

An Evaluation of
POLICY's Advocacy Manual:

Networking for Policy Change

December **2002**



The POLICY Project

The Futures Group International

in collaboration with:

Research Triangle Institute (RTI)
The Centre for Development and Population
Activities (CEDPA)

An Evaluation of POLICY' Advocacy Manual:
Networking for Policy Change

POLICY Project

**Futures Group International
The Centre for Development and Population Activities
Research Triangle Institute**

December 2002

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Abbreviations	vii
I. Executive Summary	1
II. Background	2
III. Methodology and Data Sources	3
<i>Questionnaires</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Non-POLICY Respondents.....</i>	<i>6</i>
IV. Data and Findings	7
<i>Overall Assessment</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Content, Organization, and Language.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Training Applications of the Manual</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Modifications and Suggested Improvements.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Policy Changes Attributed to Advocacy Training Using the Manual</i>	<i>18</i>
V. Summary and Recommendations.....	19
Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Country Manager/Resident Advisor	21
Appendix 2: Questionnaire for Trainers	22
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Workshop Participants.....	24
Appendix 4: Questionnaire for External Organizations and Projects	26
Appendix 5: Focus Group Questions	28

List of Tables

Table 1.	POLICY Countries Reporting Training Conducted with Advocacy Manual	4
Table 2.	Countries Included in the Evaluation	5
Table 3.	Respondent Groups, Number Contacted, and Number Responding	5
Table 4.	Workshop Conducted in POLICY Countries	10
Table 5.	Sections of Manual Used in Training	12

Acknowledgments

Authors:

Anne Davenport, Independent Consultant

Imelda Z. Feranil, CEDPA, Senior Advisor for Advocacy/Policy Analysis, POLICY Project

Technical Advisors:

Karen Hardee, Director, Research

Nancy McGirr, Director, Quality Control and Assurance

Minki Chatterji, Evaluation Specialist

Technical Reviewers/Editors:

Karen Hardee

Nancy McGirr

Abbreviations

AED	Academy for Educational Development
ARH	adolescent reproductive health
CA	cooperating agency
CBO	community-based organization
CEDPA	The Centre for Development and Population Activities
DYI	Democratic Youth Initiative
FP	family planning
FP/RH	family planning/reproductive health
FGD	focus discussion groups
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Disease Syndrome
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
IEC	information, education, and communication
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
ITRFP	Institute for Training and Research on Family Planning
MOH	Ministry of Health
NGO	nongovernmental organization
PLCPD	Philippine Legislators Committee on Population and Development
PLWHA	People Living With HIV/AIDS
PNGOC	Philippine NGO Council on Population, Health, and Welfare, Inc.
RH	reproductive health
SARA	Support for Analysis and Research in Africa
TA	technical assistance
TOT	Training-of-Trainers
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

I. Executive Summary

The USAID-funded POLICY Project promotes a supportive policy environment for sustained access and high-quality family planning and reproductive health (FP/RH) services, including HIV/AIDS and maternal health. To achieve this objective, POLICY works to increase political and popular support for FP/RH, improve planning and financing, ensure databased policymaking, and enhance local capabilities in policy-related fields. To help broaden and strengthen political commitment and public support for FP/RH, the project provides training and technical assistance (TA) to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), other civil society groups, and policy champions to help them become effective and credible advocates for accessible and high-quality FP/RH services at national and local levels.

In October 1999, POLICY published the *Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual* (Advocacy Manual), a detailed training curriculum for creating NGO networks, assessing FP/RH policy environments, and developing advocacy skills of local partners. Since then, the Advocacy Manual has been a major tool in building advocacy capabilities and has been disseminated and used widely by POLICY staff, trainers, and partners in more than 25 countries, as well as by donors, cooperating agencies (CAs), and development projects throughout the world.

In February 2002, POLICY commissioned a study to evaluate the manual's use, the usefulness and relevance of training conducted with the manual, and the qualitative and quantitative impacts attributed, in part, to putting the acquired advocacy skills into practice. The main data for the evaluation were responses to questionnaires and interviews with POLICY regional and country managers/resident advisors, trainers, and workshop participants (mostly from local NGOs) from 14 countries. Respondents included 12 POLICY country managers and/or resident advisors, 18 trainers, and 27 participants. Non-POLICY individuals were also contacted as part of the evaluation. Supplementary sources of data included focus group discussions (FGDs) with POLICY staff, project records, country documents, and advocacy training materials developed by outside organizations.

Overall, respondents rated advocacy and related training that was conducted using the Advocacy Manual very positively. Trainers described the manual as well-organized, clear, and written in easily understandable language (either in English or translated versions). Trainers and country managers noted that the manual can be easily adapted to different socio-cultural contexts, to varying types of participants—including representatives of national or local organizations, NGOs, government agencies, and diverse development sectors—and for use with networks at different stages of development. In terms of impact, POLICY Project country managers and training participants credited the Advocacy Manual as instrumental in generating broader support for FP/RH and in achieving FP/RH policy changes in their countries.

The Advocacy Manual has become a major resource for FP/RH organizations and/or projects outside the POLICY Project. The Institute for Training and Research on Family Planning (ITRFP) of the Egypt Family Planning Association adapted and translated the manual into Arabic and subsequently used the curriculum to train nearly 900 multisectoral leaders in 14

governorates. UNFPA/Philippines and the Philippines Population Commission adapted selected portions of the Advocacy Manual to include in their RH advocacy guide for working with local governments and NGOs. The UNFPA Country Support Team in Slovakia used the manual to train NGOs in advocacy for RH. ASICAL, a regional coalition of NGOs representing men who have sex with men, is working with POLICY to adapt and expand the manual into an advocacy training guide, focusing exclusively on issues and concerns to their members.

The manual has also been a resource for non-FP/RH applications. The World Wildlife Fund and the Biodiversity Project in Indonesia translated major sections of the manual into Bahasa and adapted materials for advocacy on environmental issues. Cognizant of the dearth of advocacy materials in Croatia, the Croatian NGO Democratic Youth Initiative (DYI) translated the manual into Croatian. It has already been used in training youth activists from NGOs, trade unions, student organizations, and political parties.

In summary, the Advocacy Manual was cited as a highly effective tool for building and developing advocacy networks, facilitating understanding of policy decision-making processes, strengthening advocacy skills, attaining political and popular support for FP/RH, and ultimately helping advocates achieve policy and financing changes. Efforts are underway to prepare maternal health, human rights, and adolescent RH supplements to the manual. These new supplements will widen the manual's applicability to other policy concerns.

