

4-1999

A Comparative assessment of the status, structure and process utilized by Nevada's family support and preservation consortia to achieve collaboration

Marlys A. Morton
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), [Social Welfare Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Morton, Marlys A., "A Comparative assessment of the status, structure and process utilized by Nevada's family support and preservation consortia to achieve collaboration" (1999). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 281.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/1480670>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS, STRUCTURE AND
PROCESS UTILIZED BY NEVADA'S FAMILY SUPPORT AND
PRESERVATION CONSORTIA TO ACHIEVE COLLABORATION

By

Marlys A. Morton

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master
in
Public Administration

Department of Public Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
April 1999

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to a number of individuals for their assistance with this extended project. Bill Thompson, Ph.D., Chair, Department of Public Administration patiently provided guidance and direction to this research effort. In addition, I would like to provide recognition to the professors serving on my defense committee, Leonard E. Goodall, Ph.D., Karen Layne, D.P.A. and Anthony Townsend, Ph.D.

A special note of commendation is extended to the members of Nevada's regional consortia who provided the data necessary to conduct this research paper.

Finally, personal gratitude is expressed to both UNLV Master of Public Administration graduate Deborah Young and Candace Young-Richey, M.P.A. for their encouragement, mentorship, and support regarding the successful completion of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
METHODOLOGY.....	23
DATA ANALYSIS.....	28
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION.....	55
REFERENCES.....	61

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1:	Number of Returned Responses by Regional Consortia.....30
Table 2:	Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 1).....30
Table 3:	Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 2).....31
Table 4:	Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 3).....31
Table 5:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 4).....32
Table 6:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 5).....32
Table 7:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 6).....33
Table 8:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 7).....33
Table 9:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 8).....34
Table 10:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 9).....34
Table 11:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 10).....35
Table 12:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 11).....35
Table 13:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 12).....36
Table 14:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 13).....36
Table 15:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 14).....37
Table 16:	Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 15).....37
Table 17:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 16).....38
Table 18:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 17).....38
Table 19:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 18).....39
Table 20:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 19).....39
Table 21:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 20).....40

Page

Table 22:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 21).....	40
Table 23:	Responses by on regarding Members (Item 22).....	41
Table 24:	Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 23).....	41
Table 25:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 24).....	42
Table 26:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 25).....	42
Table 27:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 26).....	43
Table 28:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 27).....	43
Table 29:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 28).....	44
Table 30:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 29).....	44
Table 31:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 30).....	45
Table 32:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 31).....	45
Table 33:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 32).....	46
Table 34:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 33).....	46
Table 35:	Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 34).....	47
Table 36:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 35).....	47
Table 37:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 36).....	48
Table 38:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 37).....	48
Table 39:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 38).....	49
Table 40:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 39).....	49
Table 41:	Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 40).....	50
Table 42:	Context Indicators (Items 1-3) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	51

Table 43a.:	Structure Indicators (Items 4 - 9) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	51
Table 43b.:	Structure Indicators (Items 10 - 15) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	52
Table 44:	Membership Indicators (Items 16 - 23) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation	52
Table 45a.:	Process Indicators (Items 24 - 29) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	53
Table 45b.:	Process Indicators (Items 30 - 34) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	53
Table 46:	Results Indicators (Items 35-40) Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation.....	54
Table 47:	Comparisons among Categories by Regional Consortia.....	58
Table 48:	Ranking of Categories of Collaborative effectiveness by Consortia..	59

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A: Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration.....	70
APPENDIX B: The Liaisons for Integration of Family Enrichment (L.I.F.E.) Northern Consortium Membership List as of October 1997.....	74
APPENDIX C: The Nevada Rural Services (N.R.S.) Consortium Membership List as of October 1997.....	76
APPENDIX D: The Family Advocates for Community Empowerment (F.A.C.E.) Southern Membership List as of October 1997.....	77
APPENDIX E: Cover Letter attached with Survey.....	79

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a framework for understanding inter-organizational collaboration and describes and analyzes how collaboration was used as a method to build new service networks, the characteristics of the consortia, and the status of the collaborative processes.

Although the literature on inter-organizational collaboration in the human services is increasing, little is known about how regional consortia view the process of working together towards a common purpose. The results reported in this paper are intended to help fill that gap.

The findings reported in this study are based on a survey process using a standardized questionnaire to study the collaborative status. This external, independent, student based study examined the process of inter-organizational collaboration in within Nevada's child and family service system.

INTRODUCTION

Public administrators are increasingly called upon to lead or participate in inter-organizational collaborations, coalitions, and partnerships. Funding for collaborations in the public and private sector is increasing. Yet, cooperation and coordination across service, issue, and geographic lines is not automatic or simple. The scholarly research demonstrates that collaborations can be complex and fragile mechanisms.

The process of regional inter-organizational collaborations (IOC) in human services is the administrative topic of this professional paper. The purpose of this paper is to describe and analyze three community-based consortia, initially funded in 1995, in the northern, rural and southern regions of Nevada. These collaborative efforts were implemented under the Nevada Title IV-B Family Preservation and Support Five Year Plan as a result of landmark federal child welfare legislation. This quantitative cross-site study of three regional collaborative efforts was undertaken to understand more about the process, structure, and perceptions regarding collaborative efforts.

The status of these collaborative efforts was measured utilizing a survey instrument offered to all members of each separate consortium. The measurement device is regarded as public domain and based on a research project funded by the American Leadership Forum. The 40 scale instrument, "Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration," was used to assess five dimensions of collaborative efforts: the context for the collaborative group; the structure or design of the collaboration; the members' skills and attitudes; the process that is being used; and the results that are being accomplished.

This paper reports findings from an organizational analysis of three regional inter-organizational consortia in which practitioners from a variety of agencies worked to create, implement, and sustain a community-based network. The research findings will be reviewed in relation to previous, although limited studies of collaborative efforts that reported among other factors, a significantly high regard for the context of their collaborative group. The research presentation will offer insight regarding how consortia members view the effectiveness of the collaborative process and can be used as a baseline measure of the three regional efforts to meet the goals of the Title IV-B Steering Committee and the State of Nevada.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Communication can help people to do their jobs better by providing more complete information although it does not require any joint activity. Coordination involves joint activity, but allows individuals to maintain their own set of goals, expectations, and responsibilities. Hence, Bruner (1991) finds collaboration to mean more than either communication or coordination. Collaboration requires the creation of joint goals to guide the participants' actions. Collaboration exists when two or more organizations agree to share information and resources in order to realize mutual gain (Korus and Boles, 1997). Furthermore, collaboration is deemed a process to reach goals that cannot be achieved acting alone.

As a process, collaboration is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The desired result is commonly more comprehensive and appropriate services to families that improve outcomes by combining and coordinating financial, human, and administrative resources and activities (Bruner, 1991). Many groups use a variety of terms such as alliance, coalition, partnership, and consortium to define a particular collaboration (Winer, 1994).

Features of successful collaborations

To implement successful collaborative initiatives there must be a high level of involvement, a clear purpose, adequate resources, and decision making power (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). Various features, therefore, comprise successful collaborations. One of the central features of a successful collaborative is to have the flexibility to do things differently, to break the mold regarding the way service systems are structured, the way services are delivered locally, and the manner in which funds are distributed. Broad based decision making is also necessary to ensure the commitment of key stakeholders and to create consensus, though not necessarily unanimity, about shared goals and specific strategies (Berman, 1996).

Mattessich & Monsey (1992) found numerous studies that imply membership characteristics and qualities are more important than anything else when it comes to helping a collaboration succeed. Primary findings from Aubry's (1996) study concurrently found that most professionals feel collaboration involves positive, equal relationships among professionals and the need for trust and good communication not only interorganizationally, but also intraorganizationally.

As Kraemer (n.d.) points out collaborative programs that endure have three key features: a stable funding base, a goal of systemic change, and a management style that combines entrepreneurship with nurturance. Moreover, initial funding as well as ongoing support is also critical (Blank & Lombardi, 1991). Similarly, the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice (n.d.) concludes that collaboration entails:

- Partnerships with community members, not just among professionals;
- Shared agreements about problem domains;
- Shared aims, values, change principles and improvement strategies;
- Shared commitment to monitoring results and making flight adjustments when barriers and stuck-points are identified;
- Shared information and resources;
- Opportunities for calculated risk-taking, role release and continuing learning;
- Democratized leadership and decision-making structures;
- Shared commitments, expressed in inter-agency agreements, needed changes in policies, organizational structures and cultures, and definitions of "best practices."

Bruner (1991) further states that collaboration includes all of the following elements: jointly developing and agreeing to a set of common goals and directions; sharing responsibility for obtaining those goals; and working together to achieve those goals using the expertise of each collaborator.

Purposes of Collaboration

Collaboration interests people in human services, government, and community organizations; the political and social climates act as a positive external motivator for collaboration. For example, the United States is facing a resurgence of political emphasis on decentralizing government functions. Federal, state, and local governments are increasingly requiring collaborations. Berman's (1996) study finds local governments are driving forces for community-based strategies, as are requirements by higher governments and a variety of local events and conditions. Many consortia form when state policymakers encourage or require the agencies they oversee to form interagency task forces, councils, or committees to help them plan together. Policy makers establish these or other administrative structures to improve interagency understanding and planning in addressing cross-agency concerns and large scale social problems (Bailey & Koney, 1996; Bruner, 1991; Leach, 1995; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). Whether spurred by vision, opportunity, adversity, or mandate, all collaborations strive to do something similar; essentially, they try to work out how to work together (Kraemer, n.d.).

One of the pressing concerns according to Sykora (1996) is that individual agencies provide services based upon legislative mandates although they are almost never a part of a larger 'network' of services. Consequently, a fragmented system of services has developed resulting in inefficient and ineffective services. Berman (1996) discusses the idea that organizations often lack the necessary resources, or legitimacy to effectively deal with these problems on their own. Given our fragmented system of services, the relationships among service providers are critical to ensuring a more holistic approach to meeting the comprehensive needs of families (Blank & Lombardi, 1991). Again, the purpose of collaboration is to create a shared vision and joint strategies to address concerns that go beyond the scope of any one entity; as its Latin roots - *com* and *laborare* - indicate, collaboration means "to work together" (Chrislip & Larson, 1994).

Collaboration, however, is much more costly and time consuming than cooperative efforts alone because collaboration requires partners to put aside individual agendas in favor of common goals (Bruner, 1991). Indeed, collaborative efforts are different than those traditionally practiced. Policy makers must recognize that the substantial resources that go into establishing inter-

agency collaborative ventures should be expended only when the benefits of collaboration are correspondingly large. While some initiatives may leverage new resources and deploy existing ones more efficiently, collaboration will not actually create resources. Collaboration, then, is not always the best investment of resources; depending on local needs and circumstances, some services may be better provided without multiple agency involvement.

