**EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATIONS TO END CHILDHOOD HUNGER (EDECH)**

**TYPES OF RESPONDENTS FOR STAFF INTERVIEWS**

Respondent types will vary across sites because of variation in the interventions. For example, we will want to interview staff at the food bank that is involved in project implementation for the Chickasaw Nation demonstration project, and the School Foodservice Authorities (SFAs) involved with the Virginia, Chickasaw Nation and Navajo Nation demonstration projects, but interviews with these respondent types will likely not be relevant for other sites. There will be some common types of respondents across sites and some project-specific types of respondents, as listed below.

A. Common Respondent Types

* Demonstration project director/administrator
* Individual responsible for demonstration project financial management (if different from project director/administrator)
* Day-to-day project director and/or manager (if different from project director) responsible for supervising project implementation
* Individual managing any system technology (e.g. changes to automated SNAP benefit determination process, changes to SNAP EBT, online (or paper-based) food delivery orders, establishment of summer EBT cards)
* Individual managing demonstration outreach/enlistment/recruitment
* Individuals conducting demonstration outreach/enlistment/recruitment
* Individual supervising/conducting demonstration services (such as nutrition education, case management, or food access coordination)

B. Potential Demonstration Project-Specific Respondent Types:

* State SNAP director/manager (if different from list of respondents above)
* ITO Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) director/manager
* SNAP eligibility and benefit determination staff and supervisors at local SNAP offices participating in demonstration
* Demonstration staff responsible for working with schools and communities to enlist schools to implement or expand School Breakfast Program, School Lunch Program, and CACFP At-Risk Afterschool meals program
* State/ITO and regional/local SFA administrators
* School principals
* State/ITO Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) administrators
* Administrators at local sites where SFSP is implemented
* State CACFP program administrator
* On-site supervisor at locations where afterschool meal program is implemented
* Individual managing direct food packages distribution
* Individual responsible for liaison with food vendors
* Project liaison from State/ITO Division of Health
* Food bank director/manager (e.g. Feed the Children in Chickasaw Nation demonstration project)
* Staff in other partner organizations involved in project implementation (e.g. community health center, extension service)

**STAFF INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDE**

The topic areas for the site visit interviews are presented below by domain, with three sections to indicate the timing for addressing each domain (during the site visit that will take place before implementation or during the site visits that will take place during project operations). Specific interview guides for the site visits will be tailored to reflect the unique aspects of each demonstration project.

Each topic area is not applicable to all respondents. For example, development of partnership agreements, project design, and project management will be the focus of the discussion with project managers, while client recruitment and service delivery will be the focus of discussions with staff who interact directly with the target population.

## I. SITE VISIT NEAR END OF PLANNING STAGE AND PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION

A. Background on Respondent/Organization

1. History and mission of organization
2. Respondent’s role in and tenure at organization
3. Organization’s role in designing and implementing demonstration
4. How demonstration project fits in within the structure and goals of the respondent’s organization
5. Respondent’s role in designing and implementing demonstration
6. Organization/respondent experience in other childhood food security related efforts
7. Organization/respondent experience working with other organizations partnering in the demonstration

Reasons why State/ITO applied for the demonstration project

B. Community Context

1. (To supplement quantitative data collected prior to site visit) Perceptions on local prevalence of food insecurity and/or related indicators of need(e.g. availability and use of emergency food assistance among households with children)

2. Information on local risk factors for food insecurity

3. (To supplement quantitative data collected prior to site visit) Perceptions on participation rates of eligible children/schools/communities in available food assistance programs for children and households with children prior to demonstration implementation (e.g. SNAP, Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, School Meals Programs, Summer Food Service Program, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and other public food assistance programs if relevant)

4. Availability of supplemental services (e.g. outreach, nutrition education, case management services, feeding programs, health/medical care) to demonstration project target population

5. Environmental factors (economy, political climate, access to food/supermarkets, urbanicity) impacting local food security

C. Planned Project Design and Logic Model

1. Target population

* Demographic characteristics of the target population
* Eligibility criteria
* Participant identification/recruitment/outreach/engagement
* Enrollment targets
* Engagement/participation targets

2. Nature, distribution, and anticipated dosage of benefits and services

3. Project logic model

* Planned inputs
* Planned outputs
* Expected outcomes/impacts (short-, medium-and long-term)

4. Organizational roles and staffing structure

D. Implementation Plan and Planning Process

1. Roles of organizations and individuals in the planning process

2. Nature and frequency of stakeholder communication during planning process

3. Timeline for/milestones in planning process

4. Information technology changes required, implementation process, and related challenges

5. Policy changes required (including waivers), implementation process, and related challenges

6. Staffing and organizational changes required, implementation process, and related challenges

* Reorganization of existing mangers/staff
* Hiring managers/staff and qualifications sought
* Additional space/facilities/equipment required

