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Introduction

Since 2010, Keystone has been conducting benchmark surveys of partners of international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). 80 INGOs have since taken part in these surveys. 18 INGOs have repeated the process.

In the survey, partners are asked to rate and comment on different aspects of an INGO’s performance. The surveys are conducted confidentially, with Keystone guaranteeing as an independent third party that respondents’ identities will not be revealed to the INGO.

In 2016, Vitamin Angels took part in this process. This report presents what the partners of Vitamin Angels said about the INGO compared to benchmarks reflecting partner ratings from the 80 INGOs in our data set. It provides credible data on how well Vitamin Angels carries out its role in the partnership, as seen from the partner perspective.

● **Annex 1** is the questionnaire that was used for the survey.

● **Annex 2** includes the raw quantitative data as well as all the responses given to the open-ended questions of the survey. These have been edited to protect the anonymity of respondents.

● **Annex 3** contains a list of Vitamin Angels’ partners that have expressed their willingness to take part in follow-up interviews, which Vitamin Angels can conduct should they wish. 80% of respondents expressed an interest in seeing the results from the survey.

● **Annex 4** is a short outline of how Keystone can assist Vitamin Angels to introduce more regular partner feedback into its management systems to complement these larger periodic surveys.

● **Annex 5** is additional analysis tables as requested by Vitamin Angels

Survey process

The survey process was managed by Keystone Accountability. The questionnaire was administered to Vitamin Angels’ partners in English, French, Indonesian, Kreyol, Spanish and Tagalog, from November 21, 2016 to January 31, 2017. Regular reminders were sent to encourage a high response rate.

The questionnaire was administered via an online survey form. It was distributed by Keystone directly to partners by email. Partners completed it on-line but had the option to complete it off-line if necessary. The survey was limited to partners who had a basic level of Internet access. From experience, we do not believe that this makes the data significantly less representative.

Keystone emphasised to partners that their participation was voluntary and anonymous.
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**Benchmarks and Indexes**
Throughout the report, Vitamin Angels’ results are compared to the 80 northern INGOs listed below.

- ACTEC
- AGIR
- ASF-Belgium
- BC
- Blagrave Trust
- CAFOD
- CARE UK
- CARE USA
- Caritas Belgium
- Caritas Luxembourg
- Catholic Relief Services
- CBM
- ChildFund International
- Christian Aid
- Church World Service
- Concern
- Cordaid
- DCA
- DISOP
- Ecosystems Alliance
- Entraide et Fraternité
- Free a Girl
- Free Press Unlimited
- Handicap International Belgium
- Helen Keller International
- Helvetas
- Hivos
- IBIS
- ICCO
- ICS
- IDS/MK4D programme
- IKV Pax Christi
- International Alert
- International Rescue Committee
- International Service
- Kinderpostzegels
- Kvinna till Kvinna
- Liliane Fonds/Strategic Partner, National Coordination Team
- Lutheran World Relief
- Mennonite Central Committee
- Mensen met een Missie
- Mercy Corps US
- Methodist Relief and Development Fund
- Minority Rights Group
- Netherlands Institute for Multipart Democracy
- Oxfam Canada
- Oxfam (confederation)
- Oxfam Novib
- Peace Direct
- Plan International
- Practical Action
- Progressio UK
- Red een Kind
- RFSU
- Rutgers WPF
- Save the Children International
- Save the Children UK
- Save the Children US
- Schorer
- Self Help Africa
- Simavi
- Skillshare
- Solidarité Socialiste
- SOS Faim
- SPARK
- Tear Netherlands
- Tearfund
- Tearfund ELAC
- Terre des Hommes Netherlands
- Trias
- Trocaire
- UM COR US
- VECO
- Vitamin Angels
- VSF-Belgium
- V.S.O. International
- WaterAid
- Wereldkinderen
- Woordendaad
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The INGOs in the global cohort operate in different ways and places, providing a variety of support including funding, training, moral support, joint advocacy and volunteers. While the agencies have different goals and structures, they all share a common purpose and operating model: they aim to tackle poverty, injustice and suffering in developing countries by working in partnership with organisations. This commonality provides the basis for useful comparisons through benchmarks. The benchmarks enable international development organisations to understand their partner ratings in relation to how partners rate other INGOs and see what kind of performance ratings are possible. However, the data needs to be interpreted with care, in light of Vitamin Angels’ specific context, goals and activities. It is unlikely that any organisation would be ‘best in class’ across all performance areas.

The majority of benchmarks (unless otherwise mentioned) are calculated as the average ratings of the 80 INGOs in the global cohort, not the average of all survey respondents. This reduces the chance that data is skewed by larger INGOs with larger respondent numbers. No benchmarks are available for some of Vitamin Angels’ unique questions.

The performance summary (Figure 3) consists of four performance indexes. Each index was calculated by combining the results from 4 - 10 specific questions in the survey. Most indexes correspond to one of the sections of the report. Where questions from one section are more relevant to another index they have been included there to increase accuracy.

