Coalition Building and Community Mobilization Measurement Tools for Nebraska RPE

Report by:
December Lange Treacy, M.S., PA Ph.D. Student
Claire Rynearson, MPA, PCMSW, PLMHP, Program Evaluator

with Jeanette Harder, PhD, Professor, STEPs Project Director

December 20, 2018

Table of Contents

To navigate through this document, *click on any of the boxes below to learn more about a specific topic.*

You can return to this menu at any time by clicking the ✳ in the upper right corner of each page.

Introduction & Using this Report

Overview of Coalition Building & Community Mobilization

Evaluation of Community-Level Interventions

Outcomes by Measurement Tools

Tips for Using the Measurement Tools

Measurement Tool Directories

Introduction & Using this Report

The purpose of this report is to provide sexual violence advocates and practitioners in Nebraska with measurement tools for evaluating sexual violence prevention at the community and societal levels.

The beginning sections of this report will provide you with an overview of how to use the report. It includes the definitions we used to provide additional information about each of the measurement tools. There are also examples of the types of outcomes the tools may measure. The beginning section ends with important tips on how to use the measurement tools. The majority of the report is dedicated to the measurement tools.

We would also like to note while all of these tools are appropriate in certain situations, not every tool is appropriate for every situation. It is important to choose a measurement tool with your specific organization in mind.

Our hope is that this report provides you with the measurement tools you need to begin evaluating your sexual violence prevention efforts at the community and societal levels.

Coalition Building & Community Mobilization

Coalition building is the process by which community members and organizations come together to achieve a common goal, in this case preventing sexual violence. Ideally, coalition building involves a broad spectrum of community representatives working together to jointly develop a vision, mission, and goals, and to take action. Coalition building encourages collaboration which is defined as "exchanging information, modifying activities, and sharing risks, resources, responsibilities, and rewards" (Nebraska's Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, 2017).

Community mobilization creates change in communities by facilitating a shift in ownership for the solution to the community in order to impact the complex interplay of factors that contribute to sexual violence. While coalition building is about individuals and agencies working together in collaboration to prevent sexual violence, community mobilization is about facilitating community ownership and action to prevent sexual violence (Nebraska's Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, 2017).

Coalition Building & Community Mobilization

- **Formation:** Involves initial mobilization, establishment of an organizational structure, building capacity for action, and planning for action (Goodman et al., 1996; Florin, Mitchell, & Stevenson, 1993).
- **Implementation:** Involves the implementation of strategies from the formation stage (Goodman et al., 1996) and developing a thorough work plan (Florin, Mitchell, & Stevenson, 1993).
- **Impact:** Involves institutionalization, investigation of community impacts, maintenance of activities (Goodman et al., 1996), and refinement of programming (Florin, Mitchell, & Stevenson, 1993)

Community Mobilization Only

- A hallmark characteristic of community mobilization is **community ownership.** Communities are seen as taking a lead role in the development of activities rather than simply existing as the recipients of grants and services. Community mobilization not only encourages community participation but views it as necessary for decision-making and sustainability.

Evaluation of Community-Level Interventions

Process Evaluation

Process evaluation examines what the group is doing, how many people have been reached, and whether or not the group is functioning ideally. This is often evaluated periodically throughout the life of a group. Process evaluations typically involve surveys or questionnaires completed by coalition members as well as group records and reports. Groups may ask:

1. How long has the group been together? How often does it meet?
2. What type of structure has been developed by the group?
3. Who is represented within the group?
4. What has the group done to train its members or community members?
5. Do all community members have equal access to the group's efforts?
6. What is the group doing well? What are some problems?

Process evaluation additionally examines whether programs are provided as they were intended. Groups will want to reference their logic model to assist in determining whether activities have been carried out successfully. Interviews, focus groups, and structured observation of the group's efforts can be utilized in addition to surveys and questionnaires. Groups may ask:

1. Has duplication of services been reduced?
2. Have funds been used effectively? Has the group accessed new funds?
3. Did the group use resources effectively?
4. Is the community aware of and supportive of the group's efforts?
5. Do elected officials and other community leaders support the group's efforts?