II. Background

The USAID-funded POLICY Project began as POLICY I (September 1995–June 2000) and continues under POLICY II (July 2000–2005). The main objective of POLICY I was to promote a supportive policy environment for FP/RH. Following on the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo, POLICY I included a new component of broadened participation of NGOs in the policymaking process. The strategic objective of POLICY II is the development of policies, programs, and plans that promote and sustain access to high-quality services for FP/RH, HIV/AIDS, and maternal health. To achieve this objective, the project endeavors to

- Broaden and strengthen *political and popular support*;
- Improve *planning and financing*;
- Ensure that accurate, timely, and *relevant information informs policy decisions*; and
- Enhance *in-country and regional capacity* to provide policy training.

POLICY II is based on the premise that laws, regulations, and operational policies, and the guidelines, plans, and financial mechanisms through which those laws, regulations, and operational policies are implemented, should promote access to high-quality RH information and services and enable men and women to make informed choices about their family life and reproductive well-being. This premise basically requires support for FP/RH from various sectors of the population, from policymakers and leaders to civil society and local communities. To help this occur, POLICY works with local partners to create and strengthen multisectoral advocacy networks and provides advocacy and other policy-related training to networks, NGOs, and public

and NGO policy champions. The project also fosters multisectoral partnerships among the public/NGO/private sectors to ensure participatory policymaking, program planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

In late 1995, POLICY began designing and facilitating network development and advocacy training workshops on FP/RH policy issues for partners and counterparts in all regions of the world. As training needs grew in countries where POLICY operates, the need to standardize the advocacy-related training curricula and develop a manual for trainers became apparent. POLICY initiated the development of the Advocacy Manual to help NGO representatives and other civil society groups (1) form and maintain advocacy networks, (2) understand their respective national and subnational policymaking processes, and (3) develop effective FP/RH advocacy skills. The manual's training curriculum included new approaches and tools for building networks and developing advocacy skills, and adapted and incorporated existing training materials, project documents and experiences, lessons learned, and successes attained in the first years of POLICY I. The manual referenced numerous training manuals, tools, and resources from other development projects in the fields of advocacy, organizational development, management, and policy analysis. POLICY published the Advocacy Manual in October 1999.

Since its release, the manual has served as a major tool for building FP/RH advocacy capabilities. The manual has been used to design and conduct training in 23 POLICY countries for more than 3,000 participants. In addition, the manual has been widely disseminated to and used by POLICY, other development projects, donors, CAs, trainers, and academic and training institutions in more than 30 countries worldwide. Workshop participants from several countries—Armenia, Benin, Egypt, Ghana, Mexico, the Philippines, Romania, Russia, and Turkey—have designed and conducted second-tier training with the manual, utilizing skills acquired from POLICY Training-of-Trainers (TOT) workshops. In addition to the original English publication, POLICY supported the translation of the manual into French, Spanish, Arabic, Russian, Turkish, and Romanian. Also, other organizations have translated and adapted the manual into Bahasa, Portuguese, Russia (Slovakia) and Croatian. POLICY country staff reported numerous policy results linked to advocacy training using the manual and follow-up TA.

In February 2002, POLICY commissioned a study to evaluate the manual's use, the usefulness and relevance of training conducted with the manual, and the qualitative and quantitative impacts attributed, in part, to putting the acquired advocacy skills into practice.

III. Methodology and Data Sources

The main tools used in conducting this evaluation were interviews using questionnaires designed for the various respondent groups, written responses to the questionnaires, FGDs, and project records (e.g., training materials, policy documents, manual dissemination records, testimonials, and quarterly reports). Specific questionnaires, which were developed for each of the following respondent groups, are presented in Appendices 1–4:

- Questionnaire for Country Manager/Resident Advisor
- Questionnaire for Trainers
- Questionnaire for Workshop Participants
- Questionnaire for External Organizations and Projects

To identify the POLICY countries where training occurred using the Advocacy Manual, all POLICY country managers—24 country managers representing 29 countries—as of March 2002 were surveyed. Advocacy Manual curricula were used to conduct training in 21 of those countries. Two countries that were no longer receiving USAID Mission funding, Bolivia and Benin, also received training with the manual under POLICY I. Thus, the number of POLICY countries where the manual had been used as of March 2002 was 23. Those countries are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. POLICY Countries Reporting Training Conducted with Advocacy Manual (N=23)

Africa	Asia and Near East	Latin America/Caribbean	Europe & Eurasia
Benin Ethiopia Ghana Kenya Malawi Mozambique Nigeria REDSO/ESA South Africa Tanzania Uganda	Egypt Jordan Philippines	Bolivia Guatemala Jamaica Mexico Peru	Romania Russia Turkey Ukraine

Of the 23 countries, 14 were selected for the evaluation based on the following criteria:

- Regional representation.
- Number of workshops conducted with and extent of application of manual in workshops.
- Time elapsed since first training using the manual (to ensure sufficient time for results or impact to occur).
- Status as a POLICY country.

Those countries are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Countries Included in the Evaluation (N=14)

Africa	Asia and Near East	Europe & Eurasia	Latin America and the Caribbean
Benin Ghana Nigeria South Africa Tanzania	Egypt Jordan Philippines	Russia Turkey Ukraine	Guatemala Mexico Peru

For each of the 14 countries, respondents were identified from the following three groups: (1) country managers and/or resident advisors, (2) trainers, and (3) workshop participants. Data were collected from respondents through personal or telephone interviews or written responses using questionnaires. Table 3 presents the total number of respondents contacted in each target group and the total number who responded.

Table 3. Respondent Groups, Number Contacted, and Number Responding

Respondent Groups	Number Contacted	Actual Respondents
POLICY Staff and Counterparts		
Country managers/resident advisors	16	12
Trainers	19	17
Workshop participants	32	27
Total	67	56

In summary, those who responded to the evaluation interviews and/or written questionnaires included 12 POLICY country managers/resident advisors, 17 trainers, and 27 participants of advocacy-related workshops supported by POLICY. In addition to interviews and questionnaires, two FGDs were conducted with POLICY staff in March 2002 during POLICY's Technical Development Week. Staff from the 14 target countries participated in the FGDs, along with country managers, resident advisors, and trainers from Bolivia, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, West Africa, and Uganda. The questions asked during the focus group discussions are presented in Appendix 5.

Questionnaires

Three different versions of the questionnaires were developed for the respective POLICY respondent groups. To varying extents, each of the evaluation questionnaires addressed three main areas:

1. Content, organization, and language of the manual.
2. Applications of the manual within and outside POLICY.

3. Policy impacts attributable in part to skills acquired during training sessions using the manual.

Within each area, questions addressed the following key elements of the manual:

1. *Content, Organization, and Language*

- Satisfaction with content, layout, training methodology, activities, and timeframes.
- Cultural appropriateness.
- Understandability of the language in other countries/cultures.
- Appropriateness of translations.
- Sections considered most critical.
- Sections considered least important.

