO ACCESSING INFORMATION

We asked open-ended questions directed toward impact evaluations, performance monitoring and capacity building around these to identify barriers to accessing M&E-related information.

The vast majority (92%) of respondents said they have constraints to accessing information about impact evaluations. These constraints included difficulty finding the most relevant information; an overabundance of material available and limited time for searching the multiple web sites that contain information. A combination of these comments comprise nearly two thirds of the responses. A common desire expressed was a central, user friendly, “intuitive” website that utilizes powerful search engines to quickly enable finding information by topic. Several commented that USAID’s new guidelines on evaluation have made it difficult to know when you are finding the correct material (e.g., does it meet the criteria for an Impact Evaluation?).

About 30% of the people noted that they have no constraints when accessing the information that they are seeking on performance monitoring. Several noted that they are more comfortable finding information on performance monitoring. Constraints were reported by two-thirds and, most frequently (nearly 40%), these were related to limited time and problems finding documents when needed.

Constraints to accessing information about M&E-related capacity building were reported by nearly two thirds of the respondents. The need for better access to training programs and training materials, problems finding information when it is needed and having too many indicators and variables were cited as constraints.

3.5 USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

While the usage of social media sites for personal pleasure is now globally pervasive, less is known about using these sites for professional purposes and, specifically, professional use by our target audience. Therefore, we asked interviewees if they *regularly* use any specific sites and if they use these sites for personal and/or professional purposes.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents used Facebook for personal purposes; of these, only 38% use it professionally (i.e., 23% of all respondents). Fifty-eight percent reported regular personal use of YouTube and of these, 60% use it professionally (i.e., 35% of all respondents). Twitter is used by 15% of the respondents: all of them for professional reasons. Some Twitter nonusers reported a strong dislike of this form of communication while others said they were open to learning how to use it. LinkedIn is used professionally by 50% of those asked; many users noted, however, that *regular* use might not be interpreted the same way for this site as it is for other social media sites. Some responded that they are hesitant to use LinkedIn because of the problem of spam, and others noted they are unsure of the benefit of LinkedIn. MySpace is not used by this group of respondents. Presented in Table 1 is a summary of the responses.

Table 1. Summary of the Number of Social Media Users

Site	Do Not Use	Personal User	Professional User
Facebook	9	17	6
YouTube	11	15	9
Twitter	22	4	4
Linked-in	13	**	13

We found that many of those who use Facebook for personal reasons are reluctant to use it for professional reasons. Currently Feed the Future's Facebook page has about 1,500 followers, symbolized as "liking" the page, and the Agrilinks Facebook page has fewer than 400 "likes." Time did not permit the determination of whether the users among the respondents knew of these pages on Facebook, or that Facebook can be used to join or establish on-line community groups.

Several of the respondents stated that they knew of the USAID YouTube Channel (over 1,000 subscribers) and watched those videos on a regular basis. None of the respondents mentioned the Agrilinks YouTube Channel (about 20 subscribers) but they are regular users of YouTube, indicating that they may be encouraged to subscribe to these videos.

3.6 BLOGGING

The integration of blogs into Agrilinks and many economic, agriculture, nutrition, and development sites is very prevalent. Blogs have been recognized as a good mechanism to deliver information to a common audience. One quarter (n=6) of the respondents reported writing blogs; 5 respondents blog for professional reasons. Nearly one third (n=8) read blogs regularly for fun or personal, whereas nearly an equal percentage (n=9) regularly read for professional reasons. With one third of the participants in this assessment reading blogs for professional reasons, this mechanism appears to offer great potential to reaching them on M&E-related subjects.

3.7 OTHER ONLINE COMMUNITIY, GROUPS AND FORUMS[ii]

Forty–five percent (9/20) reported participating in online communities for personal reasons within the past month, most of these (7) participated within the past 10 days. The same respondents who participated in the past 10 days in online communities for personal reasons also participated in online communities for professional reasons.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents (11/20) indicated they subscribe to an email list serve. The most mentioned was USAID; though many mentioned additional professional email list serves but none were mentioned more than once.