Types of Collaboration

Informal decision-making models involving collaboration are increasing in comparison to traditional formal models found in governmental agencies. Kraemer (n.d.) finds collaboration as a balance of informal and formal processes and distinguishes between two types of collaboration: program-centered and system-centered. Program-centered collaboration involves one program reaching out in many directions to gain access to resources for its own participants. Alternatively, system-centered collaboration describes the attempt to create a multi-partner system to address the needs of a particular population. This often involves the creation of a new entity or the designation of a new governance structure for existing entities. A system is a group of key individuals and organizations that interact to produce a benefit.

System-centered collaborations typically involve government agencies, which sometimes have less operational flexibility than the local programs engaged in program-centered collaboration. Larger system alliances involves a greater pool of partners, implies restructuring a range of services and programs, and necessitates the designation of new authority structures for coordinating and linking services.

The Family Resource Coalition of America (1998) also identifies the program and system types of family support networks, in addition to a universal system. A universal approach may have thousands of members, including members of the general public who join because they believe in the services or work associated with the principles of family support.

Approaches to Collaboration

Researchers have documented the trend towards more collaborative approaches where activities are carried out by a number of interested parties. Numerous cities and counties, often with financial support and technical assistance from the state and private foundations, have formed collaborations and begun initiatives to create more responsive child and family services. In addition to the mounting state and local experience with collaboration, at least three issues are pushing schools and communities

toward new interagency relationships: Collaboration is the only way to fund emerging needs; wide gaps exist in the quality of services to children and families; and the push for better outcomes is pervading all public policy making with regard to services for children and families (Lewis, 1993).

Similarly, the literature outlines a great number of case studies where local governmental entities and human service programs have adopted collaborative efforts among public employees, community representatives and other stakeholders. For example, inter-organizational collaboration has been perceived as a strategy for those interested in improving community health services (See for example Bray, 1995; Chambers, 1996; Coogle, Ansello, Wood & Cotter, 1995; Fawcett, Paine, Francisco, Shultz, Richter, Lewis, Williams, Harris, Berkely, Fisher & Lopez, 1995; Weaver, 1997). Interagency task forces are also emphasized to be an effective means to educational reform under the Clinton Administration (Lewis, 1993). Furthermore, interprofessional practice has been mandated in the implementation of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program (Woehrle, 1996). An extensive review of the literature regarding education reforms by Bailey (1995) found four primary school partnership prototypes: School-

business/industry, school-higher education, school interagency, and school-multiple stakeholders. Many education leaders are using collaborative efforts to develop significant educational improvements (see for example Anderson, 1995; Antognoli, 1996; Atkinson, 1996; Ellis, 1996; Gravius, 1995; Hardy, 1995; Hotalling, 1995; House, 1995; Kibler, 1997; Kulpa, 1996; Namey, 1995; O'Brien, 1996; Olson, 1997; O'Rourke, 1996; Ovando, 1996; Paugh, 1995; Temple, 1996; Todd, 1995; Viggiani, 1996; and Wilson, 1996,).

Levels of Collaboration

Chrislip and Larson (1994) present a fundamental collaborative premise that underlies the various levels of collaboration, *"If you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concern for organization and community."* A central tenet of these ideas is related to the complexity of many contemporary problems that require increased collaboration between and within organizations. Collaboration, therefore, should be fostered at every level of organization, from the top administrative level to the level at which the family interacts with frontline service workers. Collaboration at one level of organization will

foster collaboration at other levels. The following four levels of collaboration have been identified by Bruner (1991):

- Level 1 - Interagency Collaboration - Administration: Administrators in the state or local levels manage to facilitate interagency and intra-agency collaboration through protocols, interagency agreements, staff organization, staff incentives, and job evaluation systems.
- Level 2 - Inter-agency Collaboration - Service: Workers at the service-delivery level in various agencies are given incentives and support for joint efforts with staff in other agencies.
- Level 3 - Intra-agency Collaboration: Workers at the frontline, service-delivery level are given the discretion in serving clients, providing support for decision making, and the opportunity for involvement in agency planning.
- Level 4 - Worker-Family Collaboration: Frontline workers and family members determine needs, set goals, and work toward greater family autonomy and functioning.

These four levels of collaboration are interrelated and interacting. Successful collaborative initiatives may start at any one of these levels of organization, although

they most frequently begin with the administrative planning level.

Results of collaboration

Policy makers are serious about collaboration across agencies and programs that serve children (Lewis, 1993). Although policymakers have identified the community-based human service network as a promising model for restructuring services, researchers have found this approach complex and difficult to implement. An increase in networks and partnerships among service providers suggests that organizations are learning to work together, yet little is known about their process of collaboration (Mulroy, 1997). Indeed, the alliance of child welfare, mental health, and legal systems has received little empirical attention, despite the magnitude of its impact on children and families (Butler, Atkinson, Magnetta, and Hood, 1995).

Bruner (1991) contends that collaboration will succeed only if it changes the nature of the relationship between workers and families and has as its goal the alleviation of children's very real needs. Successful collaboration, therefore, produces tangible results, not just structures and activities that create the illusion that a problem is being addressed (Chrislip and Larson, 1994).

Understandably, Mattessich & Monsey (1992) arrive at the conclusion that the research on collaboration is problematic in that virtually every study employs only a case study methodology, not detailed empirical methods. Furthermore, the traditional system of accountability fails to perform well in new administrative environments which use interagency collaboration to accomplish policy purposes (Bardach & Lesser, 1996).

Daka, Thornburg, Filbert, and Klein (1995) document that professionals who collaborate provide more adequate and efficient delivery of human services and, Lindbland (1995) finds sustained collaborative endeavors bring about substantive, democratic change. Conversely, a national study of rural hospital consortia found that on average, across consortia members, there was no significant impact from consortium participation (Chan, 1997). Unfortunately, despite growing recognition of the need to collaborate to solve public policy problems, there is a substantial gap between intention and result (Chrislip and Larson, 1994).

In a complex world, particularly where families face significant environmental risks, identifying the impact of collaborative strategies will be particularly challenging (Bruner, 1991). Collaboration poses special obstacles to evaluators. According to Bruner, 1991, the issue of

whether or not collaboration is occurring may best be reflected in how people's attitudes have changed toward their roles. Indeed, collective responsibility is difficult to measure and to assign responsibility for. It becomes clear that our traditional ways of thinking about networks needs to change, or at the very least challenged, in order to fully understand the impact of these unique collaborative arrangements.

Obstacles to the Success of Collaboration

Inter-organizational collaboration is complex, takes many forms and is difficult to do. As Blank and Lombardi (1991) suggest, "as we move to improve services through collaboration, we face the challenges of documenting results, providing technical assistance, and sharing information across the country regarding what works." Conflicting regulations are probably the most frequently cited impediments to successful collaboration (Kraemer, n.d.). Other issues include criteria about program components, timelines of funding, and assessment criteria. Differing and sometimes conflicting bureaucratic procedures can make collaboration difficult for staff members and participants. Moreover, as collaborative projects are still viewed as experiments they are sometimes at greater

risk for funding cutbacks than traditional service delivery systems (Kraemer, n.d.).

One reason Bruner (1991) cites for the poor performance regarding many interagency groups is that responsibility for attending meetings is relegated to those without significant decision-making authority or with little interest in changing the manner in which their own agency interacts with other agencies. A second barrier is that the available resources to support these undertakings are not adequate. A third reason for the limited success of many collaborative activities is that interagency groups are unlikely to develop recommendations that will not be perceived as threatening any one partner's existing activities. Moreover, Kraemer (n.d.) maintains resentments can occur within organizations included in a coalition. Some complaints emerge from misperceptions about the varying resource bases, capacities and goals of partner organizations. If members are provided no significant incentives for their collaborative work they are unlikely to engage in such a time-consuming process. Not surprisingly then, Bruner (1991) declares that healthy and secure agencies usually find it easier to collaborate than those in less favorable circumstances.

Indeed, collaboration requires more complex long-term thinking and conflict management (Winer, 1994; Berman, 1996; & Frederickson, 1996). While all collaborations face management issues, it is usually the larger-scale system-centered collaborations that are forced to create new governance arrangements (Kraemer, n.d.).

Although collaboration among agencies or organizations is often critical to community building strategies, not all collaborations in the community really support community building (Bruner, 1991 and Sviridoff & Ryan, 1997). Finally, interagency collaboration is far from the solution to all problems faced by children and families. Perhaps some services can and should be delivered through a single agency without the need for cross-agency collaboration.

Family Preservation and Support Services Program Overview

A review of major legislation addressing child welfare in the past 20 years finds that policy has failed to meet the needs of children, who, because of abuse and neglect by caregivers, have entered the complex system of child protection. As the first major child welfare legislation in over a decade, the Family Preservation and Support Services Program was enacted in August 1993 as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and is codified as Subpart 2 of Title IV-B of the Social Security Act. The

goals of the Family Preservation and Supports Services are to:

1. Protect children's safety;
2. Strengthen families' ability to promote their children's healthy development; and
3. Contribute to the development of a more responsive, collaborative, family-centered child and family service system.

Approximately, \$900 million was distributed to states as a result of Title IV-B over the course of five years (FY 94 through FY 1998). The law offered an opportunity for necessary collaborations among state, local and private agencies and for developing a new advocacy constituency through these relationships. To ensure that states used the opportunities and resources provided by the new program to make comprehensive, cross-system improvements, the statute required states to develop and implement a state five-year plan.

Governance and Operations

Nevada's Title IV-B Family Preservation and Family Support (FP/FS) Five Year Plan was submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children, Youth & Families in June, 1995. While the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) is responsible

for the administration of the Title IV-B FP/FS Program, the five-year plan was organized and developed by a 37 member statewide steering committee. The steering committee membership reflected representation from state and county agencies, the Schools of Social Work and the Universities of Las Vegas and Reno, Native American organizations, service consumers, community leaders, and a variety of private non-profit agency representatives dedicated to child and family welfare. The steering committee made decisions on governance, policy, and membership. Since January 1995, the Title IV-B FP/FS Steering Committee has provided Title IV-B, Subpart II funding, oversight and technical assistance to three community based consortia located in northern, rural, and southern regions of Nevada.

Description of the three regional consortia

The following three community-based consortia located in the northern, rural, and southern regions of Nevada were selected to receive Title IV-B FP/FS funding:

- The Liaisons for Integration of Family Enrichment (L.I.F.E.) Consortium represented the northern region, primarily from Washoe County which covers about 1,000 square miles.
- The Nevada Rural Services Consortium (N.R.S.C.) represented the rural regions, encompasses the rural

counties of the state which cover about 100,000 square miles.

- The Family Advocates for Community Empowerment (F.A.C.E.) Consortium represented the southern region from the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Clark County which covers about 7,000 square miles.

The project goal was to develop regional, as well as statewide, family-strengthening services through a collaboration of strong agencies already located in the target regions to maximize existing resources; reduce service fragmentation; and link parents and families to family based services in their own neighborhoods. A mid-year evaluation report prepared by contract researchers and presented to the Title IV-B Steering Committee indicates that the decision to fund the three consortia equally, rather than allocating funds on a population-based formula, promoted norms of equality and collaboration rather than competition (Albers, Bitonti, & Santangelo, 1998). The public child welfare agency - Nevada's Child and Family Services Division - was perceived as a funding entity - a pass through agency of federal support grants. Each regional consortia had a different fiscal agent serving as the project's sponsoring agency.

