

Arizona Nutrition Network



Partner Satisfaction Survey

FY 2008

Prepared by
Shelley Kuklish
Epidemiologist
June 2008

Introduction

The vision of the Arizona Nutrition Network (AZNN) is “To shape food consumption in a positive way, promote health, and reduce disease among all people living in Arizona.” The Network’s work is accomplished primarily through the efforts of the partners. For the purpose of continuously improving the Network, a survey was developed to measure the partners’ satisfaction with the Network. The survey assesses partners’ satisfaction with program planning and implementation, leadership, community outreach in the network, communication, progress and outcome, and overall impression of the AZNN.

Methods

A link to the web-based survey was emailed in March, 2008 to 97 partners. Partners were asked to provide a copy to each of their staff involved with the AZNN partnership. Therefore, approximately 142 partners received the survey. Of these 58 returned a survey (response rate = 40.8%). Just under half (45%) of respondents identified themselves as Local Incentive Award Matching Partners, and approximately one-fifth (22%) identified themselves as Community Nutrition Program partners. Less than ten percent (8.6%) identified themselves as “Other”. Three percent of respondents identified themselves as being from the Arizona Department of Economic Security. The remaining one-fifth (21%) did not identify the type of partnership they had with the Arizona Nutrition Network.

Partners were asked to report their satisfaction with each of seven areas of the Network (Program Planning and Implementation, Leadership, Community Outreach in the Network, Communication, Progress and Outcomes, Materials, and Overall Impression with the Network). A satisfaction scale from 1 to 5 was used for this assessment: 1= Completely Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3= Neutral, 4= Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied. Partners were also asked to compare their satisfaction with the performance of the Network with each evaluation measure with the Network’s performance during the previous fiscal year (1= Became worse, 2= Stayed the same, 3= Improved).¹

Results

Aspects of the network with the *lowest* averages included the planning process used to prepare the network’s objectives, utilization of partner input, opportunities for network members to take leadership roles, communication among members of the network, and communication between the network and the broader community, all receiving average satisfaction scores of 3.6. The diversity of network members, design of the Fun Food News, posters and recipe cards, television ads for all three campaigns, and the website received the *highest* average satisfaction scores (4.1). Respondents were also asked if each of their assessments of the nutrition network became worse, stayed the same or improved between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008. The Network’s contribution to improving nutrition and physical activity practices in the community and the website were the areas that showed the most improvement from FY 2007 to 2008 (2.4). The average satisfaction scores and confidence intervals are listed in Table 1.

¹ The survey is an adaptation from Fawcett, S., Foster, D. & Francisco, V. (1997). “Monitoring and evaluation of coalition activities and success”, in Kaye, G. & Wolff, T. (Eds.) “From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development”. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners, pp.163-185.

