

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

Franklin County OD2A Year 3-EXT 2023

Prepared by: Dr. Lesli Johnson, Daniel Kloepfer, Dr. Jacob White, Robin Webb, & Peyton Ryba



Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Service

Contents

Introduction	2
Methodology	2
Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory Results	2
OD2A Specific Statements Results	4
Conclusion	5
Appendix.....	6
YR3-EXT Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory Descriptive Statistics	6
YR3-EXT OD2A Specific Statements Descriptive Statistics.....	6

This work was funded through the Overdose Data to Action (OD2A) grant received by Franklin County Public Health (FCPH) from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Division of Overdose Prevention (DOP), National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC)

Introduction

To track collaboration strengths, growth, and potential areas needing attention within the Franklin County Overdose Data to Action (OD2A) grant collaborative, project partners, including Franklin County Public Health (FCPH), completed the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory¹ along with nine OD2A specific statements in the first, second, third, and fourth and final year of the OD2A project. The inventory does not aim to provide total collaboration scores; instead, it offers descriptive factor scores that collaborative groups can use as "starting points for discussion" and markers of functioning. Although yearly changes are visible, the most crucial aspect when interpreting these data is whether the factor scores indicate a strength (greater than 4) or an area that may need attention (between 3-3.99). The following sections describe the methodology used, discuss the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory and OD2A-specific statements results by project year, and provide a brief conclusion.

Methodology

The Ohio University (OU) evaluation team distributed the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory and OD2A-specific statements to all project partners in February of YR1, March of YR2, March of YR3, and in February and March of the YR3 Extension. The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory contains 40 statements divided into 20 factors linked to successful collaboration. Researchers identified these 20 factors through a meta-analysis of case studies from previous successful collaborations. In the first year of the project, the OU evaluation team collaborated with FCPH to create nine additional OD2A-specific statements for measuring factors unique to the OD2A project in Franklin County. Each of the 40 Wilder Factors Inventory and 9 OD2A-specific statements received a score on a Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral/No opinion, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree, 6=Don't Know). The average Likert scores for each factor make up the factor scores and help identify strengths (i.e., factors with average scores of 4.00 or higher), borderline areas needing attention (i.e., factors with average scores between 3.00 and 3.99), and areas of concern (i.e., factors with average scores below 3.00). After discussing with FCPH, the team added the 'Don't Know' response option to the survey for increased flexibility. All 'Don't Know' responses have been removed from the analysis in the tables below to maintain consistency with the original scoring. Since not every respondent answered each statement, the number of respondents might vary by statement. Furthermore, because some partnering agencies did not complete the survey each year and because of the possibility that different agency representatives completed the survey each year, the results of this survey should be interpreted with this in mind and used as a general collaboration guide that can help identify areas of concern within the collaborative. The Appendix contains the response breakdown for each individual statement in the Year 3 Extension.

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory Results

Table 1 presents the results of the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory by project year. In general, these results demonstrate that collaboration is not only a strength of the project but has also improved over the duration of the OD2A project. In Year 1, survey results revealed that eight factors were considered strengths of the collaboration, while 12 were borderline areas that might need attention. In Year 2, the number of factors considered strengths dropped slightly to seven, with 13 factors considered borderline areas needing attention. In Year 3, the number of factors considered strengths increased from seven to 11.

In the Year 3 Extension, the number of factors considered strengths decreased slightly to nine. Among the remaining 11 factors considered borderline areas needing attention, four scores were very close to

¹ Mattessich, P.W., Murray-Close, M, Monsey, B.R. (2001) Collaboration, What Makes It Work, 2nd Ed. <http://www.fieldstonealliance.org/productdetails.cfm?SKU=069326>



four (3.9 or higher) and almost considered strengths. For example, the *Multiple layers of participation* factor score reached 3.92 and has increased for the last two years, trending towards becoming a strength in the Year 3 Extension. Additionally, the *Development of clear roles and policy guidelines* factor maintained its score of 3.9 from Year 3 to Year 3-EXT. **Most strikingly, no factors were identified as areas of concern in any of the four project years.**

What stands out further is that five factors were consistently considered strengths throughout all four project years: 1) *Favorable political and social climate*, 2) *Members seeing collaboration as in their self-interest*, 3) *Members sharing a stake in both process and outcome*, 4) *Shared vision*, and 5) *Unique purpose*. Furthermore, in the fourth year (Year 3-EXT), two factors, *History of collaboration or cooperation in the community* and *Ability to compromise*, increased from a borderline factor to a strength, while two factors decreased from a strength to a borderline factor. However, the factors that decreased from Year 3 to Year 3-EXT (*Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community* and *Established informal relationships and communication links*) only experienced a slight decrease.