Each consortium developed its own collaborative structure with representatives from various disciplines and partner agencies. The following excerpt from the Nevada Title IV-B FP/FS Subpart II Annual Progress and Services Report FY 1998 describes the anticipated consortia goals and implementation process:

The first year of funding, FY 1996, was intended for needs assessment and regional planning to implement a more coordinated, integrated and community-based system of child and family services throughout the state. The second year of funding, FY 1997 was intended to provide ongoing needs assessment, capacity-building, direct service implementation, and process evaluation. The third year of funding, FY 1998, was intended to continue capacity-building, direct services designed to preserve and support families while developing an improved child welfare system, ongoing process evaluation, attainment of benchmarks, and development of outcomes to be measured in the final year of the five year plan, FY 1999.

Each consortium implements a grant process to provide direct services (prevention and early intervention programs: family support and family preservation services). These services address critical issues affecting families such as job opportunities, alcohol and drug abuse, crime prevention, disintegration of the family, affordable housing, unsupervised children, child neglect, youth activities, a lack of services in the community, a lack of awareness of services, and barriers to accessing available services.

Each of the three consortia in Nevada is required to maintain, convene, and further develop their respective consortium with membership to reflect both traditional and non-traditional community stakeholders. Each consortia either sub-contracts or employs a coordinator. However, all

members of each regional consortium participate as volunteers.

And according to the Nevada Title IV-B FP/FS Subpart II Annual Progress and Services Report FY 1998:

The evaluation efforts have not been able to clearly demonstrate that any movement toward positive indicators, improved outcomes (direct benefit to families), or systemic change can be linked to consortium strategies.

The contract evaluators additionally found the original outcome indicators in the Five Year Plan to be unrealistic as they were more related to the particular goals of the public child welfare system, than to consortium efforts which focused on family support at the community level, "as a result, cross-site and site-specific outcomes were not clearly articulated, leaving consortium members and evaluators constantly struggling to connect program activities to these broader objectives" (Albers, Bitonti, & Santangelo, 1998).

METHODOLOGY

The framework used to gain more detailed and substantive knowledge to assess the overall status and specific components of three regional consortia was a cross-site quantitative survey design. The measurement instrument, "Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration," (Appendix A) was co-developed by Learning Profiles, Inc. and the American Leadership Forum, and can be utilized to assess the status of collaborative efforts. This model was selected as it captures concepts outlined in the literature review by scholars and practitioners - that the process, structure and perceptions surrounding collaborative efforts are critical to their effectiveness.

Chrislip and Larson (1994) claim that in addition to serving as an instrument for research, the chosen device may serve as a feedback strategy. Thus, members of a collaborative group can thereby describe the group, obtain a sense of how well the group is doing, and uncover for discussion issues related to improving the collaborative process.

Instrumentation

The four page measurement instrument, titled "Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration" was recreated via word processing software and employed to assess the status

of three regional collaborative efforts. The instrument was implemented to effectively capture the strengths and weaknesses of collaborative groups and improve their ability to work together. Hence, the instrument, assesses five critical dimensions of collaboration:

1. The context of the collaborative group
2. The structure or design of the collaboration
3. The member's skills and attitudes
4. The process that is being used
5. The results that are being achieved

The measurement tool is divided into categories and is therefore considered "structured". Structure refers to the number of subscales contained in a given instrument.

Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration contains a total of 40 items, divided into five subscales: three of which address context, twelve of which address structure, eight of which address membership, eleven of which address process, and six of which address results.

The instrument (a forty-item scale) provided for closed-ended questions with discrete, multiple choice-responses from which the respondent selects the most appropriate response. Closed-ended surveys impose a set of fixed ideas or values on the respondent by providing choices from a limited array of options. It was assumed for purposes of this study that the respondents were

familiar with the conventions surrounding basic survey completion.

The instrument has been tested for reliability and validity. Cronbach's alpha (a reliability index) for the five respective dimensions as follows: .463, .769, .869, .851, and .799 respectively. The low alpha for Dimension 1 (context) is derived from very little variance on the item scores regarding the context of the collaboration. The instrument is sensitive to, and discriminates among, many features of the collaboration, including urban verses rural groups, according to Chrislip and Larson (1994).

Description of Subjects

This study executed a purposive sample drawn from complete membership lists supplied at the request of the researcher by a designated representative from each consortium. The entire membership (current participants as of October 1997) from each of the following three collaborative efforts originally sponsored in 1996 by Nevada's Title IV-B Subpart II funding were the subjects of this research design:

1. The Liaisons for Integration of Family Enrichment (L.I.F.E.) Consortium;
2. The Nevada Rural Services (N.R.S.) Consortium; and

3. The Family Advocates for Community Empowerment

(F.A.C.E.)

These particular units of analysis were selected because they each have the following consistent characteristics: each consortium was originally sponsored with equal funding levels by Title IV-B monies in 1995, each consortium represents a geographic region on Nevada, each consortium required to maintain membership to reflect a variety of community stakeholders, and finally, each had a primary project goal to develop family-strengthening services through collaborative ventures.

Individual mailing labels were created in order to reflect each person listed as a member of each respective consortium (L.I.F.E, Appendix B; R.S.C., Appendix C; and F.A.C.E, Appendix D). In order to initiate the data collection phase, each regional consortia member was mailed the collaborative survey in October of 1997. Along with each survey a cover letter was attached which described the purpose for completing the questionnaire, how the responses would be analyzed, the procedures for completing and returning the survey, and the confidential nature of the research design (Appendix E). Additionally, a self-addressed and postage paid return envelope was included with each survey instrument and cover letter in order to

facilitate the timely return of completed responses. The survey distribution and data collection process took approximately eight weeks.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data was compiled using the computerized statistical analysis package, SPSS, version 8.0. A display variable was created providing for statistical analysis of each of the forty factors in the survey. These variables were structured into five main categories outlined in the survey instrument for analysis: Context, Structure, Members, Process, and Results. There were four consistent responses provided to each indicator for the extent to which it described the designated group: True (SPSS designated - 1), More True Than False (SPSS designated - 2), More False Than True (SPSS designated - 3), and False (SPSS designated - 4). Therefore, the primary plan of analysis of these data involved comparisons of the five main categories related to the perceptions of the status of collaboration across the three regions.

Non-parametric procedures were employed. As Levin and Fox (1991) indicate, this is appropriate for skewed distributions because these tests of significance do not rely on a normal distribution nor the interval level of measurement. The mean values for each of the categories for the three groups were tested for significance. The level of significance was set at .95. These values were compared between the three groups. Comparisons were made

across regional consortia as to the levels of agreement regarding the five dimensions. Descriptive statistics of the members and the regional consortia as a whole were provided.

Descriptive statistics were also used to provide for further data review. For example, the relationship between the number of members and attainment of goals was examined.

Summary of Data

A total of 205 surveys were distributed to a total of 205 members of the three consortia. The total number of returned surveys was 84. Therefore, 40% of the members voluntarily responded to this independent research effort by returning the survey. Eight of the returned surveys were not suitable for data analysis because they were not completed; for sample purposes $N = 76$. A certain number of potential subjects failed to return their survey. It was assumed that the nonrespondents were similar to the respondents in their perceptions of the status of their respective consortium. The response rates and complete membership size of each regional consortium are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Number of Returned Responses by Regional Consortia

Name and location of Regional Consortia	Number of Returned Responses from Regional Consortia membership	Total Number of Regional Consortia members	Percentage of Total Regional Consortia membership who returned Survey
L.I.F.E. - Northern	30	68	44%
R.H.S. - Rural	12	24	50%
F.A.C.E. - Southern	42	113	37%
TOTAL	84	205	40%

The total number of submissions utilized for analysis was 76; eight surveys were returned incomplete.

Tables 2 - 4 delineate three individual items in question and the regional responses regarding the context of the respective Collaborations.

Table 2: Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 1)

Item 1: Now is a good time to address the issue about which we are collaborating.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	16	61.5
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	1	3.8
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100
Rural	True	8	72.7
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	Total	11	100
South	True	27	69.2
	More True Than False	11	28.2
	False	1	2.6
	Total	39	100

Table 3: Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 2)

Item 2: Our collaborative effort was started because certain individuals wanted to do something about the issue.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	12	46.2
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	4	15.4
	False	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	5	45.5
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	No Response	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	20	51.3
	More True Than False	14	35.9
	More False Than True	3	7.7
	False	2	5.1
	Total	39	100.0

Table 4: Responses by Region regarding Context (Item 3)

Item 3: The situation is so critical, we must act now.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	7	26.9
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	5	45.5
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	False	1	9.1
	No Response	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	12	30.8
	More True Than False	12	30.8
	More False Than True	9	23.1
	False	5	12.8
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Tables 5 - 16 delineate twelve individual items in question and the regional responses regarding the structure of the respective collaborations.

Table 5: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 4)

Item 4: Our collaboration has access to credible information that supports problem solving and decision-making.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	9	34.6
	More True Than False	10	38.5
	More False Than True	6	23.1
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	8	72.7
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	21	53.8
	More True Than False	13	33.3
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	Total	39	100.0

Table 6: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 5)

Item 5: Our group has access to the expertise necessary for effective meetings.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	10	38.5
	More True Than False	13	50.0
	More False Than True	2	7.7
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	6	54.5
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	22	56.4
	More True Than False	14	35.9
	False	3	7.7
	Total	39	100.0

Table 7: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 6)

Item 6: We have adequate physical facilities to support the collaborative efforts of the group and its subcommittees.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	10	38.5
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	4	15.4
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	6	54.5
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	22	56.4
	More True Than False	13	33.3
	More False Than True	3	7.7
	False	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 8: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 7)

Item 7: We have adequate staff assistance to plan and administer the collaborative effort.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	14	53.8
	False	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	20	51.3
	More True Than False	12	30.8
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	Total	39	100.0

Table 9: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 8)

Item 8: The membership of our group includes those stakeholders affected by the issue.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	10	38.5
	More True Than False	14	53.8
	More False Than True	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	8	72.7
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	14	35.9
	More True Than False	11	28.2
	More False Than True	11	28.2
	False	3	7.7
	Total	39	100.0

Table 10: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 9)

Item 9: Our membership is not dominated by any one group or sector.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	5	19.2
	More True Than False	5	19.2
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	6	23.1
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	9	23.1
	More True Than False	18	46.2
	More False Than True	8	20.5
	False	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 11: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 10)

Item 10: Stakeholders have agreed to work together on this issue.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	5	19.2
	More True Than False	14	53.8
	More False Than True	6	23.1
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	4	36.4
	More True Than False	6	54.5
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	18	46.2
	More True Than False	16	41.0
	More False Than True	3	7.7
	False	2	5.1
	Total	39	100.0

Table 12: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 11)

Item 11: Stakeholders have agreed on what decisions will be made by the group.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	8	72.7
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	15	38.5
	More True Than False	13	33.3
	More False Than True	8	20.5
	False	3	7.7
	Total	39	100.0

Table 13: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 12)

Item 12: Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	4	15.4
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	4	36.4
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	24	61.5
	More True Than False	12	30.8
	More False Than True	2	5.1
	Total	39	100.0

Table 14: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 13)

Item 13: We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	11	42.3
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	6	23.1
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	4	36.4
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	25	64.1
	More True Than False	14	35.9
	Total	39	100.0

Table 15: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 14)

Item 14: Our collaboration is organized in working subgroups when necessary to attend to key performance areas.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	7	26.9
	More True Than False	14	53.8
	More False Than True	4	15.4
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	28	71.8
	More True Than False	10	25.6
	More False Than True	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 16: Responses by Region regarding Structure (Item 15)

Item 15: There are clearly defined roles for group members.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	More True Than False	11	42.3
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	5	19.2
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	False	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	9	23.1
	More True Than False	19	48.7
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Tables 17 - 24 delineate individual items in question and the regional responses regarding the members' skills and attitudes within the respective collaborations.

