

PD-ABQ-595

98140

**EVALUATION OPTIONS FOR THE  
BASICS RADIO TRAINING  
FOR HEALTH ISSUES WORKSHOP**

Bamako, Mali

February 23- March 6, 1998

Loretta Hieber

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ACRONYMS	vii
BACKGROUND TO THE RADIO PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION MISSION TO MALI	1
MISSION OBJECTIVES	1
MISSION ACTIVITIES	1
GENERAL REMARKS ON INTERVIEWS	2
INTERVIEWS WITH WORKSHOP FACILITATORS AND PARTICIPANTS	2
INTERVIEWS WITH NGOS, NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND MARKETING GROUPS	4
RECOMMENDATIONS	8
Evaluation of the Impact of the Spots on the Target Audience	8
Evaluation of Workshop Participants' Retention Levels and Subsequent Activities	12
Organization of an Evaluation Workshop	13
CONCLUSION	14
APPENDIX Activities Conducted	

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to thank Yaya Drabo, Pèdre N'Diaye and Martin Faye for their time and ideas. I also offer special thanks to Carrie O'Neill who went beyond the call of duty in ensuring that my trip was facilitated and that I was able to have access and time to proceed with the preparation of this report. Finally, my thanks to BASICS for giving the Radio Partnership the opportunity to participate in this initiative. It was a great pleasure to find that during the two days I sat in on the workshop to seek inspiration for the evaluation, I learned an enormous amount about not only the production of radio spots, but also how to conduct a professional and highly motivating radio production workshop.

## ACRONYMS

BASICS	Basic Support for Institutionalizing Child Survival
CNIECS	Centre National pour l'Information, Education et Communication pour la Santé (National Center of Information, Education, and Communication for Health)
DSFC	Direction de la Santé Familiale et Communautaire
ICHR	International Center for Humanitarian Reporting
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IEC	Information, Education, and Communication
JSI	John Snow, Inc
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission on Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## **BACKGROUND TO THE RADIO PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION MISSION TO MALI**

The following is a report recommending the best options for the evaluation of the BASICS Radio Training for Health Issues Workshop held in the Hotel Timbuktu in Bamako, Mali, from February 23 to March 6, 1998

This material was gathered during a one-week consultancy by the Radio Partnership of the International Center for Humanitarian Reporting (ICHR) in Bamako, Mali, during the first week of the BASICS workshop

Prior to the field visit, Radio Partnership offered a series of evaluation options to BASICS in an attempt to focus evaluation objectives. The following points were agreed upon in this preliminary stage

- 1 Focus of evaluation should be in one province only. Hence, evaluators would focus their attention on the first workshop, i.e. the Bamako and Koulikoro regions
- 2 Evaluation emphasis would focus on the impact of the spots on the target audience
- 3 Consultant should focus on finding suitable partners on the ground who can carry out the evaluation process, particularly if BASICS ceases to exist by September
- 4 Consultant should work in close co-operation with BASICS and USAID staff in Bamako

## **MISSION OBJECTIVES**

- 1 Determine the most effective evaluation strategy
- 2 Establish partnerships with local NGOs or social marketing groups
- 3 Choose radio stations/health workers to participate in final evaluation
- 4 Contribute to workshop as requested by organizers

## **MISSION ACTIVITIES**

In order to reach the mission objectives, the Radio Partnership undertook the following activities in Bamako

- 1 Participation in workshop,
- 2 Interviews with workshop participants and facilitators,
- 3 Interviews with NGOs, national institutions, and social marketing groups,
- 4 Drafting a preliminary report to serve as a discussion tool for workshop organizers,
- 5 Development of evaluation teaching tools for the workshop, and

## 6 Participation and facilitation of focus group evaluation activities

These activities are detailed in the appendix

### **GENERAL REMARKS ON INTERVIEWS**

Many of the people I interviewed expressed confusion over the impact of the radio spots and actual behavior change. There was the feeling that through questionnaires and focus group surveys, it would be possible to gauge a change in behavior among participants. It was necessary to explain that the most a surveyor could ascertain using these evaluation techniques is whether the interviewee claims to have followed the advice offered in the spot or if he or she has the intention to follow the advice. This does not necessarily mean that these changes in behavior have indeed taken place as a result of having heard the messages or, indeed, that any change has occurred at all.