3.8 PORTALS, PLATFORMS AND WEBSITES

3.8.1 AGRILINKS SITE

Nearly half (46%) have visited www.agrilinks.org within the past 90 day. Most were seeking training or Webinar information and returned multiple times (range 2-80; excluding the single person who went 80 times, the average is 3.8 times in the past 90 days). There was no particular calendar period in which people visited Agrilinks most frequently. Several noted that finding the correct information was not easy or intuitive on this site.

Note: We found that while some utilize Agrilinks to find information, they do not use it as a mechanism to connect with colleagues. Agrilinks has an online community feature (Groups) but this was not mentioned in response to the questions about online communities or even in this section when asking specifically about Agrilinks.

3.8.2 FEED THE FUTURE SITE

Nearly two thirds (65%) of the respondents visited www.feedthefuture.gov within the past 90 days. Most were seeking the Indicators Handbook, Guidance, and/or M&E information. A total of seven people were seeking the Indicator Handbook, many of whom sought multiple reference materials when they visited this site. Six reported going to the site more often during the reporting periods of the calendar year. The average times the respondent reported going to the site was 10 (range 1-60; excluding the two highest values of 45 and 60, the average is six times).

3.8.3 FTFMS DATA ENTRY AND REPORTING SITE

Over two thirds (65%) of the respondents had visited the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) within the past 90 days. Of the 19 who reported going to the FTFMS, 79% stated that they returned to the site more often during the reporting periods. Half of those who went to the FTFMS reported that they visited the site for data entry, while a quarter visited for reporting purposes. Several noted that they had difficulty finding the information that they were seeking when they went to the FTFMS reporting site.

A summary of the responses for the three web sites are provided in the Table 2. The most frequently reported reason for visiting Agrilinks was for trainings and webinars. For the FTF.gov site, the most common purpose was for M&E information. The most frequent reason for visiting the FTFMS.gov sites was to access the data entry modules.

Table 2: Summary of Reasons for Visiting to Key Websites.

AGRILINKS	#	**FTF.gov**	#	**FTFMS.gov**	#
Seeking Guidance	0	Seeking Guidance	4	Seeking Guidance	0
Looking for Updates	1	Looking for Updates	3	Looking for Updates	0
M&E Information	0	M&E Information	7	M&E Information	0
Training/Webinar	8	Training/Webinar	0	Training/Webinar	1
Articles	3	Articles	0	Articles	0
Indicator Handbook	0	Indicator Handbook	7	Indicator Handbook	0
Information On Nutrition Programs	0	Information On Nutrition Programs	1	Information On Nutrition Programs	0
Data Entry	0	Data Entry	0	Data Entry	12
Reporting Modules	0	Reporting Modules	0	Reporting Modules	7

All three sites were noted to have difficulty in use by some respondents with comments such as: ‘the organization of the Agrilinks or the FTF.gov is not intuitive’; ‘we must utilize the search engine frequently’; ‘the search engine is weak and rarely returns the results that are known to be available.’ Several noted that when using FTFMS they were not able to retrieve the results that they were seeking.

3.9 INFORMATION ON VARIOUS ASPECTS OF IMPACT EVALUATIONS

We asked the interviewees on which specific aspects of impact evaluations they wish to receive information[iii]. The aspects identified are: designs and methods; instruments and tools; full protocols; data sets; processes and field work and implementation processes; training and capacity building.

During the first few interviews, we found that people were distinguishing between impact evaluations that occur in the country in which they work or occur in a different country. Therefore we modified the instrument to accommodate this distinction. During six interviews, time ran out before this section could be completed.

Nearly all people stated that they were interested in all aspects of impact evaluations conducted in the country in which they work; there was only one qualification. The results are presented below:

Table 3: Aspects of Impact Evaluations Desired When Conducted in the Country in Which They Work

Aspect Of The Impact Evaluations	Yes, without qualification	Yes, with qualifications	No
Designs & Methods	17 (94%)	0	1
Instruments & Tools	19 (100%)	0	0
Full Protocols	18 (90%)	1[1]	1

[1] The qualification was that it must be relevant but this is implied in the other responses so this could be categorized as yes, without qualification.

