

Summary of Annual Collaboration Survey Results for Partnership for Strong Families Wave 4, Spring 2024

This document provides a report of the results of Wave 4 of the annual collaboration survey for the Partnership for Strong Families collaborative. The report's purpose is to share results from the cross-site process survey. This survey was sent to all participants for whom the grantee provided emails.

The **Introduction** describes the context and the **Interpreting Scores, Considerations in Reporting Data, and Reflection Questions** sections provide suggested ways of using the data in the report. The **Data/Results** section provides tabulated data from all elements of the Collaboration Assessment Tool (CAT). Finally, the **Explanation of Subgroup Analyses** section discusses considerations for requesting subgroup analyses based on your project's survey response rate to the background questions of the survey, as shown in the **Exhibit: Background Items Available for Subgroup Analyses**.

Please note: In order to reduce the risk of disclosing or enabling discovery of individuals' responses, we are unable to report the findings in any table cell with an n greater than 0 but less than 6. Those cells are marked with an asterisk. In addition, in some cases, by reporting which cells had an n of zero, a reader could calculate how many respondents an asterisk in another cell represented. In those cases, we protect respondent privacy by changing the n=0 cell to another asterisk.

Introduction

On 1/22/24, an invitation to complete the second Annual Collaboration Survey was emailed to 80 individuals involved in the Partnership for Strong Families collaborative. The survey was open for four weeks and non-respondents received weekly reminder emails encouraging them to complete the survey during the survey fielding period. A total of 29 individuals—36% of invitees¹—responded to the Annual Collaboration Survey.

The tables below summarize individual item-level data, as well as overall scores and standard deviations for each of the seven research-based factors associated with successful collaborations for Wave 3: (1) Context, (2) Members, (3) Process, (4) Communication, (5) Function, (6) Resources, and (7) Leadership. Perceptions of the current and future success of the Partnership for Strong Families collaborative are also summarized.

The developers of the collaboration survey suggest keeping the following in mind when reviewing your data²:

Interpreting Scores

When reviewing the data for each of the collaborative factors, consider the following:

- Scores of 4.0+ show strengths and probably do not need special attention.
- Scores of 3.0 – 3.9 are borderline and should be discussed to see if they deserve attention.
- Scores of 2.9 or lower point to areas of concern and should be addressed.

To aid your interpretation, we have plotted your mean factor scores for Wave 1 (Spring 2021), Wave 2 (Spring 2022), Wave 3 (Spring 2023), and Wave 4 (Spring 2024) in Exhibit 1 in the Data/Results section.

¹ The higher the response rate, the more reliable the survey results are as a representation of the full invitee sample for your project. Results with lower response rates should be viewed with caution because the lower the response rate, the less certainty we have that the sample that responded represents the full list of invitees.

² For more information about the CAT, please see:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262685097_Evaluating_Collaboration_for_Effectiveness.

Interpretation Caveats

1. Respondents from Waves 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not identical. Each Wave's data are cross-sectional and should be interpreted at the aggregate level, as shown in this report. We cannot track individual-level change over time.
2. Please note that the response rates (proportion of invitees who responded to the survey) were 43% in Wave 1, 30% in Wave 2, 37% in Wave 3, and 36% in Wave 4. These relatively low response rates reduce certainty that the results are representative of all potential respondents.

Considerations in Reporting Data


- Who will you share the data with?
- How will you share it?
 - In-person discussion
 - Written summary (narrative, tables, and/or charts)
 - Combination of in-person discussion and a written summary
- Start with positive results
- Include details about context (when fielded, how many invited, and number of respondents)
- Include limitations (low response rates, factors of your work that are not included in the survey)
- Can you combine the survey findings with other information or data that will be helpful to your members?
- Will this information help you answer any of your evaluation's research questions? How will this information support your evaluation?

Reflection Questions

1. According to the overall score for each factor, what are the areas of strength and concern for the Partnership for Strong Families collaborative?
2. For lower-rated factors, are there particular questions or statements that are especially problematic? If so, what can the leaders and members of the Partnership for Strong Families collaborative do to begin to address these challenges? What goals or standards for improvement should be set?
3. Are you maintaining strengths over time? Over time, what has improved? What hasn't? Why?

Exhibit 1. Mean CAT Factor Scores for Waves 1-4

The following exhibit displays the scores for each of the seven CAT factors described above. Factors are plotted along a continuum to demonstrate how each factor compares to the others and how mean scores align with interpretation guidance. Please note that the vertical grey lines represent the 95% confidence interval of each factor score and any factors with non-overlapping confidence intervals are statistically different from each other ($p < 0.05$). Note that for scores with very small standard deviations, the grey lines may not be visible in the graphic.



