2012 Coalition Assessment Report Summary: An Overview of the Annual Coalition Summary

Jacob Campbell Heritage University

This is summary report written for the Pasco Discovery Coalition regarding their annual coalition assessment report. It is meant to provide an overview of the report given to the coalition based on the survey results.

Keywords: CPWI, Community Coalition

Colin Powell is cited as stating, "Bad news isn't wine. It doesn't improve with age" (Smith, 2014) This is a very true statement. No matter how old you get, it never seems that negative feedback never seems to get easier to stomach. While this may be true, it is also true when we learn our strengths and our weaknesses, we can get better and that should be good news for all of us. The 2012 coalition assessment survey that was collected for the Pasco Discovery Coalition (PDC) and other coalitions statewide seems to show a negative outlook for the organization, but it can also be viewed as a wakeup call to what needs to be improved. Generally and rudimentary the results of the 2012 Annual Coalition Survey are reported.

The Pasco Discovery Coalition is a group of community leaders who gather from different sectors with the vision of "working to promote stronger youth and safer neighborhoods by combating gangs / violence, alcohol and other drugs, and teen pregnancy" in Pasco Washington. They are funded through the Department of Social and Human Services Department of Behavioral Health and Recovery (DBHR)¹ in Washington State through their Prevention Redesign Initiative (PRI).

The Prevention Redesign Initiative requires all coalitions to under their supervision and funding to complete a pretest posttest survey to assess various characteristics of what makes up a productive and successful. This data is compared to the previous years survey (if there is one, as is the case for the PDC) along with being compared to other coalitions in the state. The survey referenced in this report is the PDC's second set of surveys and acts as the pretest for the coalition and is compared to the pretest survey results from 2011.

The survey requests the coalition participates feelings regarding various components of being a coalition through a likert scale of one to five along with a possible answer of Don't Know or Not Applicable. The scale is listed using the following vocabulary: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The questions address the following areas related to the coalition char-

acteristics:

- Vision, mission, and goals
- Coalition structure and membership
- Coalition leadership
- Outreach and communication
- Coalition meetings and communications
- Opportunities for member growth and responsibility
- Effectiveness in planning and implementation
- Relationships with local government and other community members
 - Relationship with other organizations
- Coalitions members' sense of ownership and participation
 - Ability to collect, analyze, and use data
- Understanding of and commitment to environmental change strategies
 - Cultural competence
 - Funding and sustainability
 - Background information

A copy of the Coalition Assessment Tool can be found as [Appendices A][3]. The survey was completed via a web-based form, where a request was sent to coalition participants listed as active with DBHR. The participants were emailed by the coalition chairperson, Jacob Campbell, with an individualized password to be permitted to access their survey on a specified website. They were also given a PDF version of the survey that they could complete if desired and turn into the PRI Coordinator, Teresa Bell, although none of the participants choose to complete the survey in this fashion.

[3]: /s/pdc-coalition-assessment-tool-quvb.pdf

During the 2011 survey, the PDC turned in nine surveys out of 190 surveys turned in by 16 statewide coalitions. During this, most recent survey, the PDC turned in 10 surveys out of 233 surveys from 22 state coalitions. The members chosen for the survey were based on coalition members listed as active on the DBHR website which tracks coalition attendance and participation. The survey request was sent to 16 different

¹http://www.dshs.wa.gov/DBHR/

coalition members and then a follow email was sent again to make a second request for completion of the survey.

Overview of the Results

The Coalition Assessment Tool Report created by DBHR Performance Based Prevention System can be found as [Appendices B][4] and delineates the results both historical and comparative. The comparative results show results from the state high and low compared to the PDC. The numbers are calculated using the an average taken to the second decimal place of the coalition participants answers related to the likert scale (i.e. the closer to 5 the more the members agreed and the closer to 1 the less they agreed).