Data Sets	13 (68%)	3	3
Processes & Field Work	16 (84%)	0	3
Training and Capacity Building	15 (79%)	0	4

With regards to impact evaluations on projects outside of the country in which they work, the response was still high across all aspects but there was some variation and many more qualifications.

Table 4: Aspects of Impact Evaluations Desired When Conducted Outside the Country in Which They Work

Aspect Of The Impact Evaluations	Yes, without qualification	Yes, with qualifications	No
Designs & Methods	9 (50%)	8	1
Instruments & Tools	10 (56%)	8	0
Full Protocols	10 (50%)	8	2
Data Sets	10 (53%)	3	6
Processes & Field Work	12 (67%)	4	2
Training and Capacity Building	10 (63%)	0	6

For four aspects (design and methods; instruments; data set; and processes and field work), almost all respondents made the qualification that if outside of their country, it should be within the same region (for comparability). For the protocol, about half the respondents who made a qualification stated it must be in the same region and the other half said that it must be relevant (to their work).

We were not able to explore what respondents mean by *relevant*. This could be very important with respect to using evidence more fully. If relevance is narrowly defined by the user, then they might be missing valuable evidence to guide program design and planning. The same might be said for those qualifying that it must be within their *region*; there are many studies conducted across regions that are relevant, applicable to similar projects.

Although it appears that all individuals want information on these various aspects of impact evaluations (particularly in the country in which they work), some added clarity that their preference is to receive an announcement through an email with a link or through a website with a powerful, useful search engine.

3.10 CONSTRAINTS TO USING EVIDENCE GATHERED FROM IMPACT EVALUATIONS

3.10.1 Project Design

We finished the interview with open-ended questions about difficulties utilizing the evidence produced from impact evaluations. Respondents were happy to discuss their constraints, however not all individuals were able to complete the interview due to time constraints. Therefore answers from only 16 respondents were obtained. The most common responses received were that it is too difficult to find the information at the moment it is most needed, and that time constraints make utilizing the information difficult. Many people noted that there is a scheduling conflict, because the evidence from impact evaluations are typically available after the Missions do their (new) program planning and design.

We would have liked to explore these constraints further because it appears that *evidence* is, perhaps, perceived too narrowly. Also are only the results of an impact evaluation on a particular project considered the evidence for the design of a follow-on to that project? Unfortunately, time did not permit additional exploration of this question.

3.10.2 Performance Reviews and Annual Work Plans

These responses varied greatly, but lack of time and difficulty finding information was the most common themes. However there appeared to be fewer constraints with mid project planning than with project design.

Please see Annex C for a table containing the summary of the responses.

Annex A: PROTOCOL SUMMARY FOR FTF FEEDBACK FORMATIVE STUDIES AND ASSESSMENTS

Title of the Study	FTF FEEDBACK and Related Information Needs Assessment
Objectives of the study (*List all primary, measureable objectives*)	1. Identify USAID and IP staff's preferred sources[2] and formats for obtaining information about FTF FEEDBACK and related processes and results. 2. Identify USAID and IP staff's priority information needs about FTF FEEDBACK and related activities (Impact Evaluations, population based surveys, performance monitoring, capacity building, access to data, tools, approaches/methods, etc.). 3. Identify USAID and IP staff's constraints to accessing information when they need it. 4. Identify USAID and IP staff's use of www.feedthefuture.gov, www.Agrilinks.org, and www.FTFMS.gov sites; understand why they use it and when. 5. Identify the extent to which USAID and IP staff are to use FTF FEEDBACK-related evidence during program/project design, IP annual work plan development, and systematic performance monitoring and reporting.
Expected start/end dates of data collection	Logistics with USAID Missions should start on or about December 21, 2012. Data collection should be completed by January 18, 2013 and the final report submitted by January 25, 2013.
Date when study results needed	January 25, 2013
Source of funding for the study	Westat (FTF FEEDBACK project)
Technical lead	Tom Scialfa, trains Mary Masters (interviewer) and Leah White (scribe)
Is study quantitative, qualitative or both?	Both
What is the study design?	Cross-sectional

[2] Source in this context can mean a channel, mechanism, application, etc. It includes social media sites, information portals, blogs, discussion groups, etc.