In addition, throughout Bamako there appears to be a real need and desire to understand better exactly what radio can and cannot do. There is every indication that a study which would compare and analyze the most effective way of reaching target audiences would be most welcome. For example, it is very likely that the survey would indicate that traditional music programs work well in a rural setting but did not among youth in an urban area. This information could be quite helpful for future USAID or BASICS workshops and IEC activities in the region.

### **INTERVIEWS WITH WORKSHOP FACILITATORS AND PARTICIPANTS**

The workshop participants and/or facilitators were asked the following questions to determine their ideas about evaluation:

- 1 What do you believe should be the main objective of the evaluation?
- 2 What is the most important information to seek in this evaluation?
- 3 What evaluation techniques would be most successful in the Malian context?
- 4 What is the best way of communicating the evaluation objectives to the workshop participants?
- 5 How might workshop participants develop their own evaluation techniques?

### **Responses**

- 1 Main objective All agreed that the most important area of evaluation is to determine the impact of the spots on the target population.

- 2 Most important information Participants believe that the most important information to seek in the evaluation is if the population heard the message and if so, if they remember the message contained in the spot
  
- 3 Evaluation techniques in the Malian context A quantitative survey which would contain, for example, true/false questions to offer indications about the knowledge level of the target population would be easiest to calculate and most cost effective. However, the facilitators felt that this technique would be ineffective in the Malian context because of the populations' propensity to respond to surveys in the manner which they believe the surveyor wants to hear. Although there are survey techniques which would allow the surveyor to determine whether the person taking the survey is responding with veracity, this was deemed to be too complicated to prepare. Instead all participants argued in favor of a qualitative method of evaluation to include open-ended questions and focus groups
  
- 4 Best way of communicating objectives to participants The biggest obstacle with the workshop participants concerning evaluation lies with the radio producers rather than with the health agents. According to P. N'Diaye, radio producers tend to be uninterested in the results of the evaluation. They may resent having their work questioned and analyzed. It is important to bring up evaluation issues at a strategic point in the workshop, i.e. the middle or end rather than at the beginning which may be perceived as threatening. As participants will conduct focus groups at the pre-test phase of their messages, this will give them a good indication of how final evaluations are conducted
  
- 5 Development of evaluation tools within the workshop It is obvious that radio stations have little, or more likely no means, to conduct surveys analysing the impact of their programs. Even so, Radio Tabalé has shown particular initiative in trying to seek information about the impact of its spots. (Note that the Director of Radio Tabalé has participated in a previous BASICS workshop on the use of radio.) Radio Tabalé is a small, neighbourhood radio station with the lowest audience rating in Bamako (1.7 percent according to an Infostat survey). To measure the impact of its spots, it organised a game focussing on an open-ended question "Who knows how long a woman should breastfeed her baby?" Within the hour, more than 50 women had walked to the radio station with their response which they orally transmitted to the radio station. (This due to an 80 percent illiteracy rate in Mali.) The winner received a bar of soap which had been donated by UNICEF. I recommend that throughout the course of the BASICS workshop other simple, effective and low (no) cost techniques be explored which will help radio practitioners begin to think in terms of, "Who is listening to my program, is it the audience I want, etc." without necessarily labeling this "evaluation."

Conversations with radio producers at the workshop also revealed that there is a tremendous gap in comprehension regarding the need for audience surveys and evaluation. Radio Klédu, for example, is well-versed (according to its General Director) in modern research and broadcasting techniques whereas it is apparent that smaller and

more amateurish stations may need convincing that evaluation is worthwhile. I suggest that participants in the workshop brief their colleagues on the main elements learned during the workshop to acquaint them with the notions of radio health programming, including evaluation.

## **INTERVIEWS WITH NGOs, NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND MARKETING GROUPS**

The objective of these interviews was to identify partners and seek information about other evaluations of radio projects which have been conducted in Mali.

**CNIECS**· CNIECS (National Center of Information, Education, and Communication for Health) is currently developing a multi-media communications strategy to deliver health messages. This strategy also includes radio spots and micro-programs. CNIECS wants to become the major institutional facilitator throughout Mali for the development of health messages. Based on the discussion with Barker and Rocher, there appears to be a solid understanding at CNIECS of the steps needed to produce a successful health message using the radio. Two members of CNIECS are also attending the BASICS radio workshops. At the same time, CNIECS has expressed a keen interest in evaluation and is eager to work with BASICS to develop some evaluation tools. Primarily, CNIECS is interested in knowing what types of programs are most effective with a target audience. To that end, there was discussion concerning the possibility of conducting a survey which would analyze and compare the impact of at least three different types of radio programs in both rural and urban zones.