Table 17: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 16)

Item 16: Members are more interested in getting a good group decision than improving the position of their home organization.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	5	19.2
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	4	36.4
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	6	15.4
	More True Than False	26	66.7
	More False Than True	6	15.4
	False	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 18: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 17)

Item 17: Members are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	10	38.5
	More False Than True	10	38.5
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	5	45.5
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	10	25.6
	More True Than False	22	56.4
	More False Than True	6	15.4
	False	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0
	Total	39	100.0

Table 19: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 18)

Item 18: Members have the communication skills necessary to help the group progress.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	13	50.0
	More False Than True	7	26.9
	False	1	3.8
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	9	81.8
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	17	43.6
	More True Than False	21	53.8
	More False Than True	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 20: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 19)

Item 19: Members of the collaboration balance task and social needs so that the group can work comfortably and productively.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	1	3.8
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	2	7.7
	No Response	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	10	25.6
	More True Than False	23	59.0
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	False	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 21: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 20)

Item 20: Members are effective liaisons between their home organization and the group.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	14	53.8
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	2	7.7
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	7	63.6
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	11	28.2
	More True Than False	23	59.0
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	Total	39	100.0

Table 22: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 21)

Item 21: Members are willing to devote whatever effort is necessary to achieve the goals.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	1	3.8
	More True Than False	11	42.3
	More False Than True	10	38.5
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	More False Than True	4	36.4
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	6	15.4
	More True Than False	20	51.3
	More False Than True	10	25.6
	False	3	7.7
	Total	39	100.0

Table 23: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 22)

Item 22: Members monitor the effectiveness of the process.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	13	50.0
	False	1	3.8
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	6	54.5
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	12	30.8
	More True Than False	17	43.6
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	3	7.7
	Total	39	100.0

Table 24: Responses by Region regarding Members (Item 23)

Item 23: Members trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perception, and feedback.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	8	30.8
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	5	12.8
	More True Than False	23	59.0
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Tables 25 - 35 delineate ten individual items in question and the regional responses regarding the process of the respective collaborations.

Table 25: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 24)

Item 24: We frequently discuss how we are working together.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	More True Than False	11	42.3
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	4	15.4
	No Response	2	7.7
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	2	18.2
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	False	3	27.3
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	8	20.5
	More True Than False	20	51.3
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	3	7.7
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 26: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 25)

Item 25: Divergent opinions are expressed and listened to.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	8	30.8
	False	1	3.8
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	12	30.8
	More True Than False	18	46.2
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	False	3	7.7
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 27: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 26)

Item 26: The process we are engaged in is likely to have a real impact on the problem.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	14	53.8
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	3	11.5
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	7	63.6
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	9	23.1
	More True Than False	19	48.7
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	False	5	12.8
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 28: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 27)

Item 27: We have an effective decision-making process.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	12	46.2
	False	2	7.7
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	7	63.6
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	False	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	8	20.5
	More True Than False	23	59.0
	More False Than True	4	10.3
	False	3	7.7
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 29: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 28)

Item 28: The openness and credibility of the process helps members set aside doubts and skepticism.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	3	11.5
	More True Than False	7	26.9
	More False Than False	10	38.5
	False	5	19.2
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	More False Than False	2	18.2
	False	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	4	10.3
	More True Than False	23	59.0
	More False Than False	7	17.9
	False	3	7.7
	No Response	2	5.1
	Total	39	100.0

Table 30: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 29)

Item 29: There are strong, recognized leaders who support this collaborative effort.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	9	34.6
	More True Than False	6	23.1
	More False Than True	10	38.5
	False	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	3	27.3
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	21	53.8
	More True Than False	13	33.3
	More False Than True	3	7.7
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 31: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 30)

Item 30: Those who are in positions of power or authority are willing to go along with our decisions or recommendations.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	6	23.1
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	7	26.9
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	7	63.6
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	14	35.9
	More True Than False	21	53.8
	More False Than True	2	5.1
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 32: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 31)

Item 31: We set aside vested interests to achieve our common goal.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	3	11.5
	More True Than False	10	38.5
	More False Than True	8	30.8
	False	4	15.4
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	More True Than False	9	81.8
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	7	17.9
	More True Than False	20	51.3
	More False Than True	9	23.1
	False	2	5.1
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 33: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 32)

Item 32: We have a strong concern for preserving a credible, open process.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	3	11.5
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	7	26.9
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	5	45.5
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	15	38.5
	More True Than False	18	46.2
	More False Than True	4	10.3
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 34: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 33)

Item 33: We are inspired to be action-oriented.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	12	46.2
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	4	15.4
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	18	46.2
	More True Than False	11	28.2
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	2	5.1
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Table 35: Responses by Region regarding Process (Item 34)

Item 34: We celebrate our group's successes as we move toward achieving the final goal.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	1	3.8
	More True Than False	11	42.3
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	4	15.4
	No Response	1	3.8
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	13	33.3
	More True Than False	15	38.5
	More False Than True	10	25.6
	No Response	1	2.6
	Total	39	100.0

Tables 36 - 40 delineate six individual items in question and the regional responses regarding the results of the respective collaborations.

Table 36: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 35)

Item 35: We have concrete, measurable goals to judge the success of our collaboration.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	7	26.9
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	5	19.2
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	4	36.4
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	9	23.1
	More True Than False	18	46.2
	More False Than True	6	15.4
	False	2	5.1
	No Response	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 37: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 36)

Item 36: We have identified interim goals to maintain the group's momentum.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	1	3.8
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	8	30.8
	False	1	3.8
	No Response	7	26.9
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	8	72.7
	More False Than True	2	18.2
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	10	25.6
	More True Than False	17	43.6
	More False Than True	8	20.5
	No Response	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 38: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 37)

Item 37: There is an established method for monitoring performance and providing feedback on goal attainment.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	1	3.8
	More True Than False	9	34.6
	More False Than True	9	34.6
	False	2	7.7
	No Response	5	19.2
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	5	45.5
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	14	35.9
	More True Than False	13	33.3
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 39: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 38)

Item 38: Our group is willing in obtaining the resources it needs to accomplish its objectives.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	13	50.0
	More False Than True	4	15.4
	No Response	5	19.2
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	8	72.7
	More False Than True	1	9.1
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	11	28.2
	More True Than False	18	46.2
	More False Than True	5	12.8
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 40: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 39)

Item 39: Our group is willing to confront and resolve performance issues.

Regio	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	2	7.7
	More True Than False	8	30.8
	More False Than True	8	30.8
	False	3	11.5
	No Response	5	19.2
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	2	18.2
	More True Than False	3	27.3
	More False Than True	5	45.5
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	8	20.5
	More True Than False	17	43.6
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	2	5.1
	No Response	4	10.3
	Total	39	100.0

Table 41: Responses by Region regarding Results (Item 40)

Item 40: The time and effort of the collaboration are directed at obtaining the goals rather than keeping the collaboration in business.

Region	Responses	Frequency	Valid Percent
North	True	4	15.4
	More True Than False	7	26.9
	More False Than True	5	19.2
	False	5	19.2
	No Response	5	19.2
	Total	26	100.0
Rural	True	1	9.1
	More True Than False	6	54.5
	More False Than True	3	27.3
	False	1	9.1
	Total	11	100.0
South	True	12	30.8
	More True Than False	14	35.9
	More False Than True	7	17.9
	False	1	2.6
	No Response	5	12.8
	Total	39	100.0

Levin and Fox (1991) provide two important definitions regarding statistical research in the social services: mean - a measure of central tendency which provides the sum of a set of scores divided by the total number of scores in the set, and, standard deviation - a measure of variability which provides the square root of the mean of the squared deviations from the mean of a distribution.

Table 42 presents the mean and standard deviation among regions for each of the three inquiries related to the context of the collaborations.

Table 42: Context Indicators (Items 1-3)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

	Region =	North	Rural	South	Total
Item 1	N =	26	11	39	39
	Mean	1.5385	1.2727	1.3590	1.3590
	Standard Deviation	.9047	.4671	.6277	.6277
Item 2	N=	26	11	39	39
	Mean	1.8462	1.8182	1.6667	1.6667
	Standard Deviation	.9672	1.1677	.8377	.8377
Item 3	N=	26	11	39	39
	Mean	2.0769	2.0909	2.2564	2.2564
	Standard Deviation	.8910	1.3751	1.1173	1.1173

Tables 43a. 43b. provide the mean and standard deviation among regions for each of the twelve inquiries related to the structure of the collaboration.

Table 43a.: Structure Indicators (Items 4 - 9)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9
North	N=	26	26	26	26	26	26
	Mean	1.9615	1.7692	1.7692	2.6154	1.6923	2.7308
	Standard Deviation	.8709	.7646	.7104	.7524	.6177	1.1509
Rural	N=	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	1.9091	1.9091	2.1818	2.1818	2.2727	2.1818
	Standard Deviation	.5394	.7006	.8739	.9816	.4671	.8739
South	N=	39	39	39	39	39	39
	Mean	1.5897	1.5897	1.5641	1.6667	2.0769	2.1795
	Standard Deviation	.7152	.8497	.7538	.7723	.9837	.9140
Total	N=	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Mean	1.7632	1.6974	1.7237	2.0658	1.9737	2.3684
	Standard Deviation	.7636	.8003	.7763	.8994	.8322	1.0177

Table 43b. Structure Indicators (Items 10 - 15)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 10	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15
North	N=	26	26	26	26	26	26
	Mean	2.1154	2.2692	2.6154	1.8846	1.9615	2.8462
	Standard Deviation	.7656	.7776	1.0612	.9089	.7736	.8806
Rural	N=	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	1.7273	1.9091	2.0909	2.1818	2.4545	2.8182
	Standard Deviation	.6467	.5394	.8312	1.1677	.9342	.7508
South	N=	39	39	39	39	39	39
	Mean	1.7179	1.9744	1.9744	1.3590	1.3077	2.1538
	Standard Deviation	.8255	.9594	3.5055	.4860	.5208	.9043
Total	N=	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Mean	1.8553	2.0658	2.2105	1.6579	1.6974	2.4868
	Standard Deviation	.7951	.8538	2.6042	.8255	.8003	.9309

Table 44 presents the mean and standard deviation among regions for each of the eight inquiries related to the membership of the collaboration.