Title of the Study	FTF FEEDBACK and Related Information Needs Assessment
Describe the principal study instrument(s) to be used (all that apply).	Mixed questionnaire with some open-ended questions and some with pre-set response options.
Are the instruments already developed?	No
What is the study population(s) and in which geographic regions/zones will the study be conducted?	Select USAID staff (Washington D.C. and Missions) and FTF IP staff
How will you determine the sample for the study? (What is sampling method?)	Convenience with intentional variation in respondent roles and anticipated use of information
How many people will comprise the sample (sample size)?	20-50
Who will train the data collectors?	Tom Scialfa
Who will collect the data? How many people will be involved?	One or two people so consistency is maintained; a note taker will be on the calls
Will there be a pre-test for the instrument?	Internally at Westat
What type of analysis will be done?	Descriptive only
How will the results of this study be used? (If related to the project	Results used to revise the FTF FEEDBACK KM strategy and to design KM mechanisms, events and information products

Title of the Study	FTF FEEDBACK and Related Information Needs Assessment
PMP/targets, then state this)	
To whom will the final report be distributed?	To the FTF FEEDBACK team, BFS, and anyone designated by BFS
Does anyone intend to use results in an abstract for a conference or for publication?	No
If this is a “baseline” then list all indicators and their sources	This is not intended to be used as a baseline.

Revised December 27, 2012

ANNEX B: ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Start time ____:____	Date __ __ / __ __/ 2013	Interviewer ____
End Time ____: ____	Interviewee __________________________________	Title/Affiliation ____

Introduction

Hello, ________________? My name is ________________ and I'm calling to interview you about your own information needs relative to Feed the Future evaluations, performance monitoring and the capacity building around these activities.

I want to confirm that you are expecting this phone call and this is still a good time to talk, this will take between 15-20 minutes. Is this still a good time for us to talk?

___ OK

___No, call back: date: ___________ time ______________ am/pm, location ___________

Call Back Notes:

____

As John Spears, of BFS/USAID, had stated in the introductory email, this interview is a user needs assessment of the FTF preferred channels or methods for sharing knowledge. We will also explore how to best overcome constraints to accessing information. Thank you for your time; we appreciate your input. At the end of the interview, if there is any information that we are missing or questions that you feel we should have asked, please let us know.

