Research Question 2: To what extent does the proposed model of partnership improve the understanding of the practice of partnership in the cases under study?

Sub-question 2: To what extent do the partnerships under study fulfill criteria for effective functioning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Components</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Evidence Sought and Found</th>
<th>Interim Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Formalization            | Documentation, Partnership Coordinator (PC), Partnership Liaison (PL) | - A memorandum of understanding, contract or other formal agreement exists between members, defining coordinating structure that recognizes equality of partners, along with roles, responsibilities, and common procedures  
''There is a formal agreement between Kellogg and each organization but no central agreement.''
''[My org.] has a signed agreement with CV, listing joint activities.''
''...But there is no single board overseeing what is done. Each coalition is unique to the issue of interest.''
Procedures: no minutes, org. provided written reports to CV Kellogg through Marshall U until '01, annual retreat  
-A plan, setting out a common goal and activities setting out roles and responsibilities  
''another challenge was the lack of a comprehensive plan. The WVCV project has broad goals and outcomes but each of the many partners pursues their own strategies towards these goals and outcomes.''
-Acknowledgment of partnership through explicit support of partners  
''My job description does not mention CV but building relationships is mentioned. My position is located in top management, which is committed to CV.''
-Partnership is recognized in its own right -''  
''CV is not recognized alone but as a partner among partners, which was CV goal.''  
''was not interested in establishing its own identify but rather in building relationships.''
Benedum Foundation granted $75,000 to CV | No central agreement or coordinating structure | WEAK near zero |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Components</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Evidence Sought and Found</th>
<th>Interim Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intensity**            | PC, PL        | - Frequency of interactions: communications, meetings  
E-mail, phone, informal discussions  
Quarterly meetings; quarterly conference calls. Within individual coalitions, frequency of communications, meetings depends on agenda being pursued  
-Individual member orgs have made internal changes to enable the partnership; e.g., rewards, incentives. Liaisons have required authority to make decisions and fulfill agreed roles and responsibilities  
"CV pays 25% of my time..."  
"CV [taken a] watering can approach by facilitating existing efforts with technical assistance and $."  
4 CV liaisons are executive directors and have decision-making authority. All but one of others, have authority to commit resources within agreement with CV project office. The one exception represents the only org. internal change; i.e., creation of a new position within a government bureaucracy.  
-Partners, resources, and timeframe reflect the complexity of the goal addressed  
Proposal long-term goal of systems change not reflected in multi-sector partners from DOH; however, partners do reflect actual s-t goal of increasing access to health care and partnering activities between health care and those with outreach capacity. Link local and state  
"Wide range of needs with limited resources"  
"[Kellogg $] allowed organizations to tackle issues overlooked in the past, acts as a door opener."  
"Limited staff of participating orgs."  
"Community Voices will disappear but some individual partnerships are sustainable, others not."
"I'm concerned that the "glue" person will go when Kellogg funds end."
"In his technical assistance work, the partners had difficulty in figuring out how to knit the pieces together."

<p>|                | PL, ED       | Frequency of contacts between participating orgs. has increased with CV and is adequate. | Internal incentives are unnecessary, since CV goals are within participating orgs. mandates. CV $ act as external incentive to partner. CV activities central to participating orgs. | Resources are limited but Kellogg and other $ allow participating orgs. to achieve more. CV is not sustainable beyond Kellogg $. Increasing awareness of DOH. Sector links not established; links between local and state |
| Question (5), (7), (8), (9), (10), (12), (13) | Documents, Interview, Focus Group | | | Weak ¼ from weak end |</p>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Components</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Evidence Sought and Found</th>
<th>Interim Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
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</thead>
</table>
| Reciprocity              | Documents, PC, PL, Focus group participants | **Key stakeholders, including the community, are involved**  
Project documentation -community was consulted through regional dialogues.  
"Need to bring in health care providers to the partnership. Difficulty in engaging consumers and consumer representatives in the partnership."  