Table 44: Membership Indicators (Items 16 - 23)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 16	Item 17	Item 18	Item 19	Item 20	Item 21	Item 22	Item 23
North	N=	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
	Mean	2.7692	2.6538	2.3077	2.6923	2.3077	2.6923	2.6154	2.7692
	Standard Deviation	.9923	.9356	.9282	.9703	.9703	.8840	.8521	1.1767
Rural	N=	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	2.0000	1.7273	2.1818	2.2727	2.2727	2.4545	2.7273	2.5455
	Standard Deviation	1.0000	.9045	.4045	.9045	.7862	.8202	.6467	.8202
South	N=	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
	Mean	2.0513	1.9487	1.5897	1.9231	1.8462	2.2564	2.0256	2.2564
	Standard Deviation	.6468	.7236	.5486	.7028	.6299	.8181	.9028	.8181
Total	N=	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Mean	2.2895	2.1579	1.9211	2.2368	2.0658	2.4342	2.3289	2.4737
	Standard Deviation	.8917	.8952	.7618	.8925	.8056	.8538	.9002	.9726

Tables 45a. and 45b. present the mean and standard deviation among regions for each of the eleven inquiries related to the process of the collaboration.

Tables 45a. Process Indicators (Items 24 - 29)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 24	Item 25	Item 26	Item 27	Item 28	Item 29
North	N=	26	26	26	26	26	26
	Mean	2.8846	2.3462	2.2692	2.6538	2.7692	2.1154
	Standard Deviation	.9519	.9356	.8744	.8918	1.0318	.9519
Rural	N=	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	2.9091	2.1818	2.2727	2.3636	2.3636	2.1818
	Standard Deviation	.9439	.9816	.7862	.9244	1.0269	.9816
South	N=	39	39	39	39	39	39
	Mean	2.2051	2.0513	2.2308	2.1282	2.3846	1.6667
	Standard Deviation	.9509	.9986	1.0377	.9228	.9629	.9272
Total	N=	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Mean	2.5395	2.1711	2.2500	2.3421	2.5132	1.8947
	Standard Deviation	.9992	.9714	.9399	.9317	.9999	.9603

Table 45b: Process Indicators (Items 30 - 34)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 30	Item 31	Item 32	Item 33	Item 34
North	N=	26	26	26	26	26
	Mean	2.3846	2.6154	2.5000	2.4615	2.7308
	Standard Deviation	1.0983	1.0228	.9899	1.0670	.9190
Rural	N=	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	2.4545	2.2727	1.9091	2.2727	2.2727
	Standard Deviation	.6876	.6467	1.0445	.7862	.9045
South	N=	39	39	39	39	39
	Mean	1.8205	2.2308	1.8462	1.8974	2.0000
	Standard Deviation	.8545	.9021	.9043	1.0462	.9177
Total	N=	76	76	76	76	76
	Mean	2.1053	2.3684	2.0789	2.1447	2.2895
	Standard Deviation	.9603	.9215	.9901	1.0418	.9635

Table 46 presents the mean and standard deviation among regions for each of the six inquiries related to the results of the collaboration.

Table 46: Results Indicators (Items 35-40)
Measure of Central Tendency and Standard Deviation

Region		Item 35	Item 36	Item 37	Item 38	Item 39	Item 40
North	N=	2	26	26	2	26	26
	Mean	3.000	3.1538	3.0385	2.576	3.0385	3.0000
	Standard Deviation	1.264	1.2866	1.1826	1.331	1.2484	1.3856
Rural	N=	1	11	11	1	11	11
	Mean	2.272	2.0909	2.2727	2.181	2.4545	2.3636
	Standard Deviation	.786	.5394	.9045	.750	.9342	.8090
South	N=	3	39	39	3	39	39
	Mean	2.333	2.2564	2.1795	2.205	3.1795	2.3077
	Standard Deviation	1.199	1.1634	1.2539	1.196	5.0413	1.3009
Total	N=	7	76	76	7	76	76
	Mean	2.552	2.5395	2.4868	2.328	3.0263	2.5526
	Standard Deviation	1.204	1.2159	1.2382	1.193	3.6841	1.3002

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

The literature presents various features necessary to implement and sustain successful collaborative efforts. These include a clear purpose, positive relationships among members, and a yield of substantial results. In addition, the scholarly research supports the goals of a system centered model, similar to the three presented in this study, which form new entities with multiple partners charged with coordinating and delivering better services to children and families. Although the literature on inter-organizational collaboration is increasing, little is known about how similarly situated regional collaborative participants' view the status of their effort to work together towards a common purpose. The results presented in this study are intended to help fill that gap.

The findings reported in this study are based on an eight-week survey process. A questionnaire was implemented to study the collaborative status of the three following regional consortia: The Liaisons for Integration of Family Enrichment Consortium (L.I.F.E) serving northern Nevada; The Nevada Rural Services Consortium (N.R.S.) serving rural Nevada; and the Family Advocates for Community Empowerment serving southern Nevada. There was a relatively high

survey response rate (40%) among the consortia members giving the findings presented further reliability. This external, independent based study examined the primary process of inter-organizational collaboration developed within Nevada's child and family service system.

The findings from this survey instrument have implications for all three collaborative efforts. The results provide feedback on the strengths, weaknesses, similarities and differences of the three groups as well as insight regarding how the members perceived the collaborative efforts to be working. The information can also be used to measure the progress of future collaborative efforts.

Similarities among the three Consortia

In addition to being initially shaped out of the same decision making process by the Title IV-B Family Preservation and Support Steering Committee, each of the three consortia had the following similar descriptive characteristics:

- funding was originally initiated at the same time;
- annual funding amount were equal; and
- reporting requirements and other related accountability measures were consistent.

Differences among the three Consortia

Although each of the collaborative efforts were alike in fundamental practices, the three consortia had the following dissimilar descriptive characteristics:

- varying number of members;
- varying geographic boundaries;
- different fiscal agents; and
- divergent staffing and coordination approaches.

The research process was initiated within the same time frame for each of the consortia. It was presumed that each consortium would be at a similar stage of implementation since the funding was commenced concurrently.

Comparisons between the three Consortia

The comprehensive results of each of the five functional categories from the survey have been condensed and presented in Table 47. As the data analysis section details in length, each survey category consisted of a varying number of related questions as follows: Context (3); Structure (12); Members (8); Process (11); and Results (6). The close-ended scale of responses for each of the forty variables ranged from True, More True than False, More False than True, and False; the range was analyzed nominally as 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Therefore, a

mean of 1 would indicate that every member of the respective consortium answered the question as 'True.' Whereas, a mean of 3 and no standard deviation would indicate that every member answered the question as 'More False than True.'

Table 47: Comparisons among Categories by Regional Consortia

	L.I.F.E - North		N.R.S. - Rural		F.A.C.E - South	
	Mean	Deviation	Mean	Deviation	Mean	Deviation
CONTEXT	1.820	0.936193	1.272	1.097518	1.760	0.95276
STRUCTURE	2.185	0.923467	2.151	0.814795	1.762	1.289617
MEMBERS	2.600	0.96779	2.272	0.826671	1.987	0.752165
PROCESS	2.520	0.986531		0.885372	2.041	0.960973
RESULTS		1.277194	2.272	0.775499		2.342567

Among the L.I.F.E., N.R.S. and F.A.C.E. Consortia, the Context for the collaborative group was perceived in the highest regard as indicated by the means: 1.820; 1.727; and 1.760 respectively (indicated by shading above).

Conversely, the Results category was deemed the lowest dimension recorded by both the L.I.F.E. and the F.A.C.E. Consortia at 2.967 and 2.410, respectively. The greatest standard deviation was also found to be evident within this category by both the L.I.F.E. and the F.A.C.E. Consortia. The N.R.S. Consortium members identified the Results category as only slightly better than their poorest regarded dimension, the Process category (2.314).

Interestingly, for N.R.S., the greatest deviation found was in the category with the highest mean score (lowest regarded opinion).

Overall, the greatest range of deviation appears in the Results and Structure categories. These findings, which demonstrate strong concerns regarding the results of the collaboration, are consistent with other research efforts that which have found a substantive gap between intention and results.

To further assess the status of each consortium a descending ranking (by mean) of categories was necessary. The results are outlined in Table 47.

Table 47: Ranking of Categories of Collaborative effectiveness by Consortia

Ranking by Mean	L.I.F.E.	N.R.S.	F.A.C.E
1	CONTEXT	CONTEXT	CONTEXT
2	STRUCTURE	STRUCTURE	STRUCTURE
3	PROCESS	MEMBERS	MEMBERS
4	MEMBERS	RESULTS	PROCESS
5	RESULTS	PROCESS	RESULTS

With this presentation, it was learned that the structure or design of the collaboration was the second rated category among all three consortia. Each consortium had a differing ranking order for the following categories: The

members' skills and attitudes, the process that is being used, and the results that are being accomplished.

As a result of the findings, it is suspected that a critical factor in maintaining the identified collaborative efforts is the need for improved process and results attainment. The results of this research, therefore, should be analyzed in correlation with the actual concrete results sought by collaborative efforts. Hence, the long-term outcomes of collaboratives should also be identified. New research should also focus on the funding and leadership strategies related to collaborative strategies.

In conclusion, it must be noted that as a result of updated legislation, the *Adoption and Safe and Stable Families Act*, which reauthorizes Title IV-B, Subpart II, and creates significant changes regarding acceptable funding allocations, the utilization of previous funding parameters will not be implemented. The three regional consortia will no longer be supported extensively by the Nevada's Division of Child and Family Services. Although the three regional consortia have the option of continuing these efforts, with the lack of a stable funding source, it is unlikely that all three will survive and continue to develop or seek mechanisms to improve the collaborative process.

REFERENCES

Albers, E., Bitonti, C., & Santangelo, L. (1998). State of Nevada Division of Child and Family Services Family Preservation and Family Support Program (Title IV-B) Mid Year Evaluation Report 1997-1998.

Anderson, D.R. (1995). Factors influencing teacher collaboration in middle school interdisciplinary teams. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC MM01531.

Antognoli, J.A. (1996). Establishing a public school/community agency collaboration to deliver school-based mental health services. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9706937.

Atkinson, S.E. (1996). A case study of collaboration in an interprofessional development program: Project Cares. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9701431.

Aubry, D.M. (1996). Perceptions of interagency collaboration among battered women's service delivery professionals. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC MM12932.

Bailey, D.M. (1995). School-community networks: Three partnership case studies. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9529667.

Bailey, D., & Koney, K.M. (1996). Interorganizational community-based collaboratives: a strategic response to shape the social work agenda. Social Work, 41, 602-612.