[4]: /s/pdc-coalition-assessment-tool-report.pdf

Regarding the 2011 report, the state scored the three lowest scores with the follow categories coalition structure and membership, outreach and communication, and effectiveness in planning and implementation with scores of 3.13, 3.13, and 3.43 respectively. The states three highest scores included partnerships with other organizations, cultural competence, and ability to collect, analyze, and use data with scores of 5.00, 4.91, and 4.75 respectively.

The PDC's 2011 results showed the three lowest scores as funding and sustainability, opportunities for member growth and responsibility, and relationships with local government and other community leaders with scores respectively being 3.63, 3.79, and 3.97. Their three highest scores were in the categories of cultural competence, vision, mission and goals, partnerships with other organizations with the following scores respectively 4.50, 4.39, and 4.30.

The state in 2012 continued to have outreach and communication, and coalition structure and members as two of the three lowest scores, but with lower numbers respectively 2.77 and 2.91. Furthermore funding and sustainability were responses were lower with an average score of 2.88. The three highest scores was actually a tie with between four categories: outreach and communication, relationship with local government and other community leaders, partnerships with other organizations, ability to collect, analyze, and use data, and understanding of and commitment to environmental change strategies with top scores of 5.00.

For the PDC the three lowest scores on the 2012 survey were outreach and communication, funding and sustainability, coalition structure and membership with respective scores of 2.85, 2.88, and 2.91. The highest scores were cultural competence, coalition meetings and communications, and partnerships with other organizations with respective scores of 3.91, 3.68, and 3.56.

General Discussion Regarding Results

There are some limitations to the data collected in this survey. The number of survey responses is generally a small

number, both statewide and locally, to be considered highly generalizable and correlative. The data provided only shows averages of the various coalitions surveyed. The very limited amount of local participants for the PDC (n=10) permits the data to be skewed 10% overall for each participations responses.

The limitation of the study aside, the data is positive for getting an overview of some of the feelings of coalition participants and to be evaluated to look forward as to what are some of the ways that the PDC can improve their practices and form a more successful coalition affecting the change desired.

Looking generally over the data, it is apparent that the participants of this study scored the PDC categorically lower than they did during the previous 2011 survey. None of the general coalition characteristics showed an improvement in the views of the coalition participants. There were only a couple of quests that showed improvement in results from the previous years responses. The PDC also showed up at the lowest end of six of the coalition general characteristics and was within less then .1 of two other responses landing us at the same rate as the state low (it is not clear whether other coalitions had the same low number, but we were at least equal to or lower then all of the coalition in those areas). It is also clear that in the dataset given for the 2012 survey, the spread of high to low is much wider than the previous 2011 survey (i.e. scores with a higher standard deviation). Furthermore, the data only showcases the PDC and the lowest and the highest coalition scores. It does not give an accurate picture of where all of the other coalitions are or any type of median scores state wide, only the extremes.

The benefit of this data is that it gives the PDC a number of areas to focus on and improve to increase our overall effectiveness. Of the three areas receiving the lowest scores the lowest is funding and sustainability. The two most concerning topics within this general topic for coalition members appeared to be having multiple funding sources for the coalition and writing grants. Both of which are areas for capacity building within the PDC.

Another area of capacity building that the coalition needs to improve upon is the outreach and communication. This includes areas such as including the community in general involved in the business of the coalition, working with media (i.e. getting the coalition name out there), and engaging with you.

The third lowest scoring area of the 2012 survey responses rate also seems to showcase the need for capacity building. This respondents described not having all of the necessary sectors being represented, having the right number of members, and having well defined roles.

As a coalition, this information should be evaluated and a discussion about a couple of areas of focus should be decided as to how to improve some of the general characteristics of

the PDC.

References

Smith, J. (2014). *10 things the best leaders never say*. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/successful-leaders-never-say-these-things-2014-9

Appendices A

Coalition Assessment Tool

Your Name:

Date:

This form is to be completed by coalition members in order to gauge the overall strength of the coalition and to identify areas that may need attention. For each characteristic please place a check mark under the scale value (from 1 to 5) that most appropriately indicates the strength and/or frequency of the characteristic. Please be candid in your responses, and keep in mind that it is OK (and even expected) that your coalition may not be strong in all areas.