Table 1. Average score and confidence intervals per question item on the Partner Satisfaction Survey Fiscal Year 2008 and perceived changes from Fiscal Year 2007 to Fiscal Year 2008				
Satisfaction with:	Satisfaction Average	95% Confidence Interval	Change FY07 to FY08 Average	95% Confidence Interval
<i>Program Planning and Implementation</i>				
Clarity of the vision for where the nutrition network should be going.	3.8	(3.6-4.1)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
Planning process used to prepare the network's objectives.	3.6	(3.4-3.8)	2.1	(1.9-2.3)
Utilization of your input.	3.6	(3.4-3.9)	2.0	(1.9-2.2)
Follow-through on network's activities.	3.9	(3.6-4.1)	2.1	(1.9-2.2)
Efforts to improve collaborative action.	3.8	(3.5-4.0)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
Strength and competence of staff.	3.9	(3.7-4.2)	2.0	(1.8-2.2)
Processes used to assess the community's needs.	3.7	(3.4-3.9)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
Technical assistance provided, including training, site visits and resources.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
<i>Leadership</i>				
Strength and competence of network's leadership.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.0	(1.8-2.2)
Sensitivity to cultural issues.	3.9	(3.6-4.1)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
Opportunities for network members to take leadership roles.	3.6	(3.4-3.8)	2.1	(2.0-2.2)
Trust that network members afford each other.	3.7	(3.5-4.0)	2.1	(1.9-2.2)
<i>Community Outreach in the Network</i>				
Participation of types of community agencies.	3.9	(3.6-4.1)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
Diversity of nutrition network members.	4.1	(3.8-4.3)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
Efforts in identifying local funding for community programs.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.2	(2.0-2.4)
<i>Communication</i>				
Use of the media (television ads, billboards, materials, etc.) to promote awareness of the network's messages.	3.9	(3.7-4.1)	2.3	(2.1-2.5)
Communication among members of the network.	3.6	(3.3-3.9)	2.2	(2.1-2.3)
Communication between the network and the broader community.	3.6	(3.4-3.9)	2.2	(2.0-2.3)
Extent to which network members are listened to and heard.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
Information provided on issues and available resources.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.2	(2.1-2.4)
<i>Progress and Outcomes</i>				
Success in generating resources for the network.	3.7	(3.5-3.9)	2.2	(2.1-2.4)
Capacity of members to give support to each other.	3.7	(3.4-3.9)	2.2	(2.1-2.3)
Network's contribution to improving nutrition and physical activity practices in the community.	3.9	(3.7-4.2)	2.4	(2.2-2.5)

Table 1 Continued. Average score and confidence intervals per question item on the Partner Satisfaction Survey Fiscal Year 2008 and perceived changes from Fiscal Year 2007 to Fiscal Year 2008

Satisfaction with:	Satisfaction Average	95% Confidence Interval	Change FY07 to FY08 Average	95% Confidence Interval
Materials				
Availability of materials.	3.7	(3.4-4.0)	2.1	(1.9-2.2)
Availability of incentive items.	3.4	(3.0-3.7)	1.9	(1.7-2.1)
On-line distribution system.	4.0	(3.7-4.2)	2.2	(2.1-2.4)
Appropriateness of materials to the target population in your community.	3.8	(3.5-4.1)	2.2	(2.0-2.3)
Design of the following materials:				
Fun Food News	4.1	(3.8-4.4)	2.1	(2.0-2.3)
Posters	4.1	(3.9-4.3)	2.2	(2.0-2.3)
Recipe Cards in Color	4.3	(4.1-4.4)	2.2	(2.0-2.3)
Cookbooks	3.9	(3.6-4.1)	2.1	(2.0-2.2)
Incentive Items	4.0	(3.7-4.3)	2.2	(2.0-2.3)
Tv ads, Website, Partner Tools (Costumes, Inflatables, Games):				
“Fruits and Vegetables” June 07 - Sept 07	4.1	(3.9-4.3)	2.2	(2.1-2.4)
“Go Low” Oct 07 - Jan 08	4.1	(3.9-4.3)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
“Grow a Healthy Child” Feb 08 – May 08	4.1	(3.9-4.3)	2.3	(2.2-2.5)
Website: www.eatwellbewell.org	4.1	(3.8-4.4)	2.4	(2.2-2.5)
Costumes, Inflatables, Games	4.0	(3.7-4.3)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
Overall Impression of the Arizona Nutrition Network				
The Arizona Nutrition Network overall.	3.9	(3.6-4.2)	2.2	(2.0-2.4)

Overall, the category with the highest level of satisfaction was program planning and implementation, with an average score of 4.2 (with 1=Very Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, and 5= Very Satisfied). All other categories received an average score in the neutral range, with Leadership and Community Outreach in the Network receiving the lowest average score of 3.5. Table 2 shows the average score with 95% confidence intervals² by category.

² Confidence are interpreted as: if 100% of partners had responded to the survey, we are 95% confident that the true average would lie within the confidence intervals.