Notes:

1. Respondents from Waves 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not identical. Each Wave's data are cross-sectional and should be interpreted at the aggregate level, as shown in this report. We cannot track individual-level change over time.
2. Please note that the response rates (proportion of invitees who responded to the survey) were 43% in Wave 1, 30% in Wave 2, 37% in Wave 3, and 36% in Wave 4. These relatively low response rates reduce certainty that the results are representative of all potential respondents.
3. Vertical grey lines illustrate a 95% confidence interval, meaning that there is a 95% chance that the true value for both respondents and nonrespondents lies within this range. If the grey lines for Waves 1, 2, 3, and 4 of a given factor *do not* overlap, this means they are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$. Similarly, any factor score that has a confidence interval that *does not* overlap with another factor score's confidence interval indicates that those two factor scores are statistically different from each other at $p < .05$. Note that for scores with very small confidence intervals, the grey lines may not be visible in the graphic.

Wave 4 Detailed Results by CAT Factor

Factor #1 – Context						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. The agency/ organization that I represent in this coalition has a history of collaborating with other local agencies/organizations in my county.	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	83% (n = 24)	4.76 (n = 29)
2. Participating agencies/organizations represented within this coalition encourage and support the activities of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	38% (n = 11)	59% (n = 17)	4.55 (n = 29)
3. Members of our coalition represent the cultural diversity of our community.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	34% (n = 10)	55% (n = 16)	4.41 (n = 29)
4. Community members are aware of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 14)	28% (n = 8)	3.97 (n = 29)
5. Community members view this coalition as a leader in relation to the coalition's goals and activities.	*	*	24% (n = 7)	41% (n = 12)	28% (n = 8)	3.90 (n = 29)
6. Political leaders in our community support the mission of this coalition.	*	*	21% (n = 6)	41% (n = 12)	34% (n = 10)	4.07 (n = 29)
7. Key community leaders in our community support the mission of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	52% (n = 15)	38% (n = 11)	4.28 (n = 29)
8. Community members support the mission of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	38% (n = 11)	45% (n = 13)	4.28 (n = 29)
9. Cultural leaders in our community support the mission of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	31% (n = 9)	34% (n = 10)	34% (n = 10)	4.03 (n = 29)
10. Key stakeholders are members of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	55% (n = 16)	31% (n = 9)	4.17 (n = 29)
11. Policies, laws, requirements, or regulations that support the efforts of this coalition are in place.	*	*	25% (n = 7)	36% (n = 10)	36% (n = 10)	4.04 (n = 28)
Score for Context Factor 4.22 (SD = 0.27)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Factor #2 – Members						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. Coalition members share an understanding and respect for each other.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	39% (n = 11)	50% (n = 14)	4.39 (n = 28)
2. Coalition members share an understanding and respect for the various organizations represented within this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	39% (n = 11)	50% (n = 14)	4.39 (n = 28)
3. Coalition members trust one another.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	43% (n = 12)	43% (n = 12)	4.25 (n = 28)
4. Coalition members are willing to compromise [recognizing that many decisions cannot fit the preferences of every member perfectly].	0% (n = 0)	*	*	50% (n = 14)	36% (n = 10)	4.21 (n = 28)
5. Coalition members believe the benefits of the collaboration will offset costs (e.g., such as loss of autonomy and turf issues).	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	43% (n = 12)	36% (n = 10)	4.14 (n = 28)
6. Coalition members agree that a comprehensive response is needed to address the goals and objectives of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	46% (n = 13)	36% (n = 10)	4.18 (n = 28)
7. Coalition members understand the roles, rights, and responsibilities of all participating members.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	39% (n = 11)	36% (n = 10)	4.11 (n = 28)
8. Coalition members bring unique skills to address this coalition's needs.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	43% (n = 12)	43% (n = 12)	4.29 (n = 28)
9. Coalition members and the agencies they represent are willing to distribute power in a manner that is in the coalition's best interest.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	39% (n = 11)	43% (n = 12)	4.25 (n = 28)
10. Coalition members feel ownership in the way the group works.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	61% (n = 17)	25% (n = 7)	4.11 (n = 28)
11. Coalition members feel ownership in the results/products of their work.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	50% (n = 14)	36% (n = 10)	4.21 (n = 28)
12. Coalition members and their respective agencies/organizations share credit for coalition successes.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	54% (n = 15)	32% (n = 9)	4.18 (n = 28)
Score for Members Factor 4.23 (SD = 0.10)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Factor #3 – Process						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. This coalition is as adaptable as necessary in meeting the needs of a changing community.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	54% (n = 15)	36% (n = 10)	4.25 (n = 28)
2. This coalition meets on a regular basis.	*	*	21% (n = 6)	36% (n = 10)	36% (n = 10)	4.00 (n = 28)
3. All coalition members participate in decision-making.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	50% (n = 14)	25% (n = 7)	4.00 (n = 28)
4. Strategies to carry out the goals and objectives of this coalition are clearly articulated.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	54% (n = 15)	25% (n = 7)	4.04 (n = 28)