Respondents

Table 1 Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vitamin Angels (Active)</th>
<th>Vitamin Angels (Current)</th>
<th>Vitamin Angels Total (Active + Current)</th>
<th>Vitamin Angels (Lapsed)</th>
<th>Global Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of partners invited to respond</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>16,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses received</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table above show the total number of complete and partial responses. Some respondents did not answer all questions. The response rate varies between questions. 477 responses were received in English, 12 in French, 11 in Spanish, 5 in Indonesian, and 1 in Kreyol. The data presented in this report is only for current respondents (field partners who received a grant this year) and active respondents (field partners who received a grant last year). Lapsed respondents (field partners who received a grant 2 years ago) are included in the text where relevant. A separate section on inactive respondents is included below (Section 8).

The response rate for active and current respondents is about 40%. A response rate of 40% is below the global cohort average, however, we believe that this still gives an accurate representation for learning purposes. Organisations who send the survey to more than 1,000 partners often have slightly lower response rates.
For those partners that responded to the survey, the following people were involved in completing the questionnaire:

**Table 2 Respondents by staff category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Category</th>
<th>Vitamin Angels</th>
<th>Global Cohort Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of the organisation</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other senior leadership</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational staff / field staff</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures add to more than 100%, as several members of staff were often involved in completing each questionnaire.

- Vitamin Angels’ respondents are relatively equally distributed across different staff categories, with the majority (56%) working as head of organisations and 40% as operational staff.
- 71% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents rate the survey process as useful or very useful (global cohort benchmark: 79%).
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The Net Promoter Analysis
Keystone uses a technique of feedback data analysis increasingly common in the customer satisfaction industry known as Net Promoter Analysis (NPA)\(^1\) to distinguish between three profiles of constituents. As Vitamin Angels considers how to improve in light of the survey findings it is extremely important to develop distinct strategies to work with each of these constituent profiles.

The “Promoters” are constituents that rate Vitamin Angels as 9 and 10 on the 0-10 point scale used in the survey. These are Vitamin Angels’ champions. They are highly likely to be wholehearted participants in activities and consistently recommend Vitamin Angels to their friends and colleagues.

The “Passives” are those who give ratings of 7 and 8. They do not have major concerns, but they are not particularly enthusiastic about or loyal to Vitamin Angels. With the right encouragement, they could well become Promoters.

Those who provide ratings from 0-6 are categorized as “Detractors”. They have fairly negative perceptions of the partnership with Vitamin Angels and common developmental objectives are likely to be negatively affected as a result.

Many organisations find it useful to track their ‘Net Promoter score’ (commonly referred to as NP score). To get an NP score, one subtracts the proportion of detractors from the proportion of promoters. It is not uncommon to have negative NP scores. The most successful organisations generally have high NP scores. Data from thousands of companies show a clear correlation between high Net Promoter scores and corporate growth and profitability.\(^2\)

Keystone believes that the customer satisfaction approach is even more relevant to development and social change than it is to business. This is so because those who are meant to benefit from the intended change are key to bringing it about. In this survey context, the practices and policies of international organisations can profoundly affect the performance of their local partners. Surveys such as this provide local partners with a safe space to express what they honestly feel about their international partners, and enable more open, data-driven dialogue for improving performance by both.

NPA also provides an effective way to interpret survey response rates. A growing number of organisations include non-responses to surveys as Detractors. Keystone did not take that approach in this report. The data reported here is only for actual responses.

All data was analysed to look for trends across demographic and other variables. Unless otherwise stated, there are no significant trends to report. Only significant results have been included in the report.

Occasionally in this report, next to the NP analysis, we provide an analysis of the mean ratings given by respondents, as it helps further understanding of the distribution of perceptions and comparisons with the other INGOs in the global cohort.

---

1 For more see: www.netpromotersystem.com, as well as the open source net promoter community at www.netpromoter.com.
2 You can see typical NP scores for a range of industries at www.netpromoter.com.
**Introduction**

**Reading the charts**
The chart below shows how a specific INGO (‘INGO X’) is rated across four areas: phasing, changes, core costs and explanation. This chart is composed of the following elements:
- The bars show the range from the lowest to the highest NP score within the global cohort of INGOs. In this case, for ‘phasing’, scores range from -15 to 85 for the global cohort (grey bar).
- The data labels on the bars show the average NP score for the global cohort of INGOs and INGO X’s specific NP score for the survey. For ‘phasing’ these are 28 and 31.
- The percentages in circles on either side of the chart show the total percentages of INGO X’s respondents that can be seen as ‘promoters’ on the right (i.e. gave a rating of 9 or 10) and ‘detractors’ on the left (i.e. gave a rating from 0 to 6). The chart does not show benchmarks for these figures.

![Sample Graph](image)

**The chart shows how much respondents agree with the statements:**
1. ‘The payments are made in appropriate phases so we can easily manage our cash flow.’
2. ‘INGO X allows us to make any changes that we need to about how we spend funds.’
3. ‘INGO X makes an appropriate contribution to general / core costs.’
4. ‘INGO X clearly explains any conditions imposed by the original donors who provide the funds.’
Vitamin Angels is rated 7th out of 80 in the global cohort in terms of ‘overall satisfaction’, (this is based on an index of scores when respondents were asked to compare the performance of Vitamin Angels across seven key areas against other INGOs and funders). The picture that emerges from the survey is of an organisation that listens to its partners and is performing well.