Outcome Evaluation

Outcome evaluation determines whether specific objectives were met by the group. Like process evaluation, outcome evaluation often utilizes questionnaires, surveys, interviews and focus groups. Groups may ask:

1. Do community members have increased knowledge of the issue?
2. Do community members feel increased ownership of the issue?
3. Are community members taking action on this issue?

Outcome evaluation also involves impact evaluation. Impact evaluation looks at the "big picture" of what the group has accomplished. Ultimately, this level of evaluation aims to look at changes in the community that could be attributed to the group's efforts. Typically, impact evaluation is looking at changes over time. Groups can collect primary data on community members or examine secondary data from existing reports on community statistics.

Outcomes by Measurement Tools

Content Tool	Examples of Outcomes
Formation Tools	• Member participation and engagement • Formality of organizational structure and procedures • Organizational climate • Community partnerships and collaboration
Implementation Tools	• Intra-coalition collaboration • Community planning • Community partnerships and collaboration
Impact Tools	• Coalition maintenance • Community impact • Community institutionalization

Tips for Using the Measurement Tools

Copyright Information

Measurement tools may be reproduced and used for non-commercial research and community purposes without seeking written permission. Distribution must be controlled, meaning only to the participants engaged in the research or enrolled in the community activity. Any other type of reproduction or distribution of measurement tool content is not authorized without written permission from the author and publisher. Always include a credit line that contains the source citation and copyright owner when writing about or using any test (American Psychiatric Association and PsychTEST, 2018).

Reverse Coding

Reverse coding is used for coding items that are negatively worded. For example, let's say a measurement tool has 20 items rated on a scale of 1-5. For most items, a 5 indicates a positive attitude towards the issue, but for a few items, a 1 indicates a positive attitude. When it comes to analyzing your collected data, you will need to reverse code the items where a 1 indicates a positive attitude. This way, a 5 will indicate a positive attitude for all items in your dataset. For negatively worded items that require reverse coding, the conversion will look like this: 1→5, 2→4, 3→3, 4→2, and 5→1.

Need for Additional Measurement Tools

The measurement tools included in this document are based on the 2019-2022 RPE funding tiers.

Additional measurement tools may be found using resources such as Google Scholar, local library databases, and RPE technical assistance.

Tips for Using the Measurement Tools (Continued)

Reliability and Validity

Internal Reliability
Many tools include information about reliability, which refers to the tool's consistency. Most of the tools in this menu report an internal consistency measure, which refers to "the consistency of people's responses across the items on a multiple-item measure" (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015). Internal reliability examines how closely all items on a given scale are related to one another. This report mostly uses Cronbach's alpha (α) to express internal consistency. Generally, when α is greater than .8, there is a high level of internal consistency for the tool (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015). Raykov's rho (ρ) can also be utilized to estimate internal consistency of measurement tools. Similar to Cronbach's alpha, the closer Raykov's rho is to 1, the more internally consistent the measurement tool is.

Inter-Rater Reliability
Another type of reliability you will see in this report is inter-rater reliability, which is "the extent to which different observers are consistent in their judgments" (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015). Inter-rater reliability will also be reported using Cronbach's alpha (α).

Test-Retest Reliability
The last type of reliability in this report is test-retest reliability, which refers to the tool's consistency across time. That is, if what you are measuring is supposed to remain consistent (such as IQ score) someone will score similarly on it this week as they would next week. Test-retest reliability is reported using Pearson's *r* (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015).

No Reliability Reported
Some measures included in this report do not have reliability measures to report. One reason for this may be the tools were developed specifically for the use of practitioners, and reliability measures are not as pertinent. Another reason may be some of these tools are meant for internal use for coalitions and community groups, and would therefore not require outside reporting using reliability statistics.

Face Validity
Validity refers to the degree which a tool measures what it is intended to measure. Overall, this report was prepared with face validity in mind. Meaning, we determined the tools included in this menu measure what we would expect them to measure based on face value. We found the items to be consistent with what we would expect to be asked based on the subject of the measurement tool.