5. Coalition members select or are assigned roles and responsibilities according to their interests and strengths.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	50% (n = 14)	25% (n = 7)	4.00 (n = 28)
6. There is a system in place for resolving conflicts between the demands of partnering agencies and demands of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	46% (n = 13)	36% (n = 10)	*	3.71 (n = 28)
7. This coalition has an established system to regularly assess community needs and resources.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	54% (n = 15)	29% (n = 8)	4.11 (n = 28)
8. There is a system in place by which progress toward goal attainment is measured.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	54% (n = 15)	25% (n = 7)	4.04 (n = 28)
9. This coalition markets its efforts and accomplishments to the community to obtain support.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	46% (n = 13)	39% (n = 11)	4.25 (n = 28)
Score for Process Factor 4.04 (SD = 0.16)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Factor #4 – Communication						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. A system of communication is in place for coalition members to discuss their efforts.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	46% (n = 13)	32% (n = 9)	4.11 (n = 28)
2. Coalition members frequently communicate formally (e.g., meetings, trainings, and interagency work groups).	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	43% (n = 12)	32% (n = 9)	4.07 (n = 28)
3. Coalition members frequently communicate informally (e.g., memos, e-mail, phone, and social contact).	*	*	29% (n = 8)	36% (n = 10)	32% (n = 9)	3.96 (n = 28)
4. Coalition members' communication is adequate (in frequency) to effectively work towards meeting the coalition's goals and objectives.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	54% (n = 15)	25% (n = 7)	4.04 (n = 28)
5. Members of this coalition interact to discuss issues openly.	*	*	25% (n = 7)	46% (n = 13)	25% (n = 7)	3.93 (n = 28)
6. This coalition provides a safe environment in which disagreements and conflicts between members can be discussed.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	54% (n = 15)	25% (n = 7)	4.04 (n = 28)
7. Communication among coalition members is effective (promotes understanding, cooperation, and transfer of information).	0% (n = 0)	*	*	43% (n = 12)	39% (n = 11)	4.21 (n = 28)
8. This coalition has established communication channels with local community leaders.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	50% (n = 14)	29% (n = 8)	4.07 (n = 28)
9. This coalition has established communication channels with the broader community.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	50% (n = 14)	29% (n = 8)	4.07 (n = 28)
Score for Communication Factor 4.06 (SD = 0.08)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Factor #5 – Function						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. This coalition has clearly defined the problem that it wishes to address.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	46% (n = 13)	36% (n = 10)	4.18 (n = 28)
2. The goals and objectives of this coalition are based upon key community needs.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	39% (n = 11)	43% (n = 12)	4.25 (n = 28)
3. This coalition has clearly defined short term goals and objectives.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	43% (n = 12)	32% (n = 9)	4.07 (n = 28)
4. This coalition has clearly defined long term goals and objectives.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	46% (n = 13)	32% (n = 9)	4.11 (n = 28)
5. Members agree upon the goals and objectives for this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	25% (n = 7)	46% (n = 13)	29% (n = 8)	4.04 (n = 28)
6. The goals and objectives set for this coalition can be realistically attained.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	21% (n = 6)	43% (n = 12)	36% (n = 10)	4.14 (n = 28)
7. Members view themselves as interdependent in achieving the goals and objectives of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	29% (n = 8)	43% (n = 12)	29% (n = 8)	4.00 (n = 28)
8. The goals and objectives of this coalition differ, at least in part, from each of the partner organizations.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	29% (n = 8)	43% (n = 12)	29% (n = 8)	4.00 (n = 28)
Score for Function Factor 4.10 (SD = 0.09)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Factor #6 – Resources						
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. There is adequate financial support to maintain coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	*	37% (n = 10)	48% (n = 13)	*	3.44 (n = 27)
2. There is adequate in-kind support to maintain coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	*	37% (n = 10)	41% (n = 11)	*	3.63 (n = 27)
3. There are plans in place to secure future funding for coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	*	41% (n = 11)	44% (n = 12)	*	3.52 (n = 27)
4. There are sufficient funds to sustain coalition operations for the next two years.	*	*	52% (n = 14)	37% (n = 10)	*	3.33 (n = 27)
5. Agencies/organizations represented in this coalition provide resources to support the coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	56% (n = 15)	26% (n = 7)	4.07 (n = 27)
6. Coalition members seek outside sources of financial and in-kind support for coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	22% (n = 6)	48% (n = 13)	30% (n = 8)	4.07 (n = 27)
7. Coalition members recruit additional partners that can offer financial and in-kind support for coalition operations.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	37% (n = 10)	41% (n = 11)	22% (n = 6)	3.85 (n = 27)
8. The professional expertise, skills, and specialization of coalition members have been identified and are used to advance the goals of the coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	56% (n = 15)	30% (n = 8)	4.15 (n = 27)
9. Resources within our community (e.g., clerical assistance, time, and financial support) have been identified and are used to advance the goals of this coalition.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	30% (n = 8)	37% (n = 10)	33% (n = 9)	4.04 (n = 27)
10. Our coalition utilizes the cultural assets of our community.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	52% (n = 14)	33% (n = 9)	4.19 (n = 27)
Score for Resources Factor 3.83 (SD = 0.32)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.