**Comments** CNIECS is a logical partner for BASICS in the continuation of its workshop activities. Its mandate is to oversee information, education and communication of health issues. It has a good understanding of pre-test, adaptation, evaluation, the need for base-line surveys, etc. However, subsequent interviews indicated that CNIECS is seen as a heavily bureaucratic institution and that introduction of creative initiatives would be difficult.

**MC2** MC2 is a communications group which has been involved with the development and production of radio spots dealing with family planning issues. It has worked with USAID, the World Bank and the Futures Group most recently. The biggest problems MC2 faces while attempting to analyze the effectiveness of its spots is the expansiveness of the country as well as access to many rural parts of Mali, especially during rainy season. MC2 also favors radio games and contests as a means of testing whether or not the message is being heard by the audience.

**Comments** MC2 is primarily a production company and is therefore not necessarily a suitable partner for the BASICS project. However, there is a basic understanding of the need for evaluation and some expertise at MC2 on how best to get good results in a cost-efficient manner.

**Panos** Panos' main activity is the training of Malian journalists and the production of radio programs which are then transmitted throughout Mali on private and public stations. Panos has an excellent understanding of the Malian radio scene and is especially versed in the problems these stations are facing for their survival. However, there was a strong sense throughout our meeting that Panos is not especially keen on the production of "messages" to reach a target audience. Instead, it favours a journalistic approach to the transmission of information.

Panos believes that the most effective way to deliver messages is by putting members of the audience in the position of delivering the message. (Note: This is the micro-program approach whereby a three minute extract of a two to three hour community-based program is produced. This community-based program aims to have the audience participate in finding the right answers to health issues, for example. It is highly participatory and, hence, considered very effective.) In addition, Panos has been involved with the development of an audience survey in rural Mali conducted by a European Union sub-contractor. I will attempt to procure a copy of this report upon my return to Switzerland and send it to BASICS.

**Comments** Panos is very interested in understanding the limits of radio in the Malian context. It understands fully the need for evaluation. Panos is focussed on traditional journalistic approaches to media. Panos did say that it could undertake the development of a structured project to monitor the diffusion of the radio spots. In this sense, Panos would draw up a project proposal, containing a work plan and budget, which would be submitted to BASICS for approval. The main objective of this proposal would be to ensure that the radio spots are being diffused as scheduled with the radio stations. Another element of the proposal could be to seek information about why the spots are not being run, if indeed this would be the case, and attempt to rectify the situation.

**USAID** The main point of this visit was to solicit input into evaluation options from Karen Hawkins-Reed and Dennis Bilodeau of the Infocom project. Dennis was a fountain of information about the situation of private radios in Mali (he has lived here for 14 years). His views served to confirm earlier observations, primarily 1) that qualitative surveys would be more effective than quantitative surveys, 2) that the polling group Infostat would be a reliable and serious partner to conduct field surveys, and 3) that there is a need to distinguish the huge gap between the urban and rural radio audience in Mali.

**Comments** Dennis is attempting to draw in Peace Corps volunteers to help evaluate the impact of radio programming on the population. This would be done primarily through observation of listening habits, the number of radios in a household, etc as opposed to more formal means of evaluation. I think this is an excellent idea because of the aforementioned tendency of survey participants to respond to questions in a manner which they believe will please the surveyor. These "observers" could help confirm the results of the survey.

**Infostat** Infostat is headed by Bakary Doumbia who founded the polling agency in 1994. It is respected in Bamako as a serious organization which does good work. It has concentrated primarily on quantitative surveys in Bamako but has also conducted focus groups and open-ended questionnaires. Mr. Doumbia's CV indicates that he is highly trained in demographics and statistics. He has a thorough understanding of the development of a representative sampling frame and random samples.

**Comments** Infostat is best placed to conduct a field survey for BASICS. It has local expertise and the added benefit of training evaluators according to the subject material. In this sense, I can envisage training participants in the BASICS workshop to conduct the surveys.

(Note: Although the idea that the producers of the programs would also conduct the survey is often considered bad practice, I believe that in this context this would be an appropriate solution. This is because 1) the production of the spots was a group effort, and 2) one of the aims of the BASICS workshop is to train participants in all stages of the process, including evaluation.)

