Wolff,T. A practical approach to evaluating coalitions. In T.Backer(Ed.) Evaluating Community Collaborations. Springer Publishing

Evaluating Community Collaborations

Edited by
Thomas E. Backer, Human Interaction Research Institute

December 2002

This volume was prepared by the Human Interaction Research Institute with support from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) under Contract No. 00M00851401D. The content of the volume does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of SAMHSA or HHS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 4 - A Practical Approach to Evaluation of Collaborations

Tom Wolff [1]
Community Partners, Inc.

Those who work closely with collaborations on a regular basis know that the effectiveness in operations and outcomes from interventions labeled coalitions, collaborations, or partnerships varies widely. Some of this may result from the limitations on these interventions, even when performed at the highest level of effectiveness, to create all the community changes that the participants and funders may want. More often, ineffectiveness can be attributed to the poor design or implementation of the collaboration process. Thus, we not only must take a serious look at creating evaluations of collaboration *outcomes*, but also at creating mechanisms for collaborations to assess the effectiveness of their *processes*.

The minimal level of engagement of collaborations in effective evaluation processes can be attributed to at least three factors: 1) the motivation, interest, and intent of the collaboration to actually carry out an evaluation; 2) the failure of the collaboration to find appropriate evaluators and set up mutually effective and respectful relationships with them; and 3) the lack of access to easy, usable tools for evaluating the process and outcome of their collaboration efforts.

[1] The author wishes to thank Megan Howe and Suzanne Cashman for their assistance in the creation of this chapter. The evaluation tools in this chapter are used with their creators' permission; the creators retain the rights to the materials.

In this chapter, we will address the above three issues by first discussing the process of engaging in an evaluation and the development of effective relationships with evaluators, and then by illustrating examples of effective process and outcome tools, many of which can be used without the assistance of an outside evaluator.

Why Do Collaborations Become Engaged in Evaluation?

For most collaborations, the motivation to engage in an evaluation process is that it is a requirement for their funding. Someone else has decided for them that evaluation is a necessity. Yet, successful evaluations most often occur when the collaboration itself decides that there are critical questions that must be answered, such as: "After having been at this for three years, are we getting anything done?" "Are we being effective?" "Is the way that we are set up the most effective?" "What do all of our members think about what we are doing?" These kinds of questions can motivate a steering committee and staff of a collaboration to come into an evaluation process with a high level of interest and motivation.

How Do You Build Ownership in Collaborations for the Evaluation Process?

Collaboration evaluation is often a mystery for staff and members. As a result, collaborations often hire outside evaluators and leave the evaluation to them. They accept whatever recommendations are made because the evaluators are the "experts." This isn't necessary, nor is it recommended. The collaboration is the primary consumer of the evaluation, so the collaboration needs to be heavily engaged and invested in the evaluation process. Just as empowerment is an underlying principle for collaboration activities and functioning, empowerment must also be an underlying principle of the evaluation process.

Indeed, the concepts of empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, 1994) and participatory evaluation are increasingly popular approaches to the evaluation process. Participatory evaluation is a method in the family of action research that seeks to be practical, useful, informative, and empowering. Participatory evaluation approaches are practical in that they respond to the needs, interests, and concerns of the collaboration. They are useful because the findings are employed and disseminated in ways that the collaboration can actually use them. They are informative because, ultimately, they are aimed at improving the outcomes of the collaboration's programs. Empowerment is the core concept in that the participants are engaged in the process from design, to data collection, to analysis, to dissemination.

In participatory action research, notes Minkler (2000), researchers are "co-learners" rather than teachers – they grapple as equal partners with ethical challenges and the need for research approaches that reflect both scientific and popular perspective. Green et al (1995) observe that participatory action research is a "systematic investigation," which involves the collaboration of those affected by the matter being studied, for the purposes of education, taking action or affecting social change.

Minkler (2000) makes the case for the special value of participatory action research for evaluating collaboration activities:

- both participatory action research and collaboration are ground-up rather than top-down approaches;

- both accent the use of democratic participatory processes and social learning about the meaning of health in order to promote change;

- both emphasize the strengths of people in communities, including their capacity for problem solving; and

- both tend to be driven by community priorities rather than those of outside experts.

Finally, Wing (1998) notes that in order to transform society in support of more fundamental health promotion, a more democratic and ecological approach to scientific study is needed, one in which education of scientists and the public takes place in both directions. Such an approach is time- consuming and filled with challenges as local communities and outside research collaborators from a variety of sectors attempt to navigate difficult ethical and practical terrain, addressing issues of power and trust, research rigor and the often conflicting agendas of scientist and citizen (Minkler, 2000).

The first key step to a successful evaluation is *strategic planning* within the collaboration. This will include the development of a mission or goal statement and a list of objectives with time lines. It can also include the strategies to be employed in detailed action plans stating who will do what, when. The strategic plan will flow from some form of needs assessment that identifies relevant issues, barriers, resources and culturally appropriate ways of dealing with problems. The strategic plan helps the collaboration know where it is going and lays the groundwork for approaching and engaging in the evaluation process.

So, Why Hire an Evaluator?

Often the most compelling reason is that the funders require that you hire one. Certainly the advantage of external evaluators is that they bring an objective eye to your collaboration and the evaluation process. However, the collaboration should not rule out that many process evaluations, and even some simple outcome evaluations, can be part of the collaboration's ongoing annual functioning. These do not involve the resources required to hire an external evaluator. As the collaboration completes its own evaluations, evaluation gets built into the collaboration's rhythm, along with running task forces and meetings and producing newsletters.

If the Collaboration Is in the Position of Hiring an Evaluator Then What Does Its Members Look For?

Seeking an evaluator who has had experience in evaluating collaborations and can demonstrate some of their products makes the process much easier. In many parts of the country, however, a person like that is hard to find. So, what does an organization look for? First, for evaluators who are capable of being sensitive to the local culture (ethnic, racial, political). Second, evaluators need to be able to present information in clear, direct, user-friendly formats. Next, they need to talk *with* the collabor-ation members and funders, not down to them. Then, they must be able to produce data and reports, in a timely and readable manner, that can be disseminated to collaboration members, to funders, and to the public at large. Finally, an organization wants evaluators who will listen and respond to its needs.

Often, collaborations turn to academic institutions to find evaluators and many excellent evaluators work within those institutions. However, it is also helpful to look to local market research firms that contract for a service with the business community and produce those services in a timely manner for their customers. The responsiveness to customer needs, which is part of the for-profit market research firm, is one that collaborations should expect from evaluators they hire, no matter what sector they come from – private, public or academic.

Collaborations need to know that the goal of the evaluation is to improve the collaboration and that the evaluator must be able to provide feedback in a style that can be used to strengthen the collaboration's planning and activities. In every case, the evaluator should apply "utility criterion" to the evaluation methods. That is, will this evaluation give the collaboration information that can be used by the collaboration, its members, its funders, and the community? An evaluation does not have much value if it can't be translated into action. If it won't be used, don't do it (Francisco & Wolff, 1994).

What Questions Should the Evaluation Help Answer?

- *Process evaluation: What activities took place?* This kind of evaluation focuses on the day-to-day activities of your collaboration. Methodologies here may include activity logs, surveys, and interviews. The key variables might involve in-house developments, outside meetings, communications received, community participation, and media coverage. Surveys can be done rating the importance of feasibility of goals and satisfaction of membership. Process evaluation might also include an analysis of critical events in the development of the collaboration.

- *Outcome evaluation: What was accomplished?* This kind of evaluation focuses on the collaboration's accomplishments. It can include the number and type of changes and policies or practices in the community as well as the development of new services. It can also be useful to do surveys of self-reported behavior changes and surveys, rating the significance of outcomes achieved. The number of objectives met over time is a useful outcome evaluation tool.

- *Impact evaluation: What were the long-term effects?* This kind of evaluation focuses on the ultimate impacts that the collaboration is having on the community, over and above specific outcomes. The focus here is on statistical indicators. A teen pregnancy collaboration might focus on the pregnancy rate for its locale. Once the results have been collected and reports written, the collaboration must actively engage in a process of dissemination of the findings to the community to look at the data, decide what changes are necessary in response to the evaluation findings, and move ahead to change or adapt the strategic plan and the collaboration's activities to reflect the results found in the evaluation.

Evaluation Tools

At the end of this chapter is a series of nine process and outcome evaluation tools, most of which can be easily used by a collaboration on its own, but which can also be part of a repertoire of tools used by an external evaluator with the collaboration. This is by no means a comprehensive collection of all appropriate process and outcome tools for a collaboration. It does represent, however, many tools that have been used by this author in a wide range of collaborations, and have generally been found to pass the utility test. That is, engaging in this evaluation has been useful to the collaboration in reassessing its position and moving forward in a more effective manner.