Coalition Characteristics	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know or NA
A. Vision, mission and goals:	1	2	3	4	5	99
1. Our coalition's vision, mission, and goals are clear and well-documented						
2. Community residents are aware of our vision, mission, and goals						
3. Our coalition periodically re-assesses and updates its mission and goals						
4. We evaluate our coalition's activities in light of its mission and goals						
5. Our coalition's vision, mission, and goals consider the needs and views of the community						
6. Coalition members agree with the coalition's vision, mission, and goals						
B. Coalition structure and membership:						
1. All of the necessary sectors of the community are represented						
2. Our coalition has about the right number of active members						
3. Coalition members' roles and responsibilities are well-defined						
4. Our coalition has active committees or work groups						
5. The persons needed to attend coalition meetings are usually there						
6. Members communicate with one another as needed (not just at scheduled meetings)						
7. Our coalition seeks to fill gaps in membership skills and expertise						
C. Coalition leadership – Our coalition coordinator/director						
1. Effectively promotes the mission and goals of the coalition						
2. Encourages open dialog and expression of views among members						
3. Utilizes the skills and experience of the members						
4. Distributes responsibilities and tasks effectively						
5. Is skillful at building positive relationships with community partners						
6. Keeps the coalition focused on, and progressing towards, its goals						
D. Outreach and communication:						
1. Our coalition keeps the community updated on its activities (e.g., through a newsletter, web site, etc.)						
2. Our coalition goes to "where the residents are" to do outreach and to enhance its understanding of community issues						
3. Our coalition engages youth to help inform its planning efforts						
4. Our coalition works effectively with local media outlets						
E. Coalition meetings and communications:						
1. Our coalition has a regular meeting cycle that members can count on						
2. Agendas are sent to members in advance						
3. Childcare is provided if needed						
4. We accomplish meeting agendas in meetings that start and end on time						
5. Meetings are held in centrally accessible, comfortable places and at convenient times for all members						
6. Conflicts are resolved in an orderly and respectful manner						
7. Meeting minutes are recorded						

Coalition Characteristics - continued	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know or NA
F. Opportunities for member growth and responsibility:						
New members receive an orientation and copies of relevant background materials						
2. Our coalition makes a conscious effort to develop new leaders						
3. Training is provided to members on relevant topics						
4. We use a mentoring or "buddy system" to help less experienced members learn what is needed						
5. Committees are given important tasks to do						
6. Meetings are held as scheduled even if the coordinator cannot attend						
G. Effectiveness in planning and implementation:						
1. Our coalition develops an annual work plan that lists goals and activities						
2. Plans are based upon review and input from coalition members						
3. Action plans and target dates are developed for each task or project						
4. Coalition members are assigned specific responsibilities						
5. Coalition activities and progress in completing tasks are monitored and reported to the membership						
6. Our coalition gets things done rather just talk about them						
H. Relationship with local government and other community leaders:						
Representatives from our coalition meet with local officials and community leaders						
2. A coalition representative attends important community meetings						
Our coalition coordinator understands the power structure and decision making process in community government						
4. Our coalition participates in community-wide events						
I. Partnerships with other organizations:						
Our coalition is knowledgeable about other community organizations and what they do						
2. Our coalition collaborates with other community organizations						
3. Our coalition utilizes information and resources from those organizations						
4. Our coalition keeps abreast of issues affecting the community						
5. Our coalition interacts and shares information with substance abuse prevention coalitions in other communities						
J. Coalition members' sense of ownership and participation						
Our coalition builds social time for members into meetings and events						
2. Members participate in social activities outside formal meetings						
3. All members are treated equally and with respect						
4. Members are asked about their interests and needs						
5. Member contributions are recognized						
6. Successes are celebrated						
7. Members actively participate in the decision making process						
8. Members feel free to speak their views without being criticized						