Measurement Tool Directories

To view available measurement tools based on the content area, *click on any of the boxes below to learn more about a specific topic.*

Formation

Implementation

Impact

Formation Tools

Tool	Measuring			
	Member Participation & Engagement	Formality of Organizational Structure & Procedures	Organiza-tional Climate	Community Partnerships & Collaboration
Barriers to Collaboration Scale			✓	✓
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool	✓	✓	✓	
Community Action Program Institutionalization Scale	✓	✓		✓
Innovation Climate Scale	✓		✓	
Internal Coalition Effectiveness Instrument	✓		✓	
Levels of Collaboration Survey		✓		
Meeting Effectiveness Survey	✓		✓	
Organizational Member Involvement in Physical Activity Coalitions Survey				✓
Partnership Self-Assessment Survey	✓		✓	
Perceived Group Effectiveness Measure	✓			
Plan Quality Index		✓		
Team Incivility Climate Scale			✓	
Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory	✓		✓	✓
Work Group Committee Measure	✓		✓	

Implementation Tools

Tool	Measuring		
	Intra-Coalition Collaboration	Community Planning	Community Partnerships & Collaboration
Barriers to Collaboration Scale			✓
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool	✓		
Internal Coalition Effectiveness Instrument	✓		
Levels of Collaboration Survey			✓
Needs Assessment Index		✓	
Organizational Member Involvement in Physical Activity Coalitions Survey	✓		✓
Partnership Self-Assessment Survey	✓		
Perceived Group Effectiveness Measure	✓		
Plan Quality Index		✓	
Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory	✓		✓

Coalition Building and Community Mobilization Measurement Tools

Impact Tools

Tool	Community Institutionalization	Community Ownership	Coalition Maintenance
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool			✓
Community Action Program Institutionalization Scale	✓	✓	
Community Mobilization Measure		✓	
Organizational Member Involvement in Physical Activity Coalitions Survey			✓
Readiness-to-Change Scale		✓	
Work Group Committee Measure			✓

The header row for the last three columns spans under "Measuring".

Meeting Effectiveness Survey

When to Use	This tool can be given to coalition members at the end of a coalition meeting to get feedback on the overall meeting structure, climate, and usefulness. Results can be used as accountability and improvement measures.
Citation	Goodman, R. M., Wandersman, A., Chinman, M., Imm, P., & Morrissey, E. (1996). An ecological assessment of community-based interventions for prevention and health promotion: Approaches to measuring community coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*(1), 33-61.

Plan Quality Index

When to Use	This tool can be provided for committee members to complete throughout the plan development process. It evaluates the adequacy of a plan based on the components, scope, resources, and overall perceptions of the plan.
Reliability	Inter-rater reliability: $\alpha=0.73$
Citation	Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., Wandersman, A., Valois, R.F., & Chinman, M. J. (1996) The Plan Quality Index: An empowerment evaluation tool for measuring and improving the quality of plans. In Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S. J. & Wandersman, A. (eds), *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 304–331.

Needs Assessment Index

When to Use	This tool can be given to coalition members to evaluate the plan for a community needs assessment. It allows you to gather data on the perceptions of the overall needs assessment development, logistics planning, data collection, and data analysis strategies.
Citation	Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., Wandersman, A., Valois, R. F., & Chinman, M. J. (1996b). The Plan Quality Index: An empowerment evaluation tool for measuring and improving the quality of plans. In Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S. J., & Wandersman, A. (eds), *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 304–331.

Coalition Self-Assessment Tool

When to Use	This tool can be given to coalition members to better understand where the coalition is in its development. It can provide insight for next steps as well as areas for improvement.
Citation	Goldstein, S. (1997). Community coalitions: A self-assessment tool. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 11*, 430–435.

Internal Coalition Effectiveness Instrument

When to Use	This tool can be given to coalition members to determine the overall coalition climate and working relationships among members. It can be used as an accountability tool as well as for offering areas of improvement.
Reliability	α=0.70
Citation	Cramer, M. E., Atwood, J. R., & Stoner, J. A. (2006). Measuring community coalition effectiveness using the ICE Instrument. *Public Health Nursing, 23*(1), 74-87.

Levels of Collaboration Survey

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community partners and coalition members representing community organizations. The purpose is to measure the levels of communication among community partners and the coalition. It may be useful for demonstrating changes in community relationships over time, as well as for identifying strong partnerships and areas for improvement.
Reliability	Test-retest reliability ranges from r=.81 to r=.87 depending on the year.
Citation	Frey, B. B., Lohmeieer, J. H., Lee, S. W., & Tollefson, N. (2006). Measuring collaboration among grant partners. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(3), 383-392.