Worksheet 1: Annual Satisfaction Surveys for Community Coalitions. A wide range of surveys has been developed for collaborations to use in canvassing the membership on their sense of how well they think the collaboration is doing on a variety of dimensions. This survey was developed by the Work Group at the University of Kansas (Fawcett, 1997) and judges satisfaction in the following dimensions: planning and implementation, leadership, community involvement in the collaboration, communication, and progress and outcome.

Within the planning and implementation dimension, the survey looks at aspects of the collaboration such as the vision, planning process, follow through, strength and competence of staff, and capacity to promote collaborative action. Within the leadership area, it deals with the competence of the collaboration's management, sensitivity to cultural issues, its willingness to engage members in leadership roles and the degree of trust in the collaboration.

Community involvement evaluates the collaboration's capacity to reach people in key sectors of the community, the participation of community residents, and the diversity of the membership. Communication considers working with the media, and being in touch with members and the broader community. Progress and outcome looks at whether the collaboration is meeting its objectives, generating resources, distributing funds in a fair manner, and contributing to improving community life. Finally, at the end of the survey, a general question is asked as to whether the community is better off today because of the collaboration.

This format, although very general and subjective, can be extremely helpful to a collaboration in getting a sense of its members' views of the collaboration and developing action plans to respond to the results.

In some communities where we have administered this instrument, there is a consistent finding that although leadership is strong, community involvement is not high, especially for community residents. Some collaborations, in response to such findings, have developed active recruiting plans to engage residents in collaboration activities. The advantages of the satisfaction surveys are that they are simple, straightforward, and easy, though they can be somewhat time-consuming to score. It is easy to report the findings and easy for a collaboration to understand what the findings mean and engage in a process to modify their activities based on the members' perceptions.

The items in each of the categories, and the categories themselves, can be modified to represent specific areas of interest of a given collaboration. The great strength of satisfaction surveys is that they can overcome the excuse of many collaboration members who say, "We don't have the instruments, we don't have time, we don't have the resources to do an evaluation." At least with the satisfaction survey, collaboration members check in with each other on a regular basis as to how they think the collaboration is doing. We have seen collaborations implement this survey and successfully use the results to demonstrate to potential funders their seriousness in looking at their progress.

Worksheet 2: Diagnosing Your Coalition: Risk Factors for Participation. This second form is similar to the satisfaction survey, but more detailed, easier to score, and easier to diagnose for remedies. It was developed by Gillian Kaye (1993). In the risk factor diagnosis, Kaye suggests that partnerships look at where they are at risk of discouraging active participation of members, which parts of the collaboration are in good shape, and which could use a tune-up. Each of the items is scored from 1-5 and the categories covered include: clarity of vision; effectiveness of the initiative's structure; effectiveness of outreach and communication tools and methods; effectiveness of collaboration meetings; opportunities for member responsibility and growth; effectiveness of the partnership's planning and doing; the collaboration's use of research and external resources; the partnership's sense of community; how well the initiative meets needs and provides benefits; and the group's relationship with the elected officials, institutional leaders, and other power players.

Kaye has a scoring guideline for each of the sections. This is an easily administered instrument that collaborations can use to look more carefully at a range of internal functions of the collaboration.

Worksheet 3: Assessing Your Collaboration's Commitment to Agency- and Community- Based Approaches. This tool can assist collaborations in assessing their present level of commitment to agency-based and community-based approaches. It can also help the group plan for where they would like to be on these dimensions in the future.

A core belief of collaborations is that they often encourage diverse citizen participation and widespread community ownership. Many collaborations use the phrase "citizen drive" or "grassroots" in describing the core beliefs of their efforts. Yet, often when we sit in a room at a collaboration meeting and we look around, we mainly see the faces of the formal community service providers. We know that some of these providers of service are also residents of the community and thus are both residents and formal helpers (although that is not always true). Too often, though, community residents and grassroots organizations are just not at the table.

Chavis & Florin (1990) originally introduced these concepts using the terms "community- based" and "community development." The "community-based" approach works with community members primarily as consumers of services and is deficit oriented. The "community development" approach works with community members in planning and producing services and builds on a community's strengths. Both approaches have value. They represent two ends of a continuum, and elements of each can be present in any given program. For this assessment tool, we have changed the language to "agency-based" and "community-based," as these terms seem to be easier to understand and use for communities across the country. For openers, they can look around the room and see who is present as a first step in assessing which approach they use.

This assessment is best done in small groups of collaboration members, but also can be done by individuals. The scale asks, “Where does your collaboration fall on this dimension? Put an X on the continuum. Where would you like to be in the future? Put an O on the continuum. How can you get to the desired state?” Group discussion on how to reach the desired outcome is encouraged.

This instrument has been especially helpful to collaboration steering committees as they design or re-assess their direction and their membership. It allows them to visit or re-visit the basic premises of their approach, and to project a new direction for the future if they wish to change.

The content of the instrument is as follows:

- **Approach/Orientation.** An agency-based approach emphasizes the community’s weaknesses, and solves the community’s problems by addressing its deficits. A community-based approach builds on the community’s strengths and assets. The approach involves developing the community’s competencies.

- **Definition of the problem**. In an agency-based approach, agencies, government, or outside organizations define the problem for the community. For example, a state government may make collaboration grants available to the ten communities with the highest rate of substance abuse. In a community-based approach, the problem is defined by the target community itself. In this approach, the community is asked, or asks itself, "What are our biggest problems and which should we address?"

- **Primary vehicle for creating change.** Agency-based efforts focus on creating individual change through improving services, or providing information or education. Community-based efforts aim to build community control and capacity by increasing the community's resources and creating economic and political change.

- **Role of professionals.** Professionals are central to decision making in the agency-based approach, rather than being one of many resources for the community's problem-solving process in the community-based approach.

- **Purpose of participation by target community members and institutions.** In an agency-based initiative, the purpose for participation by the community is to help adapt or adjust services or to disseminate information about existing services. The focus is on the provision of services. In the community-based initiative the purpose for participation is to increase the community's control and ownership and to improve social conditions in the community.

- **Role of human service agencies and formal helpers.** Human services are the central mechanism for service delivery in the agency-based approach. In the community-based approach they are one of the many sectors in the community that have been activated to meet the needs of the community.

- **Primary decision makers.** In the agency-based approach, the key decisions are made by agency and government representatives and leaders from business. In the community-based model, the primary decision makers are the informal and the local indigenous leaders of the community – the people most affected by the issue being addressed. So, if the community is designing programs for youth, who is making the decisions – the agency personnel or the youth themselves?

- **View of community.** In the agency-based approach, the community is seen as the site of the problem and the community members of the community are seen as the consumers or potential consumers of services. In the community-based approach, the community is seen quite simply as the place where people live. It is seen subjectively rather than viewed externally and technically. While the agency-based view might be that this is a community with a high rate of teen pregnancy, the community-based view can be a concern for Sally, the 16- year -old new mom who lives down the street with her family.

- **Community control of resources.** In the agency- based approach, the community's control of resources (in the community and in the collaboration) is low. A community-based approach ensures that the community's control of all resources is high.

- **Potential for ownership by community members.** In the agency-based approach, community ownership of the process is low and in the community-based model, community ownership is higher.

Worksheet 4: Climate Diagnostic Tool: The Six R's of Participation. This instrument is a helpful way for a collaboration to assess the environment it has created and how hospitable it is to engaging and retaining community members. The instrument is based on research (Kaye & Resnick, 1994) that looked at what key factors of an organization attract citizens to join it and keep citizens engaged in its processes. It turns out that if an organization is able to provide the "six R's," it increases the probability that residents of the community will stick with the organization. The six R's are: *recognition, respect, role, relationship, reward, and results*.

- **Recognition.** People wish to be recognized for their contributions to communities and collaborations. At first they wish to be recognized by the members of their own groups, but then, increasingly, by the members of other groups. Collaboration members wish to be recognized for their efforts and contributions to build a better quality of life for the community and for their special contributions to the workings of the collaboration.

- **Respect.** Everyone wants respect. By participating in community activities, we often seek the respect of our peers. Respect involves an appreciation for people's values, culture, and traditions, and there may not be many settings in a community that can provide that respect for community members. By joining collaborations and other community organizations, people are seeking not only recognition, but also respect for themselves.

- **Role**. We all have the need to feel needed. People want to belong to a group that gives them a meaningful role and where their unique contributions can be appreciated. Not everyone is seeking the same role, not everyone wants to be the leader, but everyone wants to feel useful, and collaborations that can provide useful roles to members are much more successful in maintaining membership.