2. *Application*

- Reasons for using the manual.
- Factors contributing to the manual's effectiveness (e.g., project support, staff, funding, grants, or follow-up TA).
- Experience with other advocacy manuals or tools.
- Characteristics/elements that make the manual better or worse than other manuals and description of key differences.
- Non-POLICY uses—organizations or projects and where, how, and when the manual was used or adapted.
- Non-FP/RH uses or adaptations—organizations or projects and the sectors in which they work (e.g., safe motherhood, HIV/AIDS, environment, democracy, education, etc.) and the extent of adaptation or use.
- Adaptation or institutionalization of the manual's curriculum within any program of international, regional, or national training/academic institutions.

3. *Outcome and Impact*

- Manual's contributions to building local advocacy capabilities.
- Implementation of advocacy plans that were developed during advocacy training.
- Policy changes attributable in part to advocacy efforts resulting from advocacy training:
 - FP/RH policies, programs, plans or guidelines.
 - Improved planning or financing for FP/RH.

Non-POLICY Respondents

A separate questionnaire was designed for non-POLICY respondents, which included other CAs, donors, public sector agencies in various countries, NGOs, and training and academic institutions. The questionnaire for non-POLICY respondents addressed the following areas and elements:

1. *Uses of the Advocacy Manual*

- How, when, and which sections were used to conduct other training curricula.
- How the manual was adapted for or integrated into other training curricula, and other curricula.
- How the manual was used as a reference or resource (e.g., web links, bibliography, disseminated to field, translated).

2. *Content, Organization, and Methodology*

- Sections considered most critical.
- Sections considered least important.
- Overall impressions of the manual.
- Suggestions for changing or improving the manual.
- Characteristics/elements that make the manual better or worse than other manuals and description of key differences.

3. *Impact*

- How the use of the manual increased partner/staff/colleague participation in or understanding of advocacy and policy work.
- How it helped lead to policy change.

The questionnaire was sent to about 25 individuals, projects, and/or organizations that had requested copies of the manual or permission to use all or parts of it. Despite efforts to reach and follow up with respondents, or obtain written responses or conduct telephone interviews, only five responded to the structured questionnaires. Personnel or office changes complicated efforts to reach non-POLICY respondents. Some individuals who earlier requested the Advocacy Manual for their organizations had moved elsewhere. Certain organizations had changed names or addresses. Some requests for the manual came from projects that had since ended; and despite leads from organizations that had implemented those projects, individuals who requested the manual could not be reached. Some potential respondents wrote back only to say how they used or adapted the manual. The section below regarding non-POLICY uses of the manual was also based on reports from country managers and letters or emails that the project received since 1999 from non-POLICY individuals and organizations.

IV. Data and Findings

Overall Assessment

Country Managers/Resident Advisors. The project's country managers and resident advisors are in good positions to assess the quality, usefulness, and impacts associated with country-level advocacy training. As managers of country programs, they are typically the ones responsible for integrating advocacy into their workplans. When network formation or advocacy workshops are conducted, country managers and resident advisors often attend to observe the training, and they are always in the best position to monitor, evaluate, and receive feedback on advocacy-related activities and outcomes. Overall, the country managers and resident advisors provided positive

ratings of advocacy training workshops that were designed using Advocacy Manual curriculum. Several respondents noted that the manual was also an important resource for information on advocacy and networking and for use in “collaborating with and supporting NGOs.”

One respondent was particularly impressed by the participatory techniques used in the training: “I am a professor by training, so I see the difference between a workshop and a university class. This is more precise.” Another country manager observed an advocacy TOT and described the manual’s use in practice sessions as “very helpful as a guide, tool, and reference source. It teaches how to train with anecdotes, etc., specific to reproductive health.”

Nine of the 12 respondents acknowledged that the advocacy training resulted in increased visibility and awareness of FP/RH among policymakers and NGOs as well as improved participation of NGOs in the policy process. In addition, the training contributed to policy change through the advocacy efforts of network partners. Two country managers noted that there had not been sufficient time since the advocacy training to judge any results.

From Africa, a country manager said, “By increasing awareness of the role of NGOs and civil society in policy formulation and decision-making processes, all the existing networks ... have been able to ensure that they are represented and take active part in all spheres related to FP/RH.”

Training Participants. All 27 participant respondents had attended at least one advocacy skills workshop, which focused either on FP/RH, adolescent reproductive health (ARH), or HIV/AIDS. Several participants also reported attending workshops that incorporated advocacy training with policy analysis or network formation. Two participants attended TOT in advocacy workshops.

All respondents indicated a high level of satisfaction with their advocacy-related training and usefulness of their newly acquired skills. When asked to identify the topics they considered most useful, 17 participants identified the advocacy process and development of an advocacy strategy; 12 singled out development and management of networks/coalitions, five selected target audience analysis; and five chose advocacy communication and message development. These answers corresponded closely with participants’ responses to the question on the three most important skill/knowledge areas gained from the training. The top two areas were (1) understanding the advocacy process and developing advocacy plans (nine participants); and (2) networking and collaboration (eight participants). Two skill areas tied for third place—identifying advocacy issues, goals, and objectives; and developing and delivering advocacy messages.

In response to the question on why these skill areas are important, training participants pointed to their role in developing and implementing advocacy campaigns, building relationships with partners, determining areas in which to work, establishing cooperation, analyzing the policy situation, prioritizing issues, developing objectives, and formulating teams to influence decision makers. One participant wrote, “These skills are important to me not only on a personal level but because they build membership in civil society organizations especially in the fight against the HIV/AIDS epidemic.” Another said that “the skills and knowledge acquired have helped me tremendously to carry out my normal functions as a Population Officer and get more

policymakers at regional and district levels interested in and participating in population and related programs.”

For some participants in Eastern Europe and Africa, advocacy was a new concept. Participants expressed excitement about the new skills they acquired during training and their potential for achieving policy change. One respondent summed up the training as follows:

It was the first training on advocacy I have ever attended, so every subject of the training at this point was very interesting and important... For people that decide to advocate for changes, it is very important to have the same understanding of the terms, purpose, and goal of the advocacy process.

In response to the question on topics considered least useful, 21 participants answered “none” or “not applicable.” Two respondents reported that the unit on monitoring and evaluation (Section III, Unit 8) was less comprehensive than other sections and needed to be expanded; one person singled out the session on organizational structure. One participant did not report which aspect of advocacy training was least useful; however, she commented that certain sections of advocacy training required more time.