Factor #7 – Leadership

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Item Average
1. The coalition leader(s) has strong organizational skills.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	22% (n = 6)	37% (n = 10)	41% (n = 11)	4.19 (n = 27)
2. The coalition leader(s) has strong interpersonal skills.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	26% (n = 7)	37% (n = 10)	37% (n = 10)	4.11 (n = 27)
3. The coalition leader(s) supports and facilitates team building.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 13)	33% (n = 9)	4.15 (n = 27)
4. The coalition leader(s) utilizes members' skills and strengths to meet coalition goals and objectives.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 13)	33% (n = 9)	4.15 (n = 27)
5. The coalition leader(s) carries out the role with fairness.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 13)	33% (n = 9)	4.15 (n = 27)
6. The coalition leader(s) maintains a focus on the goals and objectives of the coalition.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 13)	37% (n = 10)	4.22 (n = 27)
7. The coalition leader(s) supports members in carrying out their roles and responsibilities.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	56% (n = 15)	33% (n = 9)	4.22 (n = 27)
8. The coalition leader(s) has knowledge of potential funding sources and plans for future funding.	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	26% (n = 7)	52% (n = 14)	22% (n = 6)	3.96 (n = 27)
9. The coalition leader(s) is effective.	0% (n = 0)	*	*	48% (n = 13)	41% (n = 11)	4.30 (n = 27)
Score for Leadership Factor 4.16 (SD = 0.09)						

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Wave 4 Perceptions of Success Results

Exhibit 2. Partnership for Strong Families Perceptions of Current and Future Success over Wave 1, 2, 3, and 4



Perceptions of Future Success											
	1 Not at All Confident	2	3	4	5 Somewhat Confident	6	7	8	9	10 Very Confident	Item Average
1. How confident are you that this coalition will still exist in the community two years from now?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	44% (n = 11)	8.16 (n = 25)
2. How confident are you that this coalition will continue to successfully achieve its goals and objectives?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	*	*	0% (n = 0)	32% (n = 8)	40% (n = 10)	8.44 (n = 25)
3. How confident are you that this coalition will continue to make a difference within the community it serves?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	*	*	0% (n = 0)	*	52% (n = 13)	8.56 (n = 25)
Score for Perceptions of Future Success 8.39 (SD = 0.21)											

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Perceptions of Current Success											
	1 Completely Unsuccessful	2	3	4	5 Somewhat Successful	6	7	8	9	10 Completely Successful	Item Average
1. How successful is this coalition at implementing strategies to address coalition goals and objectives?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	*	*	24% (n = 6)	*	*	*	7.56 (n = 25)
2. How successful is this coalition at achieving its current goals and objectives?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	*	*	*	24% (n = 6)	*	7.80 (n = 25)
3. How successful is this coalition in making a difference within the community it serves	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	*	*	*	24% (n = 6)	24% (n = 6)	8.08 (n = 25)
4. In comparison to the efforts of a single partnering agency/organization, how effective is this coalition in achieving its goals and objectives?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	0% (n = 0)	24% (n = 6)	*	*	28% (n = 7)	8.12 (n = 25)
5. In comparison to the efforts of a single partnering agency/organization, how efficient is this coalition in achieving its goals and objectives?	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	*	*	0% (n = 0)	28% (n = 7)	*	*	28% (n = 7)	8.04 (n = 25)
Score for Perceptions of Current Success 7.92 (SD = 0.24)											

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that a cell had fewer than 6 responses.