- **Relationships**. Relationships are the heart of the collaboration's work. It is often a personal invitation that convinces members to join the collaboration. People join for many reasons, among them: to meet new people, to make new links, and to broaden their base of support and influence. Collaborations draw community members into a wider context of community relationships which encourage accountability, mutual support, and responsibility.

- **Rewards**. Collaborations attract and maintain members when the rewards of membership outweigh the costs. Not everyone is looking for the same kind of rewards. Collaborations need to identify what the self- interests of the members are, what they are seeking, and how to go about meeting their needs.
- **Results**. Nothing works like results. An organization that cannot deliver the goods will not continue to attract people and resources. All collaboration members come into a meeting with a cost- benefit scale in their heads. They ask, "Is it worth it on a Thursday

> afternoon at 5:00 to sit for an hour and a half with this group of folks and try to make a change in our community?" The ultimate measure is whether anything gets done. Grassroots community leaders are even tougher on this issue than agency people who are being paid to sit in the room. They are giving up their precious personal time and they want to know if this is going to make their community better.

This process tool allows a collaboration to assess itself on these six R's of participation. It suggests that the collaboration members get to understand the definition of the six R's and then for each of them to ask themselves, for example, "What are we doing now as a collaboration to encourage recognition and what else could we be doing to encourage it?" Having done this for all six of the R's, the collaboration can then develop an action plan that will increase the likelihood that community members will stay with the collaboration and become more active participants.

Worksheet 5: Responsibility Charting. Community collaborations are complex organizational systems with multiple components and multiple actors having some role and responsibility in the collaboration's functioning. Among the key actors are: 1) a *funder* (either a foundation; state, local or Federal government; or other source); 2) a *local fiscal agent*, which is the conduit for the dollars, and may even be the employer of the collaboration staff; 3) a *steering committee or board of directors* that runs the collaboration and provides the leadership; 4) *task forces and task force leaders* that take on the specific identified issues of the collaboration and do the nitty- gritty work; 5) *staff,* including a director, administrative staff, and program staff, that are often the most visible representatives of the collaboration and those who are able to commit the most time in a given week to collaboration activities; 6) the *collaboration membership at large*, which may meet on a regular basis in collaboration meetings or annually at collaboration meetings; 7) an *evaluator*; 8) *technical assistance providers*; and, of course, 9) the *community at large*, those most affected by the problem, those living in the community.

The strength of collaborations is that they are new organizations and, hopefully, more flexible than many of the longstanding non-profit organizations in a community. The down side of a collaboration is that, with these many actors and components to it, there can be confusion and conflict or, more often, inaction. This often occurs because it is not clear which of the components has the ultimate or immediate responsibility for getting something done. Conflicts can arise between steering committees and collaboration directors, between fiscal agents and steering committees, between task forces and steering committees, and between funders and the collaboration as a whole. Consultants working with collaborations across the country have observed virtually every permutation and combination of difficulty between these various components.

So how does a collaboration sort out who has the responsibility to approve activities? Who has the responsibility for developing the alternatives and making these happen? Who needs to be consulted prior to a decision being reached and who needs to be informed? Responsibility charting, developed by Florin & Chavis (1996), allows a collaboration to chart out the various actors and the various responsibilities in the collaboration and to see what kind of agreement there is as to who has what degree of responsibility.

The collaboration members begin the activity by identifying for themselves who are the key actors and placing them in the blank columns across the top. If there are more than five, the collaboration can add a second page and more actors. To complete the form, the collaboration members indicate for each actor and responsibility whether the relationship is approval (A), responsible (R), consulted (C), or informed (I). For example, the first responsibility listed might be to determine goals and priorities. It may be that the steering committee of the collaboration takes responsibility for determining goals and priorities. They would get an (R). It may also be that task forces and the collaboration at large are consulted about this (C), that the lead agency approves it (A), and that the funders are informed about it (I).

After filling in appropriate letters to indicate each actor's role in each responsibility, the collaboration should turn to the next question: How much agreement is there among those filling out the charts? Responsibility charting is most effective when all the parties listed across the top fill out the form. It is helpful to know that, as in the example above, we may think that the funder just wants to be informed, but may feel that it should be able to approve. We may feel that the fiscal agent needs to approve a decision and he or she may say we don't want any part of that, all we want to do is be informed. The steering committee may feel that it has responsibility for determining goals and priorities, and yet the community groups that meet with the collaboration may feel that the goals and priorities should really come from the community.

Responsibility charting allows for fascinating discussions around these issues. It can promote some conflict, but, more likely, it will identify spots where there is confusion and allow for processes that bring clarity. Responsibility charting takes some time, and compilation of the scores can be complex. It can be done in a process meeting with all the parties present filling out charts and then putting the results on news print in front of the room for an open discussion.

Worksheet 6: Inclusivity Checklist. Checklist collaborations often declare that one of their goals is to celebrate the diversity within a community, to be inclusive of all members of the community, to be open to the participation of all the sectors in a community. Yet, many collaborations struggle to bring this amount of diversity into their ranks and they end up being less inclusive than they had hoped.

For other collaborations, the issues of diversity and inclusivity may not be high on their priority list, but may be brought to them by minority members of the community who feel excluded. Too often, we see community collaborations that declare themselves to be open to all members of the community, but instead represent the majority, the formal structure, the power brokers rather than the community at large or those representing smaller minority groups.

The inclusivity checklist is an instrument that allows a collaboration to do an internal process assessment about diversity and inclusivity. It gives collaboration members the opportunity to analyze the issues of inclusivity and diversity across a wide range of their collaboration activities. The easiest way for a group to look at the issue is to look around a room at a collaboration meeting or a steering committee meeting and ask how diverse they are in terms of race, gender, and/or ethnicity. More deeply, though, a group can look at such questions as where resources are distributed, who speaks, what are the group's stated goals and objectives, and what does the group do to welcome and encourage members from various groups in the community. The inclusivity checklist, developed by Beth Rosenthal (1997), helps a collaboration make that assessment.

Worksheet 7: Task Force Evaluation and Resource Allocation. Frequently, collaborations function by identifying issues and assigning each to a smaller group made up of key people concerned about a given issue and able to make a difference on it. These subgroups are often called work groups, task forces, or study action groups. Often in collaborations, these task forces are created and can have a life of their own, continuing for many years regardless of how effective they are. The rule seems to be "If you create a task force, it is a task force for life."

So, how does a collaboration deal with this? B.L. Hathaway (2001 a, b, c) of the Lower Outer Cape Community Collaboration, along with the collaboration's steering committee, developed a Task Force Evaluation and Resource Allocation Process that is used annually by the steering committee to evaluate the task forces and allocate resources to the task forces based on the assessment.

The process starts with the task force identifying its members, its goal, and its objectives, including the activities to achieve the goal and the target dates. The task force then requests resources from the collaboration to support its activities. The resources can include staff who will chair the meeting, mail the minutes, and evaluate progress and outcome, as well as any funding resources for programs.

The request goes to the steering committee, which then asks a series of questions, including: Does the task force address the mission of the collaboration? Which goals of the collaboration does it support? Will allocating resources to the task force detract from the core services of the collaboration? How representative is the task force? Is the goal achievable? What is the likely disposition of the task force in the future? Are members of the task forces providing resources to support the task force? If additional funds are needed, what potential resources exist? The collaboration steering committee then decides whether or not to provide support in response to the requests made by the task force.

This is an extremely simple process evaluation form to use within collaborations. In my experience it is rare that collaborations evaluate their own task forces. This process leads to an increase of effectiveness and accountability of task forces and clarification of the relationship of the steering committee to its task forces.

Worksheet 8: Sustainability Benchmarks. This tool was developed by the Center for Collaborative Planning (2000) for the Community Partnerships for Healthy Children (CPHC) initiative, based on the work of Tom Wolff (1994), to assess multiple levels of attempts to sustain collaboration efforts. This approach to sustainability of collaborations looks at four possible avenues for sustaining collaborations: *fundraising and incorporation, institutionalizing the effort, policy change, and mobilizing the community*. The Center for Collaborative

Planning took those four concepts and expanded them into a usable instrument that allows a collaboration to ask itself how it is doing in each of the sustainability benchmarks.

For each of the benchmarks, the collaboration is asked a range of key questions that are meant to help assess their sustainability potential. It is an internal process evaluation of how well the collaboration is doing in trying to plan for sustainability in all four areas. As stated by CPHC, the areas are mobilizing community residents who are committed to sustaining the efforts; creating policy and systems change at local, regional, and state levels; spinning off or institutionalizing effective strategies or programs; and successfully raising funds and/or proceeding with incorporation to sustain the core functioning of the collaboration.