Table 2. Average and standard deviation by category, AZNN Partner Satisfaction Survey Fiscal Year 2008				
Satisfaction with:	Average	95% Confidence Intervals	Change from FY 07 to FY 08	95% Confidence Intervals
<i>Program Planning and Implementation</i>	4.2	(3.9-4.6)	2.2	(1.8-2.6)
<i>Leadership</i>	3.5	(3.0-4.0)	2.0	(1.7-2.3)
<i>Community Outreach in the Network</i>	3.5	(2.8-4.2)	2.3	(1.9-2.6)
<i>Communication</i>	3.6	(3.3-3.9)	1.8	(1.6-2.1)
<i>Progress and Outcome</i>	3.7	(2.9-4.4)	2.3	(2.0-2.5)
<i>Materials</i>	3.9	(3.7-4.2)	2.3	(2.1-2.4)
<i>Overall Impression of the Arizona Nutrition Network</i>	3.9	(3.6-4.2)	2.2	(2.0-2.4)

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide comments for each section of the survey. Table 3 shows the write-in responses for each category. The responses were edited only for spelling.

Table 3. Write-in Comments by Category

Comments Planning and Implementation:
I didn't even know we could have input!!
The clarity of the Food Network's vision only becomes clear if one gets on the website www.eatwellbewell.org and does the research themselves. From trainings, etc. the message is rather vague although it can be picked up with effort. It seems there is an expectation for a partner to know what is going on and expected rather than an effort being made to inform. Site visits have become more of a critique rather than an opportunity to help, answer questions and guide. They are stressful. I think more needs to be done to familiarize new partners of the mission and their expectations with friendly help when things are not understood. I believe simple forms/templates to help keep records should be made available so (especially new) partners have an easier time with recordkeeping for quarterly reports. The simple form should include the basics to keep track of (not on Excel). It should be in word format as there are some that are still learning how to report on excel. Plus, you can't see the full layout on excel at one time. A word format page might include the headings: date, site, # direct, # indirect, lesson, age. Just to see it laid out on one page make it a lot easier for those of us who are new. With the change in staff, much of the helpfulness has disappeared.
Too much time has to be spent on developing plans for the following year that takes away from delivering nutrition educational programming. In light of the national economic crunch, we need a major policy change on being able to deliver more information on financial resources that could help families stretch their food dollar to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables. We really need to be taking a holistic approach in changing behaviors in the clients we serve.
I am new to the nutrition network, but I've had previous exposure...so most of the responses are going to neutral or N/A.
This is my first year to be involved so I'm not too familiar with all of this yet.
I've only been here from Jan. 08', so I didn't answer the bottom questions.
Site Visits would be helpful, have been helpful in the past, but have not been completed in the last few years. Technical assistance provided would be more individualized and effective if it could be provided as part of a site visit.
Pretty much these questions have very little to do with the Local Contributing Partner. I've personally had no opportunity to have input into the network's objectives or activities. I have not been asked what I felt the needs are of the community I serve. There is far too much reporting required regarding what the local contributing agency is doing. This program is about what the federal dollars are doing not the local

Arizona Nutrition Network Partner Satisfaction Survey, FY 2008

contributing dollars even though the local may be related to it. Identifying reach, ethnicity, and numbers etc of the local contributing partner is of concern. It is important to not make this program so paperwork and reporting cumbersome that agencies are not willing to participate.
The change in staffing has been seamless.
I am disappointed that it took so long for the Fruit and Veggies More Matters curriculum to be completed.
This I am not sure because I have not been with this program for a year yet so kind of hard to say if it was improve or not.
The lack of leadership, vision, and customer service is clear since Sharon Sass's departure from her role in the Network. Trainings and partnership support in particular have been of notable decreasing quality over the last year.
I love the leadership and vision of this program.
I am too new to know how things have changed from last year.
Comments other than neutral and N/A is appropriate because this person is new to the program and is not able to measure the questionnaires at this time.
Technical assistance is good but delayed. Resources/incentive products have declined in number and availability. The program is very good and serves our clients well. Thank you.
Please make sure there are no errors in the application forms