Bardach, E., & Lesser, C. (April, 1996). Accountability in human services collaboratives - for what? Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 6(2), 197-225.

Berman, E.M. (1996). Local government and community-based strategies: Evidence from a national survey of a social problem. American Review of Public Administration, 26(1).

Blank, M.J., & Lombardi, J. (July 1991). Towards Improved services for children and families: Forging new relationships through collaboration. A policy brief based on the Eighth Annual Symposium of the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation. White Plains, NY.

Bray, J.H., & Rogers, J.C. (April, 1995). Linking psychologists and family physicians for collaborative practice. Professional Psychology Research and Practice, 26(2), 132-139.

Bruner, C. (1991). Thinking Collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Butler, S., Atkinson, L., Magnatta, M., & Hood, E. (March, 1995). Child maltreatment: the collaboration of

child welfare, mental health and judicial systems. Child Abuse and Neglect, 19(3) 355-363.

Chambers, J.E. (1996). The effects of collaborative practice on the levels of moral distress in critical care nurses. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 1382312.

Chan, B.Y.Y. (1997). Organizational and environmental factors of collaboration: A study of financial performance of rural hospitals in consortia. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9715283.

Chrislip, D.D., & Larson, C.E. (1994). Collaborative Leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Connelly, O.L. (1996). The interorganizational relationship between a public school. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9633133.

Coogle, C.L., Ansello, E.F., Wood, J.B., & Cotter, J.J. (September, 1995). Partners II - Serving older persons with developmental disabilities: Obstacles and inducements to collaboration among agencies. Journal of Gerontology, 14(3), 275-289.

Daka, M.V., Thornburg, K.R., Filbert, L., & Klein, T. (April, 1995). Collaboration of services for children and families: A synthesis of recent research and recommendations. Family Relations, 44(2) 219-224.

Ellis, J.L. (1997). Increasing faculty collaboration through peer coaching: Conditions and consequences.

ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 963803.

Family Resources Coalition. (1996). Guidelines for family support practice. Chicago, IL: Author.

Fawcett, S.B., Paine, A.A., Francisco, V.T., Schultz, J.A., Richter, K.P., Lewis, R.K., Williams, E.L., & Harris K.J. (1996). (October, 1996). Using empowerment theory in collaborative partnerships for community health and development. American Journal of Community Psychology, 23(5), 677-698.

Frederickson, P.J. (1996). Community Collaboration and public policy making: Examining the long-term utility of training in conflict management. American Behavioral Scientist, 39(5), 552-534.

Gravious, T.A. (1995). The relationship between communication use and collaboration of school-based problem solving teams. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9607765.

Hardy, V.L. (1995). School-based health centers: Informing future site-based interagency collaboratives. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9608284.

Hotalling, D.R. (1995). Interorganizational coordination among schools and other human services provider agencies in three non-urban midwestern communities. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9601667.

House, J.K. (1995). General and special education teacher perceptions of collaboration. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9608835.

Kibler, L. (1997). Partnerships enhance teacher education. Education, 117(4), 498-501.

Korus, A. & Boles, J. (1997, September). In search of Collaboration: A model alliance. The Not-For-Profit CEO Monthly Letter, 4(11), 1-3.

Kraemer, J. (n.d.). Building villages to raise our children: Collaboration. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

Kulpa, J.E. (1996). An investigation of collaboration between secondary schools and colleges and the administrative features relating to success. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9630721.

Leach, M.W. (1995). Organizing images and the structuring of interorganizational relations. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9530608.

Levin J. & Fox, A.F. (1991). Elementary statistics in social research, 5th Edition. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Lewis, A.C. (December, 1993). Making collaboration happen. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(4), 284-286.

Lindland, J. L. (1995). Restructuring the learning environment: A cross-case study of three collaborative learning communities in American undergraduate education. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9612782.

Mattessich, P.W. & Monsey, B.R. (1992). Collaboration: What makes it work. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

McKnight, J. (1995). Careless society: Community and its counterfeits. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Melaville, A.I., Blank, M.J. & Asayesh, G. (1993). Together We Can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Mulroy, E. (May 1997.) Building a neighborhood network: Inter-organizational collaboration to prevent child abuse and neglect. Social Work, 42(3).

Mulroy, E.A., & Shay, S. (1997). Nonprofit organizations and Innovation: A model of neighborhood-based collaboration to prevent child maltreatment. Social Work, 515-524.

Namey, J.T. (1995). Instructional Support Team Initiative: Impact on principal and teacher perceptions relative to collaboration and problem-solving. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9530608.

O'Brien, K.A. (1996). Interorganization cooperation and the effectiveness of service delivery to homeless children and youth. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9702127.

Olson, L.M. (April, 1997). Discovering the dimensions of collaboration: An investigation of the reliability and validity of the modified interagency arrangement model. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9709983.

O'Rourke, B.L. (1996). Individual Interdisciplinary team members' perception of ethics decision-making context: A descriptive study. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9629700.

Paugh, M.J. (1995). Predictors of successful school/business partnerships. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9534045.

State of Nevada Department of Human Resources.
Comprehensive child and family services plan for Nevada.
Submission June 30, 1995.

Sviridoff, M. & Ryan, W. (1997). Community-based family service. Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Services, Families International, Inc. 128-139.

Sykora, J. (1996). Restructuring governance for children's services: A case study of a community moving toward an integrated system in Minnesota. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9635892.

Temple, T.A. (1996). Business Partners and school change: A comparative study of two school-business partnerships focused on educational restructuring. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9708531.

Todd, N.K. (1995). A case study of successful interagency collaboratives involving school districts. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9538348.

Viggiani, P.A. (1996). Social worker-teacher collaboration: Intervention design and development. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9635942.

Weaver, A. (1997). Marriage and family therapists and the clergy: A need for clinical collaboration. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 19241624.

Wilson, H.G. (1997). From rhetoric to reality: A multi-site case study of collaborative decision-making in Minnesota schools. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9907541.

Winer, M.B. & Ray, K. (1996). Collaboration handbook: Creating, sustaining, and enjoying the journey. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

Woehrle, K.L. (1996). Interprofessional practice of social workers educators: Factors that influence the coordination of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program in Ohio. ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts, AAC 9620091.

APPENDIX A

Instructions:

Items are grouped into five categories. To the left of each item is a scale to record your responses. Please read the item, think about the extent to which it describes the designated group, and fill in the appropriate circle.

Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration

True	More True Than False	More False Than True	False	
The Context of the Collaboration				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	1. Now is a good time to address the issue about which we are collaborating.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2. Our collaborative effort was started because certain individuals wanted to do something about the issue.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	3. The situation is so critical, we must act now.

True	More True Than False	More False Than True	False	
The Structure of the Collaboration				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4. Our collaboration has access to credible information that supports problem solving and decision making.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5. Our group has access to the expertise necessary for effective meetings.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	6. We have adequate physical facilities to support the collaborative efforts of the group and its subcommittees.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	7. We have adequate staff assistance to plan and administer the collaborative effort.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	8. The membership of our group includes those stakeholders

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	9. Our membership is not dominated by any one group or sector.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	10. Stakeholders have agreed to work together on this issue.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	11. Stakeholders have agreed on what decisions will be made by the group.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	12. Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	13. We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	14. Our collaboration is organized in working subgroups when necessary to attend to key performance areas.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	15. There are clearly defined roles for group members.
True	More True Than False	More False Than True	False	
Collaboration Members				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	16. Members are more interested in getting a good group decision than improving the position of their home organization.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	17. Members are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	18. Members have the communication skills necessary to help the group progress.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	19. Members of the collaboration balance task and social needs so that the group can work comfortably and productively.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	20. Members are effective liaisons between their home organization and the group.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	21. Members are willing to devote whatever effort is necessary to achieve the goals.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	22. Members monitor the effectiveness of the process.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	23. Members trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback.
True	More True Than False	More False Than True	False	
The Collaboration Process				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	24. We frequently discuss how we are working together.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	25. Divergent opinions are expressed and listened to.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	26. The process we are engaged in is likely to have a real impact on the problem.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	27. We have an effective decision-making process.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	28. The openness and credibility of the process help members set aside doubts or skepticism.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	29. There are strong, recognized leaders who support this collaborative effort.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	30. Those who are in positions of power or authority are willing to go along with our decisions or recommendations.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	31. We set aside vested interests to achieve our common goal.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	32. We have a strong concern for preserving a credible, open process.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	33. We are inspired to be action-oriented.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	34. We celebrate our group's successes as we move toward achieving the final goal.

True	More True Than False	More False Than True	False	
<i>The Results of the Collaboration</i>				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	35. We have concrete, measurable goals to judge the success of our collaboration.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	36. We have identified interim goals to maintain the group's momentum.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	37. There is an established method for monitoring performance and providing feedback on goal attainment.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	38. Our group is effective in obtaining the resources it needs to accomplish its objectives.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	39. Our group is willing to confront and resolve performance issues.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	40. The time and effort of the collaboration are directed at obtaining the goals rather than keeping the collaboration in business.

Thank you for your honest and complete responses. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope by Monday, October 20th, 1997. All individual responses will be strictly confidential.