The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

When to Use	This tool can be provided to both community partners and coalition members to measure a multitude of factors relating to collaboration. This tool can be used to track changes over time in collaborative factors, as well as to identify areas of strengths and opportunities for growth.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher levels of agreement with group collaboration factors and lower average scores indicate lower levels of agreement with group collaboration factors.
Reliability	Please see below.
Citation	Mattessich, P., Murray-Close, M., & Monsey, B. (2001). *Collaboration: What makes it work* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: Fieldstone Alliance.

Reliability scores for each factor of the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory are from Derose, Beatty and Jackson (2004, p. 58) and can be found below:

Factor	Scale Reliability (α)
History of collaboration or cooperation in the community	.85
Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community	.59
Favorable political and social climate	.81
Appropriate cross section of members	.72
Members see collaboration as in their self-interest	N/A (only one item)
Ability to compromise	N/A (only one item)
Members share a stake in both process and outcome	.71
Multiple layers of participation	.52
Flexibility	.90
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	.92
Adaptability	.81
Appropriate pace of development	.63
Open and frequent communication	.82
Established informal relationships and communication links	.73
Concrete, attainable goals and objectives	.93
Shared vision	.75
Unique purpose	.59
Sufficient funds, staff, materials and time	.50
Skilled leadership	N/A (only one item)

Work Group Commitment Measure

When to Use	This tool can be provided to coalition members to measure their commitment to the coalition. It can provide a measure for change over time, as well as be used for accountability and improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher levels of commitment to the coalition and lower average scores indicate lower levels of commitment to the coalition.
Reliability	α=0.69
Citation	Riordan, C. M., & Shore, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 342-358.

Team Incivility Climate Scale

When to Use	This tool can be provided to coalition members to measure their perceptions of the coalition climate, especially as it relates to civility. It can provide a measure for change over time, as well as be used for accountability and improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher perceptions of incivility among members of the coalition and lower average scores indicate lower perceptions of incivility in the coalition.
Reliability	α=0.89
Citation	Paulin, D., & Griffin, B. (2017). Team incivility climate scale: Development and validation of the team-level incivility climate construct. *Group & Organization Management, 42*(3), 315-345.

Note: Before administering this survey, we would recommend you remove the name, which may bias results.

Perceived Group Effectiveness Measure

When to Use	This tool can be provided to coalition members to measure their perceptions of group effectiveness, especially in regards to group meetings. It can provide a measure for change over time, as well as be used for accountability and improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher levels of perceived group effectiveness and lower average scores indicate lower levels of perceived group effectiveness.
Reliability	α=0.83
Citation	Nowak, K. L., Watt, J., & Walther, J. B. (2009). Computer mediated teamwork and the efficiency framework: Exploring the influence of synchrony and cues on media satisfaction and outcome success. *Computers in Human Behavior, 25*(5), 1108-1119.

Partnership Self-Assessment Survey

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community partners and coalition members representing community organizations. It assesses partnerships through a variety of lenses including decision making, conflict management, benefits and costs to participation, effectiveness, and other perceptions of partnerships. This tool can measure change over time, and provide insight for partnership strengths and areas for improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher levels of agreement among coalition members regarding subscale factors. Lower average scores indicate lower levels of agreement regarding subscale factors.
Citation	Hasnain-Wynia, R., Sofaer, S., Bazzoli, G. J., Alexander, J. A., Shortell, S. M., Conrad, D. A., Chan, B., Zukoski, A. P., & Sweney, J. (2003). Members' perceptions of community care network partnerships' effectiveness. *Medical Care Research and Review, 60*(4), 40S-62S.

Note: Some of the subscales for this measure will need to be adapted for dating and sexual violence prevention.

Organizational Member Involvement in Physical Activity Coalitions Survey

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community partners and coalition members representing community organizations. It assesses partner perceptions of benefits of the partnership, as well as contributions to the coalition. This tool can measure change over time, and provide insight for partnership strengths and areas for improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher levels of agreement among coalition members regarding subscale factors. Lower average scores indicate lower levels of agreement regarding subscale factors.
Reliability	$\alpha=0.92$
Citation	Bornstein, D. B., Pate, R. R., Beets, M. W., Saunders, R. P., & Blair, S. N. (2015). Organizational member involvement in physical activity coalitions across the United States: Development and testing of a novel survey instrument for assessing coalition functioning. *Health Education & Behavior, 42*(3), 313-320.