- Vitamin Angels received ratings above the global cohort average in all of the areas of performance.
- In regards to the capacity building support provided, Vitamin Angels provides more capacity building support than the other INGOs it was compared to. Its NP score of 26 is the highest in the global cohort (Figure 3). Respondents mainly found value in Vitamin Angels’ support in achieving shared goals and the strengthening of technical abilities. The least value was found in the provision of introductions and the strengthening of advocacy.

- The number of respondents who received capacity building support in terms of materials and trainings is 93% (Figure 12). Moreover, 78% of the respondents claim to have received help in strengthening their communication at local, state and national levels of government.

- In regards to the administrative support provided, Vitamin Angels provides more administrative support than the global cohort average (Figure 15). Vitamin Angels’ respondents generally scored higher in all aspects of the agreement process than the global cohort. Respondents found the most value in not being pressured by Vitamin Angels to change their priorities and having grant application questions that were useful and easy to answer. The least value was found in the ability of the grant application process to strengthen the respective organisation and the amount of support being well matched to their needs.

- In general Vitamin Angels conducts less monitoring and reporting activities than the other INGOs in the global cohort (Figure 16). The respondents found most value in the discussion of progress and submission of reports. The least value was attributed to Vitamin Angels’ staff visits and the degree to which they encourage partners to make changes to their product requests based on lessons learned.

- In regards to Vitamin Angels’ relationship with its partners, 25% of respondents would like to be contacted less (Figure 20). Nonetheless, Vitamin Angels’ partners rank it above the global cohort average. Respondents most appreciated Vitamin Angels’ staff being respectful, helpful and capable. Partners also valued the equitable
treatment they received from Vitamin Angels. They were less impressed with how Vitamin Angels asks them for advice/guidance and of feeling comfortable questioning Vitamin Angels’ understanding or actions as a result of disagreements (Figure 21).

- Vitamin Angels additionally asked how much its respondents valued the communication tools provided to them (newsletter, website and social media). 61% of the respondents were promoters claiming the communication tools to be relevant to their work, with 18% strongly disagreeing (Figure 23). Moreover, 56% of the respondents strongly agree with the statement that the content of the communication tools helps them improve their organisation’s ability to deliver their services. Lastly, 54% strongly agree that the communication tools help raise awareness of the issues the respective organisation is seeking to address, with only 24% of the respondents classifying as detractors who disagree.

- In regards to its understanding and learning, respondents generally rate Vitamin Angels’ understanding of the sector higher than the global cohort average (Figure 24). The most value was found in Vitamin Angels’ capability as a leader in the sector and being a leading partner to field partner organisations. A less positive rating was given for Vitamin Angels’ ability to be a leading partner to field partner organisations and its aptitude to learn from its mistakes and make improvements.
Performance summary

- Overall, respondents rate Vitamin Angels higher in all aspects than the other INGOs in the global cohort. The most appreciated aspects were the respect shown to partners and the resulting positive partnership. The least appreciated aspects were the non-financial support it provides and certain aspects of the monitoring and reporting process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Priorities for the future: Vitamin Angels’ respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-financial support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengthening our technical ability to deliver services to women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthening our advocacy &amp; networking abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and reporting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Share lessons and experiences among organisations working on the same issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Simplification of the reporting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve relationships through the promotion of the respective organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timely provision of product grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Looking ahead, respondents would like to receive additional non-financial support strengthening their technical ability to deliver services to women and children as well as strengthen their advocacy and networking abilities. With respect to the monitoring and reporting, respondents would also like more opportunities to share lessons and experiences among organisations working on the same issues as well as simplifying the reporting process. Finally, respondents would most like to improve their relationship with Vitamin Angels through the promotion of their partnerships and the timely provision of products.
Next steps

We provide guidelines for following up on your survey results in a recommendations section at the end of this report. In summary, they are:

- **Learn:** Dig into the report with key internal and external constituents. Many of our clients have found it useful to develop different presentations for different stakeholders such as staff, local partners and the INGOs governing bodies. During this process it is important to put the focus on getting different inputs for the interpretation of the findings and co-deciding the actions to take in response.

- **Act:** Take the corrective actions identified and agreed by staff and partners. Make sure everyone – staff, local partners and board – understands what these corrective actions are, and that there will be future opportunities to provide feedback on whether the changes are having the intended effects. Consider publishing this feedback report.

- **Repeat:** Implement a continuous partner feedback system based on micro-surveys triggered by specific interactions with your partners. For taking stock of the progress made over a larger period of time, repeat this in-depth survey in 12-36 months.

Keystone and the Feedback Commons can support you in this process. Please see Annex 4 for more details.
Section 1: Partnership profile

The largest concentration (29.9%) of Vitamin Angels’ respondents are located in India, closely followed by the United States with 25%. A breakdown of the substantive questions by country is included in Annex 5.
99% of respondents from the USA and Canada receive multivitamins intended for pregnant and breastfeeding women, which is higher than those receiving children’s multivitamins (37%).
The two predominant products received by Vitamin Angels’ respondents beyond North America are Vitamin A and Albendazole. 94% of the international respondents have received Vitamin A and 85% of the respondents have received the deworming tablet, Albendazole. Only 43% have received the Multivitamins for pregnant and breastfeeding women and only 19% have received Children’s multivitamins.
Using their last product grant, 70% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents serve 5,000 beneficiaries or less, with products for both women and children.