Coalition Characteristics - continued	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know or NA
K. Ability to collect, analyze, and use data						
Our coalition has members, or a consultant, with experience in collecting and analyzing data						
Our coalition has members, or a consultant, with experience in conducting evaluations and preparing evaluation reports						
Coalition members participate in reviewing data for planning and evaluation purposes						
4. Our coalition has access to local data on substance abuse and consequences						
L. Understanding of and commitment to environmental change strategies:						
1. Coalition members are familiar with concept of population-level change						
Our coalition supports environmental change strategies (e.g., policy changes, regulation, enforcement, and advocacy) in addition to approaches targeting individuals						
3. Our coalition is committed to working with the media						
Our coalition has positive relationships with community partners needed to implement environmental strategies						
M. Cultural competence:						
Our mission statement recognizes the importance of respecting cultural diversity (including racial/ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, and lifestyle)						
2. Our coalition is engaged with diverse cultural groups and organizations						
3. Our membership reflects the cultural makeup of the community						
Our coalition reviews its activities and products to ensure they are culturally appropriate for the intended recipients						
N. Funding and sustainability:						
Our coalition has received funding from multiple sources						
Our coalition has the strong support of local government and other community organizations						
Our coalition has the necessary office space and equipment to function effectively						
4. Our coalition plans ahead for its long term sustainability in addition to its more immediate goals						
5. Our coalition has members with experience in writing successful grant applications						
Background information						
O. Please place a check mark next to the response that best reflects your ac	tiviti <u>es o</u>	n the coa	lition.			
Are you the coalition coordinator or director?			□ Yes	□No)	
2. How many years have you been a member of the coalition?	□<1		□ 1-2	□ 3-5		□ > 5
3. How many coalition meetings did you attend in the past year (or since you started with the coalition if less than 1 year)?						
☐ all or almost all of them ☐ about half of them	□afe	ew of the	m	☐ har	dly any or	none

Thank you!

Appendices B

Using the Results of the Coalition Assessment Tool

The Coalition Assessment Tool is designed to gain insight on each community coalition coordinator and members' views on the structure and functioning of the coalition. Each scale is designed to assess various aspects of a coalition's operation and capacity. From the CAT a coalition can determine current competences and/or identify areas in need more of attention.

It is recommended that your coalition periodically reviews the results of your CAT, looking at how you scored on each scale.

The following questions might by used to begin your discussion.

- 1. Which scales are most important to the success of your coalition?
 - a. What scale scores improved or decreased from year to year?
 - b. What occurred in the past year that may explain these score shifts?
- 2. Which scales did you score the highest on? Lowest on?
 - a. What are you doing well in the areas you scored high on?
 - b. Can you think of reasons your coalition may have scored lower on some scales?

For the score(s) that are low, consider developing some objectives for improving that aspect of your coalition. Decide how you will measure your progress in that area, and include that in your strategic plan.

For example, if your coalition scored low on Vision, Mission, and Goals your objective may be: Our coalition plans to review our existing mission statement and revise it to better reflect our present day goals.

Report Layout

Following this page will be one or more pages of scale summary information. There will be 1 page for each calendar year in which your coalition members have taken the survey. Summary results show the average score for each scale based on your coalition members' answers. The summary results also show the single highest and lowest scale scores from all of the PRI coalitions that answered those questions in the same calendar year. This information provides you with a range within which you can assess your coalition's result. This information is also displayed on a chart, with your score shown as a red diamond, the state low as a white triangle, and the state high as a black triangle.

After the scale summary page(s), detail on each scale's questions is shown. Your coalition's score for each scale and question is shown and compared to the statewide average for that same year. At the end of each scale detail section you will find an explanation of each scale with possible discussion points for your coalition to engage in if you wish to raise your score in future years.

Report Notes

This report is updated as coalition members enter surveys. The statewide numbers change as other coalitions enter information, and your results change as your members enter information.