These surveyors would be supervised by a team leader who in turn would be supervised by Mr. Doumbia. Infostat would help develop the questionnaire, translate the questionnaire into Bambara (the local language), pre-test the questionnaire, offer suggestions on how to improve it, help choose the sample group, arrange all ground logistics, oversee the survey (constitution of focus groups, etc.), tally the results, assist in the analysis of the results and eventually prepare a presentation of the results.

**The Futures Group** The Futures Group has been one of the most active and apparently dynamic social marketing groups to use radio effectively in Mali. It has been involved in the production of radio spots on condoms, oral contraceptives and most recently, injectable contraceptives. The Futures Group shared its experience of working with BDA, the Dakar-based research agency, and reported that it found itself having to arrange all ground logistics which was time-consuming and wasteful (BDA had been paid to do ground logistics). The Futures Group did not recommend working with BDA because of the need to have someone in Mali to oversee preparations for the evaluation. It has worked with Infostat and has been pleased with the work. The Futures Group underlined the difficulty of working in the Malian context and emphasized the need for allowing more time for the completion of the evaluation than in other countries.

**Comments** The Futures Group has a significantly better grasp of evaluation tools and techniques than most of the individuals I encountered. They would be able and willing to take on the entire evaluation and would assuredly produce viable results. That said, I imagine this would be an expensive option and perhaps not a very practical one from the BASICS perspective. As I understand, the Futures Group is a subcontractor to USAID as is BASICS.

**UNICEF** UNICEF has had experience in evaluating participants in a workshop it held on the production of community-based radio programs and micro-programs. The results, based on a questionnaire given to participants six months after the workshop, indicated that despite extensive training, the workshop participants could only relate a superficial understanding of the content of these programs. Other questions showed similarly unsatisfactory results for this six-month period. UNICEF is not convinced that radio spots are the most effective way to reach the target audience in Mali and believes that in the rural context, spots do not work at all (Ed note: It is not known what this conclusion is based on. Evidently, UNICEF has not conducted any evaluations on the effectiveness of radio spots). This view underlines the idea that the results of the BASICS survey may show significant differences in the audience's reception of the spots in Koulikoro and Bamako. UNICEF feels that micro-programs are a more effective way to transmit health messages.

**Comments** I had originally hoped that UNICEF would be a potential partner for the continuation of the BASICS project. UNICEF has offered significant support for local radios (\$500,000 in equipment, and training), but like other organizations in Bamako, UNICEF is still grappling with understanding which format is the most effective for the target audience. UNICEF showed more interest in an evaluation which would analyze these issues than partaking or assisting in an evaluation of the BASICS workshop. That said, UNICEF's ideas about evaluating the workshop participants six months following the workshop was helpful. The UNICEF report will be made available to workshop organizers.

**Greencom** Dr. Michael Midling is a relative new-comer to the use of radio to transmit messages, in this case, about the environment. His organization is planning to develop its communication strategy to include radio and his interest is in acquiring a better understanding of what formats work best in the Malian context.

**Comments** Dr. Midling would be a potential participant in a one-or two-day workshop on evaluation and could eventually work with the radio producers participating in the BASICS workshop to produce a series of spots on the environment.

**DSFC** Dr. Dede Tandia and I spoke primarily about how to determine whether the reception and understanding of radio health messages necessarily resulted in any behavior change. Obviously, this is very difficult to ascertain. It could only be done if health workers were engaged to actually conduct household surveys or at the minimum participate in observation exercises in a selected sample group. The idea scenario, according to the DSFC, would be to conduct a baseline survey on infant malnutrition rates in a selected survey group, initiate an information campaign designed to decrease those rates, and then return within a year to determine whether malnutrition levels had decreased in the target area.