Only 9% of the respondents serve 50,001 or more beneficiaries.
39% of the respondents have received Vitamin Angels’ product grant for 1 year or less. 56% of the respondents have received Vitamin Angels’ product grant for one to four years, and only 5% have been receiving it for five years or more.
The primary distribution model used by Vitamin Angels’ respondents is done through Vitamin Angels’ local organisation representatives (58%) and is followed by 38% of respondents receiving the distribution by the organisation and other local agencies/partners.

Only 4% of the distribution is exclusively by other agencies or partners.
Out of Vitamin Angels’ respondents 90% of organisations tend to have 50 or less staff. Similarly, 79% of responding organisations have 50 or fewer volunteers.
Vitamin Angels clearly explains its terms and conditions in the grant application, with 82% of its respondents being promoters and a high NP score of 75.

Vitamin Angels has a slightly lower NP score (48) with respect to the adequacy of the amount of product provided to serve all children and women in the respective catchment areas. 20% of its respondents are detractors and 68% are promoters for this question.

The NP score for if products arrive in a timely manner is 54. This question changed from that asked normally (Support arrives when the NGO says it will) but for comparison, the NP score for the standard question is 44.
Section 2: Non-financial support

This chart shows the percentage of Vitamin Angels’ respondents who say that they receive capacity building support in each area.

- 87% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents receive capacity building support in achieving shared goals, specifically when reaching out to women and children with micronutrients and/or deworming. Thus, VA surpasses the global cohort average by 1%.
- 70% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents receive capacity building support in strengthening advocacy, which is less than the global cohort average of 73%.
- Vitamin Angels’ highest capacity building support (93%) is in the area of providing necessary materials and trainings to its constituents.

* This question is unique to Vitamin Angels.
The chart shows how useful the respondents who receive capacity building support find it. The NP scores for Vitamin Angels’ respondents are shown in relation to the global cohort of INGOs where relevant.

Vitamin Angels’ respondents deem its support in achieving shared goals to be useful, with a NP score of 46 compared to the global cohort benchmark average of 5. Respondents additionally consider the capacity building support with respect to strengthening technical abilities to be useful, achieving a positive NP score of 36 compared to the global cohort benchmark of -6.

Respondents found the provision of introductions to other organisations, people and networks to be the least useful category, with a NP score of 10, which still remains above the global cohort benchmark of -18. Respondents also consider the support in strengthening advocacy to be less useful as is reflected by its NP score of 14. Lapsed respondents scored this higher with an NP score of 21.

* This question is unique to Vitamin Angels.
Non-financial support

Indicative comments received in this area were generally positive and include:

“I strongly recommend training for field partners and small monetary support to enhance step down training for our volunteers.”

“I appreciate the quick response time that I’ve received when a need arose.”

“This partnership has been nothing short of amazing. Their follow-up practice is methodical and well maintained. Their support has helped our non-profit tremendously.”

“The program is very well structured, except we need additional funding support for field based activities.”

“I love their bilingual education brochures that we use to educate moms on a daily basis. The large poster-size posters should be sent laminated for us to keep using.”

“We received a bad batch of vitamins a couple of years ago. Vitamin Angels cooperated fully in resolving the problem.”

“Given that partners are working in different countries, it would be good to establish an easier way to network with these groups to determine if there are national or governmental shifts, changes in policy etc. that will impact our ability to meet goals - also to learn from each other any strategies or contact persons. Nicaragua, for example, has experienced some significant shifts in the response from the government to NGO activities. Having a better way to connect on these potential barriers or how to best navigate government processes would be very helpful so that each group is not acting or problem-solving in isolation.”
Respondents were each asked to identify up to two areas in general where they would most like to receive support from Vitamin Angels in the future.

- The area in which the majority of Vitamin Angels’ respondents (42%) request more support in the future is the strengthening of their technical ability to deliver services to women and children. The second highest rating (33%) is given for the request to strengthen the organisation’s advocacy and networking abilities.
- These two aspects also receive the highest rating amongst the benchmarked global cohort.
Section 3: Administration

Figure 15  The agreement process

The chart shows how much respondents agree with the statements:
1 ‘During the grant application process, we did not feel pressured by Vitamin Angels to change our priorities’
2 ‘The product amount is well matched to our needs.’
3 ‘Vitamin Angels gave us enough help to finalise the grant application’
4 ‘The process of finalizing the grant application helped strengthen our organisation’
5 ‘The grant application questions are useful and easy to answer’ (Custom question)

- Vitamin Angels receives NP scores above the global cohort average in all aspects of finalising partnership agreements listed above.
- Vitamin Angels receives its highest NP score (67) for not pressuring respondents to changing their priorities (global cohort benchmark: 25). Vitamin Angels’ second highest rating (NPS: 61) is given for its useful and easy-to-answer grant application questions.
- Vitamin Angels’ scored lowest, with a NPS of 35, on the extent to which the finalization of the grant application helps strengthen their organisation. This is higher than the global cohort benchmark average for this aspect (NPS: 15). Lapsed respondents rated this the lowest with an NP score of 14.
- One of the respondents’ second lowest NP scores (56) was given for how well the product amount matches the needs of the respective organisation. This score for Vitamin Angels still remains higher than the global cohort average of -16.
Respondents were asked whether Vitamin Angels asks for more information during the grant application process than other NGOs/funders. 52% feel that Vitamin Angels asks for less information during the grant application process than other similar organisations (global cohort benchmark: 36%). 35% consider Vitamin Angels to ask for more information during the process than other NGOs/funders (global cohort benchmark: 42%).