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Responses and Verbatim Comments</th><th>Notes</th><th>Coding</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">A. Information Format Preferences</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">We will start by asking <u>how</u> you like to receive information about Impact Evaluations, performance monitoring and capacity building. For several types of information, we'll ask "what format do you prefer"? By "formats" we mean text, video, audio, live or any combination of these. The format might also be live-in person; live & interactive on-line; self-paced, recorded multi-media , etc.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">A1. Do you have any preferred formats for</td></tr>
<tr><td>A1.1 Receiving updates or announcements on monitoring and evaluation related subjects?</td><td colspan="3">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td>A1.2 learning (not for academic credit but for training)?</td><td colspan="3">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td>A1.3 Receiving the results of evaluations and other studies?
>Your country
>Other countries but similar</td><td colspan="3">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td>A1.4 Are there any formats that you really don't like for any reasons?</td><td colspan="3">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">A1.5 Do you prefer to read a work related document as a hardcopy printed on paper or on the computer screen?
(mark with X the response; note if conditions exist to preference)</td><td>Hard copy on paper ……………………………………._____</td><td colspan="2">Short and/or long docs?</td></tr>
<tr><td>On the screen ………………………………………………_____</td><td colspan="2">Short and/or long docs?</td></tr>
<tr><td>No preference …………………………………………….._____</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>A2. Do you like to participate in <u>live</u> Webinars for professional reasons?</td><td colspan="2">___No ___ Yes
(If depends, Specify)</td><td>A2 ___
(0=No)</td></tr>
<tr><td>A3. Do you like to view <u>recorded</u> Webinars for professional reasons?</td><td colspan="2">___No ___ Yes
(If yes, Specify)</td><td>A3 ___
(0=No)</td></tr>
<tr><td>A4. Do you subscribe and listen to any audio recordings like pod casts or RSS feeds, or TED talks? <u>*For any reason*</u></td><td colspan="2">___No ___ Yes
(If yes, Specify)</td><td>A4 ___
(0=No)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">A5. Would you like to receive reminders, be alerted to new professional activities or results through: *(read each. If they have already identified this in A1.1, acknowledge it and confirm)*</td><td>a) Email? …………………………..….___ No ___ Yes</td><td></td><td rowspan="4">A5a ___
A5b ___
A5c ___
(0=No)</td></tr>
<tr><td>b) Telephone or Voicemail? … ___No ___ Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>c) Text messages (SMS)? ……. ___No ___ Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Specify any other:______________________________</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">B. Constraints to accessing information</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Now we would like to ask you about any constraints you might personally have to accessing information. Examples of constraints include “lack of time, slow internet speed, cost of a connection, not in my mother tongue, documents too technical, can’t find it when I need it, etc.”</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">B1. What are your primary constraints to accessing information about:</td></tr>
<tr><td>B1.1 Impact Evaluations?</td><td colspan="2">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td>B1.2 Performance monitoring?</td><td colspan="2">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td>B1.3 Capacity building in monitoring and evaluation?</td><td colspan="2">Response:</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">B2.What is your preferred length of reports for study progress, methods and results? (Read list; multiple responses possible)

>Your country?
>Other countries but similar?</td><td>A full length report w/exec summary __No ___ Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>A 2-4 page abstract/Exec summary __No ___ Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>A ½ - 1 abstract/Exec summary ___No ___Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">(Other, specify)</td></tr>
</table>

C. Social Networking Site Participation			
C1. Do you regularly use any of the following social networking or content sharing sites? *(Read list)*	Facebook? __No ___ Yes ___ Yes professional?		C1.1 ___
	YouTube ? __No ___ Yes ___Yes professional?		C1.2 ___
	Twitter? __No ___ Yes ___ Yes professional?		C1.3 ___
	LinkedIn? __No ___ Yes professional?		C1.4 ___
	MySpace? __No ___ Yes ___ Yes professional?		C1.5 ___
	Do you use other sites? If yes, the one or two used most regularly? A ________________________________ , B___________________________________		
D. Blogging			
D1. Do you write a blog, or do you regularly comment on other blogs?	__ No (skip[3] to D2) __ Yes __ Yes professional (skip to E2)		D1 ___
D2. Do you read blogs?	__ No (skip to E1) __ Yes __ Yes professional		D2 ___

[3] All skipped = not applicable and code 8, 88, 888, etc. (reserve 7, 77, 777 for no response given and 9, 99, 999 for missing)

E. Other On line community, groups, forum			
E1. Are you an active member of any online communities, groups, bulletin boards, or forums? *(e.g.: mac users, personal hobby groups, community activism groups?)* {If more than one, answer for only the one used the most}	……………………………………__ No (*Skip to E2)* __ Yes *(If Yes)* have you participated in past 10 days ___No _____ Yes *(Go to E1.2)* *(If No)* have you participated in past 30 days? __ No __ ______ *(Go to E1.2)* *(If No)* have you participated in past 90 days? ____ No(skip to E2) __ ______		E1 ___ (0 =No; 10, 30 or 90)
E1.2 *(If yes)* Do you participate in any of these for professional reasons?	__ No (*Skip to E2*) ___ Yes |past __10 __30 __90| |-------- days ----------|		E1.2 ___ ___ (0 = No, 10, 30 or 90)
E1.3 *(If yes) what one or two professional sites* do you visit most frequently?	A) ________________________________, B) ________________________________		
E2. Have you ever moderated an on-line forum, group, or discussion?	__ No __ Yes		E2 ___
E3. Are you a member of an email list serve for professional reasons? *(If unsure: An electronic mailing list or email list is a special usage of email that allows for widespread distribution of information to many Internet users.)*	__ No __ Yes *(If yes, specify which ones) (prompt for other than USAID*) :		E3 ___ (0=No)