APPENDIX B

LIFE SERVICES CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP LIST / OCTOBER 1997								
CODE	Lastname	Firstname	Organizati	Address	#	City	ST	Zip
G - 301	AIKEN	MICHELLE	L.I.F.E.					
G - 302	BARKER	BETTY	WCSD	425 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 303	BARSHAR	NORA	Crisis Cal	P.O. Box 8016q		Reno	NV	89057
G - 304	BECKER	PAM	Childrens	1090 So. Rock		Reno	NV	89502
G - 305	BEHAL	PAT	NV. Corp.	P.O. Box 11130		Reno	NV	89520
G - 306	BIANCHI	LOIS	WCSD	425 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 307	BITONTI, Ph. D	CHRISTINE	School of	UNR		Reno	NV	
G - 308	BROTHWELL	CHARLOTTE	NCSEA Stat	3100 Mill St. #108		Reno	NV	
G - 309	CAPELLA	MIKE	Child Protective Services			Reno	NV	
G - 310	CHAMPAGNE	KATHERINE	Pediatric	P.O. Box 11823		Reno	NV	89510
G - 311	CHRISSENGER	MARLENE	Family Cou	777 Sinclair		Reno	NV	89501
G - 312	CONGER	VALERIE	Project R&	3987 S. McCarran Blvd		Reno	NV	89502
G - 313	CROWE	KACIE	Children's	P.O. Box 3562		Incline	NV	89450
G - 314	CUSHMAN	SHERRY	WCSD	425 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 315	DINNELL	CHERYL	NV. Parent	Mail Stop 285		Reno	NV	89557
G - 316	DINNELL	DAN	Early Chil	3987 So. Mc Carron B		Reno	NV	89502
G - 317	DRAKE	BARBARA	United Way	P.O. BOX 2730		Reno	NV	89505
G - 318	EVERTS	JOANNE	WCSD	426 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89520
G - 319	FAEHLING	KAREN	DCFS	560 Mill St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 320	FARMER	GUY	COW Bus	1700 Carville Ct.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 321	FEEMSTER	DARYL	Family Foc	Glenn Duncan Elementa		Reno	NV	89512
G - 322	FOSNAUGH	PATTY	Libby Boot	1450 Stewart St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 323	GALVEZ-LOPEZ	HECTOR	Glenn Dunc	1745 Carville Dr.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 324	GARCIA-CHITW	JEAN	Cntr. For	520 Evans		Reno	NV	89512
G - 325	GREENE	RICHARD	Head Start	1090 E. Eighth St.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 326	HABERLAND	DIANA	Desert Hei	13948 Mount Bismark		Stead	NV	89506
G - 327	HAMMOND	DIEDRE	NV. Disabi	1201 Termi Suite #219		Reno	NV	89502
G - 328	HARRIS	RANDY	WCSD, Gang	525 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 329	HOBSON	IRENE	COW Bus	1700 Carville Ct.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 330	HOGUE	JANE	Campus Chi	Mail Stop 140 Dept. F		Reno	NV	89557
G - 331	HUTIG	MARY	Respite Ca	2300 Eagle Valley Rar		Carson	NV	
G - 332	IVES	MARILYN	Children's	1090 So. Rock		Reno	NV	89502
G - 333	JOHNSON	PAT	Sun Valley	5490 Leon Dr.		Sun	NV	89433
G - 334	JOHNSON	CORDELIA	Parent/Gle	1431 E. 10th Street		Reno	NV	89512
G - 335	JOICKE	CAROLYN	Student He	425 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89502
G - 336	KAUL	DAVE						
G - 337	KENDALL	KAREN	Nevada Wel	1350 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	
G - 338	LACKEY	RICHARD	Baptist Ch	525 E. 4th Ave.		Sun	NV	
G - 339	LAHREN	BRIAN	Assoc. for	790 Sutro		Reno	NV	89502
G - 340	LaPAGE	MAVIS						
G - 341	LESLIE	SHEILA		825 Humboldt		Reno	NV	89509
G - 342	LOESCH-GRIFFIN	DEBBY	Turning Po	P.O. Box 8876		Reno	NV	89507
G - 343	LOOMIS	KATHY	Rural FP/F	1802 N. Ca Suite #234		Carson	NV	89701
G - 344	LUCE	VALERIE	Principal,	3075 Heights Dr.		Reno	NV	89503
G - 345	LUNA	MICHELLE	Home Visit	1001 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 346	MARKOVICH	ED	Traner Mid	Head Start Trandition		Reno	NV	89512
G - 347	McGARY	RITA	Miquel Riv	Reno Middle School		Reno	NV	89502
G - 348	McMAHON	MIKE	Truckee Me	1001 E. Ninth St.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 349	MELIGAN	NILZA		1121 S. Nevada		Carson	NV	89773
G - 350	MOLLIAN	MICHAEL	COW Bus	1700 Carville Ct.		Reno	NV	89512
G - 351	MORRISON	JAN	Traner Mid	Transition Project		Reno	NV	89512
G - 352	MOYLE	NORMA	B.I.A.	1677 Hotsprings		Carson	NV	89706
G - 353	NAZEMIAN	LINDA	Turning Po	P. O. Box 1160		Virginia	NV	89440
G - 354	PRICE	MICHELLE	Foster Car	560 Mill S Suite 350		Reno	NV	89502
G - 355	REEVES	JANET	NV. Urban	2100 Capurro Way		Sparks	NV	89431
G - 356	RODOLICO	MIKE	Health Acc	1175 Harvard Way		Reno	NV	89502
G - 357	SCHAENER	MARCEL	Cntr. For	520 Evans		Reno	NV	89512

APPENDIX B

G - 358	SCHOEN	ERIK	Community	P. O. Box 980	Virginia	NV	89440
G - 359	SHERBONDY	PAT	Agness Ris	1900 Sullivan Lane	Sparks	NV	89431
G - 360	SIRKIN	NANCY					
G - 361	STERN	ELAINE	Childrens	190 So. Rock	Reno	NV	89502
G - 362	WALSH	MICHELE		12200 Lemmon Dr.	Reno	NV	89512
G - 363	WAUGH	SHERRY	Child & Fa	UNR	Reno	NV	
G - 364	WEIGAL	DAN	NV. Corp.	P. O. Box 11130	Reno	NV	89520
G - 365	WESTBROOK	JUANITA	BADA Resou	1090 So. Rock	Reno	NV	89502
G - 366	WIDMAN	CAROLYN	Children's	1090 So. Rock	Reno	NV	89502
G - 367	WILLIAMS	DIANNE	Community	870 Sage	Reno	NV	89512
G - 368	YOUNG	KIM	Child Assa	1539 Vassa #201	Reno	NV	89502

APPENDIX C

NEVADA RURAL SERVICES CONSORTIUM - MEMBERSHIP LIST / OCTOBER 1997							
CODE	Lastname	Firstname	Organization Name	Address	City	ST	Zip
R - 201	ALBERS	ERIC	UNR SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK -	ANSARA BUSINESS BLDG.	RENO	NV	89557
R - 202	BAYER	MARY	NYE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	P.O. BOX 113	TONOPAH	NV	89049
R - 203	DUDLEY	SUSAN	ESMERALDA COUNTY COMMISSION	P.O. BOX 517	GOLDFIELD	NV	89013
R - 204	EDWARDS	KAREN	FAMILY SUPPORT CENTER OF DO	1255 WATERLOO LANE	GARDNERVILLE	NV	89410
R - 205	GOODMAN	DEBBIE	BUREAU OF COMMUNITY HEALTH	P.O. BOX 409	TONOPAH	NV	89049
R - 206	GREEN	DAVID	GERLACH / EMPIRE SCHOOLS	555 EAST SUNSET BLVD.	GERLACH	NV	89412
R - 207	HUTCHINS	JANE	UNR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	P.O. BOX 231	TONOPAH	NV	89049
R - 208	KRUMM	LAURIE	CONSUMER	P.O. BOX 1688	PAHRUMP	NV	89041
R - 209	LOGAN	LANE	CONSUMER	P.O. BOX 808	TONOPAH	NV	89049
R - 210	LOOMIS	KATHY	NEVADA RURAL HEALTH CENTERS	1802 N. CARSON ST.	CARSON CITY	NV	89701
R - 211	MALONE	SHARON	LANDER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRI	P.O. BOX 1300	BATTLE MOUNT	NV	89820
R - 212	McBAIN	KENNETH	NEVADA RURAL HEALTH CENTERS	1802 N. CARSON ST.	CARSON CITY	NV	89701
R - 213	QUINT	KEVIN	CHURCHILL COUNCIL ON ALCOHO	90 NORTH MAIN	FALLON	NV	89406
R - 214	RELYEA	BEVERLY	ESMERALDA CITY COMMISSIONER	P.O. BOX 517	GOLDFIELD	NV	89013
R - 215	SASSI	MARY	BUREAU OF COMMUNITY HEALTH	3656 RESEARCH WAY	CARSON CITY	NV	89706
R - 216	SCOTT	KATHY	NO TO ABUSE	1471 EAST HIGHWAY 372	PAHRUMP	NV	89041
R - 217	SERPA	PHYLLIS		P.O. BOX 789	FALLON	NV	89407
R - 218	SHELTON	CATHERINE		10216 PLOMOSA PLACE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89134
R - 219	THIBODEAUX	MARY	CENTRAL NYE CHILD PROTECTIV	P.O. BOX 1491	TONOPAH	NV	89049
R - 220	TOKERUD	HAROLD	ESMERALDA CITY SCHOOL DISTR	P.O. BOX 546	GOLDFIELD	NV	89013
R - 221	TRACY	DENISE	EUREKA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	P.O. BOX 237	EUREKA	NV	89316
R - 222	WHITE	MARYELLEN	DIVISION OF CHILD & FAMILY	711 EAST FIFTH STREET	CARSON CITY	NV	89710
R - 223	WILLIAMS	TANYA	BUREAU OF COMMUNITY HEALTH	3656 RESEARCH WAY	CARSON CITY	NV	89706
R - 224	WRIGHT	JUDITH	BUREAU OF FAMILY HEALTH SER	505 EAST KING STREET	CARSON CITY	NV	89710

