Fostering Community-Led, Action-Oriented Coalitions that Change Community Policies and Conditions For Health: Research, Tools and Case Studies from the Field

Colorado Food Policy Network Webinar Series
Wednesday April 15th, 2015
12:00-12:30 p.m.
WELCOME!

Wendy Peters Moschetti

wendy@wpmconsulting.net
Agenda

- Welcome
- CO Food Policy Network Background
- Presentation,
  - PARTNER: A Tool for Collecting and Utilizing Data to Build, Manage, and Evaluate Networks
  - Dr. Danielle Varda, PhD, Associate Professor, School of Public Affairs, UCD and Department of Health Systems, Management, and Policy, Colorado School of Public Health
- Open Q&A
CO Food Policy Network

- Shared purpose: “to promote healthy, community-based, economically viable food systems in Colorado that ensure all residents have access to affordable, nutritious food”

- A collective of state, regional, and local food coalitions committed to:
  - Building the capacity of local food systems coalitions to effect change
  - Advancing regional and state level policies, investments and strategies
  - Creating the conditions for deeper collaboration and impact
PARTNER: A Quality Improvement Tool, Using Social Network Analysis

Danielle M. Varda, PhD
University of Colorado Denver
School of Public Affairs
danielle.varda@ucdenver.edu
The “Network Way” of Working

Graphic from CDC/NACCHO (MAPP website): http://www.naccho.org/topics/infrastructure/MAPP/index.cfm
Why Do We Need New Concepts & Tools To Assess Systems?

- To provide an additional way to evaluate partnerships.
- Current Assumption = More is better.
  - More partners = successful collaboration (counting noses)
- Alternative Assumption = Less can be more.
  - Not based on how many partners you have, but how they are connected.
Collects data on who is connected to whom
How those connections vary and change
Focus on patterns of relations
Set of actors connected by a set of ties

** NODES**: Individuals, Organizations, Departments, Teams
Attributes: Any description of the node (e.g. gender, sector)

** Ties**: Directed, Undirected, Valued, Binary

Social Network Analysis
1. Identifying the ideal network

2. Measuring the actual network (using SNA/PARTNER)

3. Identifying the gap between the actual and ideal network

4. Creating action steps to get closer to the ideal network

PARTNER

Program to Analyze, Record, and Track Networks to Enhance Relationships

www.partnertool.net

- With support from RWJF, PARTNER is a Quality Improvement tool, using Social Network Analysis, launched in 2008.
  - Over 600 Users in 50 States & over 29 Countries, 80% of Users in PH
  - Validated Survey/QI Methodology, SNA Analysis Tool
  - PARTNER Website: tech manual, web demos, dissemination templates; teaching simulation

Resources
- Next Web Demo: April 30, 1pm MT, RSVP to partnertool@ucdenver.edu
- Webinar Series: RSVP to: rpcg@ucdenver.edu
  - Understanding and Using Complex Systems Data: From the Basics to Applications in Practice (check website for dates)
SAVE THE DATE

Network Leadership Training Academy
Build, Manage, and Evaluate Effective Networks

May 28-30, 2015
Denver, CO

A three-day training for managers and leaders to learn how to address the challenges of building, managing, and evaluating effective interorganizational networks.

For more information go to: spa.ucdenver.edu/NLTA
To Register go HERE
Practice Example:
Using Complex Data for
Systems Building

WONDERBabies
The Problem: A Complex System That Families Have Trouble Navigating

• RQs: Who is a part of this system? How are they connected? Are they coordinating services? Where can we improve the system to better serve families? (Network = Outcome)

• We found: A strong, well-connected network!

723 Partnerships
450 Organizations

Centralization =3%
Trust = 75%
Density = 1%
Explored Nuances of the Network

Looked at the Mental Health Network

Looked at the Network by County

Adams/Arapahoe/Douglas

Weld
However, Family “Blueprints” Continued to Show a Fragmented System

Developed: Patient-Centered Network Survey
Systems vs. Family Networks
Outcome: Personal Support Network

Top Ten Key Actors in the Systems Network
- State Part C
- HCP
- Developmental Screening Initiative
- State Part B
- Department of Human Services
- Local Early Childhood Councils
- State Department of Education
- State Health Department
- Primary Care Providers

Top Ten Key Actors in the Client Network
- Pediatricians
- Schools
- Other Families
- Extended Families
- Friends
- Online Support Groups

System Level

Family Level
Members of a Personal Support Network Are:
Important, Trusted, & Provide Support,
But are Not Coordinated, Don’t Talk Together
This is Interesting, But How Does it Inform Change?