Missing partners suggested by interviewees: large hospitals, health educators, men, educators, young professionals, business  
"CV project director brings in new partners. ..[CV is] not inclusive enough."  
**Benefits, risks, decision-making and power are shared equally**  
"Partnership was mandated by Kellogg."  
"CV partners who receive project funds are accountable to the project dir."
"CV is the keeper of the funds; the Governor's Cabinet the keeper of the keys.  
"Decisions are made between individual partners and CV director, who then presents overall budget to Kellogg for approval."
"Originally we didn't intend such a broad participation but Kellogg kept broadening scope. We share resources but this was written into the grant."  
Within coalitions, “worked together as equals through consensus decision-making process within each coalition.”  
**-Organizational motivations for membership are explicit and mechanisms for dealing with differences and conflict are established.**  
"[There are] differences in motivation between those interested in services and those interested in policy but there is no conflict. Latitude is given to partners and common goals override any differences."  
"There are no problems with differences in working because we're in this together. Differences between policy and delivery seen as enriching,..."  
"Nancy juggles chain saws that are running. She resolves competitive issues. CV gets different partners to get on the same side of an issue and brings different perspectives together. “We all have shared values of social justice.”  
**Trust and mutual commitment exist**  
"CV partnership won't continue per se but partnerships fostered by CV will continue, along with the idea of partnership building."
[CV led to] strengthened trust among participants."  
"CV is more about collaboration than about $ -we collaborated with collaborators for an exponential effect."  
"There is a good level of trust." | Kellogg decided areas for intervention; CV project director identified partners | WEAK  
Near zero  
But stronger for coalitions where trust and relationships are being built and decisions are shared  
CV project office decides on resource allocation with input from participating orgs. Within each org, more equality exists  
Participating orgs have similar values but different motivations, which are seen as complementary. CV Project director works out issues in putting coalitions together.  
Participating orgs plan to continue to work together based on trust built during CV participation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Components</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Evidence Sought and Found</th>
<th>Interim Results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standardization          | PC, PL         | - Procedures and processes for working together on overall goal are established  
Common process/procedures mentioned in interviews: Quarterly meetings and conference calls, CV sponsorship of training and attendance at meetings, early TA and training for participating orgs.  
- Feedback mechanism exists to allow for ongoing change, as required  
Periodic evaluations provided information on partnership functioning  
"Quarterly reports to Kellogg [through Marshall University consultant], but this took up too large a chunk of the grant so [this consultancy] cancelled."  
"Where failure happens, we redesign activity."  
Common processes stem from CV requirements  
Previous formal reporting was to Kellogg. CV participating orgs. use informal means to track activities. | Common processes stem from CV requirements  
Previous formal reporting was to Kellogg. CV participating orgs. use informal means to track activities. | WEAK near zero |
| Contribution to Overall Health Goal | Documents, PC, PL, ED, KI, Focus group participants | - Overall collaboration as measured by effectiveness characteristics  
At weak end of continuum: reciprocity and standardization. Slightly higher: formalization and intensity  
- Increased resources are available for the health improvement effort; results are larger than if working alone  
"CV allowed development of collaboration and strengthened the resolve of [participating] groups."  
"CV developed a common vision."  
"CV has [provided] an infrastructure of orgs. interested in health care [to gain] a stronger voice and raised awareness of issues to government level."  
- Partnership exists in its own right.  
"CV has not been obsessed with creating its own identity because building relationships was more important."  
"Partnership won't continue per se but partnerships fostered by CV will continue, along with idea of partnership building." | Weak collaboration at CV level; good reciprocity in networks and coalitions  
Kellogg provided increased financial resources; participating orgs in kind and expertise | Participating orgs. brought in-kind resources and expertise together to achieve short-term successes; however, little, if any, effect at the systems level. CV will cease to exist once Kellogg funding expires |