Subgroup Analyses

The study team has provided subgroup analyses based on responses to the “Background Questions” that we added at end of the CAT survey for any category that had a sufficient number of respondents (i.e., greater than 5). **In the exhibit below, response categories with six or more responses are bolded. In the pages that follow, we have provided mean CAT factor scores for these bolded categories.**

Exhibit 3: Background Items Available for Partnership for Strong Families Subgroup Analyses (Wave 4)

Background Question	Response Options
1. Please select the category below that best describes your primary role (as an individual) in the PfsF collaborative. This should be your role on the PfsF collaborative rather than your regular employment or title:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrator/Manager/Supervisor/Leadership (e.g., Project director; program coordinator; deputy director; program manager) • Committee member/Advisor (e.g., planning committee member, early childhood senior advisor, workgroup member) • Staff trainer/Professional developer (e.g., EBP provider, Strengthening Families trainer) • Referral liaison/Coordinator (e.g., domestic violence providers, legal services professional/advocate, community partnership coordinator, referring partner) • Lived experience representative • Other (please specify)
2. When did your organization become involved in the PfsF collaborative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 months ago • 6-12 months ago • 12-18 months ago • 19-24 months ago • 2-3 years ago • More than 3 years ago
3. When did you personally become involved in the PfsF collaborative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-5 months ago • 6-12 months ago • 12-18 months ago • 19-24 months ago • 2-3 years ago • More than 3 years ago
4. Have you been invited to attend collaborative meetings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No
5. Do you attend collaborative meetings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No
5a. If you attended collaborative meetings, how many did you attend in the past 2 months?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None (no meetings recently) • One meeting (one meeting recently) • Two meetings
6a. Please select the Resource Center with which the participant is most closely affiliated: **	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gainesville <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Library Partnership (LP) ○ Cone Park Library Resource Center (CPLRC) ○ SWAG Family Resource Center • Lake City – Northstar Family Resource Center (NSFRC) • Not applicable • All
6b. Please select the geographic area to which you are most closely affiliated (you may select more than one):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gainesville • Lake City

Note: Responses in bold have Ns > 5. No questions in this survey wave had N > 5 responses.

** Data for this question are provided by CWCC grant PDs through the survey invitee template.

Appendix: Subgroup Analyses for Partnership for Strong Families Wave 4, Spring 2024

Subgroup Analysis 1: Primary Role in the PfSF Collaborative

Did respondents with different primary roles in the PfSF collaborative rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups
Administrator/Manager/Supervisor/Leadership: Respondents who had the primary role of Administrator/Manager/Supervisor/Leader, N = 10
Other: Respondents who had a primary role that was not listed (various), N = 6
Overall: The whole sample of respondents, N = 29

Subscales	Administrator/Manager/ Supervisor/Leadership		Other		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.41	0.22	4.14	0.3	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.41	0.11	4.25	0.19	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.43	0.12	3.98	0.19	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.27	0.13	4.02	0.18	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.4	0.11	4.04	0.17	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	4.08	0.47	3.75	0.29	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.37	0.14	4.19	0.10	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.04	0.33	8.07	0.22	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.63	0.31	8.67	0.00	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.

Subgroup Analysis 2: Length of Time Organization Has Been Involved in PfSF

Did respondents who were affiliated with organizations that have been involved in the PfSF collaborative for a different length of time rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
More than 3 years ago: Respondents affiliated with organizations that were involved in the PfSF collaborative for more than 3 years, N = 20	
Overall: The whole sample of respondents, N = 29	

Subscales	More than 3 years		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.35	0.22	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.35	0.09	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.20	0.15	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.19	0.08	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.21	0.08	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.98	0.32	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.29	0.13	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.00	0.27	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.52	0.15	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.