F. Portals & other platforms		
F. Have you gone to or logged on to:		
F1 Agrilinks.org past 90 days?	__ No (*Skip to F2*) __ Yes, # of times ___ ___	F1.0a ___ F1.0b # =____
F1.1	What are you seeking when you go there?	F1.1 ___ ___
F1.2	Are there particular calendar periods when you visit this site more often? __ No __ Yes *(If yes, specify when*):	F1.2 ___ ___ *(0 = No)*
F2 FeedTheFuture.gov past 90 days?	__ No (*Skip to F3*) __ Yes, # of times ___ ___	F2.0a ___ F2.0b #=____
F2.1	What are you seeking when you go there?	F2.1 ___ ___
F2.2	Are there particular calendar periods when you visit this site more often?__ No __ Yes *(If yes, specify when*): __	F2.2 ___ ___ *(0 = No)*

F3 Feed The Future Monitoring System or FTFMS past 90 days?	__ No (*Skip to F4*) __ Yes, # of times ___ ___	F3.0a ___ F3.0b #=____
F3.1	What are you seeking when you go there?	F3.1 ___ ___
F3.2	Are there particular calendar periods when you visit this site more often?__ No __ Yes *(If yes, specify when*): __	F3.2 ___ ___ (0 – No)
F4. Other sites visited for Food Security, Nutrition or Agriculture information in the past 90 days?	__ No (*Skip to G1*) _ Yes # of times __ ___ (*If yes, Specify which*):	F4.0a ___ F4.0b # =____
G. Aspects of Impact Evaluations		
We are going to ask you some questions on the different aspects of evaluation. In addition to the results of evaluations,		
Are you interested in: *>for your country*G1.1A	Design and Methods __ No, __ Yes	G1.1A ___
>Other similar studies G1.1B	Design and Methods __ No, __ Yes	G1.1B ___

>for your country G1.2A	Instruments, tools? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.2A ___
>Other similar studies *G1.2B*	Instruments, tools? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.2B ___
>for your country G1.3A	Protocols which are the document that details the sample process, sample, design, instruments utilized data management plan and analysis? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.3A ___
>Other similar studies G1.3B	Protocols .....? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.3 B ___
>for your country G1.4A	Data sets? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.4A ___
>Other similar studies G1.4B	Data sets? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.4B ___
>for your country G1.5A	Processes and field work: how data collected, any obstacles/ how overcome, other lessons learned? __ No, ___ Yes	G1.5A ___
>Other similar studies G1.5B	Processes ...	

	__ No, ___ Yes	G1.5B ___
>for your country *> G1.6A*	Training, capacity building? __ No, ___ Yes	 G1.6A ___
Other similar studies *G1.6B*	Training, capacity building? __ No, ___ Yes	 G1.6B ___

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">H. Using M&E evidence for project design and/or improvement (if time allows)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">We know that you use evidence - such as the results of Impact Evaluations, or performance monitoring – when designing projects, developing work plans and during performance reviews. We understand there are often constraints to getting the evidence you need when you need it.