With only three factors scored below 3.8 and 17 scores that are strengths or borderline strengths over 3.9 in YR3-EXT, it is evident that collaboration remained a consistent strength of the OD2A initiative throughout all four years of the project.

Table 1. Wilder Collaboration Factors

Factor (N=number of survey respondents)	Average Score			
	YR 1 (N=17)	YR 2 (N=14)	YR 3 (N=21)	YR 3-EXT (N=20)
History of collaboration or cooperation in the community	4.22	3.69	3.95	4.08
Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community	4.23	3.88	4.03	3.89
Favorable political and social climate	4.5	4.22	4.1	4.2
Mutual respect, understanding, and trust	3.97	3.93	4.03	3.93
Appropriate cross section of members	3.81	3.92	3.9	3.6
Members see collaboration as in their self-interest	4.38	4.1	4.4	4.55
Ability to compromise	3.92	4	3.95	4.2
Members share a stake in both process and outcome	4.5	4.23	4.07	4.24
Multiple layers of participation	3.65	3.42	3.83	3.92
Flexibility	3.96	3.89	4.07	3.98
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	3.4	3.32	3.9	3.9
Sustainability	3.61	3.96	3.98	3.81
Appropriate pace of development	3.73	3.82	3.69	3.66
Open and frequent communication	3.8	3.46	3.9	3.88
Established informal relationships and communications links	3.81	4.07	4.24	3.88
Concrete, attainable goals and objectives	3.95	3.8	4.33	4.07
Shared vision	4.37	4.15	4.17	4.11
Unique purpose	4.17	4.15	4.05	4.06
Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time	3.88	3.54	3.95	3.45
Skilled leadership	4	3.77	4.2	4.2

 = strength  = borderline area that may need attention

OD2A Specific Statements Results

Tables 2 and 3 display the results of the OD2A specific statements related to Franklin County and the OD2A collaborative by project year. These results reveal that the collaborative achieves a primary goal of the OD2A project: increasing data usage to address the opioid crisis. Regarding the four Franklin County Factors, we see that from Year 3 to Year 3-EXT, two factors, *Franklin County has the infrastructure to support the integration of data and information from multiple sources in a manner that allows for effective planning and the implementation of effective interventions to address the opioid crisis* and *Franklin County has the capacity to develop, implement and expand evidence-based prevention strategies to address substance use and abuse*, improved their score from borderline to areas of strength, resulting in each score above 4, demonstrating significant strengths in Franklin County’s capacity, infrastructure, and cultural awareness necessary to effectively carry out OD2A project objectives.

Although the scores in Table 3 suggest 2 borderline areas, the scores remain high, indicating the collaborative has remained consistent in the utilization of evidence-based prevention strategies scoring 3.95 in both Year 3 and Year 3-EXT. Further, the decrease in the score related to implementing new strategies in prevention was minimal, dropping from 4.1 to 3.89 from YR3 to YR3-EXT. This could be expected as this is the fourth and final year of the project. The remaining three OD2A collaborative-specific factors all scored over 4, indicating significant strength in the partnership and its ability to execute and implement the shared OD2A goals.

We see that the collaborative scored above 4 in the factors related to the increased cultural awareness of opioid addiction, education, and prevention across all four years of the project. We also saw consistent strength across all four years in the factor related to Franklin County’s capacity to develop, implement, and expand evidence-based intervention strategies to address substance use and abuse. As seen in Tables 2 & 3, seven out of nine factors scored above 4, and the remaining two both being 3.89 or higher, the OD2A-specific factors indicate substantial strength in the collaborative’s capacity and ability to leverage infrastructure and integrate data from multiple sources to implement prevention and intervention strategies.



