



**RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON**
Agriculture for
Nutrition
and Health

Led by IFPRI



**RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON**
Policies,
Institutions,
and Markets

Led by IFPRI

Workshop on Approaches and Methods for Policy Process Research

**Sponsored by the CGIAR Research Programs on Policies, Institutions and Markets
(PIM) and Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)**

**IFPRI-Washington DC
November 18-20, 2013**

Workshop Report: Prepared by Katharine Hagerman (Independent Research Consultant)
Nov. 29, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Background and objectives to the workshop.....	3
2. Workshop overview and discussion highlights.....	4
3. Synthesis of working group ideas	
a. Day One.....	15
b. Day Two.....	16
4. Evaluation synthesis.....	19
5. Additional learning needs, workshop reflections and ways forward.....	20
6. Appendices	
a. Appendix 1: Agenda.....	23
b. Appendix 2: List of Participants.....	25
c. Appendix 3: Evaluation Questionnaire.....	27
d. Appendix 4: Working Group Guides.....	29

1.0 Background and Workshop Objectives

Development-oriented research is increasingly required to move beyond a focus on providing evidence to end-users of information, to show how their work contributes to development outcomes such as changes in policies. While better evidence has the potential to improve decision-making, it is insufficient for achieving policy impacts. That evidence needs to be communicated effectively so that it is useful to targeted decision-makers, and decision-makers need to have the incentives and the capacity to use it. This requires that researchers and their partners understand how policy processes work and identify opportunities for engaging in them. Deliberate strategies to engage in the policy process can also be the basis for assessing the extent to which research has contributed to a change in a policy or in the policy process—for example by influencing the discourse, attitudes, behaviors or actions of decision-makers.

CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) are particularly called upon to show their contribution to development outcomes. To increase the capacity of CRPs to generate policy-relevant evidence and to increase the likelihood that the evidence is effectively used by decision-makers, the CGIAR Research Programs on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (PIM) and Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) hosted a small number of experts with experience in analyzing and engaging in policy processes within and across sectors including agriculture, natural resource management, nutrition, and health. They shared methods and approaches for the study of interactions among people and public policy, with particular focus on:

- Analyzing policy processes;
- Using research evidence to influence/engage with policy processes; and
- Evaluating the contribution of research to policy formulation and implementation.

We also invited researchers associated with PIM and A4NH to present ongoing work on policy analysis and influence that they felt could be strengthened by engagement with external experts and the other workshop participants. In total, approximately sixty participants came together over the 2.5 days. The workshop consisted of a combination of presentations and working group sessions focused on developing key lessons from the case studies. The workshop focused on expanding and strengthening participant knowledge of policy process. A secondary objective, going forward from the workshop, is to work towards creating a toolkit or guidance document to support researchers and development practitioners to orient themselves in the policy process.

2. Workshop Overview

Monday, November 18

Session 1: Keynote Presentation

Nutrition Policy Processes

David Pelletier, Cornell University

Presentation Highlights:

This presentation outlined the rise of nutrition on the international policy agenda, emphasizing the social and political dimensions of under- and malnutrition. Pelletier presented a 'complexity science' lens for understanding and addressing questions related to nutrition. In this theoretical perspective, problems can be understood as: difficult, complicated, complex, and 'wicked'. With wicked problems, the process of working with them is fundamentally social and should not be approached with conventional scientific methods. Instead of 'Mode 1' research characterized by traditional academic, mono-disciplinary, technocratic, certain, and predictive research. To analyze socially complex issues, such as nutrition policy processes, 'Mode 2 science' can be adopted, which is a more holistic and process-oriented approach to research. 'Mode 2' is both academic and social, and by nature, adaptive, participatory, trans- and interdisciplinary, uncertain, and exploratory. A combination of Mode 2 and Mode 1 approaches can be useful. In designing research on complex systems, generally two approaches are adopted: modeling and engaging. Pelletier suggested taking the latter, calling for a focus on building strategic capacity for mainstreaming nutrition, which he defined as the ability to work within a complex, adaptive system. Pelletier provided a variety of case studies to apply and understand the complexity science and 'Mode 2' approaches to nutrition research and program implementation. He closed with a number of suggestions to researchers interested in taking up this innovative and relatively uncharted field of research. Pelletier emphasized that complexity science researchers must be willing to embrace uncertainty and challenging research environments. They will need to develop new tools, skills, and relationships to succeed in the field of research and should draw on experts in social science disciplines for knowledge, experience, and lessons applicable to their contexts. This field of research is incredibly diverse, requiring a variety of approaches and tools, as well as an adaptable researcher.

Discussion Highlights:

- How can researchers reposition their role in conducting policy process research as facilitators of learning about policy processes rather than someone who wants to observe, write, and publish, such as the 'helicopter anthropologist'?
- How can communities of learning within the policy community be created?
- The importance of long-term engagement in policy process research.

- Challenges and potential ways for developing rigor in 'Mode 2' and/or mixed methods research designs.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/day-1-keynote-dpelletier-cornell>

PPT with audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XHO1BepMHtE&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U&index=1

Mode-1 and Mode-2 Science

Pelletier's presentation brought the concept of Mode-1 and Mode-2 scientific research to the workshop discussions. The distinction between these two approaches and methods arose in discussions, as well as when and where the various methods might be best applied in differing research scenarios. From Pelletier's presentation, this table outlines some of the common properties of Mode-1 and Mode-2 science.

Mode-1 Science	Mode-2 Science
Academic	Academic and social
Mono-disciplinary	Trans- and interdisciplinary
Technocratic	Participative
Certain	Uncertain
Predictive	Exploratory

(Drawn from: Martens, P. 2006. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy* 2(1): 36-41.)