7. Staff training provided and anticipated

8. Development of relationships and contracts/agreements among partnering organizations

1. Development/identification of project materials and language/cultural adaptations
2. Plans for quality control/performance monitoring
3. Development, structure, and contents of project MIS to track participation/service provision
4. Other processes involved in planning and implementation
5. Factors facilitating project planning

Factors impeding project planning process and how addressed

## II. SITE VISITS DURING PROJECT OPERATIONS

## A. Background on Respondent/Organization

[*We will not collect these data for respondents who were interviewed during the site visit prior to implementation; rather we will ask them about changes in their role or their organization’s role in implementing the demonstration.*]

1. History and mission of organization

2. Respondent’s role in and tenure at organization

3. Organization’s role in designing and implementing demonstration

4. How demonstration project fits in within the structure and goals of the respondent’s organization

5. Respondent’s role in designing and implementing demonstration

6. Organization/respondent experience in other childhood food security related efforts

7. Organization/respondent experience working with other organizations partnering in the demonstration

B. Partnerships

1. Project organization, roles, and responsibilities and reasons for any changes from project design

2. Changes, if any, in partner agreements and reasons for those changes

3. Nature of and processes for communication between partners

4. Perceived strengths and challenges in partnership relationships and how challenges have been addressed

C. Leadership/Management

1. Decision-making hierarchy and process

2. Methods used for communication and coordination across all involved organizations

3. Reporting expectations/processes between organizations and individuals

4. Reporting expectations/processes between project and FNS

D. Staffing and Supervisory Model

1. Number, organizational affiliation, and roles of staff involved in the demonstration and reasons for any changes from program design

2. Education, experience, background and characteristics of staff involved in the demonstration

3. Responsibilities and expectations for each staff role

4. Staff supervision (including methods, frequency, format, and focus)

5. Staff turnover (including extent, reasons, responses, and implications for project operations)

E. Training/Technical Assistance

1. Initial and in-service training provided for staff involved in the demonstration (including frequency, content, length and format of training, and affiliation and qualifications of the individuals providing the training)

2. Technical assistance or other guidance available to staff involved in the demonstration from project leadership, supervisors, or other entities to support fidelity and consistency of project implementation

3. Extent to which project staff have accessed available training, TA and resources

4. Perceived helpfulness of training, TA, and other supports, and recommendations for improvement

5. Barriers that have impeded delivery of consistent services across project staff and how managers and staff have tried to address these barriers

6. Staff “buy-in” to the demonstration project’s logic model

F. Implementation Quality Assurance

1. How project leaders define high quality project implementation

2. Efforts to monitor quality of implementation (including content of what is monitored, methods, frequency, staff involved, and how information is used for quality improvement)

G. Participant Recruitment/Enrollment/Engagement

1. Participant identification; recruitment; enrollment; engagement process; and reasons for any changes from project design

2. Tools, materials, resources used in identification; recruitment; enrollment; engagement

3. Process for obtaining informed consent (and if applicable, conducting random assignment)

4. Perceptions of what works well, challenges faced, and how challenges were overcome in participant identification; recruitment; enrollment; engagement

H. Service Delivery

1. Nature and distribution of project benefits/services (what, how, when, where, how much, how often) and reasons for any changes from project design

2. Tools, materials, resources used in benefit/service delivery

3. Communication between project staff and participants during benefit/service delivery process

4. Process for tracking benefits/services provided

5. Perceptions of what works well, challenges faced, and how challenges were overcome in service delivery

I. Factors Influencing Project Operations

1. Other factors facilitating project operations

2. Other challenges encountered during project operations and how addressed

3. Factors affecting uptake of available benefits and services by eligible children/households

4. Other factors in project operations that may explain process outcomes and household/child impacts

5. Technology and/or data system challenges encountered and how addressed.

6. Environmental factors that may explain observed results

J. Performance Monitoring and Project Outcomes

1. Processes and indicators used to monitor project outcomes

* Use of management information system (MIS)
* Development and use of project management reports

2. Enrollment outcomes

3. Engagement/participation outcomes

4. Measures of and progress toward project objectives/goals

5. Unanticipated outcomes at the participant, organization, staff, and community levels

K. Lessons Learned for Project Sustainability and Replicability

1. Respondents’ views on project successes and limitations

2. Respondents’ views on factors that contributed most to successes

3. Respondents’ recommendations for changes that could improve future implementation and impacts of the project model

4. Respondents’ recommendations to support sustainability and replicability of this or similar project models