TABLE 2. OD2A FRANKLIN COUNTY SPECIFIC STATEMENTS

Factor (N=number of survey respondents)	Average Score			
	YR 1 (N=17)	YR 2 (N=14)	YR3 (N=21)	YR3-EXT (N=20)
Franklin County has the infrastructure to support the integration of data and information from multiple sources in a manner that allows for effective planning and the implementation of effective interventions to address the opioid crisis.	3.42	3.46	3.79	4.1
Franklin County has the capacity to develop, implement and expand evidence-based prevention strategies to address substance use and abuse.	4.07	4.25	3.9	4.2
Franklin County has the capacity to develop, implement and expand evidence-based intervention strategies to address substance use and abuse.	4.21	4	4.1	4.15
Franklin County demonstrates high levels of cultural awareness about opioid addiction, education, and prevention.	4.08	3.5	4.1	4.25

 = strength  = borderline area that may need attention

TABLE 3. OD2A COLLABORATION SPECIFIC STATEMENTS

Factor (N=number of survey respondents)	Average Score			
	YR 1 (N=17)	YR 2 (N=14)	YR3 (N=21)	YR3- EXT (N=20)
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has effectively influenced the development of an integrated data and information system.	3.3	3.82	4.1	4.2
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has effectively utilized shared data to plan and implement new strategies in prevention and intervention.	3.33	3.5	4.1	3.89
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased the utilization of evidence-based prevention strategies.	4.09	3.77	3.95	3.95
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased the utilization of evidence-based intervention and treatment strategies.	4.37	3.65	4.1	4
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased cultural awareness of opioid addiction, education, and prevention.	4	4.14	4.15	4.21

 strength  = borderline area that may need attention

Conclusion

Reviewing the YR3-EXT scores for the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory and OD2A-specific statements, it is evident that the Franklin County OD2A project partners believe collaboration is a strength now and has been throughout each of the project's four years. The collaboration was identified as a strength from the project's onset in Year 1 and has continued to improve over time. Further, no factors were identified as areas of concern in any of the four project years. Moreover, the OD2A-specific statements demonstrate that the partnership has effectively addressed one of the project's primary objectives, which is to utilize overdose data to take action. The partnerships developed over the past four years through this initiative have significantly enhanced Franklin County's ability to share and utilize data to respond strategically to overdoses. Although this iteration of the Franklin County OD2A partnership is concluding, the collaborative approach and shared commitment to preventing overdose deaths and connecting individuals with substance use disorder treatment will undoubtedly continue.

Appendix

YR3-EXT Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory Descriptive Statistics

In the table below, descriptive statistics can be found for each of the 40 statements. Response options 'Strongly Agree and Agree' and 'Strongly Disagree and Disagree' were combined. The variable 'N' stands for the number of respondents to each individual item. Additionally, the number of no responses are also listed in the last column of the table.

TABLE 4. WILDER COLLABORATION FACTORS INVENTORY YR3-EXT DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

YR3-EXT		Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total responses
Factor	Statement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<i>History of collaboration or cooperation in the community</i>	Agencies in our community have a history of working together.	18	90%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	20
	Trying to solve problems through collaboration has been common in this community.	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	20
<i>Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community</i>	Leaders in this community who are not part of our collaborative group seem hopeful about what we can accomplish.	14	70%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	20
	Others (in this community) who are not part of this collaboration would generally agree that the right organizations are involved.	13	65%	5	25%	0	0%	2	10%	20
<i>Favorable political and social climate</i>	The political and social climate seems to be "right" for starting a collaborative project like this one.	16	80%	3	15%	1	5%	0	0%	20
	The time is right for this collaborative project.	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	20
<i>Mutual respect, understanding and trust</i>	People involved in our collaboration always trust one another.	10	50%	6	30%	4	20%	0	0%	20
	I have a lot of respect for the other people involved in this collaboration.	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	20

YR3-EXT		Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total responses
Factor	Statement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<i>Appropriate cross section of members</i>	The people involved in our collaboration represent a cross section of those who have a stake in what we are trying to accomplish.	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	All the organizations that we need to be members of this collaborative group have become members of the group.	9	47%	2	11%	8	42%	0	0%	19
<i>Members see collaboration as in their self-interest</i>	My organization will benefit from being involved in this collaboration.	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	20
<i>Ability to compromise</i>	People involved in our collaboration are willing to compromise on important aspects of our project.	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	20
<i>Members share a stake in both process and outcome</i>	The organizations that belong to our collaborative group invest the right amount of time in our collaborative efforts.	15	75%	3	15%	0	0%	2	10%	20
	Everyone who is a member of our collaborative group wants this project to succeed.	19	95%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	20
	The level of commitment among the collaboration participants is high.	18	90%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	20
<i>Multiple layers of participation</i>	When the collaborative group makes major decisions, there is always enough time for members to take information back to their organizations to confer with colleagues.	17	85%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	20
	Each of the people who participate in decisions in this collaborative group can speak for the entire organization they represent.	16	80%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	20