Pelletier presented the following list of commonly used Mode-2 Methods:

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| • Ethnographic narrative | • Immersion-observation | • Thematic analysis |
| • Policy review | • Onsite receipt collection | • Iterative action research via workshops |
| • Health-economic analysis | • Stakeholder analysis | • Consultative workshops |
| • Systematic internet review | • Emerging policy options with stakeholder input | • Implementation pathways |
| • Simulation of food intake patterns | • Impact pathways | |

Session 2: Keynote Presentation:

Analyzing and Understanding Agricultural Policy Processes in Africa

John Thompson, Future Agricultures Consortium and Institute of Development Studies, UK

Presentation Highlights

This presentation continued to examine the complexity of policy processes by focusing on the agricultural sector. Thompson presented key experiences and case studies from the Future Agricultures Consortium (FAC), which explores agriculture policy processes in Africa. He outlined the changing, complex, and political nature of policy processes and shared a central framework for policy process analysis utilized by FAC. When asking, 'How does policy change?' Thompson proposed that research explore the intersection of three key domains: 1) discourses /narratives 2) the interaction between actors, networks, and practices, and 3) competition and bargaining between different interests (politics). Part of this analysis includes examining the types of policy 'spaces' where these three domains intersect, and how one might create, engage in, or negotiate with them. The presentation then demonstrated two case study applications of this analytical framework: firstly, the political economy of cereal seed systems in Africa; and secondly, the political economy of agricultural policy in Africa. Thompson emphasized that policy-making must be understood as a political process as much as an analytical or technical one and that policy change requires understanding the interactions between narratives, actor-networks and political interests

Discussion Highlights

- Methodology: participants shared questions, concerns, and experiences in research design, partnership building, case study selection etc.
- A strong case was made for the strategy of giving research participants a 'case' or comparative analysis of another country when exploring policy processes, to enable critical distance and depersonalization and de-politicization of the research inquiry.
- An articulated need for greater nuance in understanding the politics of each national context.
- A need for more social scientists working in this complex field of study.

The PowerPoint presentation this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/day-1-keynote-jthompson-ids>

PPT with audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=evZHJWJdupA&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U

Session 3: CRP Studies: Methods

Enabling Policy Environments for Infant and Young child feeding and nutrition: the roles of actors, networks, narratives, and data

Purnima Menon, IFPRI-New Delhi

Discussion Highlights

The discussion following this presentation focused on methodological challenges in contexts where multiple ongoing research projects result in the same 'key' policy stakeholders being inundated with requests to participate in research activities. Workshop participants discussed the importance of finding a balance between advocacy, lobby, and research 'engagement' in policy process. Questions also arose around developing an appropriate methodology for tracking a baseline for observing changes in policy discourse.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-1-pm-pmenon-ifpri>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4BbQrrDbcHw&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U

Understanding the policy process and landscape through discourse and network analysis: qualitative and quantitative approaches

Christian Henning, University of Kiel and Jonathan Mockshell, University of Hohenheim

Discussion Highlights

Workshop participants discussed the ways in which qualitative and quantitative methodologies can inform and compliment one another. Discussion centered on some of the challenges to developing research methodologies for complexity science research, and discussed the value and applicability of the complex modeling process presented, specifically in the context of a constantly changing social environment. It was noted that the high standard of methods and rigor required in the research environment produce detailed representative models of the social and political networks under study, but that in the time needed to map the networks, the system may have already changed.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-1-afternoon-chenning-u-hohenheim>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L4p58gVKK_M&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U

Session 4: CRP Studies: Scalar elements of policy process (International-local) and bottom up approaches

Policy Network Analysis to support national implementation of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

Gea Galluzzi, Bioversity and Aseffa Wedajoo, University of Illinois-Chicago

Discussion Highlights

Following this presentation, discussion highlighted an interest in tracing and exploring how various national governments and stakeholders implement the international treaties they have signed on to, how, and why. Workshop participants discussed methodological aspects of the presented work, in particular, the sampling strategy.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-1-pm-ggalluzzi-bioversity>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WahVgD7AZzY&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U

Participatory action research to influence land tenure policy and access to the commons in the Barotse floodplain, Zambia

Blake Ratner, WorldFish and Elias Madzudzo, WorldFish

Discussion Highlights

Following this presentation of evaluation and learning in the 'Collaborating for Resilience' (CORE) approach utilized by Worldfish, participants discussed the implications of explicitly recognizing and exploring power in the policy making process. As the presentation had focused on participatory action research as an approach to research and engagement, discussion also highlighted methodological and practical implications, challenges, and lessons learned with this approach. Discussion focused on navigating tension between researcher, government and other stakeholder interests. Participants also raised questions around issues related to including collective action, common property policy, and traditional governance structures in the policy-making process.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-1-pm-madzudzo-and-ratner-worldfish>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSmh8sUHoA&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ8TqLov_5zCBGNSSqOsQm_U

Highlights From Day 1 (November 18)

John McDermott presented a brief summary and reflections on the day. A key take-away message was the importance of active engagement in researching the policy process. Workshop participants were encouraged to take action, to know which actors are involved in processes, and how power is distributed amongst them. The lesson is to then get involved in tactical and practical ways, bringing together a diversity of viewpoints in order to change the perspectives of everyone involved, including our own.

Researchers engaging in analyzing these policy processes will need to embrace complexity. To implement this research approach, it will be necessary to find a way to do systematic and rigorous research of dynamic social processes involved in policy change. The term proposed by Pelletier's presentation is perhaps fitting: "chaordic".

Critically examining and presenting the narratives involved in policy research is an important aspect of this process. Who tells the story and how, can have impacts on the relevance and feasibility of the research undertaken.

There has been a resounding emphasis on the need for mixed method research approaches. Instead of removing complexity by simplifying or narrowing research approaches, we need to instead look at how 'Mode 1' research methods can better reflect complexity and 'Mode 2' can be more scientifically rigorous.

Tuesday, Nov 19

Session 1: Keynote Presentation

IFAD's experience and emerging approach for engaging in national policy processes

Ed Heinemann, IFAD

Heinemann offered an alternative perspective on the engaging in the policy process by sharing the experiences of a funding and development partner institution, the International Fund for Agriculture and Development (IFAD). The presentation focused on IFAD's 'country level policy engagement' (CLPE) approach, which can be conceptualized in three strategic areas. Firstly, the objectives of CLPE are: creating enabling environment; drawing out lessons learnt under IFAD-supported projects and scale-up; strengthening public policies for rural development and their implementation and the responsible institutions; helping build capacity of national stakeholders to participate effectively in and shape policy processes. Secondly, the instruments by which these objectives are met include: investment projects; grant-financed projects; and direct engagement of CPM/ICO, administration and budgets. Thirdly, the array of activities for each of these instruments was discussed. Heinemann shared ten preliminary lessons learned in policy engagement. He highlighted the importance of determining a credible chain of causality associated with intended policy engagement and impacts, which could be reflected in planning tools such as a log frame. In order to be effective in policy impact work, researchers and practitioners must be clear about the intended outcome pathways of policy engagement strategies.