Comments Leadership:

I didn't know there were opportunities to take leadership roles!!!
Staff has been wearing the "Discover the Power of Fruits and Veggies" and participants are thrilled with the "Indiana Jones" vibe they have. Spanish and English has worked out great. Commercials and outreach are still very Anglo, not sensitive to culture and not sensitive to single parents. Mom being in the kitchen while the kids grow is great and eating as a family is a good message but still does not relate to working parents, etc. The Milk commercial was great, but parents with a low level of literacy, and a typical 4th grader would not be able to follow it due to the rapid movement of letters and serifs on the type of letters used. The billboards were difficult to read and use of serifs can blur together at a distance, especially when watching a small TV. Lack of Bobby B. takes away from branding that has taken place with children participants.

Comments Outreach in the Network:

I have seen no effort in identifying local share.
New members need more help to identify sources of local share funding. Even when we read through the volumes of information in the manuals, there are those of us who do not know all of the possibilities. It would be nice if more help was available here from someone who knows the rules and understands where to find sources of funding.
Again, I truly do not see the purpose of these questions that are directed to network administrative decisions. As a local contributing partner I have never had the opportunity to be in discussions about identifying local share funding, etc.

Comments Communication:

There are no opportunities to provide input and when I have tried, I felt as though I was not listened to.
There might be a list of data base of partners in a given year that could be made available to all of the partners so they could communicate with one another. Again, if you don't have prior or inside knowledge, you are left out.
Again we are going to see an increase in the number of food stamp eligible families and we need to be able to provide more information on community resources to help them during the difficult times. They might have the knowledge on the importance of healthy eating, but will make other choices due to their circumstances.
We need more media in the Northern Arizona area. Not all people get the Phoenix local news channels. The Native Americans in the Northern Arizona need some media to promote awareness. Maybe on their local radio stations.
Sue Zevan has been doing an excellent job providing us with input and resources available to implement our programs.
I receive no reporting as a local contributing partner about the network's media efforts this year compared

Arizona Nutrition Network Partner Satisfaction Survey, FY 2008

to last year.

Comments Progress and Outcome:
Physical activity plays a secondary role in the AZNN program. It is hard to comprehend that we can give away little radios but not pedometers! This program often does not make sense!
We have been successful because of local working group and sharing ideas and resources on implementation. Getting MOUs from potential partners has been very time consuming and expensive when having to access the large rural communities as they are truly in need of these services.
What does Success in generating resources for the network mean? Is it referring to new partners coming on board? What specific attribute of capacity is being referred to? Is it the capacity of the network administration to provide the structure and framework for partners/members to have easy, accessible communications/support mechanisms? As a partner, I don't know if a report exists that shows how each member's program met their objectives so I can't answer 23 (referring to: Network's contribution to improving nutrition and physical activity practices in the community).
Any nutrition education effort in the community is good.

Comments Materials:
There are several incentive items that I think are a waste of tax-payer dollars. The radios, basketball hoops, and Frisbees are not useful. The placemats were designed with so little information and not even in Spanish! I can't believe you did that! Who do you ask about these things?
Partners should be given a list of websites that are useful for obtaining lessons, incentive items with a detailed route map of getting through each site to the particular spot where you'll find the place to place an order for materials. Even though a web address is given - much time is wasted clicking through a variety of options before you can actually find the right place to order. Also, we were given a list of a few websites to access demographic data and found they were no longer in use. So, an updated list would be helpful. A simple updated list (with directions of how to click to reach the right place in a site) could be emailed to all partners. This would save many of us who don't the experience literally hours and hours of work.
The lesson plans with the most recent Go Low campaign are very good.
The incentive items are great! It seems that they run out of stock fast and it takes a while before they become available again, if at all.
Fun Food News; Discover the Power of Fruits and Veggies Spanish crossword was incorrect. Fun Food News is not as emphasized in print and the campaign titles are getting smaller. Incentive items are okay, but it would be nice to ask partners what works and why vs. discontinuing or changing to an item that does not work as well. Pens and Pencils have been a great marketing tool. The stress balls/fruit & veggies were a great tool for activities, games emphasizing the color groups, vitamins, benefits, etc. Older adults love them for a variety of reasons, including; visually pleasing, exercising hands, tactile item, playing games with staff and taking home to share. As a marketing tool seeing the "Eat Well, Be Well" has helped in our marketing. The tattoos are easy to transport, but messy and if given as incentives in a classroom or after school setting, we receive complaints about the plastic on top of the tattoo and the backing being found all over the place. The flip flying disks are well received by participants, but the covers end up everywhere. Dynabands are hard for older adults to use. There is not much for the older adult.
Many items were unavailable, some of the commercials were not geared for the target market, too intellectual for our socioeconomic group, discontinuation of incentive items that were very successful for our program