However, in order for this evaluation to prove worthwhile, it would be necessary to have a control group composed of individuals of the same socio-economic group, ages, etc. This would

be impossible in this context because of the nature of the spots (throughout the entire region, hence no comparable control group) and the sheer cost of such an exercise

Comments     The above options were seen by the DSFC as a costly venture which would not necessarily yield accurate results. I believe there is a need for further discussion with DSFC officials about the potential use of radio to deliver health messages and explanations about the need to evaluate the impact of these messages on the target audience. It will be necessary to find ways to motivate DSFC staff to consider the evaluation of health messages transmitted via the radio as important as more traditional ways of transmitting health information. Perhaps Mme Tony might envisage debriefing her colleagues at the DSFC on the aims and objectives of the workshop in an effort to increase their enthusiasm for the use of radio for health.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Taking into account the objectives of the workshop, and strengths and limitations of the Malian context, I recommend that the evaluation focus on three major points

- 5     Impact of the spots on the target audience: the reach of the spots, the level of comprehension of the messages, and the level of retention of the messages among the target audience
- 6     Participants' level of retention of the process of making spots and subsequent activities)
- 7     The organization and convening of a one to two day evaluation workshop in which the results of the workshop are presented to participants, sponsors, and other interested parties and next steps are decided

### **Evaluation of the Impact of the Spots on the Target Audience**

*Objective: To determine if the target audience has heard, understood and retained the health messages contained in the spots*

#### *Baseline Survey*

Under the direction of the BASICS office in Bamako, a two or three person evaluation task force should be formed composed of Mme Tony, the Group Pivot representative, a radio professional and Infostat. Should BASICS cease to exist in September, this task force would fall entirely under the auspices of Mme Tony's office. The task force could work with the Radio Partnership or another evaluation consultant such as the Dakar-based Intermedia Group to develop a questionnaire which would be pre-tested by Infostat.

The evaluation task force would then choose several of the workshop participants who would be trained by Infostat to conduct surveys. These surveys would be conducted primarily in the form

of focus groups. The two areas which would be contained in the survey would be Bamako (Commune V) and Koulikoro.

The information to be sought in this baseline survey would focus primarily on determining the level of knowledge and practice of breastfeeding and supplementary feeding. The focus groups would be composed of a cross-section of the population, but especially include women with children under the age of 5 years. It would also be worthwhile to include a focus group composed primarily of local health workers as this has also been identified as a potential target group for the BASICS messages.

Conducting a baseline survey of this nature will provide evaluators with a measure of comparison for the final evaluation.

#### Work Plan

- 1 Constitution of a BASICS-led task force composed of Mme Tony, a radio practitioner, Groupe Pivot, and Infostat with consultancy by an evaluation expert
- 2 Development of questionnaire and translation into Bambara
- 3 Choice of sample group number and location of survey (Bamako Commune V and Koulikoro)
- 4 Pre-test of questionnaire
- 5 Revision of questionnaire
- 6 Choice of workshop participants to be trained as evaluators
- 7 Training of workshop participants
- 8 Identification of supervisory staff
- 9 Survey (approximately three days)
- 10 Tallying of survey data and translation into French
- 11 Analysis of survey data
- 12 Preparation of a report detailing findings

#### Time Frame

It is necessary to proceed rapidly with the collection of baseline data. At the same time it is essential that the survey be conducted in a responsible manner. I suggest that the task force convene within a month of the end of the workshop (this time delay takes into account BASICS' need to have Infostat's and other participants' budget accepted). At least two weeks will be needed for the development of the survey questionnaire, the pre-test and revision will need at least another two weeks. Training of the participants and preparation for the survey will comprise another two to three weeks. The earliest possible time, therefore, for the baseline data survey to take place would be May.

### *Broadcast and Monitoring of Spots*

The most important variable in the evaluation of the impact of the spots is to know whether or not the spots will actually be broadcast by the radio stations as foreseen. This is crucial and yet not at all certain. One may only proceed with the idea that the radio spots will be broadcast within three months of the end of the workshop. To that end, the evaluation will assume that

- The participating radios will broadcast the spots regularly and as scheduled throughout a pre-determined time frame, i.e. three to four months
- The broadcasts will begin by June and run until August

An essential part of the evaluation will consist of monitoring these spots. Under the auspices of the evaluation task force, a team of monitors (at least three) will be requested to monitor the broadcast of the spots. Essentially, these monitors will be health workers and will fall under the direction of Mme. Tony who will supervise their work. These health workers should be paid for their monitoring activities.

In addition, BASICS may contract out an independent monitoring exercise conducted by Panos. I recommend this option, if budgetary considerations allow, as this will also be a manner of evaluating the effectiveness of the monitoring exercise undertaken by the evaluation task force and health worker monitors.