Do you lead or participate in…</td></tr>
<tr><td>H1. What are some of your constraints and/or how can we help you in this regard for project design?</td><td>Verbatim comments:</td><td>H1 ___ ____</td></tr>
<tr><td>H2. ….. for performance reviews and annual work plan development?</td><td>Verbatim comments:</td><td>H2 ___ ___</td></tr>
<tr><td>End: Thank you …….</td><td colspan="2">For Mission staff: can we email you for suggestions of IPs we can interview and would you be willing to introduce us to them?</td></tr>
</table>

ANNEX C: CONSTRAINTS TO USING EVIDENCE

Summary Of Responses: Constraints To Using Evidence For Program Design	Cannot Obtain Information Needed/Usable	Time and Timing
Constraint in getting evaluation and assessment results when you need them. We are trying to overcome this issue with a clear Scope of Work. It is more helpful to have documents that are process-oriented or have key information presented in clear summary. Timing does not allow incorporation of results in IE design of the next program due to the overlap of when planning for new programs start and when old programs end. If there was a way to give midyear or early results so Missions can use that evidence for program design it would be useful	1	1
We work a lot with in-country companies, and it is necessary that IPs agree to share information with us, however they often do not wish to do so. We want/need the details of the programs and the results; the companies do not want to share it, instead just an overview is given. The details are important, but are difficult to get. It is also difficult to isolate that the impact is from a specific program, and not of other confounding factors.	1	
Our biggest constraint the FTF program is country-specific, and our work is on a regional level. The FTF indicators do no really work well on regional areas. Not doing agriculture at the farm level, or health and nutrition- all within individual country, we do policy and trade within the region. The information handed from DC is focused on the country level; that is how the majority of programs are designed. However the natures of our programs do not meet those indicators. We look at things at a regional level, a higher level, and integration multicounty policy issues.	1	
Time constraints are a major issue. From the time the results are available to when the project must be designed there is very little time, or the results are not yet available as you are trying to develop the design for a new project. We don’t want a gap in projects that people utilize to provide food and sustenance. The design has to happen before the project goes into process. We may wait to design the next program until the last year of the current program, but a lot of things happen in the last year, and you risk missing that. We may want to use the finding to inform the government on progress or the program, but the results analysis is not yet available. A large issue, for me, is not knowing that there are similar projects in other area. If we did we may be able to utilize the information created from them, however we have tried to access this information in the past the finding the correct documents was a large issue.	1	1
I appreciate the ability to interact with the people who have performed the Impact Evaluations. This is the most valuable. It is too difficult to make sense of the data if I am not able about to interact with people who have information.	1	

We have large constraints in finding the correct information to use in: strategies, big picture, and evidence. In knowledge management, it is critical to find information when you need it, and currently it so too hard to find right info at right time.	1	
I can't think of any at the moment.		
The evidence is important and is helpful for project design; however, having the information that you need when you need it is a major constraint. Time is a major constraint as well. Missions can spend a lot of money on evaluation, but then rarely have the time to use the data. There is not a good method for sorting information. When reviewed information from other countries it is hard to tell what information is narrative to the region or applicable to all. The ability to sort the information to find what is relevant is important.	1	1
Very definitely *(We ran out of time to probe further)*.		
We currently have a need for different sampling approaches and methodologies. We face many problems in rural areas particularly with sampling.		
From my experience finding specific evidence on a specific area is very difficult. Either I did not know that the activity and Impact Evaluations has been conducted or I can't find the information with the level of precision that I am seeking.	1	
There is a vacuum of information on many levels, in particular we need the population survey data to set targets when designing programs, and this is not always update and current. There is time also constraints when applying evidence to program design.	1	1
The additional information would be helpful; I think that I can find the information that I need so I go to the literature. However to draw the information out take more time that I have available.	1	1
There is not a capacity for M&E with in our partners who we give grants to- We give a lot of grants, some are for training.		
I do not contribute much to project design. I am interested in receiving info on biggest challenge to FTF--the linkage between agriculture and nutrition as intervention to childhood and maternal health. We need a solid relationship, nutrition is a sensitive development struggle--how are countries going to be able to respond?		
Limited development resources, including human resources. There are constraints in the quality and accuracy of data and information that could be used as M&E evidence for project design.	1	