Heinemann shared IFAD's strategic interests in policy process research, such as: expanded learning on policy process analysis; use of stakeholder analysis as a guide for policy engagement; tools for rapid stakeholder analysis; donor roles in policy processes; and evaluation of policy engagement activities. A key focus in attending the workshop was to build networks in order to share lessons and approaches to this work

Discussion Highlights

- How to create an optimal architecture at country level for a the range of policy engagement activities
- The model of agriculture working groups in many African countries, which serve as a platform for civil society organizations in the field to contribute to policy development and implementation strategies.
- The importance of strategic planning for impact of engagement
- Tensions between time and resources needed for conceptual clarity and rigorous research with the fast pace of policy change environment.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-keynote-eheinemann-ifad>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mSAbu8FIUPc&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU&index=1

Session Two: Keynote Presentation

Evaluation of health policy processes

Sanjeev Sridharan, University of Toronto

Sridharan presented a strategic take on evaluation science, with an intention to 'get us to change our minds on evaluation-from something we 'have to do' to something we 'want' to do'. Sridharan emphasized the importance of conducting useful and well-planned evaluations. If workshop participants are undertaking policy oriented research and engagement, and wish to evaluate the impacts of those efforts, they must first ask themselves what it is they want to learn from the evaluation process. He outlined four common types of evaluation: assessing merit and worth; program and organizational improvement; oversight and compliance; and knowledge development, focusing on how the last could be applied to the topic of policy process research and engagement. In this sense, evaluation moves beyond an assessment of performance and becomes a means of strategic planning for the program or 'policy engagement' strategy. In order to respond to the complexity of the social conditions being researched and 'engaged' with, evaluation designs and research methods must also be adaptive, flexible, and iterative.

Sridharan discussed how to develop a conceptual framework for such evaluative research, including the importance of choosing a theory of change, strategic pathways of influence, linked to areas of impact and indicators. Drawing on discussions in the related academic literature, he spoke to the tension between the need for responsive and iterative evaluation and the traditional conceptualization of 'rigorous' evaluation. Realist evaluation was proposed as a methodology to connect complex contexts, mechanisms and outcomes. The application to the workshop focus was to draw attention to the ways in which strategies for policy oriented research and engagement can be informed by evaluation studies and adjusted accordingly in order to achieve impact in their desired strategic areas.

Discussion Highlights

- How can researchers negotiate the tension between a need for complex and responsive evaluations and the traditional indicator-based impacts required of the funding environment?
- When working with partners in the research process, how to co-create evaluative research designs, build relationships and engage with partners
- How to expand the understanding of 'scientific' research and evaluation beyond randomized controlled trials, how to conduct rigorous mixed methods and responsive research designs.

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-keynote-ssridharan-u-toronto>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s02OBSasmVg&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU

Session 3: CRP Studies: Engaging actors in the policy process

Agricultural policy processes and the youth in Southern Africa – the case of Malawi

Mariam Mapila, IFPRI-Malawi

Discussion Highlights

- How the research could be described in relation to a theory of change, strategies for policy engagement, conceptual pathways of ‘influence’/impact and measurement of indicators
- Moving forward and addressing a diversity of capacity gaps in the youth population, such as literacy and numeracy skills
- Programs to provide capital, training and investment to train youth in relation to ‘value-added’ aspects of agriculture

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-am-mmapila-ifpri>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iy4YiBa0HeY&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU

Colombian Agricultural Supply Chain Organizations: How Public Policy Shapes Agriculture and how value chain actors shape policy

Rafael Parra-Pena, CIAT

Discussion Highlights

- Public and private sector roles in shaping value-chains and policy
- Finding a balance between donor, government and researcher interests in order for a study to have an impact

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-am-rparrapena-ciat>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2p5FgNgMsE&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU

Session 4: CRP Studies: Focus on engaging different/non-traditional stakeholders and cross-sectoral collaboration

Drivers of Public Investment in Nutrition—Mozambique

Tewodaj Mogues and Lucy Billings, IFPRI

Discussion Highlights

- Exploring the political incentives for this research from different stakeholders
- The importance of policy process analysis work in learning to effectively strategize action and engagement
- Research conceptualization process
- Dynamics of navigating the political environment and continuum of participatory processes of government, civil society and researcher consortiums

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-pm-mogues-and-billings-ifpri>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0hljLHwD00Y&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU

Supporting agriculture and public health ministries to implement a national food safety policy based on risk-based approaches

Hung Nguyen, Hanoi School of Public Health and Lucy Lapar, ILRI

Discussion Highlights

- Power and politics of international-national adoption of food safety standards, complexity of adopting in local contexts, issues of feasibility
- Motivations for adopting standards, i.e. export versus domestic consumption
- From a governance perspective, top-down versus demand-led

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-2-pm-hnguyen-and-llapar-ilri>

PPT and audio:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XGdpiQLthzg&list=PLeqdWbb3KnJ91r_IDxSMZJh4MnRZdzBkU

Wednesday, November 20

Session One: Keynote Presentation

Policy Process Research Under Construction: India's Food Security Act

Devesh Roy, IFPRI; Danielle Resnick, Discussant

This presentation explored the agenda, decision and implementation phases of a policy process in relation to the Indian Food Security Act. To do this, Roy presented the dynamic political and social context in which the policy process is taking place, the need for time-sensitive research and the influential role of politics in the process. In addition, Roy articulated common constraints of western research on India, including: lack of common sense of the data or contextual understanding; and a disconnection between the research agent/institutional priorities and local research needs when determining research questions and methodologies.

The discussion, led by Danielle Resnick, centered on the following key areas:

- Further clarifying the policy process: agenda phase, decision phase, implementation phase
- Drawing on ODI research-policy linkages (Julius Court), there is need to:
 - Incorporate the political context (institutional relations, inter-ministerial, federal context, etc.)
 - Address the issue of the quality of evidence and nature of institutions presenting evidence (credibility, perceived quality, biases)
 - Identify links between advocacy coalitions and policy champions
 - Articulate how “noisy” is the discussion, with different groups vying to be heard?
 - Elaborate the following areas to show how research influences policy: 1) Timing 2) Nature of policy issue 3) Modality 4) Political will or administrative capacity

1) Timing: There is a ‘window of opportunity’, researchers must assess how big it is, and who opened it?

- Least scope for research to influence policy is during a crisis (short turnaround)
- Most scope in political cycle (more than just electoral cycle)
- Policy cycle: 5 year development plans gives longer time frame for credible, rigorous research, identify policy champions
- How much can window be closed by political actors, e.g. when GOI said they would implement bill through executive order, because government has staked its reputation on a policy

2) Nature of policy issue: difference between valiance and positional/programmatic goods:

- Valiance goods: things commonly accepted as ‘good’, rights-based, hard to debate, less sphere of influence
- Positional/programmatic goods: things that can be debated, e.g. carbon tax, where research has more scope for influence discussion, creates different array of interest groups, with different stake in the policy, each commissioning their own research

3) Modality of policy:

- Rolling something out, e.g. Progressa—pilot studies, scope for research to look at how to design it, see what effects it had
- Scaling something up: design features are more or less set through previous research; now research can focus on administrative constraints, accountability, who takes credit, politically contentious

4) Political will or administrative capacity:

- Do researchers need to be challenging larger ideological views (e.g. government preferences for state vs market, urban vs rural, large vs small farms)?
- What is the administrative capacity for long-term research?