Indicative comments received in this area are generally very positive, with certain specific exceptions:

“Grant is easy to complete, thank you for that! Some are so cumbersome, we give up!”

“Their having information of our past grant applications is very helpful to put in for a new one each year.”

“I am very pleased with their application process, they truly follow up with everything and they make sure of it until the product reaches our hands.”

“The period of waiting for an answer should be shorter. Communication should be sent to partners that the grant is being processed or rejected etc. Vitamin Angels should acknowledge all communication promptly.”

“Vitamin Angels should distribute the products through the medical channel only because they should be stored in a special place and handled by medical people.”

“Sometimes we received more Vitamin A & deworming than required; then we are under pressure to finish the product as we do not want any loss of product. In that situation we have to work under pressure besides our usual commitment.”

“They demand too many questions which suggests that there is lack of trust and confidence on their side and most of those questions most of the time are too technical and scientific.”

“Gathering the data for the grant is time-consuming.”
Vitamin Angels conducts less monitoring and reporting activities with its respondents than the average of the INGOS in the global cohort.

Vitamin Angels performs well with providing monitoring and reporting in the areas of submitting reports (94%) and discussing progress (93%).

Only 40% of the responding organisations have experienced staff visits in person, which is significantly lower than the global cohort average of 95%.

Moreover, Vitamin Angels conducts monitoring and reporting activities through systemic feedback for 62% of the respondents and encourages changes for 71% of its respondents.

![Figure 16 Monitoring and reporting activities](image_url)
This chart shows the NP scores for respondents who said that each activity applies to them. It excludes those who said that the activity does not apply.

Vitamin Angels receives above average scores for three out of five monitoring and reporting activities it carries out with partners.

Following the general trend in the global cohort of INGOs, respondents find value in discussing progress as well as submitting reports. For these two monitoring and reporting activities, 67% and 68% of the respondents sit in the promoters’ category respectively (global cohort benchmarks: 52% and 69%). Lapsed respondents rated submitting reports lower at an NP score of 30.

Respondents additionally see value in the monitoring and reporting activity of providing systemic feedback with a NP score of 34, compared to the global cohort average of 4. For this reporting activity, 60% of the respondents sit in the promoters’ category (global cohort benchmark: 39%). Lapsed respondents provided an NP score of 0.

Respondents attribute the least value to monitoring undertaken by Vitamin Angels through staff visits. The NP score of 12 is lower than the global cohort average of 36.
The chart shows how much respondents agree with the statements:

1. 'It is quick and easy for us to collect information and write reports for Vitamin Angels’
2. ‘Vitamin Angels gives us useful comments about the reports we send them.’
3. ‘The monitoring and reporting we do for/with Vitamin Angels helps us improve what we do.’
4. ‘Vitamin Angels makes us report on what is important, rather than details.’
5. ‘We understand how Vitamin Angels uses the information we provide.’

- Vitamin Angels receives NP scores above the global average in five areas.
- Vitamin Angels’ respondents give high ratings (NPS: 38, global cohort benchmark: 3) to Vitamin Angels for making its respondents report on what is important, rather than focusing on details. 60% of respondents sit in the promoters’ category for this aspect (global cohort benchmark: 35%).
- The aspects rated lowest (with an NPS of 19 and 20, respectively) are the provision of useful comments on reports by Vitamin Angels (global cohort benchmark: 19) and respondents’ understanding of the way Vitamin Angels uses the information provided to it (global cohort benchmark: -15).

Comments received in this area are generally positive with certain requests for further assistance or on-site visits:

“Vitamin Angels is very good at monitoring our progress every 6 months. With all that they do, they still remember to get our feedback and provide advice regularly.”

“It could beneficial to connect to NGOs that are both receiving Vitamin Angels donations in the same country that year. That way we can compare reports/feedback each received from the MOH and share experiences on each NGO’s annual report.”
“There is a need to have a better interaction platform for partners at least once a year.”

“There should be a forum where all Organizations working with Vitamin Angels come together on monthly bases to meet and share experiences. Reporting and knowledge sharing for “Lessons learned from the field” based on region would be useful.”

“We would also like a feedback from them after reporting.”

“Vitamin Angels should regularly train and build the capacity of all its partners on Monitoring and Evaluation and report writing and documentation.”

“On-site visits should be conducted for mentoring and capacity building. Vitamin Angels should also come and discuss the findings with us.”