#### Work Plan

- 1 Designation of monitoring contact person in evaluation task force
- 2 Monitoring contact person organizes meeting with Panos to further explain objective of monitoring and formally request the preparation of a project proposal from Panos
- 3 Approval of Panos proposal and budget
- 4 Designation of health worker monitors
- 5 Meeting between health worker monitors and Panos team under the coordination of monitoring contact person
- 6 Monitoring
- 7 Tallying of results of monitoring
- 8 Possible option: Panos and monitoring contact person investigate why spots are not being broadcast, as arranged (if this is the case) and attempt to remedy the situation

#### Time Frame

It would be necessary to put in place the monitoring structure at the same time that the baseline survey is organized. The monitoring team should be operational by early June with its monitoring results made available to the team coordinator at monthly or bi-monthly intervals and appropriate action taken promptly, if needed.

### *Post-Broadcast Evaluation*

The evaluation task-force will conduct a qualitative survey approximately three to four months after the launching of the information campaign. The target groups and sample areas will be the same as those designated for the baseline survey and the evaluation team should also be the same. There will probably be a need for some additional training, if only as a pre-survey refresher course. The post-broadcast evaluation will focus on determining

- 1 If the target audience heard the spots
- 2 If so, on which station they heard the spots
- 3 If the target audience understood the messages
- 4 If the target audience can remember the messages
- 5 If the target audience claims to have changed its behavior after hearing the spots or if it says it intends to change its behavior (Note: Again, we must be careful to understand that this does not qualify as a serious measure of behavior change, but merely an indication of intent.)

### Work Plan

- 1 Development of questionnaire by evaluation task force and evaluation expert, translation into Bambara
- 2 Pre-test of questionnaire
- 3 Revision of questionnaire
- 4 Refresher training of workshop participants
- 5 Survey (approximately three days)
- 6 Tallying of survey data and translation into French
- 7 Analysis of survey data
- 8 Preparation of a report detailing findings

### Time Frame

Preparation for the final survey should begin shortly after the baseline data survey is collected. Organizers should plan to conduct the survey at the end of September (if the spots are broadcast as desired). Although this will be too late for the BASICS project, any earlier would not yield satisfactory results. This is because the excessive rains in Mali throughout August and early September will severely limit access to Koulikoro and neighborhoods within Bamako. After the survey is conducted, organizers must count on one to two months for the tallying of the data, translation into French and analysis of survey data. Final results should be available by late November.

**Conclusions** This method of evaluation will allow BASICS to determine 1) if the spots reached its target audience, and 2) if the target audience increased its knowledge of the message.

All other indications, primarily whether or not the audience followed the advice given in the message, may not be accurately documented in this survey. Other indications may only be determined by following a more detailed study which would include household surveys, observation by health workers, and eventually a baseline and post-broadcast evaluation analyzing malnutrition rates. None of these options appear particularly feasible in the Malian context at this time.

### **Evaluation of Workshop Participants' Retention Levels and Subsequent Activities**

*Objective To assess whether workshop participants are able to recall the process of the development of spots and if they were able to apply what they learned*

#### *SEPO Survey*

At the end of the workshop, participants will be requested to fill out what is known in French as a SEPO survey designed to evaluate “*succès, échec, potentialité et obstacles*” This is a useful evaluation tool in that it will be possible to compare what workshop participants hope to achieve from their experience and what they are eventually able to achieve. This survey will also give workshop organizers an opportunity to respond early on to any potential obstacles which will impede BASICS from reaching its workshop objectives.

#### Work Plan

- 1 Development of SEPO survey
- 2 Participants requested to fill out the survey
- 3 Analysis of results
- 4 Preparation of a preliminary report detailing findings.

#### Time Frame

Radio Partnership will develop the survey prior to leaving Bamako in coordination with a facilitator (M Faye). This facilitator will issue the survey towards the end of the workshop and then make the surveys available to Radio Partnership or any other evaluation consultant contracted to serve as the evaluation expert on the evaluation task force. These results will be analyzed and measured against results of post-workshop interviews with participants.

#### *Interviews with Workshop Participants*

The evaluation task force should plan to interview participants in the workshop approximately six months after the completion of the workshop to determine the following points:

- What workshop participants retained from their experience. This could be achieved by either re-issuing the pre- and post-test distributed at the workshop or by the development

of a second questionnaire. I recommend the development of a new questionnaire as participants will have already focused much attention on the pre- and post-tests and this would not be a satisfactory indicator of what they really remember. The questionnaire will focus on the process of making spots rather than the content of the spots (i.e., information about breastfeeding, etc.)