The PowerPoint presentation of this session can be found here:

PPT: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-3-droy-ifpri>

PPT and audio: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UnSoVdI5fts&feature=youtu.be>

Session Two: Future Directions of Policy Process Research

- EMBRAPA Policy process work: Reflections on the workshop (Alcido Wander)
- IITA Policy Process work on aflatoxins: Reflections on the workshop (Francesca Nelson)
- Suresh Babu: Measurement of Policy Process—What Role for Indicators and Indices?

Discussion Highlights

This presentation session incorporated three different research projects and contexts brought a variety of issues together in a discussion building on the information and approaches shared in the previous two and a half days. Some key issues and questions included:

- Finding balance between universal rights-based approaches and feasibility (economic, capacity, political will) of implementing international standards locally
- Uneven geographic distribution of CG research in this field, why so little on Latin American countries?
- A desire to examine how CG centers are (or might) interact with national research institutes to build local research capacity
- Strategies for improving communication of results portfolio to governments, questions about how to induce demand for policy process research, leading to more funding
- Developing research designs that draw on 'Mode 1' and 'Mode 2' research
- How to determine and assess 'efficacy' of policy processes?
- Can an index identify problem areas or weak spots to be prioritized for capacity strengthening initiatives?
- Capacity strengthening angle: of whom and how? Government, civil society, media?
- How can you reduce the complexity to an index without losing the crucial elements?

The PowerPoint presentations from this session can be found here:

Wander: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/day-3-awander-embrapa>

Nelson: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-3-paca-iita-and-ifrp-paca-iita-and-ifpri>

Babu: <http://www.slideshare.net/Ag4HealthNutrition/ppwnov13-day-3-s-babu-ifpri>

2. Synthesis of working group ideas

Day One (November 18):

Working groups focusing on methods and frameworks for policy process analysis

Participants were split into four groups based on their sector of interest. These included agriculture, natural resource management, health and nutrition. Each group was given a set of reflective questions and asked to generate a list of ideas about what they deemed most important to relay back to colleagues about the frameworks and case studies discussed. Groups reported back on their discussions with key highlights:

Natural Resource Management Group

- Researchers should acknowledge and explore the political tensions and power dynamics between global and local policy processes.
- Policy and research require different types of evidence and levels of detail; studies should be designed appropriately.
- Both 'Mode 1' and 'Mode 2' research methods should be incorporated in policy process research designs. When using participatory action research designs and methods, tensions between local interests and needs with research and donor priorities need to be managed.
- In NRM specifically, policy interests cut across many ministries. Key policy issues that arise are management of common resources and property rights.

Agriculture Group

- Researchers must reflect critically on the utility and political feasibility of the policy research they undertake.
- Long-term engagement is needed to have an impact with policy research.
- Impact/influence pathways between policy research, engagement and outcomes need to be established.
- Evaluating impact of policy oriented research and engagement will need innovative approaches moving beyond traditional quantitative impact indicators.
- Mixed methods ('Mode 1' and 'Mode 2') are critical for inclusion in policy process research designs and must be employed with high standards of academic rigor.

Health Group

- A 'complexity' lens is needed to explore the multidimensional facets of implementing and adopting international standards for food safety in local contexts, including political, economic and capacity considerations.
- Trust is a critical component of effective and sustainable partnerships between researchers and policymakers.

Nutrition Group

- This group discussed the challenges of undertaking policy process research, engagement and evaluation and the need for a systematic and strategic approach.
- There is a need to assess the institutional capacity and foreseen challenges for policy engagement. These include donor priorities for engagement in policy processes, the classic mono-disciplinarity of CG staffing, current incentive system and the bias of performance metrics towards peer-reviewed publications.
- From a nutrition specific perspective, a key issue going forward is the question of how to engage in SUN process.
- Gaps to address going forward include: a need for increased political and social science capacity in the CG system; a consensus-building process for the CG system that would lead to a theory of change for policy change processes.
- Strategic directions for policy engagement, action areas and appropriate impact indicators could be developed through this process.
- There is great potential to take advantage of the decentralized structure of the CG system by reorienting approaches to support local or national learning programs in countries.
- If working as a CG consortium, we will need to be aware of a bias towards IFPRI and PIM language and experience, and to consciously engage with and include perspectives from other CG partners involved in the research programs of interest.

Day Two (November 19)

Participants split into four groups, were given a set of reflective questions and asked to compile a list of key recommendations for strategizing and evaluating policy engagement. Responses have been synthesized below:

Complexity theory: a comprehensive approach to research design, policy engagement and evaluation of strategic activities

- Complexity theory can be utilized to acknowledge uncertainty, multiple actors and factors involved in policy processes. It can enable us to trace theory and understanding and push for higher-level, 'outside the box' thinking.
- In following with complexity theoretical approaches, there is a need to be able to accept uncertainty and manage ambiguity at the boundaries between issues, disciplines and actors.

Long-term engagement and relationship building

- Effective policy engagement is driven by long-term local relationships built on trust, legitimacy, credibility and quality of research. Institutionally, this may involve the long-term placement of some researchers in the local context who can also provide institutional support and reputational credibility for short-term visiting researchers.
- The reputations of the researcher and the institution have considerable impact on the success of the 'engagement'.
- To effectively engage with and influence policy processes, researchers need to develop long-term and trusting relationships with 'boundary partners', who can enable negotiation of unfamiliar contextual environments, be they countries, policy arenas or issue areas. Establishing the credibility and reputation of these boundary partners is critical, and relationships should be carefully managed.