Trainers. The 17 trainers who responded to the evaluation questionnaire had conducted several advocacy workshops. Table 5 provides information on their countries and workshops they conducted or helped facilitate, including the number of workshops and focus areas, training dates, and number and types of participants.¹ All advocacy workshops focused on FP/RH, HIV/AIDS, and/or ARH issues, and participants represented networks, NGOs, people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA), media, national and local government ministries and councils, grassroots organizations, military, and service providers.

The 17 trainers reported using the manual in various advocacy and advocacy-related workshops, although one trainer indicated that “only bits and pieces of all sections of the manual were referred to when developing workshop sessions and the manual was not utilized directly in country-level training programs.”

¹ This table also includes data from the POLICY training database on advocacy training conducted by trainer respondents in other countries.

**Table 4. Workshops Conducted in POLICY Countries²
(September 1998–August 2002)³**

Country	No. of Workshops and Topics	Dates	Total No. Participants	Types of Participants
Benin	4 advocacy workshops (ARH)	Sept. 98–Oct. 1999	140	Journalists, NGO leaders
Bolivia	Numbers not available		(Numbers not available)	NGOs, national/local governments, journalists, grassroots organizations
Egypt	2 TOT in advocacy workshops; 1 network building workshop; 1 partnership workshop	June 2000–August 2002	115	Government, NGOs, other CAs, faculty members, health managers
Ghana	10 advocacy workshops (RH, ARH, HIV/AIDS, and policy analysis)	Oct. 1999–April 2002	498	National/local population councils, MOH, other government ministries, networks, NGOs, local district assemblies
Jordan	1 network-building workshop; 1 advocacy/policy analysis workshop	Nov. 2001–May 2002	40	Government, NGOs, journalists
Kenya	11 advocacy workshops	Mar. 2000 – Mar. 2002	289	Government, NGOs, midwives, PLWHA
Nigeria	2 advocacy workshops; 3 network-building workshops	Feb.–Nov. 2001	120	NGOs, CBOs, government, military branches, PLWHA, RH NGOs
Peru	15 advocacy workshops	March 2002–Dec. 2001	325	RH Networks and local government
Philippines	13 advocacy workshops; 4 network building workshops	Feb. 2000–May 2002	455	Local government leaders, NGOs, civil society groups
Russia	5 advocacy workshops (RH); 1 advocacy TOT	Dec. 2000–May 2001	111	RH NGOs, PLWHA, Ukraine network members
South Africa	9 provincial advocacy workshops (HIV/AIDS)	Nov. 2001 - March 2002	320	Grassroots women’s organizations
Tanzania	1 advocacy workshop	August 2001	37	NGOs and CBOs
Turkey	6 advocacy workshops; 1 advocacy TOT	Jan. 1999–May 2002	98	NGOs working in FP/RH, legal rights, and education
Ukraine	4 advocacy workshops; 1 fundraising workshop	Dec. 2000–May 2001	111	RH NGOs, PLWHA, Ukrainian Network

Non-POLICY respondents. The five non-POLICY respondents provided overall assessments that were positive and encouraging. The manual has been used in FP/RH and other areas of concern. A staff member working on various RH issues with the UNFPA Country Support Team in Slovakia summed up the manual as

² Workshop data were provided from only these POLICY countries.

³ September 1998 is used as a cut-off date, since this marked the time when the final draft of the entire Advocacy Manual was delivered for printing. At the same time, copies were provided to trainers who requested immediate access to the final draft.

Very useful, well laid out, simple language, full of useful hints and exercises, encourages heavy participation, and user friendly. . . . This manual is clearly superior.

Respondents who used the manual in non-FP/RH applications also indicated their positive impressions of the manual. A respondent from the WWF reported that the manual became part of its organizational and project resources. The respondent rated the manual as

Excellent. . . . Also referred other people to get their own copies as the best training manual I could find on this topic.

Having used the manual to conduct advocacy training and workshops as well as integrating it into other training curricula (e.g., youth participation in elections), a senior official of a democracy, political participation, and youth program in Croatia stated that

(The) Manual provides technical assistance and training to NGOs, and in Croatia we don't have many advocacy literature translated in Croatian language... The Manual is useful and it has fulfilled the purpose, even here in Croatia. I think that is the best recommendation for the manual.

Content, Organization, and Language

Evaluation of the Advocacy Manual's content, organization, and language focused mainly on POLICY trainer responses, supplemented with perspectives from country managers and non-POLICY individuals or organizations. The manual consists of an introduction followed by three major sections, and each section comprises units addressing different topics and skill areas from network building to the steps of the advocacy process.

- *Introduction* summarizes adult learning principles, role of the facilitator, and components of effective facilitation and adult learning.
- *Section I—The Power of Numbers: Networking for Impact* focuses on defining and describing advocacy networks, identifying the benefits of networks, and strengthening skills in effective communication, team-building, decision making, and network management in order to form and maintaining effective advocacy networks.
- *Section II—Actors, Issues, and Opportunities: Assessing the Policy Environment* presents training activities on the RH policy environment in a country, mapping the policy process, and prioritizing policy issues.
- *Section III—The Advocacy Strategy: Mobilizing for Action* highlights advocacy and the steps of the advocacy process, then focuses on each step of the process, including selecting an issue for advocacy, developing advocacy goal and objectives, identifying and studying target audiences, advocacy message development, data collection and analysis, fundraising, developing and implementing an action plan, and monitoring/evaluation.

Content of the Advocacy Manual. When asked which sections or units of the manual they included in their advocacy workshops, POLICY trainers were in agreement that the selection of curricula depends on the purpose of the training and the participants' needs. However, all 17 trainers indicated frequent use of Section III either alone or in conjunction with Sections I and/or II. The following are comments from some trainers:

I chose all the units of Section II and III for the NGO leaders, and for the journalists I chose the overview of advocacy (advocacy issues, objectives, and power dynamics) and strategic communication (audience analysis, message development, and delivery).

We used Section I when forming networks. Once they're formed, we use Section III. We hardly ever use Section II.

Table 5. Sections of Manual Used in Training

Sections	Number of Trainers
All sections	7
III only	5
I and III	3
II and III	2
Total	17

Overall, trainers were not specific about which training units they incorporated in their advocacy workshops. Those who did comment noted that the following units were included in the advocacy training they conducted:

- Adult learning and facilitation skills, from Introduction.
- Effective communication, team building, decision making, from Section I.
- Identifying and prioritizing an advocacy issue, preparing an advocacy goal and objectives, identifying and analyzing target audiences particularly through power mapping, message development, and developing an action plan, from Section III.