- If workshop participants have participated in or initiated the production of any new spots
- If participants produced new spots, whether or not these spots were produced following the procedure laid out in the BASICS workshop
- What obstacles they have faced in putting into practice what they learned during the workshop
- Their overall appreciation of the workshop and what elements within the workshop turned out to be most useful in practical terms

Work Plan (Note: For this stage of the evaluation process, the evaluation task force would only comprise Mme Tony, and eventually, an evaluation expert for analysis. Ideally, Mme Tony or her staff would conduct these interviews.)

- 1 Development of a questionnaire
- 2 Interviews with participants
- 3 Analysis of results
- 4 Preparation of a preliminary report detailing findings
- 5 Preparation of a final report compiling data from SEPO survey and participants' questionnaire

### **Organization of an Evaluation Workshop**

***Objective: To share the findings of the evaluation with all interested parties, to provide a forum for workshop participants to share their post-workshop experiences and to develop a structure for implementing "next steps."***

The Radio Partnership believes that the results of both of the aforementioned evaluations should be shared with the participants of the workshop as well as with USAID, BASICS, DSFC, UNICEF, CNI ECS, Greencom, URTEL, and other interested parties. This should be done not only through the issuing of a final report, but also through the convening of a one- to two-day evaluation and "next steps" workshop. This is important because

- It will be the most systematic evaluation of the BASICS radio plan for health workshops in West Africa (because of its baseline survey) and should provide useful information for future activities throughout the region
- Participants in the workshop will better understand the usefulness of evaluation
- The evaluation techniques can be analyzed and discussed in a forum setting
- Participants will be given an opportunity to brainstorm about the results of the evaluation and its significance

- The evaluation workshop will reinforce the need to work in partnership between radio producers, donors and health workers or others to produce quality products
- “Next steps” can be proposed which may then be coordinated by a single organization such as CНИЕCS or through the creation of a group composed of donors and others who have an interest in ensuring radio messages are produced in a reliable and effective manner

The following elements should be presented in the evaluation workshop

- 1 Presentation of objectives and methodology of evaluation (Infostat, Mme Tony and evaluation expert)
- 2 Presentation of results and explanation of analysis (evaluation expert)
- 3 Discussion of results and questions/answers
- 4 Workshop participants explanations about obstacles etc encountered in the realization of workshop objectives
- 5 Reaction by workshop organizers
- 6 Proposal for body to coordinate next steps (this should be prepared in advance by evaluation task force and may be CНИЕCS or other)

#### Work Plan

- 1 Identification of evaluation workshop participants
- 2 Development of evaluation workshop agenda
- 3 Choice of site and other logistical arrangements made
- 4 Issue invitations to workshop
- 5 Make available copy of evaluation report to participants
- 6 Convene workshop
- 7 Write summary report on outcome of evaluation workshop

## CONCLUSION

The above three-prong approach to the evaluation of the BASICS workshop on radio health message contains, I believe, all of the elements needed to determine whether or not this was a worthwhile initiative

Bearing in the mind the particular context in Mali (uncertainty about whether or not the spots will actually be broadcast) I would suggest that BASICS focus, in the first instance, on ensuring that the participants have actually retained the information that they learned during the workshop and try to understand the obstacles which may have prevented the spots from being broadcast as planned. This approach is also the least expensive and may be conducted in early September, which means that the information will be made available before BASICS closes at the end of September

For the evaluation of the impact of the spots on the target population, BASICS must decide if it wants to take the risk of paying for a baseline survey to be conducted without having any assurance that the spots will actually be broadcast. Of course, if the spots are not broadcast within a reasonable time frame, i.e. six months to a year, this in itself is a significant evaluation indication. If this were to occur, the interviews and questionnaires with the participants of the workshop would be especially important.

I believe that all the suggestions made above are feasible with the major variable being the time frame. If workshop organizers can get some indication that the spots will be broadcast on time or at least without too significant a delay, there is every indication that BASICS should be able to gather the data needed to assess the success of the workshop thoroughly.

In addition, I have found that such an extensive evaluation would be of extreme use not only for BASICS, but also for the many organizations attempting to profit from Mali's remarkable radio environment. It is my hope that some or all of the elements contained in the evaluation undertaken in Mali will serve as a model for future workshops elsewhere in Africa and provide radio practitioners, donors, NGOs, and national and international institutions with results which will encourage them to use radio creatively and effectively to reach their target audiences.