Strategic Policy Engagement

- Organizations should strategically plan their policy research and engagement. This includes articulating a clearly defined purpose, conceptual framework or theory of change, strategic action areas and intended areas of impact for their research and engagement. By undergoing such a planning process, organizations and individuals will be better positioned to assess the impacts of their actions.
- Teams need to articulate and address the strategic roles and responsibilities of policy ‘engagement’. Individuals will participate in ‘engagement’ activities differently depending on personal capacity, motivation and the institutional incentives for undertaking such activities. These roles and responsibilities should also be flexible and respond to the local policy context.
- Engaging in the policy sector is a complex and political endeavor. Researchers undertaking such activities are advised to think critically about the nature of the role they are choosing, the type of engagement and corresponding responsibilities, as well as the professional implications and trade-offs.
- Acknowledge that the IFPRI mandate is to understand the policy processes and provide options, not only to focus on advocacy.
- When engaging in advocacy, researchers can make good use of their ‘expert’ role on the particular issue, and advocate for certain policies by bringing new knowledge or evidence to the debate.
- Policy process mapping can provide a valuable public good for NGOs or CG groups that may not have policy-oriented personnel or resources to have a better idea of who they should coordinate with within the policy process for advocacy efforts. It can highlight disconnects between policy formulation and implementation between levels of government. A basic map can help donors and governments better understand and address capacity limitations of certain actors that are necessary to promote transparency, learning, and feedback within the policy process system.
- A need to move away from ‘evidence-based’ towards ‘evidence-informed’ policy as an engagement objective, recognizing the limits of research impact on policy and the strength of competing factors, such as politics.
- To address the many facets of agenda setting, systematic engagement strategies are needed that generate public knowledge and raise awareness through communication strategies, not just handing over ‘results’ to end-users. Researchers must also be aware of governmental and political agendas and take these into account in negotiating support for research priorities. Donor priorities also play an important role in agenda setting and should be included in an assessment of agenda setting in the policy process.
- Policy actors can be conceptualized as actors in a social network of institutional boundaries. The idea that ‘institutions are comprised of individuals’ – engagement strategies should be made with this in mind.

Evaluation of Research and Engagement

- Evaluate the impact of their efforts on policy processes by: setting institutional roles, accountability, and find ways to measure the impact. Use historical narratives and a set of learning pathways.
- In designing evaluation studies for policy oriented research and engagement, critical attention to the selection of impact indicators is needed.

- Comprehensive and critical approaches to evaluation are needed to assess the impact pathways of policy influence/engagement efforts. This will require a shift in standard measures and indicators of policy ‘impact’ towards those corresponding with theories of change that incorporate complexity.

Strategic Policy Research

- Create ‘demand and supply’-driven research. Respond to the needs and interests of country actors engaged with policy, demand and supply driven research, thereby increasing the relevance and applicability of research outputs to the needs of stakeholders.
- Researchers engaging in this work could connect with specific policy coordination mechanisms within the policy process system around key issues. An example of such coordination could be a platform by sector in each country including donors, relevant ministries, and key stakeholders around a given issue.
- Include policy options based on technical incentives and analytical products developed through deliberative and participatory processes. This ensures easy accountability from participants that can be evaluated.
- For policy process analysis researchers should acknowledge the inherent political nature of this research, and take measures to support an objective and critical analysis to the best of their ability.
- It is important to critically examine the motivations for policy process research, as they play important roles in shaping the research agenda. Impetus to produce research that has policy impact may limit the range of research undertaken, with a bias towards research on ‘success’ stories and an exclusion of ‘failed’ or unimplemented policies may be excluded. There is also potential for policy process research to be biased towards our ongoing work, which may reflect donor priorities.

Capacity Building

- Build sustainable capacities to influence uptake of research output. Researchers should move out of their comfort zone or pre-defined research areas and collaborate with other stakeholders beyond the traditional ministry of agriculture.
- To the extent possible, convincing donors to take a longer-term perspective of work on policy processes supports local capacity building of the policy analysis system. Such capacity building could generate more local buy-in for and ownership of evidence-based policy making, and increase the value of such policy research for local actors. In turn, this could contribute to building future demand for evidence-based policy analysis and generate more local dedication to sustaining the necessary data collection systems and local analytical capacity for such policy analysis. Building local capacity for policy analysis would help to improve the long term sustainability of the policy analysis system in the country, leading to more-informed policy decisions over time.
- Effective communication strategies for policy actors must also address their capacity and knowledge gaps for utilizing research results.

3. Evaluation Synthesis

The participants of this workshop were comprised of diverse professional and academic backgrounds with a range of experiences related to the thematic foci. In the area of analyzing policy processes, participants noted experience in: assessing and understanding policy 'actors'. This included the capacity and roles of 'actors' in policy process, along with strategies for how to engage with them. Other participants came with experience in developing frameworks for governance analysis; national implementation of international treaties; and studying the political economy of policy choice. Participants were aware of the complex nature of policy process research and required a multidisciplinary approach.

Workshop participants brought a variety of policy engagement experiences to the meeting. Many noted that although they had been part of 'engagement' or 'influence' in different capacities and settings, they wanted to learn more specific strategies for effective engagement and methods to assess the impacts of their strategies.

Participants had a diversity of experiences in evaluating the impacts of their policy oriented research and/or engagement strategies, including assessing and measuring the contribution of research to policy formation and implementation in different contexts and levels of analysis. The need for a long-term view and commitment to embedding evaluation within policy-oriented research and engagement strategies was also emphasized and elaborated on during the workshop. In addition, participants came to the workshop with experience in operational research programs including, but not exclusive to: agriculture, microfinance, trade, health and economics fields.

Workshop participants arrived with diverse learning needs and goals. They were largely interested in strengthening their knowledge of research approaches and methods for analyzing, engaging in and assessing impact on policy processes. The specific interests ranged from conceptual frameworks for overall analysis to suggested indicators for measuring impact. As demonstrated in the 'further learning needs' articulated at the end of the workshop, there is a need for an overarching guide for researchers to draw upon at various stages of their work. Participants also attended the workshop with intentions to share, compare experiences, and learn from one another. They hoped to build networks and partnerships to continue conducting research in the field. Participants also expressed interest in strengthening their understanding of the CG portfolio in this area, as well as to identify research gaps they could potentially fill. Whilst some arrived with open ended and/or knowledge-based expectations, others hoped to walk away with a more consolidated agreement on tangible outputs to be created by the group going forward.

A brief evaluative questionnaire was distributed at the close of the workshop to assess participant learning and experience. Using a Likert scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree and moving towards 5 = strongly agree, the response averages are presented below:

Question	Average
1. Strengthened my understanding of policy processes	4.2/5
2. Strengthened my understanding of how to use research evidence to influence/engage with policy processes	3.6/5

3. Strengthened my understanding of how to evaluate the contribution of research to policy formulation and implementation	3.8/5
4. Promoted discussion and collaborative learning amongst participants	4.7
5. Enabled me to reflect on how I will move forward with research, engagement and evaluation of policy processes in my own work	4.2
6. Strengthened my relationships with others working in this field.	4.5

Participants reported an array of learning outcomes, including: increased knowledge of conceptual frameworks, research methods and approaches for analyzing, engaging in and measuring impact of policy oriented research; strategies and implications of doing mixed methods research; the complex nature of policy change processes and the correspondingly comprehensive research frameworks needed to understand these issues; and strategies for moving evaluation beyond a traditionally narrowly focused linear and indicator-based process towards a more comprehensive and ‘determinants of impact’ approach. Participants also reported that the workshop enabled them to identify potential research opportunities in their own portfolios for future research and that the case studies and examples presented enhanced their learning experiences.