Be careful about using the current year results if it is still early in the year. The report is based on calendar year. With fewer surveys, it becomes more possible for your coalition's results to be heavily skewed by one person's response. The N is shown to alert you to the possibility of this happening.

Source: DSHS DBHR Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS)

12/3/2012 10:51:37 AM CAT_CalYear

Coalition Assessment Tool Report

By Calendar Year - Our coalition compared to statewide results

Franklin County: Pasco Discovery Coalition

2011: Summary of scale results based on 9 surveys from our coalition and 190 surveys from 16 coalitions statewide during the same year.

scale	our coalition	△ state low	state high	
A. Vision, mission and goals:	4.39	3.68	4.39	
B. Coalition structure and membership:	4.05	3.13	4.25	2 3 4 5
D. Outreach and communication:	4.06	3.13	4.18	2 3 4
E. Coalition meetings and communications:	4.16	3.49	4.57	2 3 4 5
F. Opportunities for member growth and responsibility:	3.79	3.48	4.34	2 3 4 5
G. Effectiveness in planning and implementation:	4.15	3.43	4.44	
H. Relationship with local government and other community leaders:	3.97	3.71	4.50	2 3 4 5
I. Partnerships with other organizations:	4.30	3.69	5.00	2 3 4 5
K. Ability to collect, analyze, and use data	4.03	3.95	4.75	2 3 4 5
L. Understanding of and commitment to environmental change strategies:	4.13	3.59	4.45	2 3 4 5
M. Cultural competence:	4.50	3.49	4.91	
N. Funding and sustainability:	3.63	3.62	4.42	2 3 4 5
			-	

note: There are no thresholds for an acceptable score on this report. The low and high scores represent the highest and lowest score reported by a PRI coalition in the indicated year and are presented to show the relative position of your coalition compared to other coalitions, not where you need to be.

Coalition Assessment Tool Report

By Calendar Year - Our coalition compared to statewide results

Franklin County: Pasco Discovery Coalition

2012: Summary of scale results based on 10 surveys from our coalition and 233 surveys from 22 coalitions statewide during the same year.

scale	our coalition	▲ state low	state high	
A. Vision, mission and goals:	3.54	3.21	4.83	<u> </u>
B. Coalition structure and membership:	2.91	2.91	4.77	1 2 3 4 5
D. Outreach and communication:	2.85	2.77	5.00	1 2 3 4 5
E. Coalition meetings and communications:	3.68	3.52	4.69	1 2 3 4 5
F. Opportunities for member growth and responsibility:	3.17	3.17	4.39	1 2 3 4 5
G. Effectiveness in planning and implementation:	3.45	3.41	4.83	1 2 3 4 5
H. Relationship with local government and other community leaders:	3.32	3.32	5.00	1 2 3 4 5
I. Partnerships with other organizations:	3.91	3.45	5.00	
K. Ability to collect, analyze, and use data	3.52	3.52	5.00	1 2 3 4 5
L. Understanding of and commitment to environmental change strategies:	3.56	3.56	5.00	1 2 3 4 5
M. Cultural competence:	3.92	3.38	4.67	1 2 3 4 5
N. Funding and sustainability:	2.88	2.88	4.57	1 2 3 4 5

note: There are no thresholds for an acceptable score on this report. The low and high scores represent the highest and lowest score reported by a PRI coalition in the indicated year and are presented to show the relative position of your coalition compared to other coalitions, not where you need to be.

Franklin County: Pasco Discovery Coalition

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scal	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
A. V	ision, mission and goals:	4.39	4.03	3.54	4
A1	Our coalition's vision, mission, and goals are clear and well-documented	4.6	4.2	3.8	4.2
A2	Community residents are aware of our vision, mission, and goals	3.6	3.0	2.3	3.1
А3	Our coalition periodically re-assesses and updates its mission and goals	4.6	4.0	3.4	4.0
A4	We evaluate our coalition's activities in light of its mission and goals	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.1
A 5	Our coalition's vision, mission, and goals consider the needs and views of the community	4.5	4.4	3.7	4.3
A6	Coalition members agree with the coalition's vision, mission, and goals	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.3

Clearly articulating your vision, mission, and goal statements are key foundations for your coalition. If you scored low on this scale you may want to revisit your vision, mission and goal statements and determine if they are still relevant, align with your coalitions overall purpose and work, or perhaps need to be revised. Revising your vision, mission, and goals may be a good idea if your coalitions direction has changed over time. Consider if the original goal has been met or are coalition members ready for new or expanded tasks?

