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• Welcome and Housekeeping
• Opening Remarks
• Speakers
• Q&A/Discussion
• Wrap-Up & Survey
HOUSEKEEPING

- All lines will be in listen-only mode (to mute/unmute your line press *6)

- If you need to step away from the phone, please do not put the call on hold. Hang up and join again.

- If you have a question for the presenters, please type it in the chat box.

- Please fill out the evaluation survey at the end of the call.

- Download resources from the files pod.

- Today’s call will be recorded.

- If you encounter technical difficulties, use the chat box on the lower right hand side of your screen.
WELCOME!

Opening remarks – Caroline Stampfel, AMCHP Director of Programs

This project is supported by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) under grant number U01MC00001 Partnership for State Title V MCH Leadership Community Cooperative Agreement ($1,696,335). This information or content and conclusions are those of the author and should not be construed as the official position or policy of, nor should any endorsements be inferred by HRSA, HHS or the U.S. Government.
OBJECTIVES

• By the end of this webinar, participants will be able to:
  o Provide an overview of Improving Community Outcomes for Maternal and Child Health (ICO4MCH)
  o Describe measurement of collaboration using Wilders Collaborative Factors Inventory
  o Describe barriers to successful collaboration and solutions
  o Learn how to measure factors related to collaboration with the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
  o Identify ways to improve your key collaborations
SPEAKERS

Rebecca Wells, Ph.D
Professor—University of Texas School of Public Health

Dorothy Cilenti, Dr.PH
Clinical Associate Professor—UNC Gillings School of Public Health
Learning Objectives

• Learn about a current collaboration example - Improving Community Outcomes for Maternal and Child Health (ICO4MCH)

• Learn how to measure factors related to collaboration with the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

• Identify ways to improve your key collaborations
Improving Community Outcomes for Maternal and Child Health (ICO4MCH)

Using a Collective Impact framework, the principles of Implementation Science and a health equity lens, ICO4MCH implements evidence-based strategies to address the following aims:

- Improve birth outcomes
- Reduce infant mortality
- Improve the health of children ages 0 – 5
## ICO4MCH: Evidence Based Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve birth outcomes</th>
<th>Reduce infant mortality</th>
<th>Improve child health, ages 0 – 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using a Reproductive Justice Framework (RJ) to improve the utilization of Reproductive Life Planning (RLP) and access to long-acting reversible contraception (LARC)</td>
<td>Tobacco Cessation and Prevention</td>
<td>Positive Parenting Program (Triple P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Steps for Successful Breastfeeding, Steps 3 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Family Connects Newborn Home Visiting Program</td>
<td>Clinical Efforts Against Secondhand Smoke Exposure (CEASE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Action Team (CAT)

- Responsible for supporting broad implementation of the EBS and health equity to promote systems change

- Teams composed of various stakeholders from the community, including consumers/community members

- Structure of each CAT is dependent on the needs of the county(ies)

- The goal is to create sustainable collaboration
Measuring Factors Affecting Collaboration: Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilder Collaboration Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of collaboration or cooperation in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative group seen as legitimate leaders in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable political and social climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect, understanding, and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate cross section of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members see collaboration as in their self-interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members share a stake in both process and outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple layers of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory Survey

Select the response that best indicates how much you agree or disagree with each item.

1. Agencies in our community have a history of working together.
2. Trying to solve problems through collaboration has been common in this community. It’s been done a lot before.
3. Leaders in this community who are not part of our collaborative group seem hopeful about what we can accomplish.
4. Others (in this community) who are not a part of this collaboration would generally agree that the organizations involved in this collaborative project are the "right" organizations to make this work.
Results

- 4.0 or Above
- 3.0-3.9
- 2.9 or Below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1) History of collaboration or cooperation in community</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>2) Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>3) Favorable political and social climate</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>4) Mutual respect, understanding and trust</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>5) Appropriate cross section of members</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6) Members see their collaboration as in their self-interest</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7) Ability to compromise</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14, 15</td>
<td>8) Members share a stake in both process and outcome</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>9) Multiple layers of participation</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>10) Flexibility</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>11) Development of clear roles and policy guidelines</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>12) Adaptability</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 25</td>
<td>13) Appropriate pace of development</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 27, 28</td>
<td>14) Open and frequent communication</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>15) Established informal relationships and communication links</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 32, 33</td>
<td>16) Concrete, attainable goals and objectives</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 35</td>
<td>17) Shared vision</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 37</td>
<td>18) Unique purpose</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38, 39</td>
<td>19) Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20) Skilled leadership</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
Average Score Across Sites
Year 1 and Year 2 Results

Strengths

Areas of Concern

YEAR 1
YEAR 2
What Is Working Well In Our Collaboratives?

Common responses to open ended questions:

• Good leadership

• The genuine energy and motivation of diverse, participating members

• Coordination and communication is improving

• Location and time of meetings is good. (Not a specific factor)
What Needs Improvement In Our Collaboratives?

Common responses to open ended questions:

• Tangible timelines and actions for group members to participate both within and beyond meetings.

• Community members and other agencies needed at the table, including leaders/managers from those agencies.

• Sustainable model of engagement and funding source
What Does The Data Show Us?

• Scores improved from year 1 to 2.

• No areas of concern in year 2.

• Despite strengths, sites had areas that need to be addressed.

• Increase in scores is a result of implementation coaching, site leadership, and time.
Lessons Learned for ICO4MCH

Barriers to Successful Collaborations
• Community buy-in.
• Broad participation, including community members.
• Balancing grant requirements with other priorities.
• Staff turnover.

Next Steps
• Compensate consumers for participation.
• Use technology to facilitate participation.
• Provide tailored technical assistance.
• Help sites build sustainability for the work.
• Administer Wilders Inventory in Year 3.
Think about a key current collaboration you are involved in.
For that collaboration, select the response that best indicates how much you agree or disagree with each item.
Reflection

• What is working well now in your current collaboration? What can you share with other participants about how you have achieved that?

• What challenges does your collaboration face? What can others share about how to overcome those challenges?

• How might you use the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory or a related approach?
Other Tools

• One useful list has been compiled by Broadleaf Consulting

• Others?
Thank You

Dorothy Cilenti
cilenti@email.unc.edu

Rebecca Wells
rwells@email.unc.edu
Q & A
Thank you!

Mark your calendars for part 3 of the Collaboration Science series in April!

Tools for Measuring Partnerships: Using Social Network Analysis and the PARTNER Tool and the Person-Centered Network App to measure social connectedness, trust, and leveraging of resources.