4. Additional learning needs, workshop reflections and ways forward

This section brings together participant input from the workshop evaluation forms (‘future learning needs’ and ‘suggested ways forward’) with the final plenary discussion on Wednesday, November 20th “Reflections, Knowledge Gaps, Priorities, Next Steps and Close”.

Key conclusions reported by participants

- High quality policy process and policy oriented research matters.
- There is a real need to understand how to support better policy.
 - Policy research can be done to increase the effectiveness of investments and address multiple goals, such as reducing poverty, including stakeholders, understanding value chains, and mobilizing private investment
- The space between research and advocacy is not a dichotomy, but rather a continuum between research and advocacy.
- Working with capacity takes time. Partnerships and involvement of other sectors is important.
- Establishing long-term relationships with credible boundary partners is critical to taking research into advocacy.
- A ‘complexity’ lens to understanding and engaging with policy processes is needed to undertake policy process research, engagement and evaluation.

Additional learning needs to be met:

Participants recognize the need for and would support efforts to continue building their capacity for research, engagement in and evaluation of policy processes. The proposed toolkit, follow-up workshops and community of practice would all contribute to increasing the capacity of CRP researchers to more effectively engage with policy processes. The follow is a summary of suggested areas for capacity development of workshop participants and colleagues in the field.

- Support for CRP center strategic needs assessment and planning for policy research, engagement and evaluation, particularly when approaching research questions with a 'complexity lens'. Centers will need to take into account:
 - Organizational structure
 - Human resource capacity
 - Identifying policy engagement needs
 - Roles to be met within the organization and those met by partners
 - Building long-term partnerships and relationships
 - Learning from country support strategy programs
- Lack of capacity in CGIAR in politics, political scientists, politics of policy processes. Recruit new ones, and think about partnerships and collaborations
- Need for capacity building of Southern research partners for policy oriented research, engagement and evaluation.
- Critical assessment and planning for an incentive system for researchers that incorporates policy engagement outcomes/outputs.
- Focused capacity building in evaluation of policy oriented research and engagement strategies

Suggestions for going forward

1) Create a Toolbox of Research Methods and Tools

As researchers and practitioners in this field, it was suggested that we could take the lead on producing guidance documents, which could be structured in a number of ways, including as a decision tree for choosing the appropriate analytical framework, study design and methods for each context and issue under study. Participants articulated a need to include standards for rigor, particularly when using qualitative methods, as quantitative research approaches dominate most CG centers. The suggestion was made to include more qualitative and 'complexity'-focused researchers as part of research teams from inception onwards. The proposed toolbox or 'guide' could provide specialized recommendations and resources in each of the three capacity domains:

- **Research methods and tools for policy process analysis, specific need for capacity strengthening in qualitative research skills**
 - Policy process analysis: role of research within policy processes
- **Research methods and tools for engaging in policy process**
 - Tools for participatory action research in policy engagement
 - Strategies for how to increase understanding of the private sector
- **Research methods and tools for evaluating engagement/influence of the policy process**
 - Strategic planning for evaluation
 - Examples of monitoring and evaluation of engagement
 - How to use and apply 'Mode 2' tools to evaluate policy processes

General guidance in the following areas could also be included:

- Participatory action research: how to link research, engagement, evaluation
- Learning to improve rigor to withstand external criticism
- Guidance for donors (e.g. IFAD, USAID)

2) Take the learning and new networks forward

- **Form a community of practice (COP)**
 - A strengthened and focused community of practice could be formed with CG staff members, partners and/or other interested actors in order to further collaborate on research and continue strengthening learning in the policy research areas. Suggested forms for this network include a combination of the following: a virtual network, a series on follow-up workshops, and/or structure like the CAPRI network. The COP could focus on policy process analysis, engagement, and evaluation to support CRPs, with dedicated funding from PIM.
- **Hold a follow-up workshop**
 - Participants indicated strong support for follow-up workshops on methods, applications and conceptual frameworks for policy process research, engagement and policy impact evaluation. These workshops could be in person or as a series of online consultations and focused seminars.
- **Establish an inter-CG policy task force**
 - This task force could be a resource guide to researchers for effective policy research, engagement and evaluation.
- **Collaborate within this growing COP to conduct and publish lessons on policy oriented research, engagement and evaluation**
 - Workshop participants proposed a number of tangible projects to be produced, either individually or as a group. These included a: working paper series; webinar or seminar series; synthesis of research approaches and methods; a website with the presentations and resources from this workshop; space to share documents for non-IFPRI based colleagues; a virtual interaction platform among participants; and blog posts

3) Engage stakeholders, donors, management and research partners in strategic planning for policy oriented research, engagement and evaluation

Individual researchers conducting policy oriented research and engagement face difficult professional implications in the traditional academic environment. Participants articulated a disconnect between the time and human resource capacity needed effective engagement in the policy process and the traditional indicators of success by which researchers are evaluated, both within their home institutions and the field of work. Participants suggested that if CRPs move forward in undertaking more policy-oriented research, engagement and evaluation, they could become leaders in the development of frameworks and methods that move beyond traditional short term policy 'impact' indicators, both institutionally and individually. Such a move would require managerial support and a reconceptualization of the metrics by which researchers are assessed, as well as timelines and indicators of measurable policy impacts.

4) Develop new areas of policy oriented research, engagement and evaluation in the agriculture, nutrition and health sectors

Directions for future research were also articulated by participants, including: further study on the pathways of influence between policy research, engagement and evaluation; the practices and implications of IFPRI engagement with national research institutions; applications of policy process research outside of academia; and the need to engage donors throughout the process of developing new indicators of policy impact, so as to include their perspectives and generate support. Participants emphasized that an important preliminary step in moving

forward with any research agenda within the CRP/CG network will be to conduct a through consultation of policy-engaged researchers and CRP stakeholders in order to set research priorities, strategic directions and propose areas of intended impact of the research.