Trainers did not identify any specific units from Section II when discussing their training designs. One possible reason for this was that some trainers incorporated policy environment analysis into the session on identifying and prioritizing advocacy issues in Section III, or into the session on target audience analysis, also in Section III.

Two non-POLICY respondents stated that all sections of the manual were useful in undertaking training or in adapting the manual. As one of these two stated: “All of it was useful, and the different parts are essential to a holistic approach to the problem.” Two other respondents found Sections I and III useful; one of these two has used the manual mainly for reference, not yet applying it to designing training agenda or in an actual training. The other respondent, who is from a non-RH NGO, stated he has not used Section II, given the NGO’s focus and concern that the decision-making and policy environment section of the manual is different.

Organization of the Manual. Trainers reported that they were “very satisfied” with the way the contents of the manual were organized. Seven cited its flexibility and user-friendliness in allowing trainers to pull out and use specific sections and units relevant to their unique workshop needs. Several also mentioned the “universality” of the activities and exercises in the manual, as these were easily adaptable or transferable to different cultures and settings. The following are quoted from interviews with trainers:

The manual is easily adaptable to other situations because you can use the section you want. It depends on the need of the country. I work for POLICY in all their African countries, so I know that it depends very much on the country, the participant's needs, how advanced they may be in forming networks or not, and where they are at in the process. Every group is different, but that is the beauty of this manual. You can pick and choose which sections you need to accomplish your training goal.

The manual is very easily organized and user-friendly. Exercises are clear. Good format.

It steers the trainer and helps you to plan your time. It forms the skeleton of the training and gives you the flexibility to make changes.

The chronological arrangement of the units gives the trainer a sense of direction and enables one to take note of important and relevant issues to deal with. The universality of the manual makes it easily adapted for use across borders.

Country managers who had some familiarity with the manual also endorsed the way it is organized. During the FGD, an Africa country manager commented, "It is well thought out, laid out, easy to use. If you give it to a manager, they can see how the training will be even before the event."

Language and Cultural Appropriateness. Sixteen of the 17 trainers stated that they found the language and cultural content used in the Advocacy Manual appropriate. One-half of those also stressed that it is the responsibility of any trainer/facilitator to adapt training materials to the local culture and the needs of the training audience. One trainer summed it up with the following observation.

Since I worked in very, very different cultural contexts, from illiterate peasants from the south to NGO directors and high-level journalists, maybe the only thing I can say about this and the language is that it is appropriate to facilitators and it will be their responsibility to adapt the manual's rationale and language to the audience they are dealing with. I have the feeling that no one single manual will be the perfect recipe. The value of this type of material is offering a guide of content in an adequate order and a teaching/learning methodology. In this sense, I find the manual most useful and valuable.

Another trainer, who uses English and another language in advocacy training, gave the following assessment of the manual,

It is easy to translate. I have translated other training manuals, and this one is the easiest I have worked with. The same words we were using in advocacy are the ones they have in this manual; the concepts are the same. We liked the background information and concepts at the beginning, and as a handout. We like the tables that guide the training and they all work! Those analysis and case studies make sense and they work.

Several respondents, however, noted that they encountered some difficulty translating certain terms and concepts into the local language because the concepts did not exist. One trainer reported skipping the concept "community mobilization" because it was very difficult to find an actual example of community mobilization in the country. Three trainers indicated that they had to adapt some of the materials and examples to fit the religious and political systems in their respective countries.

Only one trainer gave negative comments on the manual's language and appropriateness, noting that "the language is more like the U.S. or UK, as if a developed country were trying to teach ... something."

Training Applications of the Manual

Reasons for Using the Manual in Advocacy Training. Reasons cited by trainers for using the manual included its adaptability for training advocates and networks at various stages of the network-building and advocacy process, and its applicability for various types of participants and their needs and for a broad range of FP/RH and HIV/AIDS issues, including related concerns such as gender and youth. Thus, the manual has been used in several countries as a resource in forming a new network, in helping members of a newly formed network to develop communication and management structures, and in moving a network through the advocacy process.

Training Techniques Used in the Manual. Some trainers cited the participatory activities that were drawn from the manual and used during training workshops. Comments of trainers include the following:

I like the approach used in this manual. Participants learned from what they know and the activities complete their knowledge.

Activities proved to be an effective and fun way of hands-on training. The handouts (also) efficiently summarized the important points the participants have to remember.

Modifications and Suggested Improvements

POLICY trainers. Sixteen of the 17 trainers reported modifying some sessions or activities in the manual to make their workshops more attuned to the culture in which they were working, the needs of participants, or the time they had available for training. Trainers commonly mentioned that they adapted case studies, activities, examples, and scenarios to suit the educational or socio-cultural backgrounds of participants. Only one trainer reported modifying practically the entire manual to make it more relevant to local grassroots activities:

We had to simplify it to make it more relevant to the local context. This manual is more for higher government policy level work, and nothing much for grassroots organizations; we work with local women's organizations. The manual needs to be more user-friendly, much more connected to the needs of those of us who are closer to organizations on the ground. It needs more case studies or examples from other countries.

Another frequent observation was that the time allowed for sessions was unrealistic, given the constraints of workshops and schedules of participants. A full workshop—beginning with analyzing the policy environment and ending with developing an advocacy strategy—lasts four to five days. Participants, including network members, NGO representatives, and government officials, were often unable to leave their jobs for more than two days. Thus advocacy workshops had to focus on certain topics depending on participants' needs and

backgrounds. Time for certain sessions had to be compressed; some sessions were skipped and exercises or activities were chosen over others.

The following is a list of units in the manual that were modified by various trainers:

- *Section I, Unit 2—Effective Communication: Understanding One Another.* One trainer expressed concern that the manual focuses more on effective listening; therefore, advocacy workshops were modified to provide a more general framework for communication.
- *Section III, Unit 1—What Is Advocacy?* One trainer reported starting all advocacy workshops by inviting participants to share their own advocacy experiences. While this activity usually takes two to three hours, it was deemed necessary by the trainer to help participants realize they have been advocating all their lives. This exercise was then used to introduce the manual’s “strategic, systematic, and efficient approach to advocacy.”
- *Section III, Unit 4—Messages: Informing, Persuading, and Moving to Action.* This unit was modified to suit the peculiarities of target audiences like the military and adolescents, particularly for discussions on HIV/AIDS.
- *Section III, Unit 7—Implementation: Developing an Action Plan.* Trainers added columns on results and indicators to facilitate monitoring and evaluation.

When asked to describe how the manual could be improved, three respondents made suggestions to “include more examples from Islamic countries in the curriculum as well as more current data sets in the unit on data collection.” Two other respondents suggested that the inclusion of more case studies and country examples would further enrich the training.