More broadly speaking, I would like to make a recommendation which falls beyond my brief to prepare evaluation options for the BASICS workshop. My experience in Mali has underlined the need for organizations such as BASICS, UNICEF, Health Unlimited (a British NGO), UNHCR, ICRC, DFID, Save the Children, Plan International, etc. using radio to transmit health and other social messages, to undertake a collective approach to determining the strengths and weaknesses of radio in development. There is still some confusion of what radio can and cannot do (e.g., it can inform, but can it really change behavior? What is the best use of radio to change attitudes and behavior?) Many organizations appear to be groping in the dark about how best to use this medium whose reach and cost-efficiency seemingly makes it an ideal tool for message dissemination. I believe USAID and BASICS would be well-served to participate in or even initiate such a broad-scale evaluation which would provide essential information that could be used before deciding how best to launch radio-led information campaigns in Mali in the future. UNICEF has already indicated an interest in participating in such a coordinated effort. The Radio Partnership would also be interested in being involved in such an initiative as this type of extensive research would be of great value for other radio-led campaigns elsewhere in the world. Mali is emerging as Africa's premier country for radio, this makes it an ideal laboratory for exploring the potential of radio for the transmission of development messages.

**APPENDIX**  
**Activities Conducted**

## ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED

In order to reach Mission objectives, the Radio Partnership undertook the following activities in Bamako

### **Monday, February 23, 1998**

Participation in the workshop in order to understand the context, meet the participants, appreciate the methodology and general aims of the organizers of the workshop

### **Tuesday, February 24, 1998**

Interviews with facilitators and participants in the workshop to gauge their views on how best to evaluate the effectiveness of their workshop. These interviews were conducted formally with

- Pèdre N'Diaye BASICS workshop facilitator and Producer of Programs at Radio Senegal
- Martin Faye BASICS workshop facilitator, Head of Programs at Radio Senegal and consultant for Intermedia
- Tiemoko Koné BASICS workshop facilitator and Director of Radio Tabalé
- Dr Yaya Drabo BASICS IEC Regional Advisor, lead facilitator of the BASICS workshop

In addition, the Radio Partnership conducted several informal discussions with workshop participants to assess their understanding and acceptance of evaluation techniques and objectives

### **Wednesday, February 24, 1998**

Interviews with NGOs, social marketing groups, and national institutions

To identify potential partners and explore practical evaluation options in the Malian context, the Radio Partnership conducted a series of interviews with the following

<b>CNIECS</b>	Kriss Barker, IEC Advisor, JSI, Tim Rocher, Chief of Party, CHPS/JSI
<b>MC2</b>	Ibrahim Fall-Director
<b>Panos</b>	Mme Rokia Touré-Coordinator and Johannes de Flanders - Radio Production Advisor
<b>USAID</b>	Karen Hawkins-Reed, and Dennis Bilodeau, Director of Infocom project
<b>Infostat</b>	Bakary Doumbia, Director

### **Thursday, February 25, 1998**

Interviews with NGOs, social marketing groups and national institutions, cont

<b>UNICEF</b>	Salifou Yaye- Communications Officer
---------------	--------------------------------------

**Greencom**  
**DSFC**  
**The Futures Group**

Dr Michael Midling  
Dr Dede Tandia  
René Rovira

**Friday, February 27 1998**

Participation in morning session of workshop Elaboration of a preliminary report to serve as a draft for future discussion with workshop organizers in the afternoon

**Saturday, February 28, 1998**

Development of Evaluation Tools for Workshop Participants

It was originally envisaged that the Radio Partnership would address the workshop as evaluation experts at the end of the second week Because the Radio Partnership consultancy was only for the first week of the workshop, it was determined that Radio Partnership should work with another facilitator (Martin Faye) to develop tools which would be presented at the workshop at the appropriate time in the schedule This would avoid a disruption in the schedule which calls for evaluation to be discussed at the end of the workshop

These tools include the development of a "SEPO Fiche d'Evaluation", that is, a questionnaire in French which examines the success, failure, potential and obstacles associated with the objectives of the workshop This questionnaire will be used essentially for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the workshop on the participants

In addition, Radio Consultancy will explore interactive ways to inform participants about the aims and purpose of evaluation This would include having the participants act as both evaluator and evaluatee

**Sunday, March 1, 1998**

Debriefing of Workshop Organizers and distribution of report