5. Appendices

a. Appendix 1: Agenda

Monday November 18	
9-9:15	Welcome and introduction: Karen Brooks and Stuart Gillespie
9:15-10:15	Keynote Presentation David Pelletier, Cornell University: "Nutrition Policy Processes"
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-11:30	Keynote Presentation John Thompson, Future Agricultures Consortium and Institute of Development Studies, UK: "Analyzing and Understanding Agricultural Policy Processes in Africa"
11:30-12:00	Workshop background and process (Nancy Johnson)
12:00-1:00	Lunch
1:00-2:00	CRP Studies: Methods Chair: Danielle Resnick Purnima Menon, IFPRI-New Delhi: "Enabling Policy Environments for Infant and Young child feeding and nutrition: the roles of actors, networks, narratives, and data," Christian Henning, University of Kiel and Jonathan Mockshell, University of Hohenheim: "Understanding the policy process and landscape through discourse and network analysis: qualitative and quantitative approaches"
2:00-3:00	CRP Studies: Scalar elements of policy process (International-local) and bottom up approaches Chair: Katrina Kosec Gea Galluzzi, Bioversity and Aseffa Wedajoo, University of Illinois-Chicago: "Policy Network Analysis to support national implementation of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture" Blake Ratner, WorldFish and Elias Madzudzo, WorldFish: "Participatory action research to influence land tenure policy and access to the commons in the Barotse floodplain, Zambia"
3:00-3:30	Break
3:30-5:30	Working groups focusing on methods and frameworks for analysis
5:30 – 7:00	Reception

Tuesday November 19	
9:00-9:15	Highlights from Day 1 and speaker introductions: John McDermott and Ruth Meinzen-Dick
9:15-10:15	Keynote Presentation Ed Heinemann, IFAD: "IFAD's experience and emerging approach for engaging in national policy processes"
10:15-10:30	Break

10:30-11:30	Keynote Presentation Sanjeev Sridharan, University of Toronto: “Research and evaluation in global health policy processes”
11:30-12:30	CRP studies: Engaging actors in the policy process Chair: Nuzhat Ahmad “Agricultural policy processes and the youth in Southern Africa – the case of Malawi,” Mariam Mapila, IFPRI-Malawi “Colombian Agricultural Supply Chain Organizations: How Public Policy Shapes Agriculture and how value chain actors shape policy,” Rafael Parra-Pena, CIAT
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-2:30	CRP studies: Focus on engaging different/non-traditional stakeholders and cross-sectoral collaboration Chair: Phil Dobie Tewodaj Mogues and Lucy Billings, IFPRI: “Drivers of Public Investment in Nutrition—Mozambique” Hung Nguyen, Hanoi School of Public Health and Lucy Lapar, ILRI: “Supporting agriculture and public health ministries to implement a national food safety policy based on risk-based approaches”
2:30-3:00	Report back from Day 1 working groups
3:00-3:30	Break
3:30-5:30	Working groups on methods for engaging in policy processes and evaluating impacts of policy influence

Wednesday November 20	
9-9:15	Report back from Day 2 working groups and planning to finalize workshop outputs
9:15-10:30	Policy Process Research Under Construction: How to Evaluate the Influence of Research on Policy Chair: Mywish Maredia Devesh Roy, “Research influences in India’s Food Security Bill” Danielle Resnick, Discussant
10:30-11:00	Break
11:00-12:00	Future Directions of Policy Process Research Chair: James Garrett Alcido Wander: “EMBRAPA Policy process work: Reflections on the workshop” Francesca Nelson: “IITA Policy Process work on aflatoxins: Reflections on the workshop” Suresh Babu, IFPRI: “Measurement of Policy Process—What Role for Indicators and Indices?” Discussion
12:00-1:00	Reflections, Knowledge gaps, Priorities, Next steps and Close

6.2 Appendix 2: List of Participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Workshop on Approaches and Methods for Policy Process Research

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
AHMAD	Nuzhat	International Food Policy Research Institute
ASARE-MARFO	Dorene	International Food Policy Research Institute
BABU	Suresh	International Food Policy Research Institute
BENSON	Todd	International Food Policy Research Institute
BERNIER	Quinn	International Food Policy Research Institute
BILLINGS	Lucy	International Food Policy Research Institute
BLOCK	Charlotte	International Food Policy Research Institute
BROOKS	Karen	International Food Policy Research Institute
CHARETTE	Dan	Development Alternatives Inc.
COMSTOCK	Andrew	International Food Policy Research Institute
DOBIE	Philip	World Agroforestry Centre
DOMENECH	Laia	International Food Policy Research Institute
GALLUZZI	Gea	Bioversity International
GARRETT	James	International Food Policy Research Institute
GAUTAM	Yoshina	International Food Policy Research Institute
GELLI	Aulo	Bioversity International
GILLESPIE	Stuart	International Food Policy Research Institute
GUVVENARA	Lokesh Basanna	University of Agricultural Sciences, Karnataka
HAGERMAN	Katharine	Institute of Development Studies-Sussex
HEINEMANN	Ed	International Fund for Agricultural Development
HENNING	Christian	University of Kiel
JOHNSON	Nancy	International Food Policy Research Institute
KIERAN	Caitlin	International Food Policy Research Institute
KIM	Sunny	International Food Policy Research Institute
KOSEC	Katrina	International Food Policy Research Institute
LAPAR	Lucy	International Livestock Research Institute
LUNDY	Mark	International Center for Tropical Agriculture
MABISO	Athur	International Food Policy Research Institute
MADZUDZO	Elias	WorldFish Center
MAPILA	Mariam	International Food Policy Research Institute
MAREDIS	Mywish	Michigan State University
MATHER	David	Michigan State University

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
McDERMOTT	John	International Food Policy Research Institute
MEINZEN-DICK	Ruth	International Food Policy Research Institute
MENON	Purnima	International Food Policy Research Institute
MOCKSHELL	Jonathan	University of Hohenheim
MOGUES	Tewodaj	International Food Policy Research Institute
MWANGI	Dena	International Food Policy Research Institute
NELSON	Francesca	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
NGUYEN	Hung	Hanoi School of Public Health
OGWAL	Richard	Bioversity International
PANDYA-LORCH	Rajul	International Food Policy Research Institute
PARRA-PENA	Rafael	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
PELLETIER	David	Cornell University
PEREIRA	Betsy	International Food Policy Research Institute
PRADHAN	Mamata	International Food Policy Research Institute
RATNER	Blake	WorldFish Center
RESNICK	Daniele	International Food Policy Research Institute
RESNICK	Danielle	International Food Policy Research Institute
RICKERT	Pilar	International Food Policy Research Institute
ROY	Devesh	International Food Policy Research Institute
RUEL	Marie	International Food Policy Research Institute
SABBAGH	Pascale	International Food Policy Research Institute
SALTZMAN	Amy	International Food Policy Research Institute
SENGUPTA	Debdatta	International Food Policy Research Institute
SPIELMAN	David	International Food Policy Research Institute
SRIDHARAN	Sanjeev	University of Toronto
TARDIF-DOUGLIN	David	Development Alternatives Inc.
TENORIO	Maria Theresa	International Food Policy Research Institute
THOMPSON	John	Future Agricultures Consortium and Institute of Development Studies, UK
WANDER	Alcido	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation)
WEDAJOO	Aseffa	University of Illinois-Chicago
WYATT	Amanda	International Food Policy Research Institute
YOSEF	Sivan	International Food Policy Research Institute