Two POLICY trainers felt that the units on fundraising (Section III, Unit 6) and monitoring and evaluation (Section III, Unit 8) should be expanded and dealt with in greater detail. One trainer noted, “(The section on) Monitoring and evaluation looks like it was tacked on at the last minute. This is a very important part of the training that deserves to be expanded—it is too simplified as is.”

Several of the POLICY trainers criticized the time the manual allocated for specific activities and exercises and suggested they be revised. A trainer wrote, “There is difficulty in the timing of the exercises. Why does there have to be a timeframe? It is quite restrictive.”

There was also a suggestion to include a glossary of terms, since so much of the terminology was new. In terms of the manual itself, two respondents felt it was too heavy and cumbersome and suggested repackaging each section separately. Two respondents suggested including a sample or standardized evaluation form that provide immediate feedback to the trainers on their style of training, relevance of the content of specific sessions and the usefulness of the practical exercises, in order to improve the quality of the training. This suggestion was deemed particularly important in transforming a reaction-oriented group into a proactive one that can affect the policy process. Some also proposed that, if possible, there should also be opportunities for trainers to observe any “downstream” advocacy training conducted by their trainees to assess the quality of the original training and the training materials.

Non-POLICY Respondents. One non-POLICY respondent, who is an instructional designer of a USAID project aimed at improving the training of RH providers, made the following comment about the segment of the advocacy workshop in which participants develop action plans to implement an advocacy strategy (usually undertaken toward the end of workshop):

Waiting until the last section to introduce the action plan is not the most effective use of this technique. For an action plan to be most useful, it should be introduced before the training even begins so that the learners can be setting expectations and making plans throughout the training about how they will implement what they have learned. Introducing the action plan earlier may provide more opportunities during the training intervention that encourage/require learners to use some of their real-life advocacy problems/issues in the activities included in the workshop.

A respondent from UNFPA suggested revising the manual to emphasize the need for various types of data on a particular issue, and the linkages among issue, data, research, and monitoring and evaluation. The respondent also stressed obtaining data on popular or policymakers' support for an issue or policy change initiative before undertaking any advocacy campaign:

I feel the biggest weakness of the manual is the lack of clear understanding of the role of data collection in advocacy. . . . If we believe in the definition of advocacy . . . our first and foremost activity in an advocacy strategy should be to study and analyze the issue, i.e., what is the issue? Why is it an issue? Do policymakers agree or contest the issue? Does the issue require a simple or an elaborate action? How much support do community and affected people have for the proposed action? What research tells us about such support? Is it worthwhile to change a policy or law before people really understand its significance? Should one rush to changing policies and laws even when intended beneficiaries don't even regard the matter as an issue? In other words, research and data collection should be closely tied to the issue, and lead the activity plan. . . . Although the (manual . . . shows data collection and monitoring and evaluation as parallel activities encompassing other activities, the application of these activities in real terms does not come clear. . . . The role of data collection, monitoring and evaluation in advocacy should be spelled out leaving no ambiguity. . . . (Also) add some examples of information gathered through qualitative means and its application.

Other comments dealt with the manual including examples from fields other than reproductive health. One non-POLICY respondent proposed including more examples of health and environment themes, while another suggested including more applications, exercises, and examples of activities focused on stimulating youth participation in the policy process:⁴

Very often youth citizens do not believe that participation is meaningful and that their activities can influence decisions. . . . In present conditions, when nobody will bring something to them or their community on a silver platter, they have to learn to draw on their own resources and make the most effective use of them and to compete with others for limited national or international resources. . . . They should develop interest for political processes, feel the sense of political efficiency, and recognize the need to rise above narrow personal interests as well as the need to develop a sense of civil duty. . . . some suggestion in that direction- how to persuade or show youth that political activism has meaning?

Other Advocacy Training Manuals or Materials Used in Training. Six trainers identified additional advocacy resources. Five cited “An Introduction to Advocacy Training Guide” by Ritu Sharma (also known as the SARA Manual) as a resource used in advocacy training. Also,

⁴ POLICY is already finalizing the adolescent RH supplement of the Advocacy Manual.

three of the five noted that the SARA Manual was a principal resource before the Advocacy Manual. In fact, the SARA Manual is cited frequently in the Advocacy Manual. However, two of the five trainers indicated preference for the Advocacy Manual because, among other things, it includes “better materials for participants and is better arranged” and because it is “more complete and comprehensive.” Another trainer mentioned the World Learning International Training Guide, noting that it consists mainly of articles and resources that are useful for adult learners. International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and Global Health Council materials were identified as resources by another trainer.

FP/RH Applications Outside POLICY. The ITRFP of the Egypt Family Planning Association adapted and translated the manual into Arabic. The Arabic version was subsequently used in the ITRFP curriculum to train nearly 900 multisectoral leaders in 14 governorates. UNFPA/Philippines and the Philippine Population Commission adapted selected sections of the Advocacy Manual for inclusion in their RH advocacy guide for working with local governments and NGOs in efforts to strengthen local support for population and FP/RH concerns, and for the integration of these concerns into local development policies, plans and programs. Also, the Philippine Legislators Committee on Population and Development (PLCPD) and the Philippine NGO Council on Population, Health, and Welfare, Inc. (PNGOC) use the manual with their members and constituents in various advocacy initiatives that included legislative bills that have population, gender, or RH implications. In Latin America, the Advocacy Manual was adapted for use by ASICAL—a regional coalition of NGOs representing men who have sex with men—to strengthen advocacy for issues of concern to its members. In Brazil, the SOMOS Project requested permission to translate the manual into Portuguese in order to train its members, and Groupe Pivot Santé and Population in Mali use the manual to train its member NGOs. The manual is also a resource of the UNFPA Country Support Team in Slovakia; sections of the manual have been translated into Russian for use in training NGO leaders in advocacy of RH programs.

Three country managers cited other examples of the use of the manual. In Nigeria, the National Action Committee on AIDS uses the manual in training they conduct to establish the State Action Committees on AIDS. In Peru, advocacy training is being conducted for the College of Nurse Midwives to prepare for upcoming legislation regarding midwifery practices. In Turkey, the International Training Center for Reproductive Health of the Ministry of Health (MOH) conducts advocacy training using the curricula as does various NGOs who learned about the work of POLICY’s partner networks in the country.

Applicability to non-RH Issues. A number of non-FP/RH organizations have requested and used the Advocacy Manual in their training programs. Reasons cited for these requests were always the same—they wanted to learn skills and strategies necessary to advocate for policy change regarding various socioeconomic development concerns. For example, the WWF and the Biodiversity Project in Indonesia translated major sections of the manual into Bahasa and adapted materials for advocacy by conservation organizations for training in environmental policy reform.