“Online reporting would simplify the process, but need not be made mandatory for all participating non profits.”
Respondents were asked to identify two actions from this list that they would most like Vitamin Angels to do to improve its monitoring and reporting in the future.

In the future, respondents would most like Vitamin Angels to share lessons and experiences among organisations working on the same issues (38%). This is also the most popular choice for respondents in the global cohort of INGOs.

Their second choice is to have a simplification of the reporting process (24%), which is unlike the choice of the global cohort which shows a preference for help with the monitoring and reporting process.
Section 4: Relationship and communications

- 67% of respondents feel that the amount of contact they have with Vitamin Angels is about right. The average for the global cohort of INGOs is 24%.
- 25% of the respondents would like to have less contact with Vitamin Angels (global cohort benchmark: 35%).
Relationship and communications

**Figure 21** Respondents’ interactions with Vitamin Angels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DET %</th>
<th>NET PROMOTER SCORES</th>
<th>PRO %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks advice</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff attitude</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands on time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable treatment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>VA 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows how much respondents agree with the statements:
1 ‘Staff from Vitamin Angels asks us for our advice and guidance’
2 ‘We feel comfortable questioning Vitamin Angels’ understanding or actions if we disagree with them.’
3 ‘Vitamin Angels listens and responds appropriately to our questions and concerns.’
4 ‘Vitamin Angels’ staff are respectful, helpful and capable.’
5 ‘Vitamin Angels does not make demands on our time to support their work.’
6 ‘Vitamin Angels treats all partners the same way.’

- In five out of the six aspects listed above, Vitamin Angels is rated above the global cohort average.
- Vitamin Angels receives its highest NP score (79) for its respectful, helpful and capable staff. 84% of the respondents strongly approve of the Vitamin Angels’ staff attitude, compared to the global average of 61%.
- The second highest NP score (67) is for the equitable treatment of Vitamin Angels’ partners. The global cohort average in comparison has an NP score of 14. Like Active respondents, Lapsed respondents rated this lower with an NP score of 55.
- Other areas in which Vitamin Angels receives a higher NP score than the global cohort average include not making timely demands, listening and responding to questions and concerns, and feeling comfortable with questioning Vitamin Angels’ understanding or actions.
Vitamin Angels’ respondents give lower ratings for the extent to which Vitamin Angels asks partners for advice and guidance. The NP score for this aspect is -13, which is below the global cohort average of -10.

Comments received in this area are generally positive with certain specific requests concerning the communication between Vitamin Angels and its partners:

“We have a very good relationship. The partnership is not easy because it involves complexities, but it is valuable and critically important to our organization and beneficiaries. Vitamin Angels’ staff are respectful, collaborative, a pleasure to work with and we value the partnership.”

“The Vitamin Angels team has been great to work with and the products delivered are making a difference in the lives of the needy women and children that we serve. Keep up the significant contribution to those in need!”

“Though staff of Vitamin Angels maintain positive relationship and effective communication with the partners still we suggest that Vitamin Angel should visit at least twice a year which can enhance quality of implementation as well.”

“Our relationship and communication is great! The only request I would add is to promote our organization more through social media or website, if possible.”

“Should provide identification clothing such T-shirts, caps and umbrellas for our Volunteers as a source of motivation.”

“Though staff of Vitamin Angels maintain positive relationship and effective communication with the partners still we suggest that Vitamin Angel should visit at least twice a year which can enhance quality of implementation as well.”

“Communication materials should be in local language (Spanish, French, etc.).”
Respondents were asked to select the two options they would most like Vitamin Angels to do to improve its relationship with them.

- In the future, most respondents (46%) would like Vitamin Angels to improve its relationships with them by promoting the respective respondent’s organisation.
- 34% of the respondents do not consider there to be a need for improvement.
- Two other areas in which the respondents clearly indicate an opportunity for improvement is the timely provision of product grants (33%) and understanding the respective organisation's context better (24%).
- The respondents consider Vitamin Angels to have the least need for improvement in being fairer (1%) and having less communication (1%).
Vitamin Angels additionally asked its respondents several questions about their communication tools. 61% of the respondents strongly agree with the statement that these communication tools are relevant to their work, with only 18% being detractors (Figure 23).

With respect to the communication tools’ impact on the organisation’s ability to deliver their services, Vitamin Angels receives a NP score of 33. 56% of the respondents are classified as promoters and 23% as detractors.

Lastly, Vitamin Angels addressed whether the communication tools help raise awareness issues that the respective organisation is seeking to address. 54% of the respondents are promoters who strongly agree with this statement and 24% are detractors.
Section 5: Understanding and learning

In all aspects, Vitamin Angels receives NP scores above the average of the global cohort.

As is the case for most INGOs, Vitamin Angels receives high ratings for being a leading partner in the nutrition community (NPS: 58, global cohort benchmark: 23) and causing positive changes to take place in the respective field as a result of its engagement (NPS: 54).

Lapsed respondents gave the lowest NP score of 10 for Vitamin Angels learning from its mistakes and making improvements to how it works.
Respondents were asked to rate how likely they think it is that Vitamin Angels will make changes as a result of their answers to this survey.

The NP score rating of Vitamin Angels’ respondents concerning the likelihood of making improvements is 45, which is significantly higher than the global cohort average of 9.