6.3 Evaluation Questionnaire

Workshop on Approaches and Methods for Policy Process Research
Sponsored by the CGIAR Research Programs on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM) and
Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)

IFPRI-Washington DC
November 18-20, 2013

Thank you for participating in this workshop. We would appreciate your feedback as it will help us assess the impact of and gain valuable lessons from the activity. Please take a moment to complete this questionnaire and return it at the break.

1. Please describe your role and experience in relation to the three workshop areas of: Analyzing policy processes; Using research evidence to influence/engage with policy processes; and Evaluating the contribution of research to policy formulation and implementation:
2. What were you hoping to gain or learn by participating in this workshop?

Where:

[1] Strongly disagree ☐ [2] Disagree ☐ [3] Not sure ☐ [4] Agree ☐ [5] Strongly agree ☐

This workshop:

1. Strengthened my understanding of policy processes.
2. Strengthened my understanding of how to use research evidence to influence/engage with policy processes
3. Strengthened my understanding of how to evaluate the contribution of research to policy formulation and implementation
4. Promoted discussion and collaborative learning amongst participants.
5. Enabled me to reflect on how I will move forward with research, engagement and evaluation of policy processes in my own work.
6. Strengthened my relationships with others working in this field.
7. What were your key learning moments or insights from this workshop?
8. What additional learning needs do you still have in these policy research areas?
9. What suggestions do you have about how to take the learning and networks from this workshop forward?
10. Please share any other comments, questions or concerns about this workshop and your learning needs related to the topic.

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

6.4 Working Group Guides

Nov 18, 2013

Working Group: Methods and Frameworks for Analysis

Objective

As a group, please discuss the following questions. Please take time to have each group member share a short response to each question:

- What key words, pictures, ideas, or other things stand out to you from the presentations and discussions today/or from any of the references and papers sent to you about frameworks and methods for analyzing policy processes?

Reflective

- What was exciting or interesting to you?
- What was challenging, complex or unclear?

Interpretive

- Which frameworks or methods are familiar to you, which are new?
- What was missing in terms of relating to your previous experience?
- What have you learnt about policy process research?

As part of this workshop, we are designing a toolkit for analyzing policy processes that will be used as a 'guide' for researchers working in the nutrition, agriculture and health sectors. The 'guide' is intended to be used as a starting point for researchers embarking on policy process research, and will outline key approaches, frameworks and methods for analyzing policy processes.

Today we have reviewed many different frameworks and methods for analyzing policy processes. You have also received an annotated bibliography outlining some of these frameworks, policy process models and methods for conducting this research. In your group, you also have a wealth of experience and knowledge on this topic and we invite you to draw on that in this discussion.

Next steps: Imagine that you are part of a research team that is just beginning to do policy process research. The team wants to start doing policy process research so that you can strategically orient and engage your research in policy-making and implementing processes. Your team needs to learn how to make their policy-oriented research more effective and have sent you to this workshop to learn about frameworks and methods for analyzing policy processes. For the purpose of this discussion, please choose a:

- Sector
- Policy issue of interest
- Discipline of research study
- Level of policy analysis

Based on today's sessions focusing on frameworks and methods for **analyzing policy processes**,

- If your team at home wants to begin researching policy processes what social, political, economic and/or other factors need to be considered in designing their research study? (Taking into consideration the variety of contexts and issues in which this research takes place)
 - o I.e. what social processes need to be analyzed?
- Which frameworks or models for policy process could they draw upon to explore these different factors?
- What kinds of study design, methods and/or specific research tools can be used to analyze policy process?
 - o How are study designs shaped by the context, resources, disciplinary backgrounds, and/or institutional affiliations of those designing and conducting the research?
 - o What other factors at the individual level, such as characteristics such as ethnicity, gender, nationality, age, ideological views etc. shape the research design as well?
- Where do you think you (and/or your team at home) need to learn more about this process? (Policy change models, policy analysis frameworks and/or methods?)

5:15-5:30 Summary and reflection on the working group session

Please take 10-15 minutes at the end of this session to reflect on your process as a group.

- What are the key ideas that you discussed in this session?
- What was exciting or interesting to you?
- Where did you get stuck, what were the low points?
- What were your 'aha' or learning moments?
- Today we have focused on analyzing policy processes, with the intention to engage with or influence the policy process itself. From your participation in today's sessions, what new ideas do you have about a strategy for how or where to engage in policy processes? We will focus on this tomorrow.

Working Group Session Nov 19

Strategies and Methods for Engaging in Policy Processes and Evaluating the Impacts of Policy Influence

Objective

- What key words, pictures, ideas, or other things stand out to you from the keynote and case study presentations today?

Reflective

- What was exciting or interesting to you?
- What was challenging, complex or unclear?

Interpretive

- How did the presentations and discussions connect to your past experiences or current work?
- What was missing?
- For you as a researcher, what does it mean to engage in or influence policy processes?
- What challenges to researchers face to engaging in policy processes? How could these challenges be addressed?

Decisional

Please create a list of key things for researchers engaging in policy processes to consider. For example, it would become a 'how-to' guide for researchers to work with when engaging in policy processes.

Here are some ideas that you could include in your discussion. You don't need to answer all of these questions, they are simply suggestions. Please also add any other factors you think are relevant:

- How would you define 'pathways of influence' for researcher 'engagement' in policy processes?
- How would you define and measure the 'impacts' of policy engagement strategies? (What kinds of evaluation are needed?)
- What are the roles of ethics and values at individual, organizational (and other) levels when engaging with research in policy processes?
- How do ethics and values shape the theory of change you choose to inform your strategy for engagement?
- What do you need to think about when choosing your 'role' as a researcher engaging in policy processes?
- What capacities, resources, time etc. do you have available for engagement?