

Children's Mercy Kansas City

SHARE @ Children's Mercy

Research at Children's Mercy Month 2022

Research at Children's Mercy Month

5-2022

An Evaluation Of Shared Governance In A Mobile Market Setting

Shelly Summar

Matt Kleinmann

Evelyn Donis De Miranda

Kimberly Pina

Emily A. Hurley

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlyexchange.childrensmercy.org/research_month2022

An Evaluation of Shared Governance in a Mobile Market Setting

Shelly Summar¹, Matt Kleinmann², Evelyn Donis de Miranda¹, Kimberly Pina¹, Emily Hurley¹

¹Children's Mercy Kansas City; ²KU School of Architecture

Background

Community health initiatives across the country seek ways of ensuring community engagement. One method is through shared governance, an alternative governance structure, that aims to promote a mutual understanding of a collaborative decision-making process. We designed a shared governance framework and applied it to a food access initiative in a low-income community in Kansas City, KS.

Objectives:

- 1) to explore how a framework for shared governance facilitates collaborative decision making in community health initiatives;
- 2) to identify and define effective participatory methods of collaboration for use in a revised governance framework.

Methods

- A Mobile Market Community Council (MMCC) made up of resident, organizational, and neutral members, was established to guide the development of a mobile market.
- The Wilder Factors of Collaboration Inventory (WCFI) measured collaboration among the group evaluating 44 statements across 21 factors.
- Collaboration was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1= "Strongly Disagree to 5= "Strongly Agree) .

Results

Table 1: Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory (WCFI) Survey Results

Collaboration Factor	Statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)	2018 (N = 12) Avg. Rating:	2019 (N = 16) Avg. Rating:
History of collaboration or cooperation in the community	1. Agencies in our community have a history of working together.	3.3	3.8 (+16%)
	2. Trying to solve problems through collaboration has been common in this community. It has been done a lot before.	2.8	3.6 (+29%)
Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community	3. Leaders in this community who are not part of our collaborative group seem hopeful about what we can accomplish.	3.4	3.9 (+16%)
	4. Others (in this community) who are not a part of this collaboration would generally agree that the organizations involved in this collaborative project are the "right" organizations to make this work.	3.4	3.7 (+8%)
Favorable political and social climate	5. The political and social climate seems to be "right" for starting a collaborative project like this one.	3.8	4.5 (+18%)
	6. The time is right for this collaborative project.	4.3	4.7 (+9%)
Mutual respect, understanding and trust	7. People involved in our collaboration trust one another.	3.1	4.2 (+35%)
	8. I have a lot of respect for the other people involved in this collaboration.	4.1	4.6 (+11%)
Appropriate cross section of members	9. The people involved in our collaboration represent a cross section of those who have a stake in what we are trying to accomplish.	3.7	3.5 (-5%)
	10. All the organizations that we need to be members of this collaborative group have become members of the group.	2.5	3.0 (+20%)
Members see collaboration as being in their self-interest	11. My organization will benefit from being involved in this collaboration.	3.8	4.2 (+10%)
Ability to compromise	12. People involved in our collaboration are willing to compromise on important aspects of our project.	3.3	4.1 (+23%)
Members share a stake in both process and outcome	13. The organizations that belong to our collaborative group invest the right amount of time in our collaborative efforts.	3.4	4.0 (+18%)
	14. Everyone who is a member of our collaborative group wants this project to succeed.	4.5	4.9 (+8%)
	15. The level of commitment among the collaboration participants is high.	3.8	4.4 (+17%)
Multiple layers of participation	16. 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 about what the decision should be.	3.1	4.3 (+39%)
	17. Each of the people who participate in decisions in this collaborative group can speak for the entire organization they represent, not just a part.	2.7	4.0 (+48%)
Flexibility	18. There is a lot of flexibility when decisions are made; people are open to discussing different options.	3.6	4.6 (+27%)
	19. People in this collaborative group are open to different approaches to how we can do our work. They are willing to consider different ways of working.	3.6	4.5 (+25%)
	20. People in this collaborative group have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities.	2.7	3.9 (+44%)
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	21. There is a clear process for making decisions among the partners in this collaboration.	2.8	4.0 (+43%)

- **82%** of all responses were rated as either "agreed" or 'Strongly Agreed'.
- A decrease was seen in only 2 statements (9 & 41).
- The largest improvement was item 17 - average score at baseline=2.7, at project end=4.0
- The highest scoring statements were items 14 and 37 (4.9)
- Other statements that scored highly were 6 (4.7), 23 (4.8), 39 (4.7), and 40 (4.8)

Results

Table 1 (Continued): Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory (WCFI) Survey Results

Collaboration Factor	Statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)	2018 (N = 12) Avg. Rating:	2019 (N = 16) Avg. Rating:
Adaptability to changing conditions	22. This collaboration is able to adapt to changing conditions, such as fewer funds than expected, changing political climate, or change-in-leadership.	3.3	4.3 (+31%)
	23. This group has the ability to survive even if it had to make major changes in its plans or add some new members in order to reach its goals.	3.6	4.8 (+34%)
Appropriate pace of development	24. This collaborative group has been careful to take on the right amount of work at the right pace.	3.4	3.8 (+12%)
	25. This group is currently able to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people, organizations, and activities related to this collaborative project.	3.4	4.0 (+18%)
Evaluation and continuous learning	26. A system exists to monitor and report the activities and/or services of our collaboration.	N/A*	3.9
	27. We measure and report the outcomes of our collaboration. Information about our activities, services, and outcomes is used by members of the collaborative group to improve our joint work.	*Questions not included in earlier version of WCFI	
Open and frequent communication	29. People in this collaboration communicate openly with one another.	3.7	4.4 (+18%)
	30. I am informed as often as I should be about what is going on in the collaboration.	3.8	4.4 (+15%)
	31. The people who lead this collaborative group communicate well with the members.	3.9	4.4 (+12%)
Established informal relationships and communication	32. Communication among the people in this collaborative group happens at formal meetings and in informal ways.	3.6	4.3 (+18%)
	33. I personally have informal conversations about the project with others involved in this collaborative group.	3.2	4.0 (+25%)
Concrete, attainable goals and objectives	34. I have a clear understanding of what our collaboration is trying to accomplish.	3.8	4.4 (+15%)
	35. People in our collaborative group know and understand our goals.	3.6	4.4 (+23%)
	36. People in our collaborative group have established reasonable goals.	3.2	4.3 (+35%)
Shared vision	37. The people in this collaborative group are dedicated to the idea that we can make this project work.	4.2	4.9 (+16%)
	38. My ideas about what we want to accomplish with this collaboration seem to be the same as the ideas of others.	3.5	4.1 (+18%)
Unique purpose	39. What we are trying to accomplish with our collaborative project would be difficult for any single organization to accomplish by itself.	4.1	4.7 (+14%)
	40. No other organization in the community is trying to do exactly what we are trying to do.	4.1	4.8 (+16%)
Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time	41. Our collaborative group has adequate funds to do what it wants to accomplish.	3.4	2.2 (-36%)
	42. Our collaborative group has adequate "people power" to do what it wants to accomplish.	3.2	3.5 (+9%)
Skilled leadership	43. The people in leadership positions for this collaboration have good skills for working with other people and organizations.	3.8	4.3 (+12%)
Engaged stakeholders	44. Our collaborative group engages other stakeholders, outside of the group, as much as we should.	N/A*	4.1

Conclusion

This evaluation showed a governance framework can be a useful tool to guide decision making and increase collaboration for long term success of community health initiatives.