Subgroup Analysis 3: Length of Personal Involvement in PfSF Collaborative

Did respondents who have a different length of personal involvement in the PfSF collaborative rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
More than 3 years ago:	Respondents that were involved in the PfSF collaborative for more than 3 years, N = 18
Overall:	The whole sample of respondents, N = 29

Subscales	More than 3 years		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.34	0.23	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.31	0.08	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.14	0.17	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.20	0.06	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.15	0.09	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.93	0.27	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.27	0.09	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.12	0.21	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.57	0.17	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.

Subgroup Analysis 4: Invited to Attend Meetings

Did respondents who were invited to attend meetings rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
Invited to attend:	Respondents who were invited to attend meetings, N = 20
Not invited to attend:	Respondents who were not invited to attend meetings, N=5 (not shown)
Overall:	The whole sample of respondents, N = 29

Subscales	Invited to Attend		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.34	0.25	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.39	0.13	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.26	0.18	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.25	0.09	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.23	0.09	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.89	0.40	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.27	0.11	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.20	0.23	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.58	0.26	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.

Subgroup Analysis 5: Attended Meetings

Did respondents who attended meetings rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
Attended meetings:	Respondents who attended meetings, N = 15
Did not attend meetings:	Respondents who did not attend meetings, N = 9
Overall:	The whole sample of respondents, N = 29

Subscales	Attended Meetings		Did not Attend Meetings		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.32	0.30	4.10	0.20	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.40	0.09	4.09	0.16	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.22	0.18	3.93	0.18	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.29	0.06	3.85	0.18	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.24	0.08	4.06	0.13	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.95	0.37	3.63	0.29	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.27	0.09	4.00	0.18	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.20	0.28	7.42	0.24	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.6	0.35	7.89	0.00	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.

Subgroup Analysis 5a: Attended Meetings Recently

Did respondents who attended meetings in the last 2 months rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
Attended meetings recently:	Respondents who attended meetings in the last 2 months, N = 7
Did not attend meetings recently:	Respondents who did not attend meetings in the last 2 months, N = 8
Overall:	The whole sample of respondents, N = 29

Subscales	Attended Meetings Recently		Did not Attend Meetings Recently		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.36	0.30	4.09	0.31	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.26	0.13	4.34	0.13	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.25	0.12	3.92	0.27	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	4.13	0.18	4.15	0.14	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.14	0.15	3.98	0.14	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.86	0.48	3.84	0.29	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.14	0.07	4.18	0.14	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	8.00	0.27	7.60	0.41	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.19	0.44	8.42	0.07	8.39	0.21

Subgroup Analysis 6: Geospatial Areas Served by the Resource Centers as Reported by the Grantee

Did respondents who were affiliated with different geospatial areas served by the RCs *as reported by the grantee* rate the collaboration differently?

Subgroups	
Gainesville: Respondents who were affiliated with the Gainesville area (any RCs), N = 22	
Gainesville (Library Partnership, LP): Respondents who were affiliated with the LP RC in the Gainesville area, N = 19	
Gainesville (SWAG FRC): Respondents who were affiliated with SWAG FRC, N=22	
Lake City (NSFRC): Respondents who were affiliated with the NSFRC RC, N=18	
Overall: The whole sample of respondents, N = 29	

Subscales	Gainesville – All 3		Gainesville - LP		Gainesville - SWAG		Lake City (NSFRC)		Overall Average	
	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
Factor 1 (Context)	4.21	0.29	4.23	0.30	4.21	0.29	4.39	0.27	4.22	0.27
Factor 2 (Members)	4.18	0.07	4.16	0.07	4.18	0.07	4.44	0.14	4.23	0.10
Factor 3 (Process)	4.05	0.14	4.02	0.15	4.05	0.14	4.20	0.20	4.04	0.16
Factor 4 (Communication)	3.99	0.09	3.98	0.11	3.99	0.09	4.27	0.08	4.06	0.08
Factor 5 (Function)	4.13	0.08	4.16	0.08	4.13	0.08	4.24	0.11	4.10	0.09
Factor 6 (Resources)	3.85	0.30	3.88	0.29	3.85	0.30	3.94	0.38	3.83	0.32
Factor 7 (Leadership)	4.11	0.12	4.15	0.14	4.11	0.12	4.39	0.09	4.16	0.09
Perceptions of Current Success	7.78	0.24	7.87	0.29	7.78	0.24	8.31	0.29	7.92	0.24
Perceptions of Future Success	8.22	0.22	8.49	0.23	8.22	0.22	8.98	0.26	8.39	0.21

Factor scales range from 1-5, perceptions of success scales range from 1-10.