	CY 2011		CY 2	2012	
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scale	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
B. Co	palition structure and membership:	4.05	3.78	2.91	3.84
B1	All of the necessary sectors of the community are represented	3.8	3.7	2.3	3.6
B2	Our coalition has about the right number of active members	3.7	3.4	2.4	3.6
В3	Coalition members' roles and responsibilities are well-defined	4.1	3.6	2.7	3.6
B4	Our coalition has active committees or work groups	4.2	3.9	2.8	4.0
B5	The persons needed to attend coalition meetings are usually there	4.1	3.8	3.1	3.9
B6	Members communicate with one another as needed (not just at scheduled meetings)	4.1	4.0	3.2	4.1
B7	Our coalition seeks to fill gaps in membership skills and expertise	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.1

Newer coalitions should focus on having core members with experience in coalitions, commitment to being a member, diversity, and lack conflict with the coalition mission and other members. Make sure you have established formalized rules, roles, structures and procedures. If this scale score is low you may consider forming a steering committee or sub-committees to divide up the workload; and establish rules of operation, b laws, policy statements and written goals and objectives. For established coalitions, discuss forming sub-committees which could address areas where you are less sufficient. For example, could you benefit from having a recruitment team for new members?

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
Scale	e Questions	Coalition (N=9)	Statewide (N=190)	Coalition (N=10)	Statewide (N=233)
D. O	utreach and communication:	4.06	3.72	2.85	3.81
D1	Our coalition keeps the community updated on its activities (e.g., through a newsletter, web site, etc.)	3.2	3.6	2.9	3.7
D2	Our coalition goes to "where the residents are" to do outreach and to enhance its understanding of community issues	4.7	3.6	3.3	3.7
D3	Our coalition engages youth to help inform its planning efforts	3.9	4.0	2.7	4.0
D4	Our coalition works effectively with local media outlets	4.3	3.7	2.6	3.8

Community participation is crucial for achieving effective community change. Has your coalition been involving the community in decisions; keeping the best interests of the community in the forefront; or evaluating the communitys readiness for change? How does the coalition inform the public of its efforts? It is essential to open up and maintain relationships with external entities in order to develop community capacity. Low scores on this scale may point to needing to reevaluate the level of involvement your coalition has with the community. Perhaps set goals to increase communication with new or existing partners and the community.

		CY 2011		CY	2012
Scale	e Questions	Coalition (N=9)	Statewide (N=190)	Coalition (N=10)	Statewide (N=233)
E. Co	palition meetings and communications:	4.16	4.13	3.68	4.2
E1	Our coalition has a regular meeting cycle that members can count on	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.5
E2	Agendas are sent to members in advance	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
E3	Childcare is provided if needed	3.8	2.6	2.9	2.8
E4	We accomplish meeting agendas in meetings that start and end on time	4.1	4.1	3.3	4.2
E5	Meetings are held in centrally accessible, comfortable places and at convenient times for all members	4.2	4.3	3.7	4.4
E6	Conflicts are resolved in an orderly and respectful manner	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.3
E7	Meeting minutes are recorded	4.3	4.4	3.6	4.4

Evaluate your coalitions ability to be consistent with meetings and have open communication between members. Routine operations are more easily sustained overtime. If your coalition scored low on this scale you may want to consider establishing regularly scheduled meetings with agendas and clear pathways for communication.