APPENDIX D

FACE SERVICES CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP LIST / OCTOBER 1997							
CODE	Lastname	Firstnam	Organization Name	Address	City	ST	Zip
Y-101	ALSTON	JACKIE	ALSTON ASSOCIATES	POST OFFICE BOX	PAHRUMP	NV	89041
Y-102	ANDERSON	GEORGE	ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BOAR	2228 COMSTOCK	LAS VEGAS	NV	89030
Y-103	ARENTZ	CATHY	S.A.F.E. HOUSE	P. O. BOX 93054	HENDERSON	NV	89015
Y-104	ASHLEY	LISA	HEALTHY FAMILIES PROJECT	2500 APRICOT LANE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-105	BAKER	SUE	MOAPA VALLEY COMMUNITY CE	P.O. BOX 837	OVERTON	NV	89040
Y-106	BALLENTIN	BARBARA	S.A.F.E. HOUSE	P. O. BOX 93054	HENDERSON	NV	89009
Y-107	BARNES	TOMIKO		3 WEST TONOPAH	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-108	BASH III	DAVID	YOUTH CORRECTIONS	650 BELROSE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-109	BECKETT	JODEE	PAHRUMP FAMILY RESOURCE C	2220 E. NEVADA W	PAHRUMP	NV	89048
Y-110	BEERS	SARAH	CC FAMILY & YOUTH SERVICE	601 N. PECOS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-111	BLAZZARD	DEANNE	FOSTER PARENTS OF SO NV	4920 CARMICHAEL A	LAS VEGAS	NV	89110
Y-112	BLUMBERG	SOPHIA	F.A.C.E.	1417 LAS VEGAS, E	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-113	BOYLAN	TIM	CCDFYS PHYSC SERVICES	3401 E. BONANZA E	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-114	BROOKS	SHARON	CC LIBRARY DISTRICT	833 LAS VEGAS BL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-115	BROOKS	ELAINE	FOSTER PARENTS OF SO NV	1016 NEWPORT STR	LAS VEGAS	NV	89110
Y-116	BURCH	TIM	GREATER LAS VEGAS FRC	1200 N. EASTERN	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-117	BURGESS	KIRBY	CCFYS	601 N. PECOS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-118	CALMERTON	VALERIE	BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS	2850 SOUTH LINDEL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-119	CAMPBELL	DEBORAH	UNITED WAY OF SO NV	1660 E. FLAMINGO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89119
Y-120	CIRRI	RENATA	COMMUNITY ACTION AGAINST	749 VETERANS MEMO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-121	CLOVER	LISA	CHILD RES BUREAU	6171 W. CHARLESTO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-122	COURTNEY	FRAN	CC HEALTH DISTRICT BABY F	625 SHADOW LANE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-123	DAVIS	POCO	HACA	15 EAST BASIC RO	HENDERSON	NV	89015
Y-124	DAVISSON	ALICIA	HACA	15 EAST BASIC RO	HENDERSON	NV	89015
Y-125	DELGADO	LYNDA	WESTCARE	401 S. MARTIN LU	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-126	DENTON	THERESA	CLARK HIGH SCHOOL FRC	4921 PENNWOOD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-127	DISSELKOE	MARK	BRIDGE COUNSELING	1701 W. CHARLESTO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-128	DREITZER	MICHAEL	ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE	555 E WASHINGTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-129	DUNN	BETSY	ADOPTION SUPPORT GROUP	2300 THERESA DR.	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-130	EATMAN	JOYCE	L.A.C.E.	3355 SPRING MOUN	LAS VEGAS	NV	89103
Y-131	FANNING	MAUREEN	CC HEALTH DISTRICT	625 SHADOW LANE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-132	FORD, DR.	PAULA	WE CAN INC.	3441 WEST SAHARA	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-133	FOX	DAISY	VARIETY DAY HOME FRC	990 D STREET	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-134	FREDLUND	STUART	DCFS WELFARE	610 BELROSE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-135	GARCIA	GRETCHEN	CHILDREN'S BEHAVIORAL SER	6171 W. CHARLESTO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-136	GILLIS	NANCY	CTR FOR INDEPENDENT LIVIN	1417 LAS VEGAS BL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-137	HERST	CHARLENE	SIERRA HEALTH SERVICES PR	P.O. BOX 15645	LAS VEGAS	NV	89114
Y-138	HOGAN	JULIE	BADA	1830 E. SAHARA AV	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-139	HOPPER	ANNA	VARIETY DAY HOME FRC	990 D STREET	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-140	HUGHES	SANDRA	S.A.F.E. HOUSE	3914 EAST WYOMING	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-141	ISBELL	KELLIE	NEVADA CHILDREN'S CENTER	2929 EAST DECATUR	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-142	JENSEN	JANE	"I HAVE A DREAM FOUNDATIO	8048 HACKBERRY DE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89123
Y-143	JOHNSTON	NEAL	DCFS CHILD & ADOLES SRVCS	6171 CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-144	KALLIHER	BONNIE	HELP OF SOUTHERN NV	953-35B E. SAHARA	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-145	KENNEDY	BRUCE	YOUTH PAROLE	620 BELROSE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-146	KNIGHT	CLAUDIA	PAHRUMP FRC	2220 EAST NV. WES	PAHRUMP	NV	89048
Y-147	KOON	BERT	NEVADA PAROLE & PROBATIO	319 SOUTH 3RD ST	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-148	KRAMER	DIANNE	CC FYS - PARENTING PROJEC	601 N. PECOS RD.	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-149	KUHN	CYNTHIA	FAS FAMILY RESOURCE NETWO	4521 QUEEN ANGEL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89110
Y-150	KURCZ	PAMELA	SAFY	1000 S. THIRD ST	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-151	LaROY	FLORENCE	NEVADA PEP	601 S. RANCHO,	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-152	LAWRENCE	RON	COMMUNITY COUNSELING CENT	1120 ALMOND TREE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-153	LEE	SUSIE	INNER CITY GAMES	233 SOUTH 4TH ST	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-154	LEY	LINDA	CASA	200 S. THIRD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89155
Y-155	LINDSEY	JOAN	DCFS LICENSING	620 BELROSE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-156	LUKE	BELINDA	MOJAVE MENTAL HEALTH	3171 S. JONES BLV	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-157	LUNA	NORA	YMCA OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	4141 MEADOWS LANE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89107

APPENDIX D

Y-158	MADRID	DIANA	LOWDEN FRC	4138 EAST COLORADO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-159	MAGUIRE	SISTER D	VARIETY DAY HOME	990 "D" STREET	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-160	MAN	PEGGY		6861 W. CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89117
Y-161	MANDELL	HARVEY	M.A.S.H.	1559 NORTH MAIN	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-162	MARCONI	KAREN	S.A.F.E. HOUSE	P.O. BOX 93053	HENDERSON	NV	89009
Y-163	MARSHALL	FRAN	FAMILY AND CHILD TREATMENT	4800 W CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-164	MARTINEZ	ED	GREATER LAS VEGAS FRC	916 W. OWENS AVENUE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-165	MATRONE	CAROL	DCFS	3075 E. FLAMINGO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89121
Y-166	MCCORMICK	SHAWN	CCSD JUVENILE COURT SCHOOL	3401 E. BONANZA BLVD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-167	MCHENRY D	DON	ALTERNATIVE EDUC DIVISION	2701 E. ST LOUIS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-168	MEARS	SUSAN	DCFS FAMILY PRESERVATION SVCS	4220 S. MARYLAND	LAS VEGAS	NV	89119
Y-169	MERRIFIELD	PATTY	INTENSIVE FAMILY SERVICES	6171 W. CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-170	MILLER	BILL	CCSD PSYCH SERVICES	2625 E. ST LOUIS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-171	MORTON	MARLYS		2375 E. TROPICANA	LAS VEGAS	NV	89119
Y-172	MOUER	MARGE	CC HEALTH DISTRICT	625 SHADOW LANE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-173	MURPHY	ESTELLE	TADC-SAFE NEST	P.O. BOX 43264	LAS VEGAS	NV	89116
Y-174	NIXON	SUZANNE	PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF SO	3220 W. CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-175	ORYAM	EDWARD	PLAN	4633 S. PARADISE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89109
Y-176	OSTLUND	JANIE	UNLV SCHOOL OF SOC WORK	4505 S MARYLAND	LAS VEGAS	NV	89154
Y-177	PACULT	SUE	COMM ADV FOR CLD & FM MEN	1600 PINTO LN	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-178	PARKER	JENNIFER	NIKE HOUSE	4775 W. PIONEER	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-179	PATTERSON	RAE		3040 E. CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-180	PERNATOZZI	ANGELA	CLASSROOM ON WHEELS	439 SOUTH DECATUR	LAS VEGAS	NV	89107
Y-181	RESENDEZ	MARY	CCDFYS	601 NORTH PECOS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-182	RICHARDSON	CHESTER	LAS VEGAS NAACP FRC	P.O. BOX 4887	LAS VEGAS	NV	89127
Y-183	RICHTER	MARLENE	CATHOLIC CHARITIES	1501 N LAS VEGAS	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-184	ROURKE	NICOLE	BOYS & GIRLS CLUB OF LAS	2850 S LINDELL RD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89126
Y-185	SABITINO	TERESA	HELP OF SOUTHERN NV	953-35B E. SAHARA	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-186	SAINSBURY	MICHELLE	UNITED WAY OF SOUTHERN NV	1660 E. FLAMINGO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89119
Y-187	SANTANGEL	LINDA	UNLV-SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK	4505 S. MARYLAND	LAS VEGAS	NV	89154
Y-188	SCOTT	KATHERINE	NO TO ABUSE CRISIS CENTER	1471 EAST HIGHWAY	PAHRUMP	NV	89048
Y-189	SINCLAIR	CORLISS	UNR COOPERATION EXTENSION	3333 CAMBRIDGE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89109
Y-190	SMITH	STEVE	BEST COALITION	1417 LAS VEGAS BLVD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-191	SIVOLI	DIANNE	CCFYS PARENTING PROJECT	3464 E. BONANZA BLVD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-192	SMITH-HAN	MARLENE	HEALTHY FAMILIES PROJECT	2500 APRICOT LN	LAS VEGAS	NV	89108
Y-193	STAMOS RE	GRETCHEN	LIGHTHOUSE AIDS MINISTRY	780 BACHMAN COURT	LAS VEGAS	NV	89123
Y-194	STECKLER	LESLIE	NAH PROJECT REST	6200 W. OAKLEY	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-195	STEELE	DANGEL	STEELE CORPORATION	2900 SO. VALLEY VIEW	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-196	STILLIAN	CAROL	CCDFYS CHILD PROTECTIVE SVCS	6171 WEST CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-197	SWETNAM	LAUREL	DCFS EARLY CHILDHOOD SVCS	6171 W. CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89158
Y-198	TAYCHER	KAREN M	NEVADA PEP	6910 EDNA AVENUE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89117
Y-199	TERRILL	DARLENE	WESTCARE SHELTER	401 MARTIN L KING	LAS VEGAS	NV	89106
Y-200	THOME	LINN	NEVADA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	2820 WEST CHARLESTON	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-201	THOMPSON	DEBRA	EXCEL HUMAN RESOURCE DEV.	2835 SOUTH JONES	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-202	THOMPSON	BOB	LACE	3355 SPRING MTN.	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-203	TOLES	SANDY	CITY OF LAS VEGAS	400 EAST STEWART	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-204	TRIGGS	VINCE	NV ASSN FOR HANDICAPPED	6200 W. OAKLEY BLVD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-205	VAN PELT	PAMELA	UNR COOPERATIVE EXT.	2345 RED ROCK ST	LAS VEGAS	NV	89102
Y-206	VASQUEZ	MARIA	LAKE MEAD HOSPITAL HELPING	1409 E. LAKE MEAD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89030
Y-207	VONDENBRI	DOROTHY	HACA / EPAH	852 VERMILLION DR	HENDERSON	NV	89015
Y-208	WAGNER	JULIE	UNITED WAY OF SOUTHERN NV	1660 E. FLAMINGO	LAS VEGAS	NV	89119
Y-209	WALDRON	BRAD	CCSD JUVENILE COURT SCHOOL	3401 E. BONANZA BLVD	LAS VEGAS	NV	89101
Y-210	WILLIAMS	GRACIE		P.O. BOX 1865	LAS VEGAS	NV	89121
Y-211	WILLIAMS	TONY	METROPOLITAN FRC	2200 E. CHEYENNE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89030
Y-212	YOUNG	DEBORAH	AMERICAN RED CROSS	1155 E. SAHARA AVE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89104
Y-213	YOUNG-RICH	CANDACE	YOUNG-RICHEY & ASSOCIATES	3549 SUMMERDAY CIRCLE	LAS VEGAS	NV	89117

APPENDIX E

Marlys A. Morton
2375 East Tropicana # 336
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Phone: (702) 893-6628
Fax: (702) 893-3436
email: marlys@vegas.infi.net

October 9, 1997

Dear Consortia Member:

As a Master in Public Administration candidate, I am contacting you to request your prompt completion of the attached questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire, entitled Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration, is to record opinions about items that measure collaboration effectiveness. Your honest responses to these items will be extremely helpful. Your responses will be statistically summarized, along with the responses of others, without identifying individual responses. All correspondence will be strictly confidential.

You are a member of a group which exists to deal with one or more concerns, issues, or goals. As you respond to each of the items in this questionnaire, please keep in mind the group you are describing. Collaboration Identification:

L.I.F.E., R.S.C., or the F.A.C.E. Services Consortium

Please return the attached materials, to the address above, by October 20, 1997.

I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of completed responses. Please contact me if you have any questions, or desire further information regarding this research effort. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

Marlys A. Morton

Marlys A. Morton, LSW