62% of respondents sit in the promoters’ category for this aspect (global cohort benchmark: 35%) and only 17% sit in the detractors’ category (global cohort benchmark: 26%).
Respondents were asked to rate how likely they would be to recommend Vitamin Angels to others.

- Vitamin Angels is very likely to be recommended by its respondents with a NP score of 75.
- 83% of respondents sit in the promoters’ category and only 8% sit in the detractors’ category.
- The global cohort benchmark here is 20. This is not asked in the standard partner survey but comes from 796 other organisations that have asked this ‘ultimate question’.

Figure 26 The Ultimate Question
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Section 6: Overall satisfaction

The chart shows how respondents compare Vitamin Angels to other INGOs/funders they receive support from, across each of the areas listed.

- In all of the aspects listed above, Vitamin Angels receives NP scores above the average of the global cohort.
- Vitamin Angels receives its highest ratings for the respect shown to its respondents’ organisations (NPS: 54). For this aspect, 67% of the respondents are promoters (global cohort benchmark: 48%). Lapsed respondents rated this lower with an NP score of 34.
- Vitamin Angels’ partnership and quality thereof receives the second highest ratings with a NP score of 47.
- Respondents are the least satisfied with Vitamin Angels’ non-financial support where it receives a NP score of 13, which still remains higher than the global cohort average (NPS: -11). Lapsed respondents rated this negatively with an NP score of -13.
- Vitamin Angels’ respondents are also less satisfied with their monitoring and reporting experience, leading to a NP score of 21 (global cohort benchmark: 2).
This section presents findings from the tailored questions that Vitamin Angels asked their partners. These questions were not asked to any other INGOs’ partners, however one of them was asked to 7 international networks in 2012. This benchmark has been included below for guidance and discussion.

- Vitamin Angels receives negative NP scores for two out of the three aspects listed above.
- 51% of respondents believe that Vitamin Angels’ network has enabled their organisation to work to complement government health systems. 51% of the respondents are promoters and 32% detractors.
- 51% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents are detractors that do not consider themselves to have been able to access additional resources through Vitamin Angels’ network. Only 33% of the respondents are promoters.
- The negative NP score (-4) is reflected by the 44% of Vitamin Angels’ respondents who feel that they have not established valuable new relationships because of their participation in Vitamin Angels’ network. Compared to 7 international networks, this is lower than the benchmarked NP score for this question, which is 0.
The respondents were asked four questions about why they work with Vitamin Angels.

- Vitamin Angels receives its highest NP score (67) for helping its partners fill gaps in their services which are unmet by the government. 77% of its respondents are classified as promoters and only 10% as detractors.
- For the lowest scoring aspect with a NP score of 8, Vitamin Angels’ respondents express that they do not fully agree with the statement that Vitamin Angels helps them build their capacity to engage with the government directly on health service provision. Only 46% of the respondents are promoters and 38% detractors.
Section 8: Inactive Respondents

In addition to the main survey sent to active, current and lapsed contacts, we sent a short three-question survey to inactive contacts.

The survey was sent to 130 contacts and there were 17 responses for a response rate of 13%. The survey was sent in English, French and Spanish.

Based on their experience, 65% of survey respondents would strongly recommend partnering with Vitamin Angels to a friend or colleague. 6% of the survey respondents were classified as passives and 29% would not recommend partnering with Vitamin Angels to a friend or colleague.

When asked why they did not continue working with Vitamin Angels, responses included:

"At the time of renewal we still had a good amount of vitamins"

"At this time we are not working in situations where we can import supplies."

"There is no management support for implementing the program"

"Too much reporting and recordkeeping burden our small national staff who doesn’t have same skill sets as US staff"

"We had an overstock of vitamins and we could not give them all out. Also, the vitamins did not contain the FDA recommended dosage of many of the nutrients and the prenatals did not contain DHA."

"There was no follow-up support after distribution from Vitamin Angels to NGO Partner. Though this programme is really a useful programme, convincing the local Government to distribute Vitamin A has been very challenging."

When asked what would make them work with Vitamin Angels again, responses included:

"They were easy to work with and we did not have to charge our clients for the products."

"The cause for which they work and the commitment they show in executing."

"Simplifying the system by reducing and streamlining reporting."
Inactive Respondents

“Vitamin Angels should make an agreement with the Government to allot the area for NGOs. There should be approval letters/authorisation letters from the Ministry of Health (Both Central and respective State Government) to administer the solutions with the help of Govt. Primary Health Centre staff.”
Recommendations

The leitmotiv for partner feedback is Listen, Learn, Act, and Repeat. You have now listened, so it is time for Learn, Act and Repeat. Following are some recommendations to take into account for making the most of partner feedback.

Learn
Dig into the report with key internal and external constituents. Many of our clients have found it useful to develop different presentations for different stakeholders.