YR3-EXT		Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total responses
Factor	Statement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Flexibility	There is a lot of flexibility when decisions are made; people are open to discussing different options.	16	80%	3	15%	1	5%	0	0%	20
	People in this collaborative group are open to different approaches to how we can do our work.	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	People in this collaborative group have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities.	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	There is a clear process for making decisions among the partners in this collaboration.	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Adaptability	This collaboration is able to adapt to changing conditions, such as fewer funds, changing political climate, or change in leadership.	14	70%	4	20%	0	0%	2	10%	20
	This group has the ability to survive even if it had to make major changes in its plans or add new members to reach its goals.	13	65%	5	25%	1	5%	1	5%	20
Appropriate pace of development	This collaborative group has tried to take on the right amount of work at the right pace.	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	We are currently able to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people and organizations related to the project.	11	55%	6	30%	2	10%	1	5%	20
Open and frequent communication	People in this collaboration communicate openly with one another.	16	80%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	I am informed as often as I should be about what goes on in the collaboration.	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	20
	The people who lead this collaborative group communicate well with the members.	16	80%	3	15%	1	5%	0	0%	20
	Communication among the people in this collaborative group happens both at formal meetings and informal ways.	17	85%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	20

<i>Established informal relationships and communication links</i>	I personally have informal conversations about the project with others who are involved in this collaborative group.	14	70%	3	15%	3	15%	0	0%	20
---	--	----	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	----	----

YR3-EXT		Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total responses
Factor	Statement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<i>Concrete, attainable goals and objectives</i>	I have a clear understanding of what our collaboration is trying to accomplish.	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	People in our collaborative group know and understand our goals.	18	90%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	20
	People in our collaborative group have established reasonable goals.	19	95%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	20
<i>Shared Vision</i>	The people in this collaborative group are dedicated to the idea that we can make this project work.	19	95%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	20
	My ideas about what we want to accomplish with this collaboration seem to be the same as the ideas as others.	15	75%	4	20%	0	0%	1	5%	20
<i>Unique purpose</i>	What we are trying to accomplish with our collaborative project would be difficult for any single organization to accomplish by itself.	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	20
	No other organization in the community is trying to do exactly what we are trying to do.	12	60%	2	10%	4	###	2	10%	20
<i>Sufficient funds, staff, materials and time</i>	Our collaborative group has adequate funds to do what it wants to accomplish.	12	60%	4	20%	3	15%	1	5%	20
	Our collaborative group has adequate "people power" to do what it wants to accomplish.	11	55%	2	10%	6	30%	1	5%	20
<i>Skilled leadership</i>	The people in leadership positions for this collaboration have good skills for working with other people and organizations.	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	20

YR3 OD2A Specific Statements Descriptive Statistics

In the table below, descriptive statistics can be found for each of the nine OD2A specific statements. Response options 'Strongly Agree and Agree' and 'Strongly Disagree and Disagree' were combined. The variable 'N' stands for the number of respondents to each individual item. Additionally, the number of no responses are also listed in the last column of the table.

TABLE 5. YR3 OD2A SPECIFIC STATEMENTS DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

YR3-EXT	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total N	No Answer
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	#
Franklin County has the infrastructure to support the integration of data and information from multiple sources in a manner that allows for effective planning and the implementation of effective interventions to address the opioid crisis.	18	90%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	20	0
Franklin County has the capacity to develop, implement and expand evidence-based prevention strategies to address substance use and abuse.	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	20	0
Franklin County has the capacity to develop, implement and expand evidence-based intervention strategies to address substance use and abuse.	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	20	0
Franklin County demonstrates high levels of cultural awareness about opioid addiction, education, and prevention.	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	20	0

YR3-EXT	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Don't Know		Total N	No Answer
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	#
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has effectively influenced the development of an integrated data and information system.	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	20	0
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has effectively utilized shared data to plan and implement new strategies in prevention and intervention.	15	75%	3	15%	1	5%	1	5%	20	0
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased the utilization of evidence-based prevention strategies.	16	80%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	20	0
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased the utilization of evidence-based intervention and treatment strategies.	16	80%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	20	0
The collaboration/partnership that I am participating in has increased cultural awareness of opioid addiction, education, and prevention.	17	85%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	20	0