Innovation Climate Scale

When to Use	This tool can be provided to coalition members to measure coalition climate, especially related to willingness to engage in creative problem solving and to try new things. It can be used to demonstrate change over time, as well as for accountability and improvement.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher perceived levels of innovation in the coalition and lower average scores indicate lower perceived levels of innovation.
Reliability	$\alpha=0.87$
Citation	Campbell, J. W., Im, T., & Jeong, J. (2014). Internal efficiency and turnover intention: Evidence from local government in South Korea. *Public Personnel Management, 43*(2), 259-282.

Community Action Program Institutionalization Scale

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community partners and coalition members to measure perceptions related to community institutionalization. It may be helpful for demonstrating change over time, as well as for identifying areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.
Scoring	Higher aggregate scores indicate higher levels of community institutionalization and lower aggregate scores indicate lower levels of community institutionalization.
Citation	Wallin, E., Lindewald, B., & Andréasson, S. (2004). Institutionalization of a community action program targeting licensed premises in Stockholm, Sweden. *Evaluation Review, 28*(5), 396-419.

Barriers to Collaboration Scale

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community partners and coalition members to identify barriers to collaboration internal and external to the coalition. It can be used to identify opportunities for removing barriers, as well as demonstrate change over time.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate higher perceived barriers to collaboration and lower average scores indicate lower perceived barriers to collaboration.
Citation	Cooper, K. R., & Shumate, M. (2012). Interorganizational collaboration explored through the bona fide network perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(4), 623-654.

Readiness-to-Change Scale

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community members to identify community ownership for sexual violence prevention at the individual level. It can be used to demonstrate change over time.
Scoring	Higher average scores indicate a higher readiness-to-change and lower average scores indicate a lower readiness-to-change.
Reliability	α=.63 (subscale of items 2-3) α=.77 (subscale of items 4-6) α=.69 (subscale of items 7-9)
Citation	Banyard, V. L., Eckstein, R. P., & Moynihan, M. M. (2010). Sexual violence prevention: The role of stages of change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(1), 111-135.

Note: This tool can be adapted for community use. For example, you could adapt the first question to "I don't think sexual assault is a big problem in my community."

Community Mobilization Measure

When to Use	This tool can be provided to community members to assess community concern and collective action regarding sexual and dating violence. It can be used to demonstrate change over time, as well as for an accountability measure.
Scoring	This report contains two subscales from the Community Mobilization Measure, which have been adapted for dating and sexual violence prevention. Higher average scores on the shared concerns subscale indicates higher levels of concern about dating and sexual violence in the community. Higher scores on the collective action scale indicate higher levels community and individual action.
Reliability	Shared Concerns Subscale: ρ=.85 Collective Action Subscale: ρ=.84
Citation	Adapted from Lippman, S. A., Neilands, T. B., Leslie, H. H., Maman, S., MacPhail, C., Twine, R., Peacock, D., Kahn, K., & Pettifor, A. (2016). Development, validation, and performance of a scale to measure community mobilization. *Social Science & Medicine*, *157*, 127-137.

References

American Psychologial Association. (2018). PsycTESTS [database]. Retrieved from
     https://libguides.unomaha.edu

Butterfoss, F. D., & Francisco, V. T. (2004). Evaluating community partnerships and coalitions
     with practitioners in mind. *Health Promotion Practice, 5*(2), 108-114.

Centers for Disease Control. (n.d.). *Types of Evaluation*. Retrieved from
     https://www.cdc.gov/std/program/pupestd/types%20of%20evaluation.pdf

Derose, K.P., Beatty, A. & Jackson, C.A. (2004). *Evaluation of Community Voices Miami: Affecting
     health policy for the uninsured*. Retrieved from
     https://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR177.html

Ohio State University. (2018). *Evaluating Coalition Progress and Impacts.* Retrieved from
      https://ohioline.osu.edu/factsheet/CDFS-14

Price, P.C., Jhangiani, R., & Chiang, I.A. (2015). *Research methods in psychology: 2nd Canadian
     edition*. Retrieved from https://opentextbc.ca/researchmethods/