1 Staff. It is generally best to start with the staff, and then return to them after dialogues with local partners (see below). Different staff may need different presentations. Themes to explore with staff include:
   a The implications of the main findings
   b Interpretations of the data where, as they often are, the meaning is ambiguous. This is also explored with the local partners.
   c Possible explanations for the feedback received
   d Possible corrective actions
   e Their sense of your organisational capabilities around feedback
      i Working together with our partners at Feedback Labs, we have created a simple organisational self-diagnostic tool called the Quiz. We recommend that you have a number of staff take the Quiz and that you aggregate and compare their answers to discuss in staff meetings.

2 Local Partners. The main way to deepen your interpretation of your feedback is through dialogue with your local partners. These activities serve the additional all-important purpose of demonstrating that their feedback is taken seriously. This can be done in dialogue sessions with groups of partners or through follow up interviews with a sample of them. Annex 3 to the report provides a list of respondents that expressed a willingness to take part in follow up interviews. We recommend that these sessions be introduced as an opportunity to co-create solutions. These sense-making dialogues build directly out of staff discussions and focus on three main themes:
   a Areas where Vitamin Angels needs improvement
   b Questions arising from the findings that need more interpretation to understand (including staff-generated ideas)
   c Corrective actions – co-creating solutions

3 Governing Board. Your board members need a simple dashboard with the key metrics that you propose to track and report to the board, accompanied by a narrative that sets out the main findings and your response, including planned improvement activities. This board report can be done right away, when your interpretations of the data are not yet validated through dialogue with local partners and your response plans are prospective, or after some follow up and therefore incorporating more about how improvement activities are bedding down.

Act
Take the corrective actions identified and agreed by staff and partners. Make sure everyone – staff, local partners and board – understands what these corrective actions are, and that there will be future opportunities to provide feedback on whether the changes are having the intended effects.

Consider publishing this feedback report and similar such reports in the future. This establishes your commitment to public accountability for your work, and creates incentives that lubricate the joints between performance, reporting and funding. A growing number of the organisations in the benchmark dataset have published their Keystone partner survey reports.¹

¹ Links to these reports can be found here: http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/ngoreport
**Recommendations**

**Repeat**

1. Get a short cycle of feedback-to-action going
   a. The “Big Bang” survey that you just completed is comprehensive, and generates a wealth of data that you are now busy digesting. Going forward, in order to make sustained and steady progress, you need a continuous, clean signal that will tell you if things are getting better or worse in real time. Fortunately, this is easy and inexpensive to do by sending out micro-surveys (one or two questions only) that are triggered by interactions with your partners (e.g., when they submit a funding application or a report, after a training, or even after a meeting). You can rotate different questions in these micro-surveys, allowing you to get a steady signal on different issues. By surveying in this way at or near these touch points you will get a high response rate – as long as you remember to continue to demonstrate to people that their feedback makes a difference.
   b. Your partners experience you in different ways, so don’t engage with them all in the same way! Develop and implement distinct strategies to respond to feedback based on the three categories we used in this report – promoters, passives and detractors.
   c. Over the next year, as you work steadily to reduce the time between listening and acting, you will want to invest in your staff.
      i. Empower frontline staff to try different ways to improve and learn from what happens. If your partners feel listened to, they will appreciate what you do, as long as you keep trying until you get it right.
      ii. Discuss with them the benefits of receiving and being open to feedback. Receiving feedback is not easy. In fact, recent neuroscience tells us that we are all to different extents hard wired to resist feedback!4
   d. Use on-going micro-surveys to discover some predictive questions. You can do this by correlating partners’ answers to certain questions to other outcome measures you may be collecting. To give you one example, the Gates Foundation discovered five questions that predicted student learning in US high schools.5 Now schools can use these questions to identify which teachers need help at the beginning of the school year and not after the annual test results come in at the end of the year.

2. Get help from your peers! You don’t have to do this alone. The best way to do this is – as you have done with this in-depth survey – is together.
   a. Keystone created a web platform for this purpose: The Feedback Commons. Going forward, the commons will be a less expensive way for you to share and compare your feedback data than working directly with Keystone. Your in-depth survey feedback data are already there in the commons in the same anonymised way they appear in this report.
   b. At the commons you can also share challenges and questions and effective practices.
   c. But maybe the most immediately useful part of the commons for you right now will be the Quiz and the “How To” materials collected there. The Quiz is a free online self-diagnostic tool that we created with our partners at Feedback Labs. It will give you a benchmark diagnosis of your feedback practice capacity that you can return to as your practice matures. Having different people in the organisation take the Quiz, and comparing their results, gives you a more comprehensive benchmark. You can take the Quiz here.

3. Get help from Keystone! You may feel you have the capacity to move forward in your Constituent Voice practice on your own, or together with your peers via the Feedback Commons. That is great! Our overriding goal at Keystone is to work ourselves out of a job. But we have found that many organisations would like more direct support. We are happy to provide custom advice and training support as you advance your journey of Listen, Learn, Act and Repeat! Please see Annex 4 for more details.

4. Repeat this in-depth survey in 12-36 months to evaluate progress. The time frame depends on whether you move ahead with light touch, continuous micro-surveys. If you do, you can go longer before the next in-depth survey is needed.

---

4. For a great review of the science and a lot of practical advice on how to help staff get ready for feedback, see Thanks for the Feedback: The Science and Art of Receiving Feedback Well, by Douglas Stone & Sheila Heen (2014).