DYI, a Croatian NGO that trains youth from NGOs, trade unions, student organizations, and political parties, translated the manual into Croatian. DYI is currently implementing the

project, “Education of Youth Politicians II,” which aims for youth participation in the decision-making processes in political institutional bodies at the local and regional levels.⁵ Project activities include the publication of an advocacy training manual/guide for the election campaign, a nine-day advocacy trainers’ seminar, and six 1-day advocacy workshops in two areas to be facilitated by youth trainers. DYI used the manual in the advocacy trainers’ seminar and in developing its own manual and as reference in various workshops.

Policy Changes Attributed to Advocacy Training Using the Manual

The potential of POLICY’s Advocacy Manual for policy change was highlighted in interviews with POLICY staff and partners:

We had a training session for the National Nurses Association, and this is a very difficult group regarding attendance and level of interest. They came to the sessions on time, they stayed awake even after lunch, and they stayed after class! I was very impressed, as they all were. The main breakthrough for them, I think, was that you could actually work towards results. I think this training is so useful because you do see results and that is the entire point. How you manage the introduction depending on the group sets the stage for the entire training, and this was accomplished very well with this manual.

Anybody who goes through this training truly believes you can do something about a situation, where before you thought it was hopeless.

Responses from country managers and resident advisors as well as FGDs pointed to several policy-related changes attributable to, or partly resulting from, advocacy training using the manual. Following are *country-level results* and *excerpts* from some informants’ responses to the question, “Briefly describe how the advocacy training has led to the formation of networks advocating for policy change, increased participation of NGOs in policy processes, increased awareness among policy makers, or has contributed to policy changes”:

Increased NGO participation in the policy process

There were already policy changes going on before the manual arrived, but things really improved once we had the Advocacy Training Manual. The networks are now doing full-blown advocacy campaigns. Because of the history here, people were afraid of speaking out and the government didn’t want anything to do with NGOs. Now the network has become partners with government agencies. The government representatives were surprised and pleased with the network’s level of professionalism. Now they invite NGOs to participate in policy meetings, and the MOH person in charge of RH is attending network meetings to update them on policy and even suggest ways they can help the MOH with their agenda.

The training has been instrumental in developing the first-ever NGO network for RH advocacy, and critical to its successful application for two minigrants to initiate advocacy at the national and district levels.

The training has been instrumental in (1) encouraging public sector-NGO collaboration at the regional level to advocate more forcefully for RH and HIV/AIDS among district officials, and (2)

⁵ The DYI Project, supported by the International Olof Palme Center, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Zagreb), and the World Bank, began in May 2002 and will end in March 2003.

developing and supporting community NGO alliances and networks to inform and persuade district officials to be more supportive of RH and HIV/AIDS.

Public–NGO partnerships

At first the network participants only wanted to go directly to the governor’s house, straight to the top! With the advocacy training, they have broadened their base and their vision of who to target for policy change. Now the governor comes to them.

We used this manual to create a network of NGOs and the result was that one of the NGOs from the network was the first in the country to officially register with the National RH Federation of NGOs. They now have 37 NGOs in their network. We learned from them that they have formed other coalitions with environmental NGOs and conducted training for them. Also, the Ministry of Health has now decided to form a link between the RH NGO’s and the MOH. This is a very positive change for our country.

Policy and financing changes

We have seen the advocacy training at work. The first group of people we trained included three members of Parliament. One of the members included in her action plan the idea of building a coalition among members of Parliament to design an AIDS policy for the country. She decided that the skills she learned in the training could be taught to other members of Parliament. They formed a coalition and found out that there was already an AIDS policy, but nobody knew where the original document was! The ministers did not know where it was. The other members of Parliament did not know where it was. They all knew it existed. The HIV/AIDS parliamentary group decided to locate the document and lobby to get it approved as law. So, it was finally found. After three months of advocating, the document was approved by all of Parliament and now Tanzania has an HIV/AIDS policy for the country. This member of Parliament attributes this to what she learned about networking and advocacy in her training.”

All the NGOs in the network (women’s network) have worked toward policy changes. One woman who attended our workshop was able to run for a place on the provincial council and won! In other places, NGOs in the Neighborhood Watch Groups—formed specifically to oversee community health post and hospital care—conducted a door-to-door survey of clients, took the results to the hospital director and the Minister of Health, and were able to get some changes made. This entire process was documented by one of the NGOs in our network and presented at a meeting of the World Bank, where they have adopted this strategy as “an example that works” for their poverty alleviation programs in the country.

We were training a group that wanted to lobby Parliament about a levy, a tax, which Parliament was going to pass. Among the people we were training, some were living with HIV/AIDS. They wanted a 3 percent share of this levy for their HIV/AIDS programs. So, we hurriedly prepared them about lobbying techniques so they could get a share of the tax for their programs for HIV/AIDS. And the government did direct some of their levy towards their district level for this program for people living with HIV/AIDS. They were very excited about the results of their advocacy.

V. Summary and Recommendations

POLICY country managers, trainers, and workshop participants positively endorsed the Advocacy Manual and training. Even respondents outside the POLICY Project asserted that NGOs and networks along with policy champions from the government and other sectors have

an excellent resource in the Advocacy Manual. Most POLICY and non-POLICY respondents found the manual flexible and adaptable to various socioeconomic and cultural settings and to a mix of participants representing various development sectors, geographic areas, and national and local levels. Most trainers also recognized that the manual should to be adapted each time to fit the their own training/facilitation styles and needs, time considerations, and participant requirements and availabilities.

Several suggestions were provided to improve the manual or its application. Trainers particularly cited the timeframes given in the manual; one trainer suggested that timeframes serve only as “suggestions” or guidelines, without specific hours or minutes. Several respondents also suggested revisions to or expansion of individual units, in particular effective communication (Section I, Unit 2), message development (Section III, Unit 4), data collection (Section III, Unit 5), fundraising (Section III, Unit 6), and monitoring and evaluation (Section III, Unit 8). To improve workshop effectiveness, there were also requests for more articles or resources on policy change and the philosophy of advocacy. Some trainers recommended standardized or sample evaluation forms to help provide immediate feedback on training styles, relevance of training content, and usefulness of practical exercises, to improve the quality of the training. Some also recommended opportunities for trainers to observe any “downstream” advocacy training conducted by trainees in order to assess the quality of the original training and training materials. Another proposal was for a glossary of terms to be distributed at the end of the workshop for future reference. Non-POLICY respondents proposed that the manual contain non-RH applications, activities, and exercises—for example, for youth political participation or on the environment.