Having answered the four sets of questions, the collaboration then has an overview of the viability of its sustainability plan and is engaged in a community process that broadens the buy-in and concern around the issues of sustainability.

Worksheet 9: Annual Reports. Some of the above instruments touch on some aspects of collaboration outcome, but the simplest tool, and one not used nearly enough by collaborations, is simply to issue an annual report of the collaboration's activities. Such a report can begin with a review of its missions, goals and structure and then summarize the various activities – usually task forces and objectives for the year, the task force activities and the outcomes.

An example of such an annual report from the Lower Outer Cape Community Collaboration (Hathaway, 2001) is provided here as the final tool in this set, and many collaborations have used similar approaches. The process of putting together this type of an annual report implies a number of things: that the collaboration has clear mission goals and objectives for its overall functioning; that each of its task forces is set up to work within those mission goals and objectives; that each of the task forces itself has a set of goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes for a given year; and that, at least on an annual basis, someone is collecting and listing those activities and outcomes, and there is a system in place for doing so.

Although this may sound simplistic, few collaborations actually do this. Indeed, many of the outcomes of collaborations are never noted, never celebrated, and the collaboration does not get credit for them. Those who do promote and circulate their findings in a form, such as an annual report, make their members feel proud of their work and able to share their outcomes with others.

References

Center for Collaborative Planning (2000). *Sustainability Benchmarks*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Chavis, D. & Florin P. (1990). *Community participation and substance abuse prevention: Rationale, concepts and mechanisms*. County of Santa Clara, CA: Bureau of Drug Abuse Services.

Fawcett, S., Foster, D., & Francisco, V. (1997). Monitoring and evaluation of coalition activities and success. In G. Kaye & W. Wolff (Eds.), *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development* (pp. 163-185). Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

Fetterman, D. (1994). Steps of empowerment evaluation: From California to Cape Town. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 17*(3), 305-313.

Florin, P. & Chavis, D. (1996). *Responsibility Charting*. Gaithersburg, MD: Association for the Study and Development of Community.

Francisco, V. and Wolff, T. (1994). Evaluating coalition efforts. *Coalition Building Tip Sheets*. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

Green, L., George, M., Frankish, C., Herbert, C., Bowie, W., and O'Neil, M. (1995). *Study of participatory research in health promotion: review and recommendations for the development of participatory research in health promotion in Canada*. Ottawa: Royal Society of Canada.

Hathaway, B.L. (2001 a). Case story #2: Growing a healthy community: A practical guide. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(2), 199-203.

Hathaway, B.L. (2001 b). *Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition annual report (2000-2001).* Eastham, MA. Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition.

Hathaway, B.L. (2001 c). *Moving from issues to solutions: An evaluation of 13 years of coalition work*. Eastham, MA: Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition.

Hathaway, B.L. (1998). *Task force evaluation and resource allocation*. Orleans, MA: Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition.

Kaye, G. (1993). *Diagnosing your coalition: Risk factors for participation*. Brooklyn, NY: Community Development Associates.

Kaye, G. and Resnick, I. (1994). *Climate diagnostic tool: The six R's of participation*. Brooklyn, NY: Community Development Consultants.

Kaye, G. & Wolff, T. (1997). *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development*. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

Minkler, M. (2000). Using participatory action research to build healthy communities. *Public Health Reports*, *115*, 191-197.

Rosenthal, B. (1997). Multicultural issues in coalitions. In G. Kaye & T. Wolff (Eds.), *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development* (pp. 51-73). Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

Wing, S. (1998). Whose epidemiology, whose health? *International Journal of Health Services*, 28, 241-252.

Wolff, T. (1994). Sustainability of coalitions. *Coalition Building Tip Sheets*. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

COLLABORATION EVALUATION WORKSHEETS

Annual Satisfaction Survey for Community Coalitions

Dear Coalition Member:

The purpose of the attached consumer satisfaction questionnaire is to get your feedback on how well this coalition is doing. As you know, this coalition's mission is to …(complete this.)

Please complete each question by circling the number that best shows your satisfaction with that aspect of the coalition. We welcome additional comments and suggestions you have for improving this coalition.

To protect anonymity, please use the enclosed envelope to return your completed questionnaire to our coalition's evaluators, the (complete name of group).

Thanks in advance for your valuable advice and feedback.

Best regards,

OVERALL APPROVAL RATING:

Is the community better off today because of this coalition? (please check one)
Yes____ No ____

Overall comments and suggestions for improvement:

Thanks for your valuable feedback. Please use the attached envelope to return the completed questionnaire to:

Annual Satisfaction Survey for Community Coalitions*

***Instructions**: We welcome your feedback on how well this coalition is doing. For each item, please circle the number that best shows* your satisfaction with that aspect of the coalition. Provide additional comments if you wish.

Planning and Implementation

	very dissatisfied				very satisfied
1. Clarity of the vision for where the coalition should be going	1	2	3	4	5
2. Planning process used to prepare the coalition's objectives	1	2	3	4	5
3. Follow-through on coalition activities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Strength and competence of staff	1	2	3	4	5
5. Efforts to promote collaborative action	1	2	3	4	5
6. Processes used to assess the community's needs	1	2	3	4	5
7. Training and technical assistance provided by staff	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

*****Fawcett, S., Foster, D., & Francisco, V. (1997). Monitoring and evaluation of coalition activities and success. In Kaye, G. & Wolff, T. (Eds.), *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development.* Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners, pp. 163-185.

Leadership:

very
very
dissatisfied satisfied

8. Strength and competence of coalition
leadership 1 2 3 4 5

9. Sensitivity to cultural issues 1 2 3 4 5

10. Opportunities for coalition members to take leadership roles 1 2 3 4 5

11. Willingness of members to take leadership roles 1 2 3 4 5

12. Trust that coalition members afford each other 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Community Involvement in the Coalition:

very very
dissatisfied
satisfied

13. Participation of influential people from
key sectors of the community 1 2 3 4 5

14. Participation of community residents 1 2 3 4 5

15. Diversity of coalition members 1 2 3 4 5

16. Help given the community in meeting

its needs 1 2 3 4 5

Annual Satisfaction Survey for Community Coalitions

17. Help given community groups to become better able to address and resolve their concerns 1 2 3 4 5

18. Efforts in getting funding for community programs 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Communication:

	very very dissatisfied				satisfied
19. Use of the media to promote awareness of the coalition's goals, actions, and accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5
20. Communication among members of the coalition	1	2	3	4	5
21. Communication between the coalition and the broader community	1	2	3	4	5
22. Extent to which coalition members are listened to and heard	1	2	3	4	5
23. Working relationships established with elected officials	1	2	3	4	5

Annual Satisfaction Survey for Community Coalitions

Communication (continued)

24. Information provided on issues and available resources	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Progress and Outcome:

	very very dissatisfied				satisfied
25. Progress in meeting the coalition's objectives	1	2	3	4	5
26. Success in generating resources for the coalition	1	2	3	4	5
27. Fairness with which funds and opportunities are distributed	1	2	3	4	5
28. Capacity of members to give support to each other	1	2	3	4	5
29. Capacity of the coalition and its members to advocate effectively	1	2	3	4	5
30. Coalition's contribution to improving health and human services in the community	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Diagnosing Your Coalition: Risk Factors for Participation*

WHY? WHY? WHY?

Why do some members come to every meeting of the coalition and some won't even come to one?

Why are some families so active while others won't even take the time to fill out a survey?

There is no simple or quick answer. But we do know there are a lot of factors that influence why residents and families will and won't get involved in your coalition. Some of these factors are a little harder for the coalition to tackle, such as economic problems in the family and serious lack of time.

BUT...

You can control one of the most important participation factors: YOUR COALITION! Yes, it's true. Many different parts of a coalition's functioning can encourage or discourage participation! Your coalition might be "at risk" of being a participation discourager and you don't even know it.

One of the important roles of a leader is to step back every once in a while and look, with a critical eye, at how the coalition is working:

- Are all of the coalition's "building blocks" in place to make it a strong coalition?
- Do things get done in a way that encourages members and others to be active and have "ownership" of the coalition?

Use this COALITION RISK FACTOR diagnosis to find out which parts of your coalition are "at risk" of discouraging active participation from members and non-members and could use a tune-up, and which parts are humming along. The results may surprise you!

Put a number (based on the 1-5 scale that follows) in the bubble that corresponds to each question. Total up your score at the end of each numbered section and again at the end on the “Diagnosis Score Sheet.” Check out your coalition’s diagnosis!

NOTE: You’ll notice that all of the statements on this form are written in the “positive.” But it’s more important that you be honest than that your coalition sound “perfect.” NO COALITION IS PERFECT!!