If the system is coordinated, shouldn’t this be reflected in the personal networks of families?

- How can the system better address the way families leverage and utilize their personal support networks, to achieve greater health outcomes?

Now: Patient-Centered Network Survey (App)

- Collects data on a patient’s social support network
- Used as a screening tool by providers
- Designed to link to resources and determine patient’s ability for systems navigation/home care
Practice Example: Communicating Complex Systems Data in Simple Terms

ECC MIECHV/Health Integration
In 2014, 36 organizations answered questions about how the Mesa County Partnership for Children and Families (PCF) has strengthened the early childhood system in our county. *Here’s what they told us.*

- **How is PCF strengthening the system in Mesa County?**
  The 36 organizations *identified 591 partnerships among them.* Of these, they reported that 63% (about 372) of these partnerships are attributed to activities related to PCF.
  - 44% (260) of those partnerships were created through PCF activities
  - 19% (112) of those partnerships were strengthened by PCF activities

- **How are partnerships strengthening the early childhood system in Mesa County?**
  These 591 partnerships resulted in *systems change:*
  - 401 (68%) resulted in improved services or supports for young children and families
  - 206 (35%) resulted in exchanges of resources
  - 106 (18%) resulted in development of new programs
  - 130 (22%) resulted in exchange of information
  - 88 (15%) resulted in improved screening/referral/follow up processes
  - 70 (12%) resulted in increased organizational capacity

- **How is Mesa County PCF making a difference?**
  There was *overwhelming consensus* by more than half of respondents that PCF was responsible for:
  - Connecting many organizations in the community to one another
  - Raising awareness of early childhood issues in the community
  - Convening community organizations around a shared goal
  - Building public engagement
  - Coordination of local websites to help families
What are partners in Mesa County doing together?
- 271 partnerships reported in Early Learning
- 254 partnership reported in Family Support and Education
- 153 partnerships reported in Social, Emotional, and Mental Health
- 130 partnerships reported in Health
- 47 partnerships reported in Home Visitation

What resources do these partners contribute?
The most resources exchanged among these partnerships are:
- Community connections
- Advocacy
- Leadership in the early childhood field
- Services for young children and their families
- Knowledge of resources
- Expertise in early learning
- Support & commitment to engage in systems building
- Expertise in family support & parent education
- Training & professional development opportunities
- Communication/public relations technical assistance

What is the quality of relationships in Mesa County?
Members of the Mesa County early childhood system report high levels of trust among partners (and very high levels of trust of PCF) and positive perceptions of the value that engaging partners brings to the system. Overall trust scores are 79%, out of 100%, with most organizations reporting a “great deal” of trust and value towards their partners.

What has the Mesa County early childhood system achieved in the last year?
What they said the early childhood system has achieved:
- More knowledge and awareness
- More collaboration and relationships
- Creation of a shared vision
- A more coordinated approach
- Development of effective strategies
- Increased focus on health/social emotional/mental health issues for young children

Where they thought we could focus next:
- Increase referrals to community programs
- Increase data sharing
- Increased capacity building for trainings, grant writing, developing resources, and connecting to funders
- Engaging in shared policy work
- Increased project/funding coordination

The Top three accomplishments our partners reported were: 1) Increased collaboration among cross-sector partners, 2) Increased knowledge of issues, and 3) Creating a shared vision for the broader early childhood program.
Questions?
Contacts

Dr. Danielle Varda - Danielle.Varda@ucdenver.edu

Wendy Peters Moschetti – wendy@wpmconsulting.net

COFPN:

– www.cofoodsystems council.org
– www.facebook.com/groups/cofoodsystemcoalitions/
– Listserv
Resources

“Leadership Development for Nontraditional Voices”:  
– http://sparkpolicy.com/tools/introduction-overview/leadership-development-for-nontraditional-voices/


Multnomah County's (Oregon) Equity and Empowerment Lens:  

"Building the Case for Racial Equity in the Food System” Guiding Questions for Racial Equity Analysis:  
Next in the Series!

フラウ・セミナー#3: Building Diversity to Change Policy and Conditions in Community and Organizations on Thursday Apr 30, 2015, 12-12:30pm:

Thank You!

All webinars are archived here:

www.livewellcolorado.org/livewells-commitment/research-and-publications/webinars