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scal	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
F. O	oportunities for member growth and responsibility:	3.79	3.71	3.17	3.78
F1	New members receive an orientation and copies of relevant background materials	3.9	3.6	3.0	3.6
F2	Our coalition makes a conscious effort to develop new leaders	4.0	3.7	3.2	3.8
F3	Training is provided to members on relevant topics	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9
F4	We use a mentoring or "buddy system" to help less experienced members learn what is needed	3.4	3.0	2.0	3.2
F5	Committees are given important tasks to do	4.1	4.0	3.1	4.0
F6	Meetings are held as scheduled even if the coordinator cannot attend	3.6	4.2	3.9	4.1

It is important to maintain member involvement, recruit new members, and have defined, yet dynamic leader and membership roles. If you are an established coalition and have a lot of new member recruitment happening, make sure you focus your efforts on orientation materials and follow up to ensure pertinent information is being communicated to new members. Making sure new members feel welcome and connected with the coalition will also improve productivity. Members that have been around for awhile may be ready for more responsibility or new roles. You may also want to review the coalitions organizational climate. If leadership roles have not shifted in awhile, it may be time to reorganize.

		CY 2011		CY 2	2012
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scale	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
G. Ef	fectiveness in planning and implementation:	4.15	4	3.45	4.1
G1	Our coalition develops an annual work plan that lists goals and activities	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.2
G2	Plans are based upon review and input from coalition members	4.2	4.2	3.4	4.2
G3	Action plans and target dates are developed for each task or project	4.1	4.0	3.4	4.1
G4	Coalition members are assigned specific responsibilities	4.2	3.9	3.4	4.0
G5	Coalition activities and progress in completing tasks are monitored and reported to the membership	4.2	4.0	3.5	4.2
G6	Our coalition gets things done rather just talk about them	3.9	3.9	3.2	4.0

Some key barriers to planning and implementation include staff turnover, staff lacking community organization skills, dependence on state level staff during planning, and lack of member input into action plans. It is also important that members are putting forth adequate time and commitment to the mission of the coalition. Look back on your coalition turnover, organization, thoughtfulness and ownership of plans, and dedication to implementation. Find places where improvements could be made.

		CY 2011		CY	2012
Scale	e Questions	Coalition (N=9)	Statewide (N=190)	Coalition (N=10)	Statewide (N=233)
H. R	elationship with local government and other community leaders:	3.97	4.1	3.32	4.22
H1	Representatives from our coalition meet with local officials and community leaders	4.2	4.1	3.1	4.2
H2	A coalition representative attends important community meetings	4.2	4.0	3.4	4.2
НЗ	Our coalition coordinator understands the power structure and decision making process in community government	3.9	4.2	3.3	4.3
H4	Our coalition participates in community-wide events	3.6	4.1	3.6	4.2

Building relationships with local government and other community leaders is important for gaining support and building community capacity. Set goals to increase communication and partnerships with these entities if you scored low on this scale, especially if you are a newer coalition. Brainstorm ways to gain access to these entities/persons and develop a plan with action steps to build these relationships.

		CY 2	2011	CY 2	2012
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scal	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
I. Pa	rtnerships with other organizations:	4.3	4.21	3.91	4.22
I1	Our coalition is knowledgeable about other community organizations and what they do	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2
12	Our coalition collaborates with other community organizations	4.4	4.2	3.6	4.2
13	Our coalition utilizes information and resources from those organizations	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.2
14	Our coalition keeps abreast of issues affecting the community	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3
I5	Our coalition interacts and shares information with substance abuse prevention coalitions in other communities	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1

Networking with other community and state organizations is important for increasing collaboration, pooling resources, comprehensive thinking, and increased understanding of the issues/problems as a whole within a community. Investigate other coalitions/organizations working in your community and get a sense of what they are doing. Brainstorm ways to connect with these groups. If you scored low on this scale it may be time to develop plans for collaboration with other organizations or increasing communication with existing partners.