---

*Kaye, G. (1993). *Diagnosing your coalition*: *Risk factors for participation*. Brooklyn, NY: Community Development Consultants.

RATE THE FOLLOWING PARTS OF YOUR COALITION USING THE SCALE BELOW:

Strong/Always				Weak/Never
5	4	3	2	1

1. The Clarity of Your Coalition’s Vision and Goals

A. The coalition’s vision takes into account what is happening in the community. ○

B. The vision and goals are written down. ○

C. Residents and institutions are all aware of the vision and goals of the coalition. ○

D. The coalition periodically reevaluates and updates its vision and goals. ○

E. The activities of the coalition are evaluated in relation to the vision and goals of the coalition. ○

Total #1 __________

NOTES:

2. The Effectiveness of Your Coalition Structure

A. The coalition has a regular meeting cycle that members can expect. ○

B. The coalition has active committees. ○

C. All of the members have copies of the by-laws. ○

D. The executive board and committees communicate regularly. ○

E. The executive board meets on a regular basis with good attendance. ○

Total #2__________

NOTES:

3. The Effectiveness of Your Outreach & Communication - Tools & Methods

A. The coalition has a newsletter or another method of communication that keeps the school community regularly updated and informed about its activities. ○

B. The coalition uses a survey or another method to collect information about members' interests, needs, and concerns. ○

C. The survey results are always published and used to guide the coalition's projects. ○

D. The survey is conducted every year or so because the community and residents change. ○

E. The coalition "goes to where members are" to do outreach, including where people live, shop and work. ○

Total #3 __________

NOTES:

Worksheet 2

Diagnosing Your Coalition: Risk Factors for Participation

4. The Effectiveness of Coalition Meetings

A. Members feel free to speak at a meeting without fear of being attacked. ○

B. The coalition advertises its meetings with sufficient notice by sending agendas and flyers out in advance. ○

C. Child care and translation are provided at meetings when needed. ○

D. The work of the meeting, as outlined in the agenda, gets accomplished because meetings start and end on time. ○

E. The meetings are held in central, convenient, and comfortable places and at convenient times for all members. ○

Total #4 ___________

NOTES:

5. Opportunities for Member Responsibility and Growth

A. The coalition makes a conscious effort to develop new leaders.

B. Training and support are offered to new leaders as well as to the more experienced leaders (by the coalition or through outside agencies).

C. A "buddy system" matches less experienced members with leaders to help them learn jobs and make contacts.

D. Committees are given serious work to do.

E. Leadership responsibilities are shared in the coalition; i.e., chairing a meeting is a job that rotates.

Total #5 __________

NOTES:

6. The Coalition's Effectiveness in Doing Projects (Planning, Implementing & Evaluating)

A. At the beginning of each new year, the coalition develops a plan that includes goals and activities that it wants to accomplish during the year. ○

B. The plans are based, at least in part, on information collected from surveys of members. ○

C. After each activity or project, the leadership or the committee evaluates how it went, in order to learn from the experience. ○

D. The coalition always organizes visible projects that make a difference to members. ○

E. When projects are undertaken, action plans that identify tasks, who will do what, and target dates are developed. ○

Total #6 ___________

NOTES:

7. Your Coalition's Use of Research/External Resources

A. The coalition works within the community on common issues and with citywide coalitions that work on critical community concerns. ○

B. The coalition utilizes resources and information on other coalitions that can help the community, i.e., training workshops on environmental organizing. ○

C. The coalition stays on top of issues affecting communities across the city and state. ○

D. Outside speakers come to meetings to speak on topics of interest to members. ○

E. When the coalition wants to work on an issue, leaders know where to go to get necessary information, i.e., statistics, forms, etc. ○

Total #7 ___________

NOTES:

8. Your Coalition's Sense of Community

A. The coalition builds social time into the meetings so that people can talk informally and build a sense of community. ○

B. The coalition plans fun social activities. ○

C. Everyone in the coalition is treated equally. ○

D. All contributions from members, large and small, are recognized and rewarded. ○

E. All residents are made to feel welcome in the coalition regardless of income, race, gender, or education level. ○

Total #8 ___________

NOTES:

9. How Well the Coalition Meets Needs and Provides Benefits

A. Resource lists and important contacts are regularly made available to members. ○

B. Workshops are held with "experts" who can provide concrete services to members. ○

C. The coalition helps members with issues of individual need. ○

D. If a survey of the members indicated that personal issues (such as child care or landlord/tenant problems) were getting in the way of residents' involvement, the coalition would respond to those issues. ○

E. The coalition holds meetings and workshops where residents can meet elected officials and city service personnel to voice their opinions and learn about resources and programs in the community. ○

Total #9 ___________

NOTES:

10. <u>The Coalition's Relationship With Elected Officials, Institutional Leaders, & Other Power Players</u>

A. The coalition leaders know how to negotiate with "power players" such as elected officials and institutional leaders and successfully "win" on issues of concern to members. ○

B. The coalition has regular representatives who attend important community meetings. ○

C. Leaders and members of the coalition understand the lines of authority, decision making power, responsibilities, and other aspects of the "power structure" of the community. ○

D. The coalition meets with officials on a regular basis about the issues that concern members. ○

E. The coalition participates in citywide activities and demonstrations that focus on community issues. ○

Total #10 __________

NOTES:

DIAGNOSIS SCORE SHEET

Fill out this score sheet using the **total numbers** from each section of the Coalition Diagnosis.

1. VISION/SENSE OF PURPOSE	TOTAL #1:
2. COALITION STRUCTURE	TOTAL #2:
3. OUTREACH/COMMUNICATION	TOTAL #3:
4. COALITION MEETINGS	TOTAL #4:
5. MEMBER RESPONSIBILITY/GROWTH	TOTAL #5:
6. DOING PROJECTS	TOTAL #6:
7. RESEARCH/EXTERNAL RESOURCES	TOTAL #7:
8. SENSE OF COMMUNITY	TOTAL #8:
9. NEEDS AND BENEFITS	TOTAL #9:
10. RELATIONSHIP WITH POWER PLAYERS	TOTAL #10:

FINAL SCORE FOR DIAGNOSIS: __________

YOUR COALITION'S DIAGNOSIS

FOR EACH SECTION, FOLLOW THE GUIDELINES BELOW:

IF YOU SCORED BETWEEN:

5-15	**Check-up time!!** You may need an "overhaul" in this area.
15-20	**Watch out!!** It's time for a "tune-up" to get everything in good working order.
20-25	**Congratulations!!** You're running smoothly and all systems are go! Keep up the good work!

Assessing Your Collaboration's Commitment to Agency-Based and Community-Based Approaches*

Instructions:
Mark an "X" on the continuum for where you currently are.
Mark an "O" on the continuum for where you would like to be.

Issues	Agency-Based	Continuum	Community- B
Approach/Orientation	Weakness/deficit solve problems	____________________ capacity	Strength/Competence
Definition of Problem	By agencies, government or outside	____________________	By target community
Primary Vehicles for Healthy Promotion and Change	Education, improved services, lifestyle change, food availability, media	____________________	Building community control, Increasing community resources an and economic structur
Role of Professionals	Key, central to decision making	____________________	Resource
Role of Participation by target community members and institutions	Providing better services, increasing consumption and support	____________________	To increase target community control and ownership, improved social structure

*Chavis, E. & Florin, P. (1990). *Community participation and substance abuse prevention: Rati concepts and mechanisms*. County of Santa Clara, CA: Bureau of Drug Abuse Services.

Worksheet 3

Assessing Your Collaboration's Commitment to Agency-Based and Community-Based Approaches

Issues	Agency-Based	Continuum	Community-Based
Role of human service agencies and formal systems	Central Mechanism for service delivery	__________________	One of many systems activated to respond to the needs of a target community members
Primary decision makers	Agency representatives, business leaders, government representatives, "appointed" community leaders	_________________	By target community leaders
View of Community Development	Broad, site of the problem technically and externally defined, consumers Consultants	_________________	Specific, targeted, source of solution, internally defined, subjective, a place to live
Target community control of resources	Low	________________	High
Potential for ownership by target community members	Low	________________	High

Climate Diagnostic Tool: The Six R's of Participation*

Instructions: Please rate how well your organization/collaboration/initiative does the following using the scale below. Tabulate your scores for each section. (*For established groups, have each individual fill out the diagnostic, then compare your answers and attempt to come up with a group diagnostic. For new groups, prioritize the items in each section, then discuss: a) What do you currently have the capacity to do? And b) What do you need to develop the capacity to do?*)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Poor	**Fair**	**Average**	**Good**	**Excellent**	**N/A**

I. Recognition

People want to be recognized for their leadership to serve the members of their communities and organizations. We all want to be recognized, initially by the members of our own groups and then by members of other groups, for our personal contribution to efforts to build a better quality of life.