Summary Of Responses: Constraints To Using Evidence For Performance Reviews And Work Plan Development	**Cannot Obtain Information Needed/Usable**	**Time and Timing**

Reporting time constrains is also an issue, so the work plan gets neglected, because the majority of the efforts get but to reporting. The FTF info is often and issue because how the data is based on harvest is seasonal time. For our East Africa country there is a calendar time issue. The harvest time conflicts with the reporting timelines in Washington DC.		1
These are very difficult to incorporate due to timing (calendar year/season of harvest)		1
Since it our focus is regional and we have partners outside our host country, it is a bit more efforts to work with, coordinate, and communicate with IPs. We haven't started implementing any of our FTF portfolios, so we are behind. Due to this, we haven't had to review and adjust the projects, since we are just starting. Ask us again next year.	1	1
Yes that is an issue. We want to work on the performance and then compare that back to what they are promising what to do. We often see work plans that promise results that may not be achievable. Looking at what they have achieved would help them know what they can achieve. Any information would be helpful in this.	1	
I haven't been in that position yet		
Food Security issues are hard to manage, I share with colleagues, search engine not perfect, had a library with an individual who staffed it, that was better.	1	
Outcomes are important. Sometime the data feels stretched and we are not sure of the quality of the data. We are interested in how much a country invests in agriculture- but this is measured differently across countries.	1	
Yes *(We ran out of time to probe further)*.		
Nothing		
We have a process of internal review of programs that is conducted twice a year, so that helps to write work plans. But this is new to the Mission and not all partners had program management plans. So consistency has been an issue.	1	
Information is in a lot of different places, so it is hard to pool together. Now am going to 10-15 different sites, and we need to have everything in a central location.	1	
Yes		
This is no longer an issue, there was concerned about data quality, but we had it addressed by an IT firm. We used to have a problem with information overload, but we created an online dash board that organizes everything.		
Projects tend to adhere to a specific budget which in most times restricts on the choice of activities to be implemented. In our project we hold quarterly reviews and annual work plan development has a budget allocated. Some projects have limited resources for M&E.		

APPENDIX D: WEBSITES VISITED FOR AGRICULTURE/NUTRITION INFORMATION:

The below websites were mentioned more than once.

- FANTA III Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance
- Heller Keller International
- CNFA Cultivating Entrepreneurship
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
- HCO Ministry of Agriculture
- The United Nations
- The UN Millennium Goals
- UN data: A World of Information
- United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition
- The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
- Michigan State University

The below websites were mentioned only once

- Searched out sites for survey instruments
- Business Innovation Facility - The Practitioner Hub
- Global Environment Facility
- SADC Southern African Development Community
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- IDS
- Globalization and Development
- http://transition.usaid.gov/press/factsheets/2012/fs120518_1.html
- IDS- Institute of Development Studies
- ILO- International Labour Organization
- Partnership to Cut Hunger and Poverty in Africa
- AGG
- CIT Center for Information Technology
- National Institutes of Health
- The World Bank- Working for a World Free of Poverty
- CDC Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet)
- Welcome to the United Nations: It's Your World
- Fuse Web Multimedia User Interface
- WFP United Nations World Food Programme – Fighting Hunger Worldwide
- Regional market sites
- International Coffee Organization
- ITET Institution of Textile Engineers & Technologists
- Cotton and apparel trade sites

TECHNICAL NOTES:

[i] Twenty-eight interviews were conducted but three were done by email because we could not reach them by telephone. Because a single instrument was completed by these three respondents

On several occasions, two or three respondents participated in the telephone interview. During these calls, we were careful to address each individual and write their responses on separate instruments. While we cannot be certain that the presence of multiple interviewees did not bias the results, analysis of the data shows enough diversity in these that we feel the bias is negligible.

[ii] Due to lack to time only 20 respondents were asked about their participation in online communities.

[iii] We intended to ask people the same questions on impact evaluations in section F relative to performance monitoring and capacity building, however, due to time constraints, we focused on the multiple of impact evaluations.