		CY 2011		CY	CY 2012	
Scale	e Questions	Coalition (N=9)	Statewide (N=190)	Coalition (N=10)	Statewide (N=233)	
K. Al	oility to collect, analyze, and use data	4.03	4.2	3.52	4.24	
K1	Our coalition has members, or a consultant, with experience in collecting and analyzing data	3.9	4.2	3.1	4.2	
K2	Our coalition has members, or a consultant, with experience in conducting evaluations and preparing evaluation reports	3.6	4.1	3.2	4.2	
К3	Coalition members participate in reviewing data for planning and evaluation purposes	4.2	4.1	3.3	4.2	
K4	Our coalition has access to local data on substance abuse and consequences	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	

It is hard to know how well your coalition is performing if you are not tracking the results of your efforts. Newer coalitions should make sure an evaluative component is built into the structure of your coalition. Identify members who have experience in data collection and analysis. Established coalitions should assess how well the data is being analyzed and determine where improvements can be made. Perhaps it would be useful to seek out new members who have experience in evaluation.

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scale Qu	uestions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
L. Unders	standing of and commitment to environmental change strategies:	4.13	3.97	3.56	4.06
L1 Coa	alition members are familiar with concept of population-level change	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.8
reg	r coalition supports environmental change strategies (e.g., policy changes, gulation, enforcement, and advocacy) in addition to approaches targeting lividuals	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.1
L3 Our	r coalition is committed to working with the media	4.5	4.0	3.7	4.1
	r coalition has positive relationships with community partners needed to plement environmental strategies	4.3	4.2	3.4	4.2

An integrated prevention strategy is critical to successful outcomes. Newer coalitions should make sure environmental strategies are in the works and there are members who know and understand how to plan and implement them. Consider if you have the relationships necessary with community leaders/groups to implement effective environmental strategies. If you are an established coalition and have never planned an environmental strategy or are unfamiliar with them, develop a work group that is interested in learning more about environmental strategies. Are there people in the community you can talk with that are already implementing environmental strategies?

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
Scale Questions		Coalition (N=9)	Statewide (N=190)	Coalition (N=10)	Statewide (N=233)
M. C	ultural competence:	4.5	3.94	3.92	3.98
M1	Our mission statement recognizes the importance of respecting cultural diversity (including racial/ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, and lifestyle)	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.1
M2	Our coalition is engaged with diverse cultural groups and organizations	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.0
M3	Our membership reflects the cultural makeup of the community	4.6	3.7	3.7	3.8
M4	Our coalition reviews its activities and products to ensure they are culturally appropriate for the intended recipients	4.4	3.8	4.0	4.0

Coalitions need to be culturally competent in terms of the community you are serving and the members of your group. You may want to assess the cultural makeup of your community and find ways to be more encompassing of the diversity within your community if you scored low on this scale. This is an on-going process as the dynamics of your community will always be changing. If you are an established coalition, it may be useful to revisit your coalitions cultural competence as your community dynamics may have shifted since your inception.

		CY 2011		CY 2012	
		Coalition	Statewide	Coalition	Statewide
Scale	e Questions	(N=9)	(N=190)	(N=10)	(N=233)
N. Fu	unding and sustainability:	3.63	4.01	2.88	4.02
N1	Our coalition has received funding from multiple sources	3.5	4.0	2.4	3.9
N2	Our coalition has the strong support of local government and other community organizations	4.1	4.0	2.7	4.0
N3	Our coalition has the necessary office space and equipment to function effectively	3.6	3.8	3.4	4.0
N4	Our coalition plans ahead for its long term sustainability in addition to its more immediate goals	3.5	4.1	3.0	4.0
N5	Our coalition has members with experience in writing successful grant applications	3.4	4.1	2.8	4.2

The stronger the community capacity, the better off long term sustainability of the coalition will be. There are a few key elements to sustainability: maintaining the benefit of the program(s) over time; developing and expanding resources; maintaining funding over time; and building community capacity. New coalitions should be planning for sustainability early on and addressing it often over time. Look at your funding sources and determine if it needs diversifying. Make sure your programs/efforts are still benefiting the community.