Does your organization/collaboration:

☐ Regularly praise members or individuals for work they have done through awards, dinners, or other public events?
☐ Regularly praise members or individuals for work they have done, even small tasks by recognizing them in meetings and on occasions when others are present?
☐ Contact members or individuals after they have completed a task or contributed to an event or program and privately thank them?
☐ Use a newsletter or other written communication tool to praise and recognize member or individual contributions?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

*Kaye, G. & Resnick, I. (1994). *Climate Diagnostic Tool*. Brooklyn, NY: Community Development Consultants.

II. Respect

Everyone wants respect. By joining in community activities, we seek the respect of our peers. People often find that their values, culture, or traditions are not respected in the work place or community. People seek recognition and respect for themselves and their values by joining community organizations and initiatives.

Does your organization/collaboration:

☐ Thoughtfully delegate tasks, making sure that members' and individuals' skills and strengths are being used?
☐ Provide translators or translated materials for members or individuals who do not speak English as their first language?
☐ Include celebrations and traditions that reflect the diversity of your membership and/or community?
☐ Reflect the diversity of your membership and/or community through the foods and refreshments you share at meetings and other events?
☐ Provide child care at meetings and/or dinner at evening meetings so that people with families and children can participate equally?
☐ Hold your meetings at times other than during the 9-5 workday so that people who work or go to school during those hours and cannot take time off can attend?
☐ Listen to and acknowledge the contribution of all members?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

III. Role

We all need to feel needed. It is a cliche; but it is true. We want to belong to a group that gives us an important role, and where our unique contribution can be appreciated. Not everyone searches for the same role. But groups must find a role for everyone if they expect to maintain engagement.

Does your organization/collaboration:

☐ Provide the same kinds of roles for professionals and non-professionals with the same responsibility and power?
☐ Delegate tasks to grassroots members and individuals that involve contacts with

important stakeholders and others with power?
- ☐ Ask members and individuals what kind of roles they would like to play in the organization/collaboration?

- ☐ Dedicate some portion of time to working with grassroots members and individuals to develop their skills to accomplish these tasks and play these roles?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

IV. Relationship

Organizations are organized networks of relationships. It is often a personal invitation that convinces us to join an organization. People join organizations for personal reasons, to make new friends, and for the public reason to broaden a base of support and/or influence. Organizations draw us into a wider context of community relationships that encourage accountability, mutual support, and responsibility.

Does your organization/collaboration:

- ☐ Regularly provide opportunities for socializing before and after meetings?
- ☐ Provide opportunities for members and individuals to formally network with each other around common interests?
- ☐ Provide opportunities for grassroots members and individuals to meet with powerful stakeholders who have access to and who may or may not be part of your organization?
- ☐ Provide opportunities for individuals to work together as partners on projects and tasks?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

V. Reward

Organizations and coalitions attract new members and maintain old members when the rewards of membership outweigh the costs. Of course, not everyone is looking for the same kind of rewards.

Does your organization/collaboration:

- ☐ Work to identify the public and private rewards that respond to the self-interests of members and individuals? In other words, does it try to understand what people want out of their involvement and try to meet their self-interest?
- ☐ Provide the same information and access to funding opportunities to all members and individuals who are involved with the organization/collaboration?
- ☐ Provide other resources and/or referrals to members and individuals involved with the organization/collaboration that matter to them?
- ☐ Create opportunities for members to share information and other resources amongst themselves in special interest committees or some other way?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

VI. Results

Nothing works like results! An organization or initiative needs to be able to "deliver the goods."

Does your organization/collaboration:

- ☐ Have short-term goals and projects that show immediate results on issues that matter to grassroots members and individuals?
- ☐ Have long-term goals and projects that will create meaningful change?
- ☐ Welcome members and individuals who have specific concerns that may not fit directly into your long-term agenda but may fit indirectly and have the support of others in the community?
- ☐ Use short-term victories as a way to build your base of membership or involvement in the community?

☐ SCORE *(for this section)*

When you have completed the diagnostic, score the results. Using the handout provided, discuss the results with your team and facilitator and answer the following questions:

- What do we do well?
- What more can we do in each of these areas?

Climate Diagnostic Score Sheet

Use the guidelines below to help your group identify areas that need to be strengthened. While there is no "magic bullet" for getting citizens engaged and keeping them at the table, these "Six R's" are a good guide to understanding what will keep people involved.

If you've scored in the lower numbers, take some time to reflect on what you could be doing differently to improve your process. If you've scored in the middle numbers, don't just move on and assume you're doing all you can. Keep trying to improve your work in these areas. If you've scored in the higher numbers, you should feel positive about the effort you are putting in to making your initiative, collaboration, or organization a welcoming place for citizens to be active partners. Remember, though, that there is always work to be done to continue to improve and grow.

Section I: Recognition

If you scored:

4-9 Take a hard look at what you are doing or not doing to satisfy people's need for recognition. Can you provide more opportunities for praising members or individuals and their contributions? Do you have a newsletter? Create one! Do you focus specific time and attention on recognizing members and other individuals?

10-15 You're on your way but not there yet. You're still at risk for discouraging participation. Keep trying to think of new ideas and make recognizing people a regular part of your dialogue and contact with members and others.

25-35 Good job. You understand the value and importance of recognizing folks for their contributions and are succeeding in making this an active part of how your organization, initiative or collaboration operates. Keep the focus!

Section II: Respect

If you scored:

7-15	Take a hard look at how you offer folks the opportunity to be respected for their involvement. Do you need to delegate better so that you are empowering folks, rather than intimidating them with tasks they are not ready to take on? Are you doing what you can to recognize and welcome diversity in your membership or in the community? Do your meetings happen on a "service provider" schedule, making it difficult for other community members to get involved?
16-24	You're on your way but not there yet. Think about how you present yourselves to the community. Is your initiative, organization, or collaboration a place where diverse people feel welcome and included? Do you give off the impression that only "professionals" have a seat at the table? Keep trying to identify what the community needs to feel respected and work this into your day-to-day operations.
25-35	Good job. You understand the value and importance of making people feel they are respected for their differences, circumstances, and the unique skills and contributions they bring. You are succeeding in making this an active part of how your organization, initiative, or collaboration operates. Keep the focus!

Section III: Role

If you scored:

4-9	Take a hard look at whether you are providing real and valuable roles for citizens, not just "professionals" in your work. Are you working at developing the leadership skills some grassroots folks may need to take on, roles that have value and substance? Do you fairly delegate tasks or just do what's easiest? Are you actively trying to identify what roles will have meaning to folks who are interested in joining you but may not know exactly how they can fit in to your work?
10-15	You're on your way but not there yet. Focus time on developing leadership skills and abilities among the "non-professionals" who are interested in working with you and work hard at understanding what roles folks want to play. Brush up on your own delegating skills and make sure delegating is done fairly and well.

15-20 Good job. You understand the value and importance of providing real and valuable roles for all members and individuals who want to work with you in your efforts and how to make this happen. Keep the focus!

Section IV: Relationships

If you scored:

4-9 Take a hard look at whether you are providing enough and the right kinds of opportunities for folks to network and build relationships, inside and outside your organization, collaboration or initiative. Do you have dinners, recreational activities, or other socializing opportunities built into your operations? Do you provide occasions for "regular" folks and "power players" to meet and work or talk together?

10-15 You're on your way but not there yet. Work to understand the value of social time, relationship building and networking to potential and existing community members and others who want to work with you and build these experiences into your day-to-day work. Having the opportunity to work with folks who have like agendas and issues is critical for keeping people involved and creating a climate for involvement.

15-20 Good job. You understand the value and importance of promoting and building relationships as a key part of your organization, initiative or collaboration's operating and are providing opportunities for folks to form relationships with each other and with decision makers and other "power players." Keep the focus.

Section V: Reward

If you scored:

4-9 Take a hard look at whether you are providing rewards for people's involvement that outweigh the costs of working with you. Are you taking the important time to identify the self-interest of members and individuals and working with this information to provide rewards and incentives for getting involved? Is everyone getting the same information and resources that will make involvement of benefit to their organizations, families, and/or other interests?

10-15 You're on your way but not there yet. Can you do anything else to better understand the self-interest of members and others who want to work with you and match this self-interest with work in your initiative, organization or collaboration? Providing resources and allowing folks to work on what interests them is an important part of creating a climate for involvement.

15-20 Good job. You understand the value and importance of providing rewards for people's involvement and matching self-interest with the activities and work of your organization, initiative, or collaboration. Keep the focus.