Comments Overall Impressions of the Arizona Nutrition Network:
There are problems getting to the meetings especially when the meeting dates keep changing and many partners have schedules set far ahead. I agree that the meetings are important but they are made compulsory and little thought is given to those who have difficulty getting there. Often trainings are set at a difficult time of year in the most inhospitable spots, too. Notice of trainings or meetings is often late or the dates change near the time of the training. This makes it very difficult to attend these functions. Also, the phone conferences made available are a good idea, but we are given fairly late notice, and once again, many have prior scheduled functions to attend.
I would like to see work plans for two years rather than one. Too much time is spent on administrative and

Arizona Nutrition Network Partner Satisfaction Survey, FY 2008

MOU's. This time could be better spent. We need a policy change to allow financial education in our outreach.
It gets better each and every year we participate. Thank you for such a wonderful program!
Although the new AZNN staff appears to be committed to the overall goal and want to be helpful to the partners, the constant change in staff over the last few years has caused lack of communication and effectiveness for the network. I hope the current staff stays on board long enough to ensure consistency with the overall program.
The AzNN staff does a tremendous job, what with budget issues and constant turnover. very dedicated to the program and it's efforts.
Too much staff turnover in the AzNN department.
Need more recipes on website
I do not like the way the program is operated. I think the incentive items, for the most part, are not useful- especially when they convey little information. Some of the materials are very good, such as the cookbooks, however, they are not available most of the time (I think they are out of print now), and they do not have the nutrition label on them. While I believe the employees at the AZNN are working hard to do their jobs, the entire framework of the program seems to miss the mark. There is little flexibility of what can be done. The trainings have not been very helpful. The webinar held earlier in the year for University partners did not meet the needs of those working out of the University and seemed to be the same old canned presentation. The person who spoke at the quarterly meeting at the ASU campus was disseminating inaccurate information. This is the first time I have been asked for input. I think that you should conduct an assessment of specific components of the program including the web site (while we must rely on it as program partners, it is confusing-important information is buried in there). Furthermore, more of the funding should go directly to programming rather than being wasted on incentive items. I think that many of those items are simply handed out without ample connection with the client. I am pleased that you are evaluating your program with this survey, but you really need to do more. I hope to someday speak with my elected officials about the inefficiency of this program and the waste of tax-payer dollars.

Conclusions

The results of the partner satisfaction survey for FY 2008 have clearly identified areas of the network that the partners feel need improvement, as well as the strengths of the network. While satisfaction scores are lower than those from previous fiscal years, the results of the survey reflect the challenges that the network has faced in FY 2008, and the network staff is committed to addressing the identified issues.

Strengths of the network identified by the partners include:

- Diversity of network members.
- Design of the Fun Food News, posters and recipe cards.
- Television ads for social marketing campaigns.
- The www.eatwellbewell.org website.

Areas of improvement identified by the partners include:

- The planning process used to prepare the network's objectives.
- Utilization of partner input.
- Opportunities for network members to take leadership roles.
- Communication among members of the network.
- Communication between the network and the broader community.