As evidenced by the responses of country managers and participants, POLICY’s advocacy training using the manual has obviously contributed to policy changes in many countries and varied socioeconomic situations. These results and anecdotal evidence should be further documented and widely disseminated in countries where they occur to further encourage civil society participation in the events that affect their lives. Such dissemination efforts will also have an impact on the credibility of local NGOs and networks to further strengthen their credibility and professional standing with government.

The power of participatory processes to advance FP/RH goals is reflected in the creation and success of advocacy networks and coalitions, and in the emergence of stronger public–private partnerships for FP/RH advocacy. Networking and advocacy skills learned and passed on to communities can be effective pathways for the promotion of appropriate policies, laws, programs, and resource allocations that enable people to make healthy reproductive choices. That the Advocacy Manual is an excellent means to that end has already been demonstrated.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Country Manager/Resident Advisor

QUESTIONNAIRE for COUNTRY MANAGER/RESIDENT ADVISOR
Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual

Name _____ Date _____

Title _____ Country _____

1. Training Workshops Conducted Using the Advocacy Manual

<u>WORKSHOP TITLE</u>	<u>DATES</u>	<u>TYPES OF PARTICIPANTS (PUBLIC SECTOR, NGO, ETC.)</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

2. What was your overall impression of the training/workshops?

3. Do you think there has been an increase in FP/RH advocacy activities in your country as a result of the advocacy training? (Can you provide some examples?)

4. Briefly describe how the advocacy training has increased participation of NGOs in policy processes, increased awareness among policy makers, or has contributed to policy change or increased resources. Please provide some examples.

5. Have any portions of the Advocacy Manual been *institutionalized* in your country? If yes, how? Where?

6. Which organizations in your country have requested copies of the Advocacy Manual? To your knowledge, which have used them?

Appendix 2: Questionnaire for Trainers

QUESTIONNAIRE for TRAINERS who used the
Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual

Name _____ Date _____

Organization _____ Title _____ Country _____

1. Training Workshops Conducted Using the Advocacy Manual:

Workshop Title	No. of Participants	Dates	Types of Participants
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Which sections/units of the Advocacy Manual did you choose to include in the workshop and why?

3. What did you like about the Advocacy Manual?

4. Which, if any, of the sections/units in the manual did you *modify*? How? Why?

5. What sections/units do you consider the MOST useful? Why?

6. What sections/units do you consider the LEAST useful? Why?

7. Were the cultural context and language used in the Advocacy Manual appropriate? If not, why not?

8. What suggestions do you have for improving the Advocacy Manual?

9. What other advocacy training materials have you used in training? How would you compare those materials to the Advocacy Manual?

10. a. Do you know of groups/individuals/organizations in your country or region that are using the Advocacy Manual? Please list the organizations and contact persons:

b. Of the organizations you know of using the Advocacy Manual, are they working in fields other than family planning/reproductive health? Please list the organizations/fields.

11. How many requests for the manual have you or the POLICY office received? (if applicable)

12. How many manuals has the POLICY office distributed? To whom? (if applicable)

OF MANUALS DISTRIBUTED

TO WHOM

Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Workshop Participants

QUESTIONNAIRE for PARTICIPANTS Trained with *Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual*

Name _____ Date _____

Organization _____

Network name (if applicable) _____

Country _____

1. POLICY Training workshops attended (please list the title and dates):

Workshop Title	Dates
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Which topics or activities in the training did you find MOST useful? Why?

3. Which topics or activities in the training did you find LEAST useful? Why?

4. a. What were the 3 most important skills/knowledge areas you learned from the training?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

b. Why are they important?

c. How have you applied these skills/knowledge?

5. a. Briefly describe the advocacy GOAL(S) and OBJECTIVES(S) developed during your training.

GOAL

OBJECTIVE

b. Have you achieved any of your objectives?

c. If yes, how did the training contribute to achievement of your objective?

d. If no, why not?

6. Have you conducted training for any other NGOs or network using the Advocacy Manual? If yes, for whom and when?

7. Do you know of other participants from the training you attended who have conducted training using the Advocacy Manual? If so, who is this participant (so that we may contact him or her for more information)?

8. Have you attended advocacy training offered by anyone other than POLICY (*for the interviewer: How was the training different? Better? Worse? Why? Anecdotal information.*)

Appendix 4: Questionnaire for External Organizations and Projects

Evaluation of the *Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual*

Questionnaire for External Organizations and Projects

Date: ___/___/___

Name of Organization and/or Project: _____

MISSION OR PURPOSE: _____

RESPONDENT'S NAME: _____ TITLE _____

Address: _____ Country _____

TELEPHONE: _____ FAX: _____ EMAIL: _____

1. Please indicate how, if at all, your organization/project has used the Advocacy Manual:

a. _____ To conduct advocacy training/advocacy workshops.

Please describe the types of workshops where any portion of the manual was used, including the technical areas addressed (e.g., RH, education, environment, HIV/AIDS, human rights) and the types of participants (e.g., NGOs, public sector, youth, service providers, trainers, etc).

b. _____ To adapt for or integrate into other training curricula.

Please describe the subject of the curricula, which sections/units of the manual were used/adapted, whether your curricula is published and where it is available.

c. _____ As a reference or resource. Check all that apply:

___ Posted the manual or a link to the manual on your website.

___ Included the manual as reference or resource in organizational or project documents.

___ Distributed the manual to field offices. Where: _____

___ Translated the entire manual. What languages? _____

___ Translated sections of the manual. What language(s)? _____; Which sections or units? _____

d. _____ Other uses. Please describe:

2. Which sections/units of the manual did you find the MOST useful? Why?

3. Which sections/units of the manual did you find the LEAST useful? Why?

4. What is your overall impression of the manual?

5. What suggestions do you have for changing or improving the manual?

6. What, if any, other advocacy training materials have you used? How would you compare those materials to the Advocacy Manual?

7. Briefly describe how the use of the manual has increased partner/staff/colleague participation in or understanding of advocacy and policy work? Please provide some examples.

8. Briefly describe how and where the training led or contributed to policy change?

Appendix 5: Focus Group Questions

Evaluation of the *Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual*

Focus Group Questions

1. What did you like about the training manual?
2. What did you NOT LIKE about the training manual?
3. Did you feel like you needed to change something?
4. Would you describe what you liked or did not like about the physical aspect of the manual?
5. In the other focus group some people suggested that their organizations have been doing advocacy for so long that they did not need the first section about forming a network. What do you think about that and the other sections?
6. When you observed the training, as a country manager, what did you think about it? What were your impressions? (Directed to a Country Manager.)
7. Have any of you seen this manual institutionalized?
8. Does any other NGO or anybody else use this manual?
9. Do they use it for anything besides RH?