Section VI: Results

If you scored:

4-9 Take a hard look at how result-focused your organization, collaboration, or initiative is in its work. Are you providing space for short-term meaningful "wins" or just focused on long-term projects that require a lot of time and planning? Are you too focused on short-term "wins" and don't have any long-term vision for real change? Are you open to other ideas from community members that matter to the community or are you too rigid about your agenda?

10-15 You're on your way but not there yet. Can you create a better balance between short-term meaningful victories and long-term systems change? Building a base of community involvement means being open to taking on issues the community sees as critical that may not be exactly on your agenda.

15-20 Good job. You understand the value and importance of results, short-term and long-term, for building involvement and keeping members and others on board and can balance short-term victories with long-term systems change. Keep the focus.

Responsibility Charting*

While clarity can be promoted through general structural and procedural means, the complexity of work groups such as collaborations often makes even more detailed specification necessary. A useful tool for this purpose is responsibility charting. This tool helps to develop mutual understanding among various actors with respect to various tasks and decision-making activities.

Below is a sample responsibility chart. You may make additions either to the actors or tasks/decisions column. Simply place the appropriate letter within each box to indicate the specific role of each actor. For example, say the project director and other staff are responsible for planning methods for program delivery. Furthermore, the steering committee must be consulted on methods prior to a vote of approval by the entire collaboration, while a separate board for the project need only be informed by the project director.

The responsibility chart for this situation would look as follows:

	Project Director	Staff	Council	Steering Committee	Board
Plan models (methods) for program delivery	**R**	**R**	**A**	**C**	**I**

Responsibility Chart

Codes

A = Approve. Must sign off or veto before implementation or select from options developed by **R** role.

R = Responsible. Takes initiative in area, develops alternatives, makes recommendation.

C = Consulted. Must be consulted prior to decision being reached, but has no veto power.

I = Informed. Must be notified after a decision, but before public announcement. Needs to know outcome for other related tasks, but need not give input.

*Florin, P. & Chavis, D. (1996). *Responsibility Charting*. Gaithersburg, MD: Association for the Study and Development of Community.

Analysis of Your Responsibility Chart

A complete analysis of responsibility charting should be done in collaboration with all important actors. Here, a quick look at the codes in your chart can address the following questions:

A. Do too many "Don't knows" indicate the need for more structural and procedural specification?

Do the project directors have too many responsibilities? This not only sets the project director up for "burnout" but also prevents the fullest development of participation and leadership from other participants.

Is there a sufficient level of participation by the collaboration members to promote "ownership" of decisions?

How can you use the structure and procedures of your collaboration (e.g., delegating to subcommittees, rotating leadership) to promote higher levels of participation?

Can you "cluster" various tasks/decisions according to planning and policy, implementation, and day-to-day administrative categories?

What other agencies/organizations besides those in the collaboration should be kept informed of your activities? How will they be so informed?

The responsibility chart itself could be shared and approved by the various committees and boards.

Responsibility Chart
Actors

1. Determine goals/priorities					
2. Suggest alternatives - strategies and programs					
3. Decide on programs for implementation					
4. Identify resources for programs					
5. Community and public relations					
6. Program administration					
7. Recruit new collaboration members					
8. Chair meetings					
9. Prepare agendas					
10. Staff hiring					
11. Develop personnel policies					
12. Recruit volunteers					
13. Maintain communications					
14. Prepare budget					
15. Approve budget					
16. Purchases					
17. Collaboration leadership					
18. Decision making					
19.					
20.					

Inclusivity Checklist*

***Instructions**: Use this Inclusivity Checklist to measure how prepared your coalition is for multicultural work, and to identify areas for improvement. Place a check mark in the box next to each statement that applies to your group. If you cannot put a check in the box, this may indicate an area for change.*

- ❑ The leadership of our coalition is multiracial and multicultural.
- ❑ We make special efforts to cultivate new leaders, particularly women and people of color.
- ❑ Our mission, operations, and products reflect the contributions of diverse cultural and social groups.
- ❑ We are committed to fighting social oppression within the coalition and in our work in the community.
- ❑ Members of diverse cultural and social groups are full participants in all aspects of our coalition's work.
- ❑ Meetings are not dominated by speakers from any one group.
- ❑ All segments of our community are represented in decision making.
- ❑ We are sensitive to and aware of different religious and cultural holidays, customs, recreation, and food preferences.
- ❑ We communicate clearly, and people of different cultures feel comfortable sharing their opinions and participating in meetings.
- ❑ We prohibit the use of stereotypes and prejudicial comments.
- ❑ Ethnic, racial, and sexual slurs or jokes are not welcome.

*Rosenthal, B. (1997). Multicultural issues in coalitions. In Kaye, G. & Wolff, T. (Eds.) *From the ground up: A workbook on coalition building and community development.* Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners.

Worksheet 7

Task Force Evaluation and Resource Allocation*

Instructions: The task force should fill out the first page of this two-page evaluation as part of an annual evaluation process. After agreeing on responses and resource requests as a group, the task force should pass the form to the coalition's steering committee for resource allocation assessment (page 2).

Task Force:
Date Formed:
Purpose:

Current Task Force Members (name and affiliation): ________________________________
Chair:

Goal (the work of this Task Force will be done when):

Objectives/activities to achieve goal and target dates:

Resources to support Task Force – Indicate person or organization that will provide each service and check those requested from Coalition:

Chair meetings (schedule, set agenda, facilitate meetings)

Participate in meetings

Type and mail minutes and other correspondence

Evaluate progress and outcomes

Send meeting notices and make follow-up calls

Promote work and activities of Task Force

Carry out activities of Task Force (Specify)

Other (Specify)

Do you anticipate that additional funds will be needed to reach the goal?

Other considerations:

*Hathaway, B.L. (1998). *Task force evaluation and resource allocation*. Orleans, MA: Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition.

Task Force Evaluation and Resource Allocation

1. Does this Task Force address the mission of the coalition to improve the quality of life for those living in the program area?

2. Which goal(s) does it support?

   ☐ To mobilize and maintain broad-based community development and collaboration problem-solving initiatives around health and human services.
   ☐ To ensure the availability of and access to basic opportunities and services.
   ☐ To provide leadership in developing policies, practices, and programs that are effective, responsive, and accountable to those they serve.

3. Will allocating resources to this Task Force detract from the core services?

4. Is there a cross-section of the community represented on the Task Force?
   If no, who else should be represented?

5. Is the goal achievable?

6. What is the likely disposition of this Task Force in the future?

7. Are members providing resources to support the Task Force?

8. If additional funds will be needed, what potential sources exist?

9. Other

Coalition support to be provided:
☐None at this time
☐Chair meetings (schedule, set agenda, facilitate meetings)
☐Participate in meetings
☐Type and mail minutes and other correspondence
☐Send meeting notices and make follow-up calls
☐Promote work and activities of Task Force
☐Evaluate progress and outcomes
☐Carry out activities of Task Force (specify:)
☐Other (specify):

Sustainability Benchmarks*

Instructions
1. Review the five Sustainability Benchmarks that follow.
2. With coalition membership, discuss each benchmark to determine present strengths and challenges and possible actions.
3. Respond to each benchmark in 1 - 2 pages of narrative. Note that the key questions are meant to aid you in your thinking. **You do not need to answer each question directly.**
4. Remember that this process is meant to help you assess your sustainability potential. The actions you identify will go into your sustainability plan.
5. We hope you will use this tool for a thoughtful and honest assessment and that your narrative reflects this honesty. In that way, training and technical assistance can be tailored for the next year.
Note: These benchmarks and key questions can be tailored to your organization's specific needs and activities. Use what follows as a guide.

*Center for Collaborative Planning (2000). *Sustainability Benchmarks*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Sustainability Benchmarks

I The collaboration has mobilized community residents who are committed to sustaining efforts to improve the community.

A collaboration successful at this sustainability strategy understands that the gifts, talents, skills and capacities of individuals are essential building blocks for healthy communities. In addition, a mobilized citizenry that feels ownership of, and contributes to, collaborative efforts is key to long-term sustainability.

(Please respond in 1 - 2 pages. Describe your strengths, challenges, and proposed actions. The Key Questions are to aid you in thinking about the benchmark.)

Key Questions:

How has your collaboration identified the gifts, talents, skills, and capacities of community residents?
How has your collaboration provided opportunities for these gifts and capacities to be contributed?
How are these gifts and capacities being used to sustain collaboration efforts?
How has your collaboration acknowledged and celebrated contributions that have been made?

II The collaboration is sustaining its efforts to improve the community through policy and systems change at the local, regional, and state level.

