Methods to assess the effectiveness of partnerships: partnership survey, integration measure and social network analysis
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1. The context: more and more initiatives with partnership elements

2. What are the implications for evaluation?

3. What methods are there to assess partnership?

4. Developing a conceptual framework and identifying appropriate methods

5. Examples of applications
The context: an increasing number of initiatives in different sectors have a strong partnership component

- Partnerships are an increasingly common element of government and non-government initiatives
  - Funded initiatives across multiple organisations
  - Built into many programs as a requirement of funding

- Partnerships are getting more and more complicated
  - More levels: between sections, between organisations, between jurisdictions, between countries

- Partnership initiatives bring high expectations of enhanced outcomes and economy of scale

- Partnership initiatives may involve large investment
What are the implications for evaluation?

• Evaluation of the partnership element is increasingly required

• Need to incorporate partnership assessment at an early stage, in the evaluation strategy and framework

• More pressure for better evidence about how well partnerships work

• Need a better conceptual framework
How did we evaluate partnerships so far?

**Partnership assessment survey**

- A partnership assessment survey developed based on existing tools
  - Nuffield
  - VicHealth

- What it does: capture people’s perception and satisfaction of how the partnership is functioning in general

- **What it does not do:** capture how the partnership is working *in practice*, between organisations and between individuals
What else do we need? – more specific and practical data

• **WHAT** is shared between organisations
  • How organisations are working together
  • What are they sharing/ doing together

• **HOW** people interact
  • Information on how individuals within organisations are ACTUALLY interacting with each other
A range of methods are available.
Conceptualisation of the various dimensions of a complex partnership and methods to assess

**Organisation 1**
- Dept. 1.1
  - Ind. 1.1.1
  - Ind. 1.1.2
  - Ind. 1.1.3
- Dept. 1.2
  - Ind. 1.2.1
- Dept. 1.3
  - Ind. 1.3.1
  - Ind. 1.3.2
  - Ind. 1.3.3
- Dept. 1.4
  - Ind. 1.4.1
  - Ind. 1.4.2

**Organisation 2**
- Dept. 2.1
  - Ind. 2.1.1
  - Ind. 2.1.2
  - Ind. 2.1.3
- Dept. 2.2
  - Ind. 2.2.1
  - Ind. 2.2.2
  - Ind. 2.2.3
- Dept. 2.3
  - Ind. 2.3.1
  - Ind. 2.3.2

**Organisation 3**
- Dept. 3.1
  - Ind. 3.1.1
  - Ind. 3.1.2
  - Ind. 3.1.3

**Organisation 4**
- Dept. 4.1
  - Ind. 4.1.1
  - Ind. 4.1.2
  - Ind. 4.1.3
- Dept. 4.2
  - Ind. 4.2.1
  - Ind. 4.2.2
  - Ind. 4.2.3

**Organisation 5**
- Dept. 5.1
  - Ind. 5.1.1
  - Ind. 5.1.2
  - Ind. 5.1.3
- Dept. 5.2
  - Ind. 5.2.1
- Dept. 5.3
  - Ind. 5.3.1
  - Ind. 5.3.2
  - Ind. 5.3.3
- Dept. 5.4
  - Ind. 5.4.1
  - Ind. 5.4.2

**Partnership Assessment**
- **Cooperation Assessment**
- **Social Network Analysis**
1. Partnership survey

• Measures individuals perceptions of the OVERALL PARTNERSHIP

1. The need for the partnership
2. Partnership governance
3. The partnership in action (structures, processes, involvement)
4. Impact of the partnership
# Partnership assessment questionnaire

## Partnership governance

*Please state how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>* Partners were involved in forming the vision and goals for the Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>* Partners were involved in developing the working arrangements for the Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>* The scope or terms of reference for the Partnership are clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>* Each partners’ roles and responsibilities are clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>* The Partnership can demonstrate or document the outcomes of its collective work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>* The Partnership reviews and refines the working arrangements when necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

[ARTDCONSULTANTS](#)
Partnership assessment

Working together has enhanced our capacity for creativity and innovation in designing programs

Partners have the necessary skills to perform their role in the Partnership

Each partners’ roles and responsibilities are clearly defined

Together, the partner organisations can achieve more than they could on their own

Agree Tend to agree
2. Integration (Cooperation) Measure

• Measure the level of cooperation at PROGRAM level
  • Satisfaction as a difference between
    • **Observed** level of cooperation – rating by each partner of each other partner
    • **Expected** level of cooperation – rating by each partner of each other partner
  • Collect information about WHAT is actually being shared.
# 2. Integration Measure – Levels of cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level of cooperation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No awareness</td>
<td>We are <strong>not aware</strong> of approaches by the equivalent program team in the other organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>We are <strong>aware</strong> of approaches by the equivalent program team in the other organisation, but organize our activities solely on the basis of our own objectives, materials and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>We actively <strong>share information</strong> (formally or informally) with the equivalent program team in the other organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>We <strong>work together</strong> by modifying program planning and delivery to take into account methods, materials and timing of the equivalent program team in the other organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>We <strong>jointly plan</strong> and deliver key aspects of our program with the other organisation with the aim of an integrated approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Brown et al. (2004)
Integration Measure: observed VS expected level of cooperation

- Collaboration
- Coordination
- Communication
- Awareness
- No awareness

Expected cooperation level
Observed cooperation level
What is being shared?

- Sharing program implementation material e.g. information sheets
- Sharing evaluation tools
- Sharing background research information
- Sharing program delivery models
- Coordinate timing and content of program activities

Number of responses: J1 J2 J3 J4 J5 J6 J7 J8 J9 J10
3. Social Network Analysis

• Individuals’ reports of communications with other individuals in the network
  • Which people they interacted with in a specified time period
  • How (communication channel)
  • How frequently
Example of an SNA questionnaire

**Name generator**

**You and your network**

**Relationship between your professional contacts**

Chung, K et al (2005)
Network is **sparse, except at the centre**

Some stakeholders play a **broker role**: node reach out to the periphery

Network is relatively **decentralised**
Social Network Analysis - metrics

• At the network level
  • **Network density**: explains the general level of interconnectedness
  • **Centralisation**: explains to what extent the network focuses on particular individuals or groups

• At the individual level
  • **Centrality**: measures the number of direct ties (links) a node (stakeholder) has
  • **Betweenness**: measures the extent to which a particular node lies in between the other nodes of the network

• These metrics allow to
  1. Qualify the overall network
  2. Test hypotheses through correlation tests, e.g. stakeholders in their role for a longer time are more likely to play a central role in the network (high level of centrality).
What are the benefits of combining these methods?

- Bring together data from different perspectives
- More detailed information about practical processes
- Gives a better picture of an abstract/intangible concept
- Within the mixed-method tradition
  - Combining for greater completeness
  - Triangulation
  - In combination with qualitative methods

See Pat Bazeley Metaphors for integrated analysis in mixed methods research
I'm in a partnership. You're in a partnership. He/she/they are in a partnership. We are ALL in a partnership!

NICE!

2 overused words!
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