A collaboration successful at this sustainability strategy views a mobilized local citizenry as an effective constituency to improve the community. The collaboration has built its own capacity and the capacity of a mobilized citizenry to understand how policy is made and influenced and to develop and implement policy and systems change strategies to improve the community.

(Please respond in 1 - 2 pages. Describe your strengths, challenges, and proposed actions. The Key Questions are to aid you in thinking about this benchmark.)

Key Questions:

How has the collaboration built its own capacity, and the capacity of community members, to understand how policy and systems change occurs?

Has it accomplished any of the following?

1. Mapped local institutions and formal policy bodies to see where and how rules, laws, and regulations are made that affect our specific goals.

Built relationships to gain support of local institutions and formal policy bodies where rules, laws, and regulations are made that affect our goals.
Mapped the larger policy arena including regional and state decision-making bodies to see where and how policies are made.
Built relationships in larger policy arenas.
Provided opportunities for community members to participate in mapping, relationship building, and learning advocacy skills.

Has the collaboration developed policy strategies?

Has the collaboration identified how its efforts can be sustained through policy and systems change?
Does the collaboration understand barriers to successful implementation of strategies?
Has the collaboration included community members (constituency) in identification, development and/or refinement of policy strategies?
Has the collaboration provided advocacy opportunities for constituency with decision-making bodies?

Has the collaboration been successful at implementing policy and systems change strategies?

How has the collaboration changed rules, regulations, policies, practices, or procedures of local institutions to improve the community?
How has the collaboration influenced policies and legislation to improve child health?
Can the collaboration identify why or why not?

III The collaboration is sustaining its efforts by spinning off or institutionalizing its effective strategies, activities or programs.

A collaboration successful at this sustainability strategy is able to attract resources to continue its successful strategies, but, equally important, sees itself as a catalyst and is proactive in spinning off its effective strategies to local institutions and/or associations.

(Please respond in 1 - 2 pages. Describe your strengths, challenges, and proposed actions. The Key Questions are to aid you in thinking about this benchmark.)

Key Questions:

How has the collaboration been successful in spinning off strategies?
How has the collaboration identified potential support?

Has the collaboration considered any of the following prospects? (These are examples for a collaboration focusing on child health.)

<u>Institutions</u>
Local schools
Local government: cities/counties
Community services departments
Parks and recreation
Nonprofits (e.g., community-based organizations, YMCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, Head Start)
Local Councils (e.g., CPACC - Child Abuse Prevention Council, CCJPC - Child Care Planning Council)
County Children and Families Commission (Prop 10)

<u>Associations</u>
Service clubs - Kiwanis, Rotary, Soroptomists, AAUW
Churches, faith-based organizations, interfaith councils
Neighborhood associations
Chambers of Commerce
Women's networks and business associations

How have the collaboration and a mobilized constituency engaged support?

Have they done the following?

Identified prospects
Built relationships
Built case for ongoing support (who we are, what we've done, what we've accomplished, what we need)
Gained support

IV The collaboration is sustaining its efforts to improve the community by successfully raising funds and/or proceeding with incorporation to sustain the core functioning of the collaboration.

A collaboration successful at this sustainability strategy wishes to sustain the collaboration itself as an ongoing infrastructure to improve the community. It has attracted resources to sustain this infrastructure or is moving toward incorporation to do the same.

(Please respond in 1 - 2 pages. Describe your strengths, challenges, and proposed actions. The Key Questions are to aid you in thinking about this benchmark.)

Key Questions:

1. What support has the collaboration already received?
2. How has the collaboration identified additional potential support?

   Has the collaboration considered any of the following prospects?

   Local government budgets
   Local community foundations
   Blended local agency funding
   State and/or national foundations
   State agencies
   Private donations
   Endowments
   Associations (Chambers of Commerce, interfaith councils)
   Private business

3. How have the collaboration and a mobilized constituency engaged support?

   Have they done the following?

   1. Identified potential funders
   2. Built relationships
   3. Built case for ongoing support (who we are, what we've done, what we've accomplished, what we need)
   4. Gained support

4. Is the collaboration considering incorporation as a sustainability issue? If yes,

   1. Has the collaboration researched incorporation for feasibility?
   2. Has the collaboration taken steps to incorporate?

V The collaboration is making progress in implementing its key strategies (Impact Strategies) to reach its desired outcomes to improve the community.

The successful collaboration not only makes progress on its proposed strategies, but also uses evaluation findings to make revisions when appropriate and necessary. In this way, the collaboration functions as a learning community.

Worksheet 8

Sustainability Benchmarks

(Please respond in 1 - 2 pages per Impact Strategy. Describe your strengths, challenges, and proposed actions. The Key Questions are to aid you in thinking about this benchmark.)

Key Questions:

- What are your successes in implementing your strategies?
- What are your challenges?
- What have you learned about these strategies from your evaluation findings?
- What revisions would you like to make on these strategies based on your evaluation findings?
- What have been your successes in engaging the broader community in your learning community? Does the broader community understand the evaluation findings? Are they involved in any decisions the collaboration will make based on these findings?
- Have new strategies or opportunities presented themselves that had not been anticipated? What are they?

Coalition Annual Report*

Instructions: *Use this sample Coalition Annual Report as a model for communicating with all current and potential coalition members, particular board members, volunteers, contributors and local agency representatives.*

Mission

The Happy Valley Community Coalition is a community-wide alliance committed to improving the quality of life for all those living in Happy Valley.

Goals

- To mobilize and maintain broad-based community development and collaboration problem-solving initiatives around health and human service issues.

- To insure the availability of, and access to, basic opportunities and services.

- To provide leadership in developing policies, practices, and programs that are effective, responsive, and accountable to those they serve.

Task Force

Coalition Task Forces are formed to address specific needs or issues of concern for Happy Valley residents. During 2000-2001 Task Forces actively addressed health care, transportation, and livable wages.

*Hathaway, B. L, (2001). *Lower/Outer Cap Community Coalition annual report 2000-2001.* Eastham, MA: Lower/Outer Cape Community Coalition.

Example 1: Healthy Care Advocacy Task Force

Goal

To increase access to health care, especially for the uninsured, to advocate for local, state, and Federal health policy changes that increase access, and advocate for quality patient care through every stage of medical treatment.

2000-2001 Objectives

√ To increase Happy Valley residents' usage of the Community Dental Center to 25% of the total participants.
√ Identify town health needs and resources and advocate for coordinated responses with Happy Valley Health Care and other providers.
√ Implement, track, and evaluate the effectiveness of the coordinated outreach plan for enrollment in MassHealth.
√ Involve consumers in the evaluation of the Happy Valley Community Dental Center.
√ Implement a preventive educational dental program in Happy Valley.

Task Force Activities

- Distributed 25,000 pink business cards with phone numbers to call for health insurance enrollment assistance.
- Dental Center evaluation completed by patients.
- Provided informational luncheons for 50 medical office managers on community health center.
- 8 people attended and 3 people testified at the public hearing on May 10 for the Health Now! legislation.
- Participated in the Community Health Access Project (CHAP).

Outcomes

→ 53.5% of total users of the Dental Care Center are from Happy Valley.
→ Identified and advocated for health needs of Happy Valley residents.
→ 690 people enrolled in MassHealth and CMSP.
→ CHAP efforts brought $1,279,000 in resources to the valley.

Example 2: Business/Non-Profit Partnership

Goal

To increase availability of, and access to, basic opportunities and services for low and moderate-income wage earners in the Happy Valley.

2000-2001 Objectives

√ To develop a close working relationship between the business community and the non-profit sector in the Happy Valley, focusing on housing and child care issues.
√ To provide some employee- related solutions to these issues.

Activities

Two separate groups (Child Care and Housing) were established, which include human service and business members.

Child Care

· A Child Care committee meets regularly with county child care organizations to coordinate programs and services and exchange information.

Housing

· Encouraged support of local Chambers of Commerce for local housing proposals.
· A special panel on Happy Valley housing needs and programs was developed to present to the Happy Valley Times editorial board.

Outcomes

→ The Happy Valley Council on Aging, Happy Valley Chamber of Commerce, and the coalition are developing a pilot shared-housing program matching elder homeowners and summer employees.
→ Heightened public awareness of affordable housing needs. *The Happy Valley Times* received an award for their special housing series.

Partners

Happy Valley Children's Place	Happy Valley Times
Happy Valley Chamber of Commerce	Happy Valley CDC
Happy Valley Housing Authority	Happy Valley Community Church

Task Force Worksheet

Task Force's Goal

Year's Objectives

I.

II.

III.

IV.

Activities

→

→

→

→

Outcomes

→

→

→

→

Partners